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Abstract

Ecclesiology remains recognized as an underdeveloped area within the burgeoning field of Pentecostal theology, even as more voices are addressing it. This thesis explores the more significant proposals toward Pentecostal ecclesiology offered by various scholars, and then offers a constructive proposal: the church as the People of the manifest Presence of the Tri-une God. In this thesis, I propose to construct a distinct but ecumenically-friendly Pentecostal ecclesiology based upon the theological concept of the church as the People of God’s Presence. The church is constituted by the “manifest” presence of the Holy Spirit among people whom the Spirit gathers, empowers and sends out in mission to the world. This ecclesiology builds specifically upon the description of a “third-stream of Christian tradition” first offered by Bishop Lesslie Newbigin in 1952. It is this very concept of the “recognizable” presence of the Holy Spirit “with power” as the defining constitution of the church which should inform a uniquely Pentecostal ecclesiology. The distinctive manner in which Pentecostals would understand this constitutive presence of the Spirit in the Church is at the heart of this project, so that it may be a unifying concept for the movement, and one that has potential for mutual edification in ecumenical dialogue.
Such an understanding of the pneumatological basis for the church is represented well by the biblical image of the church as Temple of the Holy Spirit. An ecclesiology of the church as Temple is an effective way for Pentecostals to understand the marks of the church, its nature and its mission, order and ministries. This proposal is then briefly compared with other major church traditions, and is finally offered as a way in which Pentecostalism can both share and learn with and from these traditions toward greater confluence and cross-pollination, so that the Pentecostal church, as flawed as it may be, can contribute to the greater health of the whole church as the People of God’s Presence which powerfully loves the world God desires to save.
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Chapter 1
Pentecostal Ecclesiology as a Third-Stream

1 Introduction

As the global Pentecostal Movement enters its second century, there are two observable patterns occurring: one is that Pentecostalism continues to be one of the faster growing religious movements in recent history. Indeed, in his work on ecclesiology Roger Haight claims that “Pentecostalism is therefore fast becoming the dominant expression of Christianity and one of the most extraordinary religious phenomena in the world at any time.” The other pattern is that this growth is taking place in the two-thirds world, while the revival has crested in North America—the continent of its birthplace. In addition, as Pentecostalism has attracted the attention of other churches, academics and researchers, the movement is now perhaps under greater scrutiny.

The urgent need for Pentecostals to continue to construct and articulate their own ecclesiology is a vital part of their maturation process, in a diverse and fragmenting movement that faces the various challenges of evolving identities—both internally and toward those who

---


study or wish to engage it in dialogue or cooperation. On the one hand, Pentecostalism as a continued world-wide Christian phenomenon must have its own theology of the church to effectively deal with all the issues of rising significance on the global Christian and spiritual scene. On the other hand, if the revival desires to avoid the fate of other past revival movements, perhaps more formal articulation of an ecclesiology will be of benefit. This is particularly urgent given the theological divergence which exists even among Pentecostal scholars. Until very recently, however, this articulation around a theology of the church has been snail-like in its occurrence. Ecclesiology remains recognized as an underdeveloped area within the burgeoning field of Pentecostal theology, even as more voices are addressing it. This thesis is an attempt to explore the more significant proposals toward pentecostal ecclesiology which have been offered, and then offer a constructive proposal of my own: that of the church as the People of the manifest Presence of the Tri-une God.

It should be noted that for the purposes of this theological exploration, the subject, broadly-speaking, will be identified as the Classical Pentecostal movement, or those churches that identify themselves as having their direct heritage from the pentecostal revival that began in the early 1900’s.

The aim of this thesis, then, is to attempt to identify a viable option of what could make pentecostal ecclesiology distinctively pentecostal. Of equal importance, however, is to also explore constructively what shape or form a “Spirit-filled” doctrine of the church should take as this global, revival movement enters its second century and continues to mature.

Part of this exploration will thus necessitate a close examination of the contributions of other contemporary scholars whose work touches directly on this issue. Primary among these will be offerings by Lesslie Newbigin, Miroslav Volf and Simon Chan. Closely behind these are
other proposals on Pentecostal ecclesiology (most of which are in chapter or article form) from contemporary Pentecostal scholars such as Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, Frank Macchia, Wolfgang Vondey, Amos Yong, Peter Althouse, Shane Clifton, Steven Land and the late charismatic Baptist Clark Pinnock. While some important threads of similarity are found in these works, what is certainly more striking is their differences.

2 Thesis Statement

In this thesis, I propose to construct a distinct but ecumenically-friendly pentecostal ecclesiology based upon the theological concept of the church as the People of God’s Presence. The church is constituted by the “manifest” presence of the Holy Spirit among a people whom the Spirit gathers, empowers and sends out in mission to the world. This ecclesiology builds specifically upon the description of a “third-stream of Christian tradition” first offered by Bishop Lesslie Newbigin in 1952. Newbigin, of course, was not himself Pentecostal, yet in this particular lecture he reveals a keen ability to describe accurately a core distinctive of the Pentecostal movement and how it may be understood in the greater Christian Tradition. After treating both the Catholic and Protestant “streams” in previous lectures, Bishop Newbigin next turned to a type of church he perceptively entitled, “The Community of the Holy Spirit.” His introduction forms the heart of his description of it so he must be quoted at length:

It is necessary, however, to recognise that there is a third stream of Christian tradition which, though of course mingling at many points with the other two, has yet a distinct character of its own…Let me in a brief and preliminary way characterise this stream by saying that its central element is the conviction that the Christian life is a matter of the experienced power and presence of the Holy Spirit today; that neither orthodoxy of doctrine nor impeccability of succession can take the place of this; that an excessive emphasis upon those immutable elements in the Gospel upon
which orthodox Catholicism and Protestantism have concentrated may, and in fact often does, result in a Church which is a mere shell, having the form of a Church but not its life; that if we would answer the question “Where is the Church?”, we must ask ‘Where is the Holy Spirit recognisably present with power?...For want of a better word I propose to refer to this type of Christian faith and life as the Pentecostal.  

It is this very concept of the “recognizable” presence of the Holy Spirit “with power” as the defining constitution of the church that I wish to build upon in this thesis.

In doing so, this thesis seeks to identify a key characteristic which, firstly, can be claimed by all in the diverse, global Pentecostal movement, and secondly can be potentially utilized as the primary distinctive contribution this ‘third-stream’ offers to a contemporary theological understanding of the church. As Allan Anderson, a leading scholar on Pentecostalism, observes in his description of what is similar among otherwise diverse Pentecostal congregations around the world,

All demonstrate what Suurmond has called ‘the Word and Spirit at play’ where everyone has a contribution to make to the service, much like the creative combination of spontaneity and order in a jazz performance. All would emphasize the immediate presence of God in the service, all would expect some sign of miraculous intervention (often called the ‘gifts of the Spirit’), and would encourage congregational participation, especially in prayer and worship.  

---


5 Anderson, Introduction to Pentecostalism, 9 (emphasis mine). Anderson’s use of the word “immediate” would be questioned by some, and thus would have to be adequately qualified for the purposes of this dissertation, but can be understood to convey the palpability and immanence of God’s presence in the Pentecostal worship experience.
The distinctive manner in which Pentecostals would understand this constitutive presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church is at the heart of this project, so that it may be utilized as a unifying concept for the movement, and a concept that has potential for mutual edification in ecumenical dialogue.

While ecclesiology is recognized as underdeveloped in pentecostal theology, work in this area, if it seeks to be genuinely pentecostal, should adequately consider the strong restorationist character of Pentecostalism’s roots—specifically the belief that the Acts 2 Pentecost experience is a divine “reality” (as Simon Chan refers to it) operating today, and that the NT charismatic gifts are the primary means by which the church is made visible to the world today. Pentecostals are those who would believe the goal for an authentic Christian community is to restore the power, message, lifestyle and corporate practices of the original, Apostolic church. The only way to authentically be the same kind of church narrated in the Acts of the Apostles is to have the same kind of divine encounter with the Spirit of God that took place on the day of Pentecost. This is obviously where the Pentecostals gain their title. This restorationist view is itself ecclesiological, and so a contemporary attempt at pentecostal ecclesiological construction should in some way engage the inherent understanding of the church which fuelled the early leaders of the movement.

Since the NT apostolic church has historically been the goal or point of orientation for Pentecostals, the ecclesiological theme of Presence proposed in this dissertation will be facilitated by the NT image of the church as the Temple, a metaphor that has long been associated with ecclesiology but is thus far underdeveloped within pentecostal scholarship at a time when ecclesiology is currently a prominent issue. This image can be appropriated here to communicate scripturally in a very useful way the idea of the church as the people among whom
the manifest—or, as Newbigin states it, “recognizable”—presence of the Holy Spirit dwells and operates in a uniquely Pentecostal way. Another common identifying feature of Pentecostalism is the value placed upon the Bible as God’s authoritative revelation. Indeed, Pentecostals have been referred to proudly as “people of the Book.” Therefore, the utilization of the Temple image to symbolize the People of Presence is designed here to serve as a unifying motif for articulating pentecostal ecclesiology, scriptural as it is, within a diverse movement where varying ecclesiological options are currently found.

3 Context

The increased presence of Pentecostals in the global religious milieu has created a growing need for dialogue with other churches. For the purpose of greater awareness and understanding of pentecostal practices by others, to facilitate increased cooperation, and to assist Pentecostals in reflecting on their own self-identity and, by extension, their relationship with other groups, the development of pentecostal ecclesiology has the potential to be of no small value. Again, this development has been painfully slow in coming, but is currently one of the more widely-discussed issues in pentecostal theology today. For instance, on June 28-29 of 2010 a special conference was held at Bangor University in Wales on the topic: “Toward a Pentecostal Ecclesiology: Implications of the Five-fold Gospel – Constructive Theological Proposals.”

---


Leading pentecostal scholars from around the globe presented papers at this conference. Many of these scholars have already read papers or written chapters or articles on this topic within the last few years (see Primary Literature section of the Working Bibliography below). More academic work has been done on this specific topic within the last decade than in all the previous decades combined, yet full-length treatments of the subject are still rare to this point.

While some pentecostal scholars have looked to Volf’s *After Our Likeness* as the preferred option for the direction pentecostal ecclesiology might go (and thus requiring it to be critically examined in this proposed project), this work was not intended specifically to fulfill this purpose. Pentecostal scholar Wolfgang Vondey’s *People of Bread: Rediscovering Ecclesiology* is likewise also not aimed at producing a distinctly pentecostal contribution to ecclesiology. Shane Clifton’s dissertation on the Australian Assemblies of God is more of a historical/sociological analysis of the story of one specific denomination. Monographs on the subject are currently in progress by Simon Chan and Terry Cross, but are not yet published.

---

8 http://www.bangor.ac.uk/trs/confpentecostal.htm


Perhaps as significant for the purposes of this project, those rare textbooks on ecclesiology that have been written by Pentecostals, specifically the works of Melvin Hodges\textsuperscript{14} and L. Thomas Holdcroft\textsuperscript{15}, have failed to present this subject from a distinctly pentecostal perspective. Hocken noted in his dictionary article that former AGUSA General Superintendent Ernest E.S. Williams’ 3-volume \textit{Systematic Theology} “has no treatment of the church.”\textsuperscript{16} These examples serve to show the glaring lack of academic reflection in the movement’s history on what distinct contribution Pentecostals can offer theologically on the topic of the church, and why today’s scholars within the movement are now beginning to address it in earnest, though often as only part of larger projects. This past neglect, and current swell of attention to ecclesiology by Pentecostal scholars in smaller doses thus constitutes the \textit{status quaestionis} of the topic.

\textit{One of the most pressing questions that will need to be addressed from this exercise, then, is what might account for the widely-differing options among these pentecostal voices?} Indeed, pentecostal scholar Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen calls the state of pentecostal ecclesiology a “bewildering variety and mix of views.”\textsuperscript{17} It should be noted from the outset that the hope of this enterprise is not merely one of self-service to Pentecostalism itself, but ultimately to contribute to the movement’s ability to engage in further, constructive dialogue with other church traditions in a mutually edifying way.


\textsuperscript{15}L. Thomas Holdcroft, \textit{Ecclesiology: Christ’s Treasure on Earth} (Clayburn, BC: CeePiCC, 1992).

\textsuperscript{16}Hocken, “Church, Theology of the,” 214.

\textsuperscript{17}Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, “The Church as the Fellowship of Persons: An Emerging Pentecostal Ecclesiology of \textit{Koinonia},” in \\textit{PentecoStudies}, vol. 6, no. 1, 2007, 1.
4 Research Question

*Can a distinctly global, pentecostal ecclesiology be articulated, and if so, on what could it be centered or constructed?* Is it possible to suggest a distinct pentecostal understanding of the church when there are ecclesiological proposals offered by pentecostal scholars that span across the spectrum? Is there an ecclesiology, or ecclesiological principle, that can capture the essence of Pentecostalism and still accommodate the amazing variety of governances and cultural expressions found within the movement (in other words, its character of diversity)? In so doing, what methodology(ies) could be used to construct a pentecostal ecclesiology that could be broad in scope and application? And, to what end have existing suggestions been effective or helpful towards this theological task?

5 Broader Setting

The unique history as well as the diversity of the global pentecostal movement, its character as a movement of praxis over intellectual theologizing, its past self-association with Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism in North America, the varying theological influences of its current scholars, the widely-differing forms of governance and polity existing among pentecostal denominations, and the formal dialogues held with other church traditions have all contributed to the existence of varying proposals as to which direction pentecostal ecclesiology should go. As mentioned, this ecclesiological proposal also must take into account that, at a time when the attention of pentecostal scholars toward ecclesiology is more acute than it has ever been, this surprisingly wide variety of proposals is being offered. Additionally, this proposal comes at a
time when pentecostals in North America are experiencing what is invariably being termed an “identity crisis,” which is brought on in part by the contextual and theological challenges to traditional pentecostal distinctives (i.e., Spirit-baptism & glossolalia as initial evidence). In particular, the blurring of distinctions between Pentecostalism and the charismatic movement in older traditions, the “Third Wave,” and the so called “new churches” (i.e. Seeker-sensitive, Purpose-Driven, and Emergent) or what is now being termed “generic evangelicalism” are necessitating a timely impetus for fresh theological probing into pentecostal beliefs and identity.

6 Procedure

This first chapter introduces the thesis and the setting which calls for its need. I will argue that Pentecostalism should not be considered merely a sub-set of evangelicalism, as earlier pentecostal writers on the church assumed (i.e. L. Thomas Holdcroft & Melvin Hodges), nor merely an assumed form of Free Church (contra John Howard Yoder, as expressed in Durnbaugh and Rasmussen), even though many pentecostal pioneers came out of this background. These ecclesiological categorizations simply do not sufficiently account for the widely-varying forms of polity found within the Movement.

18 This is such that the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (PAOC) has currently implemented a Theological Study Commission to explore issues affecting Pentecostal identity. Representative of these concerns is the paper by Dr. Van Johnson, abruptly holding the document name of “PentIdentity DefnEsc-Johnson-03-10[1].”, particularly page 1.

19 For instance, see Sam Reimer, “A Generic Evangelicalism? Comparing Evangelical Subcultures in Canada and the United States”, Ch 12 of David Lyon & Margaret Van Die, eds. Rethinking Church, State and Modernity: Canada between Europe and America (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 228-245.


21 Arne Rasmussen, The Church as Polis: From Political Theology to Theological Politics as Exemplified by Jurgen Molitmann and Stanley Hauerwas (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 19.
Chapter Two will examine the history of Pentecostalism as a Restorationist movement that sought to return back to the apostolic church of Acts (and the NT), particularly with the apostolic practices of speaking in tongues, the charismatic gifts, divine healing, and Spirit-empowered evangelization and missions. This “primitivist” or restorationist impulse will signal the ecclesiological roots of the earliest period of the movement, which is still valued in at least one high office of pentecostal leadership today. As George Wood, General Superintendent of Assemblies of God U.S.A. recently wrote:

Pentecostalism, at its roots, is basically a restorationist movement. We believe that we can cut through twenty centuries of church tradition and get back to the original church. It doesn’t mean that we do everything like the original church, but we’re trying to have the same doctrine and experience of the Early Church… That’s what Pentecostalism, in its purist form, tries to do. It tries to erase the smudges on the church for the last twenty centuries and get back to what the early Christians believed and practiced. That is our goal—to get back to biblical, original Christianity.22

Through this historical sounding, I will be able to compare the thesis of Church as People of Presence with the ‘traditional’ Pentecostal identity as a restoration of the Upper-room experience and the charismatic gifts.

Chapter Three will examine the contemporary, pentecostal scholarly landscape as described above with regards to proposals and contributions. This survey will be limited to the work of ten scholars, preceded by a unique proto-pentecostal ecclesiology offered by the Quaker/Holiness writer Seth Rees. The scholars are Miroslav Volf, Simon Chan, Amos Yong.

Frank Macchia, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, Shane Clifton, Wolfgang Vondey, Peter Althouse, Steven Land and Clark Pinnock.

In Chapter Four, a theology of the church as the People of God’s Presence will be examined biblically and theologically. Biblically, the manner in which the presence of God operates within creation and God’s people will be briefly surveyed. Theologically, a constructive proposal stemming from the image of the church as the Temple of the Holy Spirit will be developed. Out of this proposal, I will explore the influence of this theology of the Presence of God upon the order, structure, functions, marks, and ministries of the church from a pentecostal perspective.

Chapter Five will, by way of conclusion, look at the ecumenical potential of this constructive proposal, using the major report of the Reformed/Pentecostal dialogue: *Word and Spirit, Church and World* as a reference point. The outcome reported in this and the Roman Catholic/Pentecostal dialogue documents are telling for how pentecostals situate themselves theologically in relation to two other streams of the Church at a time when the movement is seen to be passing from adolescence into adulthood. In the area of ecumenism and in terms of self-identity, this concluding chapter will briefly draw out the implications from this study of a distinct pentecostal theology of the church.

---

7 Why?

The primary question this work seeks to address is, “is there such a thing as a Pentecostal Ecclesiology?” This question is equal parts valid, interesting and pressing. The paucity of work on ecclesiology by pentecostals has been noted at several points. Zachary Tackett, for instance, recently stated “Ecclesiology has not been a priority for Pentecostals. Ecclesiology has been either ignored or only minimally recognized.”

Or, as pentecostal scholar Peter Althouse also recently observed, “As a rule, Pentecostals have been slow in their reflection and development of a Pentecostal ecclesiology, instead focusing on the pragmatics of church life and ministry at the local level.” While this has dramatically changed over the last decade, precious few full-length treatments of the subject yet exist.

Several factors converge in marking the question of pentecostal ecclesiology as necessary to address. In terms of polity, it is well-noted that Pentecostal churches & denominations employ greatly varying governance models, ranging “all the way from semi-Episcopalian to an extremely Congregational form of government” as Canadian author Gordon Atter puts it. Or, as South Africans Matthew Clark and Henry Lederle similarly observe in reverse, “Pentecostal church structures run the gamut from ultra-congregationalist to groups that are so centralized as to be positively Episcopal in their functioning.” Historically, the movement came from

---


sectarian origins, to the formation of its own churches and colleges, to identification with evangelicalism, to the institutionalism and identity-crisis currently being experienced in North America. In terms of global presence, Pentecostalism continues to grow rapidly around the world, particularly in Africa, Asia and Latin America.  

Of particular curiosity is the question posed by Paul D. Lee in his own dissertation on the pentecostal/Catholic dialogue:

What is meant by calling Pentecostalism a “movement” and not a denomination? If it is a movement, is it useful or valid to talk about ecclesiology at all? What would ecclesiology mean to a Pentecostal? If the Pentecostal movement is a cluster of denominations of various origins and theologies, who or which denomination(s), then, can officially represent the movement? These are crucial questions which call for clarification.

Crucial, yes, and all the more so as the ‘movement’ continues to grow around the world, yet falter on the continent in which it began; crucial also as pentecostal scholarship continues to blossom rapidly, and both formal dialogue and informal association with other ecclesiologies occurs. Pentecostal scholar Steven Land had already articulated the need to answer the questions Lee raises beforehand, stating the following:

A fourth set of issues clusters around the doctrine of the church. Pentecostals have been clear enough in their rejection of institutionalism but have failed to produce a viable ecclesiology which could allow for ongoing change and debate without schisms. A polity for the development of consensus has yet to be constructed…Some way must be found to talk and study with the

28 This is statistically attested to in Barrett, Kurian, & Johnson, eds. World Christian Encyclopedia, 4-9, and cited in several other sources.

Independent and Oneness groups; this is vital for Pentecostal self-understanding as well as the reunifying of the movement. Can Pentecostals, among themselves and in dialog with other churches, discover another model for ecumenical discussion, development and mission?  

This chapter will thus introduce the theological context and issues surrounding the lack of a pentecostal ecclesiology, as well as identify the framework for addressing Land’s question about “another model” for ecclesiology that is viably pentecostal, and helpful for what he calls ecumenical discussion, development, and mission.

8 “Third-Article Ecclesiology”

One of the most significant contributions a distinctly pentecostal ecclesiology can offer is to articulate the role and activity of the Holy Spirit in the Church in perhaps a more full-orbed way than is often done. Indeed, a pneumatological ecclesiology is something that has garnered a great deal more attention among theologians among various stripes since Vatican II, but is still a work in development. Well after Vatican II, the former Archbishop of Canterbury Michael Ramsay observed:

There is room for an ecclesiology which gives the Spirit a greater place than much of the familiar ecclesiology in the West has done. In the West a Christological understanding of the Church has prevailed, and it has been possible to concentrate upon the concept of the Body of Christ in such a way as to suggest a rather static and institutionalized doctrine. But while indeed the Church’s sacramental and apostolic order witnesses to the historical givenness of gospel and Church, there is need to remember the continuing lively action of the Spirit whereby alone the believers are Christ’s body. The many charismata shared among the Church’s members are not

personal qualities or possessions so much as constant actions of the Spirit in which the liveliness of God touches human lives. In every epoch the Spirit is invading ruach as well as indwelling pneuma.\textsuperscript{31}

A pentecostal ecclesiology is one that has the potential to communicate the “lively action of the Spirit” within the Body of Christ in a fully-orthodox manner that has been still lacking. Consider as well the similar observation by Roman Catholic charismatic Peter Hocken:

…theologians and scholars have not done justice to the ecclesiological implications of Pentecost. For different reasons, the pentecostals and the charismatics (whether mainline or restorationist) have not elaborated a theology of the church that captures the distinctive thrust of this outpouring of the Spirit and that manifests the scope of its challenge to received ecclesiologies. The pentecostals have not done so-in part because their forte has been action, not reflective theology, in part, perhaps, through a Protestant fear that focus on the church diminishes the focus on Christ.\textsuperscript{32}

This dissertation, then, is aimed toward contributing a step towards elaborating such an ecclesiology that will “capture the distinctive thrust” of the Spirit’s outpouring in such a manner that “manifests the scope of its challenge to received ecclesiologies.”

Furthermore, charismatic Baptist theologian Clark Pinnock has also addressed the need for a pentecostal ecclesiology, stating:

(on the one hand) evangelicals neglect it [ecclesiology] mightily doing little justice to it, while (on the other hand) pentecostals live out a model of church that has the promise of transforming

\textsuperscript{31} Michael Ramsey, \textit{Holy Spirit} (London: SPCK, 1977), pp. 127-8. Archbishop Ramsey goes on to discuss the pentecostal distinctive of glossolalia as legitimate, but briefly questions exegetical and theological foundations for its pentecostal articulation as the initial evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

\textsuperscript{32} Peter Hocken, “Church, Theology of the” in \textit{The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements}, revised and expanded (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 550.
Christianity but without doing the theology of church. We both need to work on our doctrine of
curch: the evangelicals because the doctrine of the church has become insipid and the pentecostals
because they have not offered much by way of theological understanding.  

Pinnock observes that evangelicals are in need of more pentecostal theology on the church so
that they might be transformed as a result. The relationship between evangelicalism and
Pentecostalism is one impacting issue that will be explored below as it pertains to the historical
development, or lack thereof, of a distinctly pentecostal understanding of the church.

9 The Third Stream (or fourth)

Pentecostalism has historically been identified as the “Third Force” within Christendom,
following Catholicism and Protestantism. As we have noted, Bishop Newbigin used a similar
scheme in The Household of God, calling it “a third stream of Christian tradition which, though
of course mingling at many points with the other two, has yet a distinct character of its own.”
Let me return to the logic of his lecture as he builds the case for this distinction.

Newbigin uses the first part of his lecture to draw attention to the abundant biblical
evidence, not only in Acts (though mostly here) but also throughout the writings of Paul, in 1

address given at the annual meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Virginia Beach, March 11th, 2005.

Eastern Orthodoxy fits into this particular scheme! For this reason, Steven Land instead helpfully suggests
Pentecostalism may be regarded as a ‘fourth force’ (as opposed to the usual ‘third force’ designation) in
Christianity”, 20.

35 Newbigin, Household of God, 87-88.
John, Matthew and including a reference from Hebrews to show how the experience of the Spirit was central to the NT self-understanding of their corporate identity. Indeed, for Newbigin, the “New Testament writers…regard the gift of the Holy Spirit as an event which can be unmistakably recognised, and they treat it as the determinative and decisive thing by which the Church is constituted.” He goes on to emphasize the “decisive place given in the New Testament doctrine of the Church to this experienced reality of the Holy Spirit’s presence.” Then he adds, “…what I have called the Pentecostal Christian has the New Testament on his side when he demands first of all of any body of so-called Christians, ‘Do you have the Holy Spirit? For without that all your creedal orthodoxy and all your historic succession avails you nothing.”

Newbigin felt that the reception of this teaching was essential to the Christian identity when he further writes, “It is surely necessary to insist that only by the fullest acknowledgement of this truth do we truly acknowledge the lordship of Christ in His Church.” His presentation for the scriptural validity of this ‘third stream’ leaves no middle ground by way of response. This challenge issued to the older traditions could not have been more forthright had it come from a Pentecostal herself.

The second part of his lecture clarifies the purpose for this challenge. As one primarily concerned with the success of the ecumenical movement, he perceived the inclusion of this third

36 Newbigin, Household of God, 91.
37 Newbigin, Household of God, 92.
38 Newbigin, Household of God, 92.
39 Newbigin, Household of God, 92-93.
stream as an ecclesiology in its own right at the ecumenical table to be utterly necessary. He states, “It will be clear from what I have said that I believe that the Catholic-Protestant debate which has characterized the ecumenical movement needs to be criticized and supplemented from what I have called the Pentecostal angle, that in fact the debate has to become three-cornered.”

For him, the true catholicity—or what he termed “wholeness”—of the Christian church absolutely required this third element to be present.

Another reason for his championing the “third-stream” was the concern he bore for the mission or the witness of the church as well. So he reminds his listeners:

When the risen Lord bestowed the apostolic commission upon the Church and empowered it to continue His mission, the very heart of His act lay in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit…It is as anointed with His Spirit that they are bearers of His commission, and in no other way…Indeed, as we have seen, the Holy Spirit is Himself the primary and essential witness, and it is only His presence in the disciples which makes it possible for them truly to witness to Him.

The place of witness or mission in Newbigin’s own ecclesiology becomes clearer in the third part of his lecture when he discusses at length the doctrine of election. At the risk of oversimplification, the church is elected to be sent. The doctrine of election has an intrinsic missionary character, and therefore is inextricably linked to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

In the fourth and final part of his lecture, Newbigin tempers his pentecostal thrust with warnings against such nasty by-products of the movement as enthusiasm, sectarianism, and

---

“blatant self-righteousness.” He reminds his listeners of the true marks or fruit of the Spirit’s genuine presence: unity, true fellowship, and love. Finally, he renews his call to both the Catholic & Protestant participants in the ecumenical dialogue, and to Pentecostals who are “largely outside of it” to be willing to come together for their mutual benefit. 43

Throughout the lecture, Newbigin repeatedly draws attention to two theological matters which must be reckoned with. One is the cooperation with which the Holy Spirit works with the Risen Lord Jesus Christ, and with the Father to build His true church. This is exemplified by such statements as, “God’s gift of the Holy Spirit is inseparably linked by the double bond of word and sacrament to His work of redemption in Christ finished once for all in the time of Pontius Pilate.” 44 It is crucial that such a trinitarian framework undergirds the ecclesiology of “The Community of the Holy Spirit.”

Secondly, he stresses the “pentecostal reality” of the tangible manifestation of the Spirit’s presence in human lives as an ecclesiological principle in its own right. This is Newbigin’s most original contribution to ecclesiological construction. The Bishop expresses it in the following manner:

…the Church lives neither by her faithfulness to her message nor by her abiding in one fellowship with the apostles; she lives by the living power of the Spirit of God…Therefore it is only by the living power of the same Holy Spirit that we can either abide in His fellowship or bear witness to His grace. All that is done without Him is mere counterfeit, an empty shell, having the form of a Church but not its life. We must face the fact that this can happen, that a body may have all the outward form of a Church, and preach the true doctrine of the Church, and yet be dead; and on the other hand, that the living Spirit can and does give His own life to bodies which lack in some

__________________________

43 Newbigin, Household of God, 103-110.

manner and measure the fullness of the Church’s true order and teaching. And when He does so, when we are confronted with manifest tokens of the Spirit’s presence, we must, as the apostles did, accept the fact.⁴⁵

Many contemporary ecclesiologies have some understanding of the Spirit’s presence in the Church, even as that which itself constitutes the church. However, what Newbigin means by the Spirit’s “presence” is not something formalized primarily through *epiclesis*, or represented solely by the act of preaching. He is instead referring to “the pentecostal reality” of infilling power from on high. He is indeed speaking of a concrete experience that is visibly recognized and neither produced nor controlled by human or structured means. This theology of Spirit-presence as the “living power” which is “the determinative and decisive thing by which the Church is constituted” truly represents a unique, “third-stream” ecclesiology which can form the core principle from which a distinctly pentecostal doctrine of the church is constructed. What I am putting forward here is simply that Newbigin captures the essence of what constitutes the church from a Pentecostal understanding in a manner that no one else quite has. This present work will take up the challenge issued by Fr. Hocken to use Newbigin’s “third-stream” typology as the foundation or baseline for evaluating options for a truly pentecostal ecclesiology, and will further seek to exploit his theology of Spirit-presence as the main principal or model for a truly pentecostal ecclesiology. Therefore, this fundamentally entails understanding Pentecostalism ecclesiologically as a distinct kind of church on its own. As Clark and Lederle affirm, “It is

necesary thus for us to consider Pentecost apart from either of the two great religious streams of the Christian West, and to compare its norms to the other two.”

10 Temple of the Spirit

Ecclesiologies are often articulated around the images or metaphors given to describe the church in the NT. The “People of God” and the “Body of Christ” images have been the most prevalent, particularly in both Catholic and Reformed circles. A biblical image that is perhaps most conducive to conveying the pentecostal understanding of the church would be the image of the Temple. The Temple, as one recalls from the OT narrative, represents the place of God’s dwelling, or His Presence among His chosen people. St. Paul then transfers this image (before the destruction of Jerusalem’s second Temple in 70 AD) on to the church, communicating that now the ecclesia is manifestly where the Presence of God, located in the person of the Holy Spirit, operates in a manner that is nothing less than a constituting or defining reality for the identity of this community. So Paul Minear, in his classic Images of the Church in the New Testament, observes,

Perhaps because of long associations between the temple and the Spirit, the New Testament pictured the temple as a dwelling place of the Spirit. Where God’s spirit is, there is the temple. It may also have been this nuance which enabled Paul to speak of the body of each believer as a temple (1 Cor. 6:19) without excluding the idea that every congregation is also a temple (ch. 3:16-17) and without excluding the vision of the whole church as a temple (Eph. 2:21). The applicability of the image to all three areas derives from the presence of the Holy Spirit.

---

46 Clark & Lederle, What is distinctive about Pentecostal Theology?, 63.
Thus, the Temple of the Holy Spirit, I will propose, while not eclipsing the other biblical metaphors, stands as an appropriate option for imaging the church from a distinctly pentecostal perspective, and can greatly assist in depicting a theology of Presence that captures the heart of ecclesiology for Pentecostalism, in all its diversity. Just as corpus Christi has informed and relayed Catholic ecclesiology, the Temple can be shown to do the same for Pentecostals in a manner that has yet to be utilized.

11 What Kind of Church?

One of the issues in locating Pentecostalism ecclesiologically has been the associations developed between Pentecostal denominations and churches with other Christian movements, such as fundamentalism, evangelicalism, or, more recently, the methodologies of the “new churches.” Whereas Newbigin situated it as a Third-Stream alongside, yet distinct from, Catholicism and Protestantism, others even within the movement have oriented it quite differently. For a long time, for instance, Pentecostalism was presented theologically as a sub-set within Evangelicalism. This point is significant here in that it is demonstrated most starkly in books authored by classical pentecostals on the subject of the church. A perfect example would be A Theology of the Church and Its Mission: A Pentecostal Perspective by Assemblies of God clergy Melvin L. Hodges, and published in 1977. As the full title indicates, this book, which Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen calls a “classic,” and “the only substantial contribution” by a Pentecostal
on ecclesiology⁴⁸, purports to be a treatment of the doctrine of the church from a classical Pentecostal viewpoint. Yet, there is very little in the way of a uniquely Pentecostal perspective offered in its pages.

Hodges outlines the “basics to be emphasized in relationship to a Pentecostal theology of missions: The Authority of the Scriptures, The Centrality of Christ, The Dynamics of the Holy Spirit, the Lostness of Mankind Apart From Saving Grace, and the Instrumentality of the Church.”⁴⁹ As he immediately comments, however, “These are fundamentals that we hold in common with other evangelicals.”⁵⁰ Indeed, other than possibly the Dynamic of the Holy Spirit, this list could just as easily come from Donald Bloesch, or Billy Graham. What is instantly recognized from the first paragraphs of this “Pentecostal perspective,” and confirmed throughout the book, is that it assumes Pentecostalism is merely synonymous with evangelicalism and/or fundamentalism. Indeed, the Pentecostal distinctives are given surprisingly little treatment in the book, and are not treated as that which forms the Church’s essence. This is reflective of a key historical development within Pentecostalism, at least on the continent in which it was born: after being rejected by mainline churches, and in reaction to liberalism, Pentecostals aligned themselves with the Fundamentalists in an attempt to prove their Christian, “orthodox” identity. It is from this influence, then, that Hodges writes.

Let me quickly add, however, that what is constructive in Hodges is his emphasis on the Mission of the Church as central to Pentecostalism. He states, “the principal task of the Church

---

⁵⁰ Hodges, A Theology of the Church, 9.
is to extend the dominion of Christ in the hearts of men everywhere by effecting their joyful
acknowledgement of Him as their Saviour and Lord.”51 Elsewhere, he concludes, “Our
responsibility is to persuade men to turn from darkness to light and from empty forms of religion
to the vital power of God’s salvation.”52 Hodges fleshes out this mission by helpfully
distinguishing between “true evangelism” and proselytism. He also treats the subject of the
priority of evangelism over mere social concern in a balanced manner. It is also on the subject of
mission that Hodges does teach the significance of the Spirit’s empowerment for the Church.
Like a majestic anthem, he passionately proclaims:

We dare to believe that the Holy Spirit in His church is mightier than all the forces of the
world combined. As long as the Church is in the world we can expect the Holy Spirit to guide and
empower it. The task Jesus gave the Church to preach the gospel to every creature and to all
nations is still with us and must be carried out. But this task must be fulfilled in the power of the
Holy Spirit, for it is the Holy Spirit who imparts life; it is the Holy Spirit who provides the
motivation – the love of God shed abroad in our hearts. It is the Holy Spirit that calls men both to
accept Christ and afterwards to serve Him. This same Holy Spirit imparts gifts and ministries and
the power with which to perform the tasks. He gives wisdom and vision for the work of God far
beyond the capacities of the human intellect.53

While other, far more sophisticated ecclesiologies, even pneumatologically-oriented
ones, can get lost on the structures and forms of the church at the expense of emphasizing the
church’s mission to herald the gospel, Hodges certainly provides a missional ecclesiology that is
not only useful to evangelicals, but crucial to theological reflection toward an ecclesiology for

51 Hodges, A Theology of the Church, 70.
52 Hodges, A Theology of the Church, 97.
53 Hodges, A Theology of the Church, 172.
one of Christianity’s greater missionary movements over the last one hundred years. Indeed, he boldly asserts, “The Pentecostal missionary movement is prospering for the very reason that it is Pentecostal.” For Hodges, the Holy Spirit who is “the life of the Church” propels it in the task of being a global witness to the person and work of Jesus Christ by endowing the church with power in the same manner He promised in Acts 1:5.

This emphasis on the necessity of Pentecost for the contemporary church’s mission is a valuable contribution by Hodges toward a Pentecostal theology of the church, and one I wish to continue to glean from more at a later point. However, it is not substantial enough in the context of the book’s entirety to distinguish it sufficiently from broader evangelicalism. In reality, this does not even appear to have been Hodges’ primary aim, despite what the book’s title might indicate.

L. Thomas Holdcroft’s Ecclesiology: Christ’s Treasure on Earth (1992) is another example of a textbook on the subject written by a classical Pentecostal which bears absolutely no marks of a distinctly pentecostal view of the church. Holdcroft taught for many years at a PAOC bible college in western Canada, and this work served as his notes for his course on the subject. Within its more than 130 pages, there is not even a single mention of Pentecostalism, spiritual gifts, or glossolalia. Somehow, for Holdcroft, Pentecostalism and its distinctives apparently had no relevance whatsoever when teaching on the doctrine of the church. It can be speculated that the explanation for this is that Holdcroft operated out of a similar view to Hodges—only more

54 Hodges, A Theology of the Church, 35.
55 Hodges, A Theology of the Church, 171.
so—that pentecostals were subsumed under Protestant evangelicalism, and therefore did not offer anything distinct to ecclesiology as a category of dogmatics or systematics.

Russell Spittler’s booklet, *The Church*, published by the Assemblies of God (AoG) Gospel Publishing House and written for Christian education purposes, also does not present a distinctly pentecostal view of ecclesiology, other than presenting divine healing and the baptism of the Holy Spirit as parts of the message of the Church to human beings. While this is certainly a Full Gospel approach, it takes up less than five full pages out of the 125 total written. In the historical survey section, he does devote two pages to Pentecostalism; and among his six points on it, one does state that “Pentecostalism is not the same as Fundamentalism.” However, given the generic nature of this work as a whole, Spittler’s approach would appear to yet again be evidence of an inherent ecclesiological understanding of Pentecostalism as an add-on, however important, to Protestant evangelicalism.

A similar verdict could be reached with Pentecostal Myer Pearlman’s classic doctrinal textbook, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible* (1937), also published by the AoG Gospel Publishing House. Pearlman’s chapter on the Church, covering some twenty pages, also has only one paragraph treating charismatic gifts, in the historical context of Corinthian worship. The rest is a fairly generic systematic treatment of ecclesiology, with none of the Pentecostal distinctives brought into view, other than a historical emphasis on the NT church as the ideal. Once more, the underlying assumption appears to be that the Pentecostal distinctives have little

57 Spittler, *The Church*, 122-123.
58 Spittler, *The Church*, 123, italics his.
bearing on the doctrine of the church, which is influenced far more by Protestant evangelicalism, flavored with primitivism.

This trend is also found in another systematic theology textbook, *Foundations in Pentecostal Theology*, authored by Foursquare Church teachers Guy Duffield and Nathaniel Van Cleave and published by the Foursquare Bible College in Los Angeles (1983). Not unlike Pearlman, the lengthy chapter on ecclesiology barely mentions Pentecostalism or its distinctives. It focuses on the NT church through standard, systematic treatments on the terms, officers, ministries, ordinances, and biblical metaphors. There is a passing call for “Spirit-directed organization” to help the Church carry out her mission, as well as the brief statement that, “In much pentecostal preaching, the spirit of prophecy is manifest.” But the foundational definition of the Church as “the Divinely-constituted body through which the Gospel is preached and believers are nurtured” is hardly characteristic of a “third-stream” ecclesiology. Instead, it appears to be yet another example of an adopted self-understanding that Pentecostals simply imbibe a Protestant, evangelical understanding of the church.

Thankfully, this characterization has been challenged by none other than Walter Hollenweger, who is an icon in pentecostal studies. He applauds those scholars within the movement who are, as I am here, attempting to avoid this trap:

---

59 “Foursquare Church” is the common name for the *International Church of the Foursquare Gospel*, another classical pentecostal denomination in North America, founded by notable Pentecostal leader Aimee Semple MacPherson.


There is a critical awakening among pentecostal scholars, who fight the notion that Pentecostalism is Evangelicalism plus something; Evangelicalism plus fire, or dedication, missionary success, speaking in tongues or gifts of healing…Pentecostalism is a denomination *sui generis*, and not just another variation of Protestantism or Evangelicalism. Its roots in the oral traditions of African American slaves or the oral *mestizo* tradition of Latin America, in the Catholic tradition of Wesley, in the Evangelical tradition of the North American Holiness movement (with its far-reaching political, social and ecumenical programmes), in the critical tradition of both the Holiness movement and critical western theology, and in the ecumenical tradition—all this qualifies Pentecostalism as a movement which is not just a sub-division of Evangelicalism, even if the official statements of Pentecostalism mostly use out-dated concepts of the turn of the century and sometimes give the impression of a form of Evangelicalism.63

Another characterization of Pentecostalism ecclesiologically has been to perceive it as one of the groups within the Free Church or Believer’s Church tradition.64 This is demonstrated, for instance, when Arne Rasmusson writes in *The Church as Polis*, “In the widest sense church groups like Baptists, Brethren, Mennonites, Methodists, Quakers, Pentecostals, Pietists, and others could be mentioned as being part of the Believers’ Church tradition.”65 Many years earlier, Donald Durnbaugh also stated in his classic *The Believer’s Church*, “The case has been made that the best expression of the Believer’s Church in recent times is found in Pentecostalism.”66


64 In the two examples I will cite where this is explicitly the case, one (Arne Rasmusson) uses both these terms synonymously, whereas the other (Donald Durnbaugh) argues firmly and at length that “Believers Church” is a far more appropriate term than “Free Church”. Volf, however, uses the term “Free Church” in his *After Our Likeness*. I will opt not to engage this semantical debate but will, like Rasmusson, use both terms interchangeably.

65 Rasmusson, *Church as Polis*, 19.

What is interesting is that both these points of reference are made in connection with the work of John Howard Yoder, at two different time periods. In both cases, Pentecostalism as a Believers’ Church is being compared ecclesiologically with Anabaptism, or the Radical Reformation. This was the observation of Yoder. Durnbaugh states it more explicitly:

John Howard Yoder, Mennonite theologian, puts the movement within the context of the Radical Reformation. “Pentecostalism is in our century the closest parallel to what Anabaptism was in the sixteenth; expanding so vigorously that it bursts the bonds of its own thinking about church order, living from the multiple gifts of the spirit in the total church while holding leaders in great respect, unembarrassed by the language of the laymen and the aesthetic tastes of the poor, mobile, zealously single-minded”. Flaws can easily be noted in the movement, he admits, but “meanwhile, they are out being the Church.”

The connection between Pentecostalism and the Radical Reformation is also noted by Clark and Lederle, through another writer and apparently apart from Yoder. They put it in the following manner:

It may be argued that Pentecostalism finds its historical roots (as far as European Church history is concerned) in the radical reformation. This would be so because the radical reformers pursued the same aim as the Pentecostals have – a return to the Spirit and power of the original Christian community of the Lukan account in Acts – as opposed to mere reformation of structures, manners and doctrines. In this sense Pentecost is as revolutionary as the radical reformation (Turner 1985:18).

---

67 Durnbaugh, Believers Church, 174.
68 Clark & Lederle, et al, Pentecostal Theology, 64.
Like the South African Pentecostal scholars, both Rasmusson and Durnbaugh would seem to take this comparison seriously, although Durnbaugh goes on to voice a counterpoint to it:

Arguing against their inclusion into the present discussion is the fact that the Pentecostalists have issued in large part from denominations already portrayed, specifically the Methodists and the Baptists. In doctrinal position and church polity they parallel the Baptists. The large number of separate movements encompassed by Pentecostalism, and their presence in many countries, while attesting their validity, make difficult a succinct description. Of their importance, few informed observers would dispute.\(^69\)

Either way, the characterization is clear enough. Ecclesiologically, the movement is best understood as a sub-set of the Believers’ Church category. Indeed, even where Clark and Lederle attempt to articulate a distinctly Pentecostal model of the Church, they curiously end up concluding, “Where this model is upheld, the question “where is the church?” may be answered “where there are believers”.”\(^70\) Note how these Pentecostals answer this question differently than does Newbigin, who, as quoted earlier, said from a pentecostal perspective, “if we would answer the question ‘Where is the Church?’ we must ask ‘Where is the Holy Spirit recognizably present with power?’”

---

\(^69\) Durnbaugh, *Believers Church*, 174-175.

\(^70\) Clark & Lederle, *et al*, *Pentecostal Theology*, 67.
Durnbaugh, however, despite characterizing it as a Believers’ Church, is much more sophisticated in the precise location of Pentecostalism within this category, as best seen in his ingenious diagram shown below.\(^\text{71}\)

This complex illustration manages to identify several key ecclesiological characteristics of various churches, including Pentecostal. What is most relevant for our purposes here is that Pentecostalism is placed on the Believer’s Church side of the triangle as opposed to Classical Protestantism or Catholicism. It is also classed as more individualistic than institutional, and more mystical than Word or Tradition based. Finally, the movement is deemed to be a sect-type

\(^{71}\) Durnbaugh, *Believers Church*, 31.
rather than a church-type. This multi-dimensional appraisal of where the movement fits into a specific, sophisticated ecclesiological rubric warrants further evaluation.

Also crucial to note, relating to this last point about the sect-type, is that Durnbaugh draws partially upon Newbigin’s “third-stream” typology to formulate his own categories here. After a lengthy section building a definition for the Believers’ Church, he concludes, “It will be seen that Dun-Newbigin’s third category—the fellowship of the Spirit—has affinities with the sect type as defined by Troeltsch. By fusing these two categories, one comes close to an adequate description of the Believer’s Churches.”\(^72\) It is under such a rubric, then, that Durnbaugh places Pentecostalism in this sect-type category of Believers’ Church.

Durnbaugh also later acknowledges Newbigin’s characterization of Pentecostalism as a third-stream ecclesiology through the voice of another authority who helped to popularize it:

The case has been made that the best expression of the Believer’s Church in recent times is found in Pentecostalism. In 1958 Henry P. Van Dusen, the highly respected president of Union Theological Seminary, sounded this note in an article in a mass circulation periodical. The Pentecostalist movement, he insisted, was a third force standing on an equal basis with Protestantism and Roman Catholicism and more vigorous than either. It was a “third, mighty arm of Christendom” upon which middle-class Christianity could no longer gaze down their noses. In an interview he put it more forcefully: “I have come to feel that the Pentecostal movement with its emphasis upon the Holy Spirit, is more than just another revival….It is a revolution comparable in importance with the establishment of the original Apostolic Church and with the Protestant Reformation.”\(^73\)

---


\(^73\) Ibid., 173-174. The article to which Durnbaugh refers was published in *Life* magazine, June 9, 1958. The interview quote is taken from John L. Sherill, *They Speak with Other Tongues* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964), 27.
It will be observed, however, that even in this important acknowledgement of a “third-arm” classification, Durnbaugh himself still ultimately categorizes the movement as an “expression of the Believers’ Church.” While this unquestionably has validity, the question here is whether or not it is the best manner in which Pentecostals may articulate their own ecclesiological self-understanding. Can the movement be, as Newbigin and Van Dusen suggested, a third-force “on an equal basis with Protestantism and Roman Catholicism” and yet simultaneously still be understood as one of many groups under the Believers’ Church banner? Is Durnbaugh correct that, in doctrine and polity, Pentecostalism merely parallels the Baptists?

As I shall explore in greater depth later, this last question has become particularly pertinent because of the response to Miroslav Volf’s significant work, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*, by scholars concerned with pentecostal ecclesiology. Because of Volf’s Pentecostal background (he is the son of a Pentecostal minister and held membership in the Pentecostal denomination, the Evangelical Church of Croatia, when this book was penned)⁷⁴, this work has received no little attention by both Pentecostal scholars and charismatic scholars of Pentecostalism. In *After Our Likeness*, Volf builds the case for a Free Church ecclesiology by way of a communion methodology, in conversation with the Orthodox John Zizioulas (*Being as Communion*), Roman Catholic Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), and the first Baptist, John Smyth. The stature of this work is such that it has been regarded as a leading model or option upon which Pentecostals may construct their ecclesiology. For instance, in the aforementioned article on the “Theology of the Church” in the more recent *New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*,

---

charismatic Catholic scholar Peter Hocken includes a whole section on Volf’s Free Church ecclesiology (no other singular work commands a whole section). In it, he explains throughout the significance of this book for Pentecostals:

It is included here under the pentecostal, rather than the charismatic, heading for several reasons: Volf comes from a pentecostal background; it is the first major work on ecclesiology to take seriously the Holy Spirit’s-empowerment of every believer; and it does not arise from a charismatic-renewal context…Volf’s pentecostal roots show most clearly in his conviction that the church is structured by the Holy Spirit, and particularly through the charismata…Another strand in Volf’s ecclesiology that takes the pentecostal witness seriously is his eschatological framework…Volf provides a theology of the church filled with the Holy Spirit that is pentecostal without being sectarian…

The fact that a monograph on Free Church ecclesiology, based upon the original Baptist ecclesiologist, is being regarded as a major resource for Pentecostals certainly lends significant weight to Durnbaugh’s claim, and makes the question of whether or not this is where Pentecostalism should understand its ecclesiological identity all the more pressing.

By way of concluding this specific discussion, these past suggestions that Pentecostalism is a sub-set of Evangelicalism (Hodges, Spittler, Holdcroft, Duffield and Van Cleave), or that it is merely an expression of Free Church - albeit one to be reckoned with (Rasmusson, Durnbaugh, and advocates of Volf), or even a more contemporary manifestation of the Radical Reformation (Yoder), all reflect in some sense historical realities of the Pentecostal movement in the twentieth century and therefore all touch on characteristics of a ‘pentecostal’ understanding of the church that must be wrestled with. It is certainly accurate that Pentecostalism shares

75 Hocken, “Church, Theology of”, in NIDPCM, 548.
substantial affinity each with evangelicalism, Believers’ Church ecclesiology, and—I would concur—even aspects of Anabaptism, and that the movement has been influenced in a large manner by each of these sources. In that sense Pentecostal ecclesiology is surely multi-dimensional. For my Master’s thesis, for instance, I took a different approach and identified ten necessary elements in constructing a Pentecostal ecclesiology, some of which were unavoidably ‘borrowed’ from or also found outside the movement. Recognizing these various influences brings to mind the following landmark description of the movement articulated by Steven Land:

Pentecostalism flows in paradoxical continuity and discontinuity with other streams of Christianity. Insofar as it retains similarity to the first ten years of the movement, it is more Arminian than Calvinist in its approach to issues of human agency and perseverance. It is more Calvinist than Lutheran in its appreciation of the so-called ‘third use of the Law’ to guide Christian growth and conduct. It is more Eastern than Western in its understanding of spirituality as perfection and participation in the divine life (theosis). In this regard it has much to learn from persons like Gregory of Nyssa, Macarius the Egyptian and St Symeon, the New Theologian. It is both ascetic and mystical. These treasures could naturally and fruitfully be mined as the line of Wesleyan continuity is traced backwards and forwards. Pentecostalism is more Catholic than Protestant in emphasizing sanctification-transformation more than forensic justification, but more Protestant than Catholic in the conviction that the Word is the authority over the church and tradition for matters of faith, practice, government and discipline. In its origins Pentecostalism was more Anabaptist than the magisterial Reformation in its concern for peace and a covenanted believers’ church where discipleship and discipline are essential features of congregational life. Pentecostalism has a more Holiness-evangelical hermeneutic than the fundamentalist-evangelical tradition in terms of its actual use of Scripture and understanding of the role of reason. Finally, it is more liberation-transformationist than scholastic-fundamentalist in its way of doing theology as a discerning reflection upon living reality…Pentecostalism, therefore, exists in continuity but differentiating discontinuity with other Christian spiritualities.  


77 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, 29-30.
In a manner that intersects at one point with Yoder, yet also partially challenges the understanding of Durnbaugh, Land similarly, but more effectively and accurately, shows the plurality of dimensions that Pentecostalism shares with several other Christian movements. However, does this reality of affinities, confluences and continuities with other churches (or sect types) then rule out the possibility that the movement cannot or does not offer a distinct theology of the church on its own? The thesis being put forward in the midst of this particular theological milieu is that it still can. From a uniquely Pentecostal perspective, the Church is the People of God’s manifest Presence, the Temple where the Holy Spirit dwells in a particular way to witness to the world of God’s transforming power.

Further, not only does Pentecostalism as a legitimate third or fourth-stream outside of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Eastern Orthodox represent a distinct, germane ecclesiology of its own, but this ecclesiology must be recognized and articulated for and by the movement for the sake of its own health moving forward in its second century, as several pentecostal scholars have been recently realizing. These past characterizations, while identifying historical realities, also contribute somewhat to the current “identity crisis” that the movement is experiencing on the continent where it originated. As stated earlier, this provides part of the need for a model that may help contribute toward a truly Pentecostal ecclesiology. The revitalization of North American Pentecostalism, along with the maturation of the rapidly-expanding Third-world Pentecostalism, presents the double-need for such a model.

In order to accomplish this, it is necessary first to examine the historical-theological roots of the Pentecostal revival at the beginning of the last century. Steven Land has posited that the spiritual heart of the revival can be found within the first ten years of its existence, and that a
necessary re-visioning of its theology must take these first ten years as the foundation.\textsuperscript{78}

Douglas Jacobsen, a historian of Pentecostalism, similarly observes that pentecostal theology became less inventive and interesting after the first-generation, or the first twenty or so years of the revival.\textsuperscript{79} The next chapter will identify the crucial historical soundings and groundings for a uniquely Pentecostal understanding of the church.

\textsuperscript{78} Land, \textit{Pentecostal Spirituality}.

Chapter 2

Historical Groundings for a Pentecostal Ecclesiology

Constructing a Pentecostal ecclesiology requires identifying those elements of Pentecostalism that set it apart as a distinct, concrete church with its own history. This chapter will therefore attempt to identify and describe those elements that turned a Revival movement amongst adherents of already existing churches into a new expression of church over the last century.

1 The Original Vision of the Pentecostal Revival

Pentecostal theologian Frank Macchia introduces well the connection between understanding the roots of the Revival and the task of working toward a Pentecostal ecclesiology:

Pentecostals were convinced from the beginning that they were involved in a latter rain of the Spirit that included a proliferation of miraculous gifts needed to restore the church to apostolic power. This pneumatological point of departure for understanding the nature of the church in the modern world cried out for theological reflection. The fact is, however, that ecclesiology is one of the most neglected doctrines in pentecostalism, which is illustrated by the absence of a chapter on the church in E.S. Williams’s three-volume Systematic Theology. Even the formation of pentecostal denominations was done for practical rather than theological reasons, namely, the need for ministerial credentials to protect against rogue itinerant preachers, the need for accreditation of missionaries, and some central organization for the distribution of missionary funds.\(^80\)

\(^80\) Frank Macchia, “Pentecostal Theology,” *NIDPCM*, 1137.
In other words, the operating theology of Pentecostals at their inception contained a kind of implicit or latent ecclesiology that was, unfortunately, never fully developed. The reasons for this are numerous and have been identified at various points. The task here, however, is to retrieve the historical groundings of the movement that can be re-visioned and utilized to help produce a model for a pentecostal ecclesiology that is viable for the now global movement in the twenty-first century. To that end, the following key elements of the original pentecostal vision will be identified and explored: restorationism (primitivism), “latter-rain” eschatology, the Full Gospel theological rubric, social equality, holiness, and Wesleyan influences.

2 Restorationism: “Back to Pentecost”

2.1 Restorationism Defined

Restorationism is the vision of returning or restoring the church to the original practices, experience, empowerment, character and missionary zeal as the apostolic communities. By original practices, we are referring primarily to the restoration of the *charismata* (“supernatural gifts of the Spirit” such as prophecy, speaking in tongues, interpretation of tongues, and divine healing), signs and wonders, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a marked event separate from water baptism. There are a variety of pentecostal groups that also focused on the restoration of other NT practices or instructions, such as the apostolic baptismal formula (in Jesus’ name only, cf. Acts 8:16), or snake-handling and drinking poison (cf. Mark 16:18), but these will not be included here.

Restorationism was also more than a recovery of certain aspects of the apostolic church, but a specific approach to church history and a reaction to the ecclesiological context of the time
(end of the nineteenth, beginning of the twentieth centuries). The primitivist perspective of early Pentecostals is well depicted by one of the foremost historians of the movement, Grant Wacker, when he writes:

Briefly stated, they were certain that their movement repristinated apostolic Christianity. At the same time, they were equally certain that it owed nothing to the long history of the Christian church between the second and twentieth centuries…Like most sectarians, they considered their origins miraculous. As William Seymour put it, “the source is from the skies.”…As late as 1949 Donald Gee, arguably the most astute and worldly-wise figure Pentecostalism ever produced, wrote that the movement did “not owe its origin to any outstanding personality or religious leader, but was a spontaneous revival appearing almost simultaneously in various parts of the world.”

Elsewhere, Wacker confirms that “pentecostals displayed little interest in the general history of the Church, and virtually no interest in the period stretching from the Day of Pentecost to the Reformation.” Steven Ware, a scholar of restorationism, observes that “early pentecostals viewed their movement as having no relation at all to any church bodies or movements which preceded them other than the apostolic church of the first century. As Lawrence contended, ‘the Pentecostal movement has no such history; it leaps the intervening years crying, ‘Back to Pentecost’.”

---


the historiographical mentality of the movement as hearkening “Back to Pentecost” was most certainly a fundamental, defining characteristic of the Revival at its inception. Melvin Dieter confirms the distinction between the Holiness and Pentecostal movements on this point when he states, “The holiness movement generally had seen itself as a movement growing out of the development of the historical church; the Pentecostal movement came to regard itself as a de novo act of God.”\(^\text{84}\)

The perspective of church history inherent within this particular restorationist cry of “Back to Pentecost” is also articulated elsewhere by Ware,

> The basic belief behind restorationism is that something went very wrong very early in the history of the Christian church, so that the simple and biblical teaching and practice of the apostles was gradually corrupted…In restorationist thought, the result of these corruptions is that the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Ages was only a shadow of its former spiritual self, while it had grown materially rich and politically powerful. The other side of the equation is the belief that the restoration of the church to NT standards began with the Protestant Reformation of the 16\(^{th}\) century and proceeded in successive waves up to the present, in preparation for the return of Christ to earth.\(^\text{85}\)

This historiographical approach places Pentecostals in a category characterized by Samuel Hill in his article on “A Typology of American Restitutionism” as that family of churches which view “history as deviation or impertinence.”\(^\text{86}\) He goes on to suggest, “they see the history of the


\(^{85}\) Steven Ware, “Restorationism in Classical Pentecostalism,” *NIDPCM*, 1019.

church as one large perversion, or almost a non-entity, which the emergence of their group has overcome.”  Hill sees Pentecostals sharing this view in common with “the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, the Churches of Christ, and more extreme Fundamentalists.”

Hill’s view does not appear, however, to take into account the Pentecostal understanding of restoration as a rather lengthy process, of which their Revival was actually the climax. In particular, it was thought by the early Pentecostals that Luther had recovered the fundamental Gospel doctrine of justification by faith, Wesley had recovered the biblical teaching of sanctification, and now the Pentecostal Revival had restored the baptism of the Holy Spirit to the church. Douglas Jacobsen, historian of early Pentecostalism, quotes the following from *The Apostolic Faith*, the newsletter of the Azusa Street Revival:

> All along the ages men have been preaching a partial Gospel. A part of the Gospel remained when the world went into the dark ages. God has from time to time raised up men to bring back the truth to the church. He raised up Luther to bring back to the world the doctrine of justification by faith. He raised up another reformer in John Wesley to establish Bible holiness in the church. Then he raised up Dr. Cullis who brought back to the world the wonderful doctrine of divine healing. Now He is bringing back the Pentecostal Baptism to the church.

This was the basic historical-theological understanding of those involved in the spread of the Revival. For them, the movement had a very specific purpose and place in the grand scheme

---

87 Hill Jr., “American Restitutionism,” 75.
88 Hill Jr., “American Restitutionism,” 75.
of salvation-history; one that had implicit, unarticulated ecclesiological constructs. Gordon Atter, a Canadian Pentecostal leader, explained it this way:

The early Church had a continual battle with error, as recorded in every reliable Church history book. Salvation by works, Arianism, Sabellianism, Gnosticism, and a hundred other errors sought to destroy faith in God. Its adherence to truth became only a form due to the popularity of the Church after it became a state religion. Its doctrines became strangely intermingled with paganism. Finally a form of Christianity with all the trimmings and traditions of Judaism and paganism developed. This was a church which had begun to surrender to a number of subtle errors which brought about the Dark Ages.

Beginning with the Reformation, step by step God has restored to the Christian Church all the vital doctrines of Apostolic times. It has remained for the Holiness and Pentecostal Revivals to set those doctrines into a true relationship with each other and with a life of personal and vital holiness. In the baptism of the Holy Ghost the Church is again being set on fire, and is going forth to do exploits for God in a greater way than at any time since the days of the Apostles. 90

It is clear that this particular scheme of salvation-history was capitulatory, in that the progress made since the Protestant Reformation and culminating in the Pentecostal revival was in fact a return to the beginnings of the Church herself. It could almost be likened to a historical boomerang. What was new with this Revival was not new at all, but as old as Christianity itself. Pentecostalism was a true revival, not only of fervour and zeal for the Gospel, but of ‘church’ being done in true apostolic fashion. Pentecostal pioneer F.F. Bosworth, according to Jacobsen, said that “the pentecostal movement was not about anything new; instead it was about bringing

90 Atter, The Third Force, 120.
‘the church back to her ancient moorings.’ The pentecostal movement was a restoration movement pure and simple.”"91 Or, as the Dominican scholar John Orme Mills describes it,

No, what was arresting about those first twentieth-century Pentecostals was their conviction (a conviction tongue-speaking and the other gifts they believed they had been given irrefutably confirmed, in their opinion) that the new pouring-out of God’s Holy Spirit on them had empowered them to share fully the life of the church of the apostles, the ‘church of Pentecost’. And – so alive was their vision of the New Testament church – this meant that they experienced a fresh, urgent sense of expectation which they could identify with that known by the first generation of Christians.92

The name given to the movement indicates as clearly as anything the inherent understanding of the significance of what God was perceived to be doing with this Revival. As Jacobsen observes, this was promoted by none other than the leader of the Azusa Street Revival, William Seymour: “Seymour himself described the goal of the revival to be the full restoration of the church so that it would, once again, look ‘just like the one [Christ] started when He left the earth and organized it on the day of Pentecost.’”93 Donald Gee, perhaps the most prominent Pentecostal theologian of a later generation, claimed that the movement represented a “longing to recover the ‘pure fountain’” of the Apostolic Church.94

91 Quoted in Jacobsen, Thinking in the Spirit, 310.
93 Jacobsen, Thinking in the Spirit, 64.
Of note here, primitivism was hardly pioneered by Pentecostals. It was inherited from the movement’s Wesleyan-Holiness roots; though it did evolve to another, more distinctive form. Donald Dayton traces it back to the early Wesley himself.\footnote{Donald W. Dayton, \textit{Theological Roots of Pentecostalism} (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987), 40-42.} Vinson Synan notes its prominence and proto-pentecostal character in the ministry of British Presbyterian Edward Irving in the 1830s.\footnote{Vinson Synan, \textit{The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal, 1901-2001} (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 22-25.} There were, of course, several other prominent primitivist groups in the United States during the late seventeenth century, such as Daniel Warner and the Evening Light Saints. Primitivism has also been shown to be a long-standing theme of the Methodist and Holiness movements out of which Pentecostalism arose.\footnote{Cf. Dieter, “Primitivism in the American Holiness Tradition”, in \textit{Wesleyan Theological Journal}. Accessed at \url{http://www.lcogtt.org/Articles/primitivism_in_the_american.html}.} Pentecostals, however, were unique from all of these forerunners in their peculiar appropriation of primitivism as necessitating the same supernatural acts of the Holy Spirit as the apostles experienced.

It is interesting, however, that the aforementioned Mills posits that even this crucial feature of early Pentecostalism—its eschatology—was subservient to its pounding restorationist heartbeat:

“One of the leading pioneers of Pentecostalism near the beginning of the century, A.J. Tomlinson, was sure that, just as in the early church ‘the full blaze of light beamed forth from the Pentecostal chamber and shined forth with radiant glory in the early morning of the Gospel day’, so (the true church has at last been rediscovered) ‘the evening light, the true light, is now shining, and the sheep are hearing His voice and are coming from every place where they have been scattered during the cloudy and dark day.’”
“‘The evening light’, ‘the latter rain’ – phrases like these express the great hopes of many a Pentecostal of Tomlinson’s time…Among many of the Pentecostals in the Third World apocalyptic expectation is more lively still. In the slums of Santiago ‘a kingdom beyond this world is preached which will break through in the imminent future’ and its existence is ‘guaranteed as from this moment by the conviction that one’s sins are pardoned and is often confirmed or made visible by a physical sign, healing.’ But here, already, in this mention of conviction of forgiveness and an awareness of the living power of God prompted by some visible sign reminiscent of the New Testament, is a hint of one of the most important things that distinguishes Pentecostalism from the adventist sects (from the Jehovah’s Witnesses, for example): namely that is was not apocalyptic expectation which brought about the birth of twentieth-century Pentecostalism and which has sustained it; rather, the expectation grew out of the Pentecostals’ identification with themselves with what they understood to be the ‘apostolic church’.  

The understanding of the Pentecostal Revival, and the signs which accompanied it, to be the “latter rain” of the Spirit upon the earth was more than a point of eschatological orientation, it was also (a priori?) a point of historical orientation—a schema that provided a biblical logic for the restoration of apostolic practices and experiences, and of specific supernatural activities of the Holy Spirit narrated in the NT church. So while this latter-rain eschatology must still be treated as a separate characteristic, it was not at all divorced from the pervasive theology of primitivism/restorationism that marked early Pentecostal self-understanding.

While some pentecostal leaders are currently trying to grapple with the restorationist cry of “Back to Pentecost” in view of the Revival now having a century of history of its own, the restorationist/primitivist characteristic of early Pentecostalism still remains extant among some

---


99 At a meeting for the PAOC Theological Study Commission on March 26th, 2010, General Superintendent David Wells asked if the denomination wanted to go back 100 years [to the beginnings of the modern Pentecostal revival] or 2000 years [to the apostolic church].
key leadership. Recall, for example, the recent statements from AoG USA General Superintendent George Woods quoted in the previous chapter about Pentecostalism’s _telos_ to “erase the smudges on the church for the last twenty centuries and get back to what the early Christians believed and practiced. That is our goal—to get back to biblical, original Christianity.”¹⁰⁰ Thus, any attempt at constructing a contemporary pentecostal ecclesiology must still contend with the restorationist flavour of the movement.

### 2.2 Character of Pentecostal Primitivism

Let us now identify more specifically the key elements or characteristics of the original, apostolic church that the Pentecostal revival sought to restore, to discern the shape and character of their latent vision of the church. These include, in no particular order, charismatic gifts, glossolalia, apostolic experience, “signs and wonders” or miracles, divine healing, the riddance of formal institution, liturgy and creed, and the direct leadership of the Holy Spirit. This list is not exhaustive and will be supplemented when addressing other historic elements of the Revival, but these are here recognized as a core list of NT practices and values which Pentecostals intentionally sought to restore to what they perceived was their rightful place in the church.

#### 2.2.1 Charismatic Gifts

While Pentecostalism is often known for its emphasis on the event known as the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, this was hardly the only aspect of their restorationism. In fact, Atter states

that, “At first the doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, with the speaking in other tongues as the initial evidence was not clearly emphasized by many. Hence people thought of it merely as another blessing, or as only a manifestation of one of the gifts of the Spirit.”\(^{101}\) To emphasize this point, it will not be the first item treated here. Instead, early Pentecostals understood their revival to be about much more than this one event. The key Pentecostal figure William Durham, for instance, while a proponent of Spirit-baptism, did not make this his main theological emphasis. Instead, “He was convinced that God was restoring all the miraculous gifts of the Spirit that were mentioned in the New Testament.”\(^{102}\) This is echoed by Vinson Synan’s description of the emphases of early Pentecostalism, where he includes the claim, “all the gifts of the Spirit would be experienced in the normal life of the church.”\(^{103}\)

The word “all” is crucial here. The various gifts of the Spirit narrated in Acts, and more specifically listed in the Pauline epistles, were \textit{all} meant to be practiced by the last-days church. Jacobsen affirms that “Virtually all pentecostals believed that God sprinkled various gifts of the Spirit among the people of God to be used in concert for the overall benefit of the church and the effective presentation of the gospel.”\(^{104}\) The Baptism of the Holy Spirit and the accompanying sign of glossolalia, while certainly a defining emphasis of the Revival, were part of a larger restorationist vision in which the entire experience of the apostolic churches was in view. As William Faupel, a significant historian of the movement, explains regarding the theological vision of those who experienced the Revival at the beginning of the twentieth century: “The
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\(^{101}\) Atter, \textit{The Third Force}, 121.

\(^{102}\) Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 162.


\(^{104}\) Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 308.
Bible was searched for evidence which would link this second event to the initial Pentecostal outpouring in the Acts of the Apostles and yet distinguish it from other sovereign moves of God within the history of the church. Restoration of the gifts of the Spirit, especially the gift of tongues, appeared high on the list of potential possibilities for many adherents.\(^{105}\)

The historical/eschatological significance of this particular Revival, in the minds of those caught up in it, was that God was now finally restoring the rest of the NT supernatural operations of the Holy Spirit in the church to complete the revitalization of true biblical Christianity that had been gradually taking place since the Protestant Reformation. The irony here is that such restorationist thinking, specifically regarding the charismatic gifts, was actually not part of the general Protestant theological tenor. In fact, as Donald Dayton points out in his *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, “In making this claim, Pentecostals reveal a “restorationist” motif that flies in the face of the tendency of classical Protestantism to argue that the *charismata* and “supernatural gifts of the Spirit” ceased with the close of the apostolic era.”\(^{106}\) The charismatic gifts were therefore a crucial part of this restoration in that they were powerful signs that God was indeed doing this. While the Pentecostals were proclaiming that the continuing trajectory of the Reformation of the church was now including the re-emergence of spiritual gifts, they were actually employing a hermeneutic of scripture that was starkly different from the typical Reformed approach of the time.

Even though early Pentecostals did not write about these *charismata* as much as other facets of the Spirit’s work, or give them the same singular focus or attention it received in the


later Charismatic movement, there is no question that it was an inherent part of their understanding of what was occurring during this “latter-rain” move of the Spirit. Very prominent among those aspects of the apostolic church being restored by God through the Pentecostal revival were the charismatic gifts.

The restoration of these gifts is part of what set the pentecostal Revival apart from its predecessor, the Holiness movement. The emphasis of the forerunning Holiness movement was in equating baptism in the Spirit with sanctification. The main work of the Holy Spirit was in cleansing individuals from sin and making them pure and holy—as the name of the movement indicates. Events such as tongues, prophecy, divine healing and miracles were not yet expected or taught to be part of ‘normal’ church experience. These were now finally being re-introduced through Pentecostalism, and this was part of what made this Revival so historically-eschatologically significant.

Of course, since the Pentecostal Revival ‘re-introduced’ an implicit ecclesiology of the church as the Body of Christ which is edified by the Spirit operating through the charismatic gifts, several other sources—including the Charismatic Renewal movement, Vatican II, major ecclesiologists, and ecumenical studies—have all affirmed in one way or another a similar understanding of the church as authentically Pauline and still relevant today. What was a

---

century ago a distinctively pentecostal/primitivist view of the church has now become a significant ecumenical consensus point.

The key to accepting and expecting the restoration of these gifts for Pentecostals lies, I propose, in an ecclesiology that understands the church as the People of God’s Presence. When the divine presence operates among the worshipping community, they experience divine gifting, or *charismata*. This was the implicit understanding of the early Pentecostals. Jacobsen reports the following about one of the pioneers of the Azusa revival, F.F. Bosworth: “Bosworth believed that the manifestation of the Spirit – the new appearance of one or another spiritual gift as a result of one’s baptism in the Spirit – was the natural outcome of God’s newly intensified presence in the person’s life.”\(^{108}\) What Bosworth believed about the individual Spirit-filled Christian was also implied for the Spirit-filled congregation. Echoing this, Jacobsen elsewhere reports that another early Pentecostal theologian, George Floyd Taylor, taught that, “The gifts were new, supernatural infusions of power that reflected the extraordinary presence of the Spirit in the believer’s life.”\(^{109}\) The re-appearance of the spiritual gifts from the apostolic era, then, was understood to be a direct result of the manifest (or “newly intensified” or “extraordinary”) Presence of the Spirit in the church.


2.2.2 Glossolalia

Without a doubt, the best-known distinctive of the Pentecostal Revival was the re-emergence of the apostolic practice of glossolalia, or speaking in tongues—the “divinely-bestowed” ability to speak a previously unlearned language. The speaker is cognitively unaware of the meaning of what they are saying, hence the sign that this is a gift of the Holy Spirit, a divine gift. This phenomenon was one of the outcomes experienced by those followers of Jesus in the Upper Room when they were “filled with the Holy Spirit” on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:4).

The earliest Pentecostals believed that speaking in tongues was the telltale sign that one had received a “third blessing” (after salvation and sanctification), a baptism in the Holy Spirit distinct from water baptism. Additionally, however, Acts 2:5-12 also narrates that there were visitors from several other nations that all heard these uneducated Galileans speaking in their respective native tongues, and were amazed by this fact. Based on this text many Pentecostal leaders, such as Charles Parham (whom some contend is the true father or founder of Pentecostalism) further believed that these tongues were a foreign language divinely bestowed on someone to allow them to preach the gospel to the natives of that language. These tongues are technically known as xenolalia, the ability to speak an existing language without having ever learned it—the same way those Galileans in Acts 2 could suddenly speak the languages of the Parthians, Medes and Elamites after being filled with the Holy Spirit in the upper room.

The gift of tongues, understood in this way, was highly functional in that it allowed for ordinary, unlearned Spirit-filled saints to travel as missionaries to lands across the sea without having to spend the funds, energy and time learning a new language in the conventional manner. This was necessary because time was short. As those who already held an apocalyptic
eschatology, Pentecostals (along with their holiness and fundamentalist siblings) were convinced the end was very near. As with the latter-rain matrix (see below), the renewal of tongues was as eschatological as it was primitivistic, and as pragmatic as either. Grant Wacker explains:

Specifically: the Lord was coming soon, the heathen were perishing for want of the gospel, thus the Holy Spirit had given missionary tongues to the church as a speedy and practical means for meeting that need. Missionary tongues would hasten world evangelization by enabling partisans to bypass years of arduous language study. Given the urgency of the situation and the difficulty and inaccessibility of traditional means of language acquisition, it seems virtually inevitable that pentecostals would have found such a resource in their cultural tool kit.\footnote{Grant Wacker, \textit{Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 48. “Missionary tongues” is the term Wacker has come up with in place of the technical word \textit{xenolalia}.}

Jacobsen summarily adds, “For the people wandering in and out of the Azusa revival, then, speaking in tongues was understood to be both the necessary biblical marker that one had received the baptism with the Holy Ghost and an empowering gift of God that readied one to take part in evangelism to the rest of the world.”\footnote{Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 74-75.}

It soon became clear, however, that the supernatural gift of tongues did \textit{not} function in the expected manner for those who ventured into foreign missions. Humiliated missionaries faced the reality that they could not preach or converse with natives in their tongue after all. This led to a forced change in the pentecostal theology of glossolalia. Although Parham
maintained his stance on xenolalia until his death in 1928\textsuperscript{112}, and there did continue to be numerous verified accounts of xenolalic miracles in public services across North America\textsuperscript{113}, most others came over time to necessarily refine their understanding of the significance and place of the gift of tongues for the believer and, by extension, for the church. The same pragmatism that conditioned their initial view of glossolalia also fostered the evolution of it; or as Wacker puts it, “But if pragmatic considerations nurtured the birth of missionary tongues, they also dictated its demise.”\textsuperscript{114}

If glossolalia was not always or primarily xenolalia, then at least it must still be the authenticating sign of the Holy Spirit’s infilling. This eventually became doctrine among most major pentecostal groups that formed as a result of the Revival. Tongues came to function as the “initial evidence” of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Yet, though tongues were viewed as a sign, they nevertheless remained also a divine gift. And this gift was especially precious because it became the distinctive marker of Pentecostals within the Christian milieu. As Wacker articulates it, “From the outset tongues, more than any other belief or practice, defined pentecostals’ religious identity, both in their own minds and in the minds of outsiders. Tongues was the Shekinah glory in their midst.”\textsuperscript{115} This last statement is crucial for our purposes here. Glossolalia demonstrated immanent, divine Presence in a uniquely tangible way; a defining way. The reality of the practice of tongues meant that God was now present in a manner and scale not

\textsuperscript{112} Cf. Wacker, \textit{Heaven Below}, 287, n70.

\textsuperscript{113} For examples, see especially Atter, \textit{The Third Force}, 293-294; and Sherrill, \textit{They Speak with Other Tongues}, 12-15; 98-100.

\textsuperscript{114} Wacker, \textit{Heaven Below}, 48.

\textsuperscript{115} Wacker., \textit{Heaven Below}, 42.
experienced since the time of the apostles. And this empirically signaled that God’s Presence was manifesting itself in the world through a truly special means. Consequently, tongues reinforced the pentecostal restorationist-eschatological matrix as nothing else quite could, even though other divine signs were also present.

In so doing, tongues continued also to fuel the missional character of pentecostal assemblies, even after xenolalia failed to be a sustainable theological tenet. For if speaking in tongues did not normatively mean the ability to communicate the Gospel to foreigners on an ongoing basis, it did continue to serve as evidence of divine empowerment; and this empowerment was still for the purposes of proclaiming the Gospel (in accordance with Acts 1:5) regardless of specific linguistic issues. Moreover, this divine empowerment was being made available primarily to marginalized people, just as in the bible narrative (Acts 2:17-18, cf. Joel 2:28). More on that later. The point of all this is that tongues came to symbolize more than any other pentecostal practice a new spiritual/theological reality for the participants. God was now filling ordinary (or less than ordinary) people with His Spirit in a dynamic, measurable way, and in so doing was inviting them into His Mission, allowing them to participate in the great and final resurgence of the Gospel around the world. They were now tangibly shown to be the People of God’s Presence precisely because they spoke with other tongues as the Spirit enabled them. As Hollenweger puts it, “speaking in tongues can become a piece of art which, like a cathedral, proclaims: God is here.”

---

Frank Macchia has called glossolalia a manifestation of the *theophanic presence* of God through His Spirit.\(^{117}\) While the early pentecostals did not use that term, it can certainly be argued that it is a useful one for capturing their understanding of how, as Wacker puts it, tongues represented the Shekinah glory of God in their midst. The theological notion of the spiritual gift of tongues as a theophanic manifestation of God’s immanent presence is one we will return to in the next chapter. Within this understanding of the significance of tongues as a manifestation of God’s Presence is an ecclesiology that sees the *telos* of the corporate worshipping body to hear and/or experience the edifying presence of the Spirit in this manner.

### 2.2.3 Apostolic Experience

The re-emergence of both *charismata* and *glossolalia* signaled the reality that contemporary Christians could, and should, have the same experience of the divine as the apostles did. The narrative of Acts was understood hermeneutically to serve not merely as a historical record, but more significantly as a template for normative Christian living in the here and now. Following the trajectory of the antecedent Wesleyan and Holiness movements with their evangelical piety, early Pentecostals understood the Christian faith to be a matter of experience instead of mere assent to Reformed doctrine. Pentecostal theologian Steven Land has shown that this particular approach to spirituality is a triangular equation involving an equal interplay between orthodoxy (right belief), orthopathy (right experience) and orthopraxy (right

behaviour). In agreement with other pietist groups, Pentecostals affirmed that orthodoxy alone is not sufficient. Nor is salvation actualized by confession only. Just as sanctification (understood initially in Wesleyan terms until the Finished Work controversy began in 1910) takes place through crisis experiences, so does empowerment for mission. This is what Pentecostals now added. When these occur, religious affections naturally follow. Apostolic Christianity is meant to be an experienced reality today, and this was what God was bringing about through the Revival. Jacobsen summarizes it well when he notes, “Whether experience preceded theology (as was the case with Lewi Pethrus) or theology preceded experience (as was the case with Parham’s students at Bethel Bible College), the basic point is the same: Theology and experience deeply influenced each other within the pentecostal movement.”

The identification of Pentecostalism with authentic apostolic spirituality is nowhere more evident than in the name of the Azusa Street Mission during the revival of 1906-1909: Apostolic Faith. “Apostolic Faith” here again refers to a proleptical, primitivist-eschatological vision (“latter rain”) of seeing the experience, spirituality, mission and Spirit-empowerment of the apostles restored to the life of the church. Apostolic truth must lead to apostolic faith. The Azusa revival propagated a distinct understanding of apostolicity framed around experience rather than authority, office or succession. This is important to note in its own right given the


119 Jacobsen, Thinking in the Spirit, 5. Lewi Pethrus was a Baptist pastor who became a pioneer of Pentecostalism in Scandinavia after surprisingly receiving the baptism of the Holy Spirit on a ferry boat; for many years he pastored the largest pentecostal church in the world. Pethrus was compelled to change his theology following his experience. Bethel Bible College in Topeka, Kansas is where the first instance of glossolalia in the twentieth century occurred when Agnes Ozman began speaking in tongues on January 1st, 1901. This took place after the principal, Charles Parham, assigned the students to study the scriptures to determine what the sign of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is. The answer they arrived at was speaking in tongues. Thus, in this latter case, Jacobsen is referring to an instance where a spiritual experience was directly conditioned by biblical exegesis.
current wrestling among twenty-first century pentecostals over what apostolicity should mean now. Any attempt at constructing a distinctly pentecostal ecclesiology at this juncture in the history of the movement must also wrestle with this issue, but can only start to do so once this initial perspective is acknowledged and understood.

2.2.4  ‘Signs and Wonders’

Similarly, early Pentecostals held the conviction that those who receive apostolic experience can produce apostolic deeds. Specifically, miracles can be wrought by those who move in the same power of the Holy Spirit as the first apostles did. Just as “signs and wonders” performed by the apostles were a natural consequence of their Pentecostal infilling of the Spirit (Acts 2:43), so should this be expected now. Gary B. McGee explains:

As a radically innovative movement of the Holy Spirit, Pentecostalism remained loyal to the historic truths of the faith, but turned the cessationist hourglass upside down by showing that miracles had not ended with the last of the apostles. Pentecostals pressed to recapture the apostolic dimension of the early church, especially with their emphasis on tongues and prayer for the sick…Pentecostal periodicals would eventually carry thousands of accounts of conversions, healings, deliverances from chemical addictions, and exorcisms. Believers would also tell of being guided by visions and dreams as predicted by the Old Testament prophet Joel (2:28).^{120}

Elsewhere, David Barrett defines the “major characteristic” of Pentecostalism as “a rediscovery of, and a new experience of, the supernatural with a powerful and energizing ministry of the

Holy Spirit in the realm of the miraculous that most other Christians have considered to be highly unusual.”¹²¹ Pentecostals believed that miracles of a biblical proportion could happen today as a further sign that God was pouring out his Spirit as never before to prepare the world for the return of Christ. As Barrett’s research confirms, this was attested to by those in the Revival at numerous points. The faith of the early Pentecostals to expect signs and wonders to occur was apparently rewarded time and again. Writing in 1962, Gordon Atter reported:

> Not only have there been supernatural healings, but on numerous occasions miracles equal to anything recorded in the New Testament have occurred in this Revival. Missing organs have been placed in the body; hail storms have been stopped; drought has been broken; even the dead have been raised, in answer to believing prayer. These, and other miracles have become a part of the Pentecostal Revival, and have happened on many occasions during the last sixty years in the Pentecostal Movement…

> …Again and again there have been miraculous answers to prayer. Sinners have been saved, money provided, circumstances altered, dreams, visions and supernatural visitations experienced, comparable to anything in the New Testament.

> Yes, this has been a miracle-working Revival. The history of the Pentecostal Movement is the history of sixty years of MIRACLES. This is God’s answer to modernism.¹²²

It is thus evident that the expectation of God performing miracles in the present age is a fundamental characteristic of Pentecostalism, one that has profound ramifications for explicating an ecclesiology for the movement. As Atter states, the original pentecostal worldview was in certain key respects an anti-modern one; which is to say that Pentecostals were conditioned by a

---


¹²² Atter, *The Third Force*, 295 (caps his).
pre-critical, often-literal approach to scripture rather than by Enlightenment historical-critical methodologies. The movement was, in fact, a reaction to Enlightenment thought when it came to the Bible, miracles, the supernatural, cosmology, etc. Their bold, primitive faith in a miracle-working God was a kind of rebellion against the liberalism of modernity. The clash of the pentecostal worldview with modern, Western thought is such that Duke Divinity School Professor Grant Wacker—who grew up Pentecostal—describes its legacy upon him personally in the following manner: “... I remain unsure where their view ends and mine begins. I have long imagined, in other words, that God must have missed class the day they covered the Enlightenment. Clearly the Almighty did not get the word that He was not supposed to transform persons’ lives in miraculous ways day after day.”¹²³ In pentecostal theology, the power of God depicted in scripture was real and undiminished, and now demonstrating itself to remind the modern world of this fact.

The logic of such a belief comes back to their perception of God’s Presence with them and indwelling them. Jacobsen contrasts early Pentecostals with the dispensational Fundamentalists they would later align themselves with, stating that a key difference was that, “pentecostals wanted to affirm the present-day miracle-working presence of God in the world.”¹²⁴ Miracles could be expected because of the latter-rain Presence of the Holy Spirit moving across the earth. The character of the Spirit’s Presence was identical to apostolic times, and thus the promise of Jesus that even greater feats than His would be done (John 14:12) was taken seriously by those who had personally experienced the power of the Spirit’s infilling presence in their lives. As with the charismatic gifts of the Spirit, the presence or operation of

¹²³ Wacker, Heaven Below, preface, p. x.
¹²⁴ Jacobsen, Thinking in the Spirit, 356.
signs and wonders is what signifies the Spirit’s operation in the Church. This adds a significant dimension to ecclesiologies centered on Word or Sacrament. The Church is not merely where the Word is rightly preached or the sacraments rightly administered; it is where the Spirit is present with power to perform miracles as a tangible sign of the inbreaking Kingdom of God in the here and now—a foretaste of what is to come.

2.2.5 Divine Healing

One particular category of miracle which was famously emphasized by Pentecostals is divine, physical healing. This was another cherished spiritual gift that God was restoring to the church in the Last Days. Though physical healing as a result of direct divine intervention through prayer has a long tradition within Christianity, especially among Catholic mystics and saints, the prominence given to it in the Pentecostal Revival was unmistakably unique. Martin Marty quotes Frederick Dale Bruner on this point: “Bruner says ‘there is an emphasis on healing in many Pentecostal circles which makes it almost a second Pentecostal distinctive,’ and anyone familiar with the literature is likely to agree with him.”126 Nowhere is this more evident than in their appropriation of the so-called “foursquare gospel”: Jesus as Saviour, Healer, Baptizer and Coming King. Fundamental to pentecostal theology was that Christ provided healing through his atoning death on the cross. A full explanation is provided by Wacker:


…pentecostals’ abiding conviction [was] that prevailing prayer—sometimes called the prayer of faith—would automatically bring healing to the body. Holy Ghost people inherited from their radical evangelical parents an elaborate theology of healing, based on the covenantal promises in Exodus 15:26, the Great Commission in Mark 16:17-18, the gifts of healing in 1 Corinthians 12:9, the healing ministry of the church’s elders in James 5:14, and, above all, the promise of healing in Christ’s atonement on the cross. The last stemmed from the radical evangelical reading of Isaiah 53:5: “He was wounded for our transgressions…and with his stripes we are healed.” But where most Christians and a majority of radical evangelicals had considered prayer for healing a petition for God’s favor, pentecostals effectively considered it a causal agent in itself. God had promised to respond positively to all genuine prayers, therefore He would.127

Physical healing was therefore part and parcel of the Pentecostal gospel; it was intrinsically connected both to the salvific work of Christ, and to the charismatic operation of the Spirit in the church. As such, it was an integral part of the apostolic faith, and something every believer had a right to seek for in prayer. It was depicted as normative for the Christian life in an unprecedented manner. Wacker reports that, “A writer for the Azusa Apostolic Faith put the matter plainly: the full Gospel gives “power to heal our bodies, and…power to raise us from the dead.””128 Indeed, healing is listed as one of the fundamental beliefs of the movement in the first issue of the Apostolic Faith newsletter, and is repeated twice: “Seeking Healing - He must believe that God is able to heal.”129

128 Wacker, Heaven Below, 62. The quote is from AF, February-March 1907, 6.
Faith in this theological conviction was rewarded in a vast multitude of instances. Wacker summarizes his own research of the primary sources in the following report:

First-generation healing testimonies tallied in the thousands. They detailed every conceivable form of restoration, ranging from runny noses dried up to dead bodies raised to life-and everything in between. Most were cast in the symbol-rich vocabulary of the New Testament (threes, sevens, and twelves predominated), but a surprising number resembled the straightforward prose of a medical report.\(^{130}\)

Again, this was yet another prominent dimension in the restorationist-apocalyptic matrix in which Pentecostals were operating. Since physical healing was an integral part of the apostolic ministry (the first narrated act of the Apostles following the Pentecost account is the miraculous healing of the crippled beggar in Acts 3:1-10), and also simultaneously a foretaste of the fast-approaching, eschatological renewal of creation, it was therefore another crucial sign of the latter-rain outpouring of God’s presence upon the earth, and consequently a fixture on the pentecostal landscape. Donald Dayton explains that divine healing was vital to Pentecostal faith because this phenomenon “becomes not only a gift of God to his people in suffering, but also a sign of the Spirit’s presence to the believer and a form of witness to the unbeliever in the work of evangelism.”\(^{131}\) Because, as this thesis asserts, the Spirit’s presence is what forms the core of Pentecostal theology, healing as a sign of this Presence logically became a significant aspect of pentecostal expectations. Wacker succinctly concludes, “From first to last, divine healing remained central to the movement’s self-understanding.”\(^{132}\) The 2010 conference in Wales on


Pentecostal Ecclesiology therefore had one session on the Church as a Healing Community. Healing belongs at the core of the Church’s mission and life, in Pentecostal thought and therefore in Pentecostal ecclesiology.

2.2.6 Aversion to Formalism

Another defining characteristic of early pentecostal primitivism was the movement’s aversion to the orders and rituals of the older, “dead” churches. Any practice that exuded formalism was rejected. The new excitement brought about by the baptism in the Holy Spirit seemed inevitably to clash with previous ecclesiastical methods and structures. Pentecostals resounded Luther’s cry of *sola scriptura* and opposed the authority of any formal creeds. As a Holy Ghost revivalist movement, previous man-made liturgies were forsaken. And because of their reliance on the direct leading of the Spirit, any institutionalizing was frowned upon.

Wacker notes that “pentecostals were certain they had recaptured the essential features of the Apostolic Church and, more importantly, that they had eluded the ‘men made creeds and traditions’ of the intervening years.”\(^{133}\) As Macchia’s quote at the beginning of the chapter indicates, pentecostals formed their denominations over pragmatic concerns (i.e. to be a proper sending agency for missionaries, to ordain clergy for the purpose of discounted train fares, etc.) rather than on convictions pertaining to particular structures and orders.

It is important to note that, as those who were marginalized and in most cases no longer welcome in their previous churches, Pentecostals formed their own congregations more out of default and necessity, and therefore undoubtedly reciprocated the rejection they themselves

experienced. Thus, the pentecostal aversion to previous formal church practices, while certainly 
fuelled by revival enthusiasm, was also a response to the established churches rejecting their 
charismatic ways.

Yet the inherent ecclesiology behind this separatist attitude was, as Newbigin identified, 
one that understood the essence of the church as being animated by the moving of the Spirit upon 
persons, rather than on specific church practices. Indeed, this outpouring of the Spirit was 
perceived to rescue people from these ineffective, traditional ecclesiastical ways and move the 
faithful in a very different direction. From the perspective of these renewed outcasts, spirituality 
was given vitality through a dramatic infilling of the Spirit, not through rituals and orders. One 
notable historian of the movement, Robert Mapes Anderson, expresses it this way:

The Protestant denominations, in the opinion of the Pentecostals, had turned away from 
true Christianity and adopted “churchianity.” Formalism, liturgy, and organization had destroyed 
true spiritual religion in the churches. They were “cold” and “dead”, “having a form of godliness 
but denying the power thereof.” Worship was devoid of personal testimony periods, “amens,” 
“hallelujas,” and all evidence of the Spirit’s presence. “The organized church,” said Bartleman, 
“has largely proven a tremendous framework of form and ceremony built up against God.”

Anderson later continues to contrast the ways of Pentecostals with mainline churches:

It is hardly surprising, given the “esteem” in which they held the mainline denominations, that 
the Pentecostals assiduously spurned the tenor of their worship. Services were held in brush arbors, 
private homes, tents, the open air, or rented halls (an “upper room” if possible) in preference to

---

Oxford University Press, 1979), 212. Notice the use of the phrase “Spirit’s presence.” ‘Bartleman’ refers to Frank 
Bartleman, who was a pioneering Pentecostal minister involved at the start of the Azusa Street Revival, and whose 
biographical writing has been an important eyewitness source.
church buildings. Organs, altars, sometimes even pulpits, trained choirs, robes and clerical collars were “out,” pianos, guitars, tambourines, saxophones, trumpets, extemporaneous singing, praying, and preaching were “in.” Children were neither baptized at birth nor confirmed in adolescence, but “dedicated to the Lord” at birth and baptized only after undergoing “the new birth” experience. Baptism was always by immersion and took place in a lake or river, but seldom in a baptistry.\textsuperscript{135}

Pentecostals therefore favoured spontaneity over planning, novelty over tradition, congregational participation over liturgical order, and neutral ground over church facilities. All this was a reflection of their pneumatological orientation toward aspects of worship, the state of their relations to the established churches, and the earlier-described view of history from which they operated. The confluence of these factors fostered a wholesale resentment towards all expressions of formalism in worship.

It must be briefly emphasized here that although this attitude purposely strained relations with other Christian bodies, it paradoxically existed alongside a unique spirit of inclusion and, some have suggested, ecumenism which was initially present during the early part of the Azusa Revival. Pentecostalism began as an (unplanned) ingathering of those belonging to other churches who were open to the teaching of tongues as a sign of a new inbreaking of the Kingdom of God, and were seeking to experience the Presence of God in a tangible way. As such, anyone was welcome to join. William Seymour, the pastor of the Azusa Street Mission and (some contend) a founder of the Pentecostal Movement, wrote in the first issues of the \textit{Apostolic Faith} newsletter, “We are not fighting against people or churches, but we are seeking to replace dead

forms and dogmas with a living, practical Christianity.”

It was the perception of the early pentecostals that the creeds, liturgy and practices of the established churches were the problem, preventing them from experiencing the dynamic presence of the Holy Spirit in their worship services.

One of the leading theological voices of this pentecostal aversion to formalism was Richard Green Spurling, Jr. (1857-1935), one of the founders of the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) denomination. The author of one of the earliest pentecostal pieces concerning ecclesiology, “The Lost Link”, Spurling protested against “a particular strain of Baptist thought known as “Landmarkism”. Like other restorationists, he was critical of established Christianity and held to the idea of the “Constantinian fall of the church,” which he claimed “occurred about the year 325 A.D.” Subsequently, he vehemently rejected the authority of the Creeds, which

---


137 “The Lost Link” can be accessed at http://faculty.leeu.edu/~drc/Resources/LostLinkfiles/TheLostLink.htm#Table of Contents. A handwritten manuscript is dated May 4, 1897, but it was not printed until 1920, cf. Jacobsen, 371, n.72. Dale Coulter, however, believes the manuscript and the published version of “The Lost Link,” while containing some repeated content, should not be considered the same document (64, n. 17). In that case, we only know it was written sometime between 1897 and 1920. That leaves open the question of whether this document precedes or follows the outbreak of the Pentecostal revival; but its publication in 1920 by the Church of God demonstrates that it is perfectly congenial with pentecostal attitudes.


139 Coulter, “Development of Ecclesiology”, 64.

he perceived as “the wellspring of division and Christian-on-Christian persecution.”\textsuperscript{141}

Alternatively, he proposed that the church should be governed by only one law, the law of Christ, which is love. As Dale Coulter explains,

Spurling asserted that Christ’s commandment or law to love one another must ultimately define the church as the people of God. Christians do not create this fellowship. Rather, it pre-exists in the Spirit and is first given because the Spirit inscribes the law of Christ on the heart. Any other basis of fellowship must be rejected…For Spurling, if one is to develop an ecclesiology centered on the notion of \textit{koinonia}, then creedal statements cannot authoritatively define the boundaries of that \textit{koinonia} because they represent human attempts to formulate more precise doctrinal definitions.\textsuperscript{142}

The concept of \textit{koinonia} thus formed the center of Spurling’s constructive proposal: “The church is the creation of Christ, who through the Spirit has inscribed his own law on the hearts of his children.”\textsuperscript{143} This law is the great command of Christ to love God and love your neighbour as yourself. As Spurling stated, “I have said many times that love is the law on which Christ built the church.”\textsuperscript{144} Accordingly, his definition of the church was simply, “The Church is a people ruled by Jesus and His laws.”\textsuperscript{145} This governing law of Christ is only made effective by the work of the Spirit, consequently the church must be understood \textit{pneumatologically}. Thus, as Coulter explains, “While Christ’s law institutes the church, giving it a visible structure, the Spirit

\textsuperscript{141} Coulter, “Development of Ecclesiology”, 65.

\textsuperscript{142} Coulter, “Development of Ecclesiology”, 65.

\textsuperscript{143} Coulter, “Development of Ecclesiology”, 67.

\textsuperscript{144} Spurling, “The Lost Link”, Chapter One, beginning of tenth paragraph. Accessed October 16, 2010 from http://faculty.leeu.edu/~drc/Resources/LostLinkfiles/TheLostLink.htm#Table of Contents.

\textsuperscript{145} Spurling, “Address on the Church”, \textit{General Assembly of the Church of God (Cleveland, TN)}, 196, as quoted in Coulter, “Development of Ecclesiology”, 68.
constitutes the church by causing Christ’s rule to be established in persons and enabling them to
grow in that rule.”146 Ironically, this summary of Spurling’s ecclesiology is an echo of what the
leading Orthodox theologian John Zizioulas also maintains regarding the church’s essence as
determined by her specific relations both to Christ and to the Spirit: “Christ in-stitutes and the
Spirit con-stitutes.”147 That a “poster-boy” for Restorationism would have his ecclesiology
articulated in the same terms as an Eastern Orthodox theologian reveals several theological
paradoxes that cannot be unpacked here.

Nevertheless, Spurling’s ecclesiology still epitomized restorationism in its rejection of
creedal, confessional, and clerical authority. This is most evident when he proclaims, “I am glad
that we as a church have no other leader but God’s Spirit, no other law but that which Jesus gave;
no other rule of faith but the New Testament.”148 How does this church function? How do the
law of love and the constituting element of Spirit-led koinonia operate organizationally? Here is
where the chief tension is found in Spurling. Coulter provides a comprehensive explanation:

Spurling’s view of the church as government led to an unresolved tension in his ecclesiology.
On the one hand, he eschewed creeds as binding the conscience and, instead, argued that the Spirit
brought liberty and equality. Hence the church must remain grounded upon Christ’s law of love,
which is why the New Testament is its only rule of faith and practice. Spurling believed that the
New Testament authoritatively articulated the nature of the law of love. It is also why individual
believers must be given the freedom of conscience to practice Christianity. One the other hand, he
believed that the conscience should be “Christianized” and asserted that individuals could be
excommunicated “for known violations of God’s Word or commands” [“The Lost Link”].

146 Coulter, “Development of Ecclesiology”, 68.
http://faculty.leeu.edu/~drc/Resources/LostLinkfiles/TheLostLink.htm#Table of Contents.
Moreover, in an implicit reference to the Jerusalem Council, he endorsed following the *decrees* of the Apostles.\(^{149}\)

As far as endeavouring to restore or imitate the apostolic church, this tension is not irresolvable in that it can be argued that it is precisely the same balance that the NT church attempted to achieve. That the Jerusalem church in Acts found itself following the direct leading of the Spirit *while* devoting themselves to the Apostles teaching and authority would have likely been a cue for Spurling to attempt to do the same without being contradictory. It is possibly for that precise reason that “Spurling clearly desired to live in the tension between an anti-creedalism that promoted liberty and equality and a visible community that could define the boundaries of interpretation through its decrees.”\(^{150}\) Spurling, in fact, addressed this tension directly when he wrote:

> Some think Christians ought not to be united in any bond of fellowship while others are not satisfied with the law and government of Christ and the Holy Spirit but must have a great many more laws and governments. So between the two extremes there is a wise and reasonable middle ground of truth which unprejudiced and honest Spirit led Christians can surely find in the words and acts of the Savior and His followers under the leadership of the Holy Ghost.\(^{151}\)

This statement captures as well as any (and better than most) the logic of the early pentecostal rejection of the ways of the established churches, and the corresponding primitivist hope and

\(^{149}\) Coulter, “Development of Ecclesiology”, 70.


belief that the apostolic church, with particular regard to its apparent *modus operandi*, could be restored again in modern times. As Jacobsen states, “The slow return of the church to the rule of love was a sign of God’s promise ultimately to restore the church to its original character and standing before the end of the age, and Spurling welcomed that restoration with open arms.”  

While his belief that creeds and clericalism were the primary killers of love and koinonia in the church may cause many to bristle, Spurling’s child-like desire to see Christ’s law of love be the ruling standard among the Spirit-formed People of God is, as we have seen in its apparent affinity even with an important aspect of the ecclesiology of Zizioulas, perhaps more useful to Pentecostals and non-pentecostals alike than many other more-heralded ecclesiological principles. His emphasis on “liberty and equality” could also be said to be ahead of his time, but did find friendly association with the Azusa phenomenon, as I will explain below.

2.2.7 Direct Leadership of the Holy Spirit

We have just seen in Spurling evidence of the pentecostal attitude towards traditional forms of church governance – namely that they were apostate substitutes for the intended, immanent reign of the Spirit within the visible church. Coupled with their aversion to formalism in worship was an initial pentecostal rejection of traditional forms of church governance. Though they did not go so far as to imitate the Quakers in terms of lack of someone in charge (there was always a leader, and often they had autocratic-type authority), the communicated notion was that the Pentecostal Revival was restoring the guiding, authoritative activity of the

Holy Spirit in place of humanly structured leadership. This was articulated most clearly by Spurling’s declaration cited above that his church had “no other leader but God’s Spirit.”

The Azusa Street Revival meetings demonstrated the belief in the direct leadership of the Holy Spirit over services, and this is what famously characterized the meetings there. Historian Robert Owens describes this phenomenon in the following manner:

These antistructuralist tendencies also surfaced in the worship patterns established by the Azusa Street Mission. Following their belief that the Holy Spirit would guide all believers and not just leaders, everyone was free to speak, even during the services, erasing the lines between clergy and congregation…Further, their belief that the Holy Spirit should be free to direct the services however He wished led to singing and testimonies, preaching, and teaching to be mixed haphazardly throughout the meeting, thus erasing the boundaries between ecclesiastical liturgy and what some claimed was spiritual anarchy.  

At a ‘typical’ meeting, it is recorded that one elder began the service with the following statement:

We have no planned program, nor are we afraid of anarchy or crooked spirits. God the Holy Spirit is able to control and protect His work. If any strange manifestations come, trust the Holy Spirit, keep in prayer, and you will see the word of wisdom go forth, a rebuke, an exhortation that will close the door on the enemy and show the victory won. God can use any member of the body, and He often gives the more abundant honor to the weaker members.


Tradition also has it that during the Azusa Revival, Pastor Seymour was often kneeling humbly in prayer behind the makeshift pulpit of crates (or shoe boxes) while the Holy Ghost took charge of the meetings, as “there were no prearranged subjects or sermons; everything was left to the spontaneous move of God.”\textsuperscript{155} This way of conducting services manifested a clear, though informal, ecclesiology that was a distinct theological trait of the early Pentecostal movement.

In sum, these were the primary practices that the early Pentecostals sought to restore to the Church: \textit{charismata, glossolalia}, apostolic experience, miracles, divine healing, lack of formal liturgy and creeds, and the direct leadership of the Holy Spirit. It was these elements that, for them, characterized the NT church, and it is these things that they passionately believed should be imitated now during the Latter-rain outpouring of the Spirit. This theology, then, represents a most particular kind of primitivism, which Melvin Dieter classifies as “radical experientialism.”\textsuperscript{156} It is precisely this radical experiential primitivism that characterized the original Pentecostal vision of the church. Consequently, any attempt at constructing a distinctly Pentecostal ecclesiology currently, though necessarily accounting for the inevitable evolutionary process of a revival movement after a century’s time, must still in some way give consideration to these very touchstones of historic, “classical” Pentecostalism and the unique brand of restorationism that they collectively comprise.

\textsuperscript{155} Owens, “Azusa Street Revival”, 60.

\textsuperscript{156} Dieter, “Primitivism”, 12-13.
3   Latter Rain Eschatology

Another defining element of the original pentecostal historical-eschatological vision and
self-understanding was the appropriation of the Latter-Rain motif. It would be difficult to
overstate the extent to which this was a pivotal, distinct aspect of Pentecostal theology and
identity; it did nothing less than shape their entire worldview in a unique manner. Latter-rain
eschatology also provided the historical logic for the radical experiential primitivism described
above. Thus, this next section will, by way of definition, briefly articulate the significance of
this motif as it was utilized by the early Pentecostals, and then subsequently identify two major
theological facets of this eschatology: the imminence of the Second Coming, and empowerment
for last-days mission.

3.1   Definition

When Charles F. Parham published his authoritative account of what took place on New
Year’s Day, 1901 at his Bethel Bible College in Topeka, Kansas (the day Agnes Ozman, a
student there, began speaking in tongues), he titled it, “The Latter Rain: The Story of the Origin
of the Original Apostolic Faith or Pentecostal Movements.” The Revival sparked by the
events of that day subsequently went by the three alternating names found in this title:
“Pentecostal Movement,” “Apostolic Faith Movement,” and “Latter-Rain Movement.” A brief
explanation of this third moniker is provided in the introduction of a famous sermon on the topic
by early Pentecostal theologian David Wesley Myland, delivered in 1909 in Chicago:

157 Title of Ch. 7 of The Life of Charles Parham, Founder of The Apostolic Faith Movement (Joplin, Mo: Tri-State Printing, 1930), as referenced in Dayton, Theological Roots, 23; and Synan, ed., Century of the Holy Spirit, 45.
The present, and, we may say, mightier movement and manifestation of the Holy Spirit has been called, quite generally, "The Latter Rain," doubtless from the fact that it is at least the spiritual aspect of the outworking of God's great Latter Rain Covenant. If it is remembered that the climate of Palestine consisted of two seasons, the wet and the dry, and that the wet season was made up of the early and the latter rain, it will help you to understand this Covenant and the present workings of God's Spirit. For just as the literal early and latter rain was poured out upon Palestine, so upon the church of the First Century was poured out the spiritual early rain, and upon us today is being poured out the spiritual latter rain.  

In explaining the hermeneutic employed to make this association between the physical rains of Palestine and the historical activity of the Holy Spirit, Myland stated:

Let us go back and look at this Covenant a moment that you may get some real spiritual bread out of it, for though it is a matter of history as to literal Israel, it is also typical as to God's spiritual people, and it is also prophetical and therefore dispensational under the great plan of God for the ages. It is along these three lines, historical or literal as it applies to God's ancient people and land, typical and spiritual as it applies to God's people, the church, and prophetical as to its dispensational aspect in the unfolding of God's plan in the ages, and bringing in the eternal kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.  

Myland explicitly made both a typological and prophetic association between God’s covenantal promise—recorded in Deuteronomy 11:10-21—to provide Israel with seasonal rains for their harvests in the Promised Land, and the great outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the twentieth century.

---


century. This outpouring had been unprecedented since the Day of Pentecost. Thus, as Myland
demonstrated, the Pentecostals ‘spiritualized’ this particular covenantal promise of God in
scripture to allude also to the early ‘rain’ of the Spirit upon the Upper Room in Acts 2, and to the
latter rain they were now experiencing in the early 1900’s. As Jacobsen affirms:

Myland also thought Scripture could validly be read through “typical” (i.e. typological) and
“prophetical” lenses and, interpreted in that way, he believed the latter rain mentioned in the Deuteronomic
text was a reference to the pentecostal revival that had finally dawned on the church in his own lifetime. The pentecostal revival was the true beginning of God’s promised “days of heaven upon earth”.

Other scripture passages were also similarly interpreted to support this association, most notably Joel 2:23 (which occurs just before vv. 28-32, which St. Peter says is fulfilled by the events in the Upper Room in his Pentecost sermon) and James 5:7, which speaks of both the Lord’s coming again, and the early and latter rains in the same verse. Wacker asserts that “The foundation of the theory was the word of the prophet Joel: It shall come to pass afterwards that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh. Pentecostals assumed the prophet’s proclamation was proleptic, simultaneously describing both the Day of Pentecost and the Last Days of history.”

We see immediately, then, that this “latter-rain” eschatological motif as appropriated by the original Pentecostals, and voiced by Myland, was by nature covenantal, prophetic,

160 Jacobsen, Thinking in the Spirit, 111. “days of heaven upon the earth” refers to the subtitle of Myland’s series.
161 Faupel documents all the scripture passages that reference the early and latter rains: Job 29:29, Prov. 16:15, Jer. 3:3; 5:24, Hos.6:3, Joel 2:23, Zech. 10:1, and James 5:7, 31n33. Significantly, there are seven other biblical writers besides Deuteronomy that refer to latter rain.
dispensational, and proleptic. It is these very qualities that shaped their particular eschatology, and their identity as the historical and prophetic fulfillment of God’s last-days agenda. As Jacobsen explains, “Like most early pentecostals, Myland believed that he was living at the end of the age and that Jesus would soon return to earth. He believed that he was living in the final ‘cloudburst’ of Holy Ghost power, and he wanted everyone to get totally soaked by the “latter rain” which was falling so copiously from heaven.”\textsuperscript{163} He later elaborates further on the eschatological significance of the latter rain:

Myland’s spiritual interpretation of this phenomenon (and many other pentecostals shared this view) was that the “early rain” was a symbol of the Spirit’s first falling on the church on the day of Pentecost as recorded in the book of Acts. The “latter rain” was then understood as a reference to the end-time revival of pentecostal faith and experience that would take place just before Christ’s return.\textsuperscript{164}

As demonstrated in the previous section, Myland and other Pentecostals also intrinsically connected this latter rain motif to their radical experiential primitivism, or rather logically deduced this primitivism from their latter-rain understanding of salvation-history. Jacobsen notes further that Myland “argued that the ‘second Pentecost’ which was taking place during the early twentieth century was restorative, having been sent by God to bring unity and perfection to the church, and indeed to bring the entire world ‘back [to] perfection and perpetuity’ before ‘the coming of our Lord.’”\textsuperscript{165} One of the purposes of the latter rain was to restore the ‘land’ to its earlier fruitfulness before the ‘harvest’ was collected (cf. Matt. 9:37-38).

\textsuperscript{163} Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 111.
\textsuperscript{164} Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 125.
\textsuperscript{165} Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 124.
The dispensational aspect of this eschatology was an inherited one. As Wacker points out, “The origins of the latter rain concept lay in dispensational premillennialism, one of the most powerful popular intellectual traditions of the late nineteenth century.”

Dispensationalism, broadly speaking, is a view of history whose “basic assumption is that God deals with the human race in successive dispensations,” or epochs of time. It was popularized through the teachings of the Plymouth Brethren leader John Nelson Darby, and the Scofield Reference Bible. Premillennialism is an eschatological system that believes the Second Coming of Jesus Christ will occur shortly before He commences a literal one thousand year reign on earth. Wacker goes on to explain that Pentecostals assumed the basic framework of the already existent dispensational premillennialism, but modified it. One of those modifications (he identifies three) was the belief that “Christ would not return for his bride until all the world had heard the full gospel message of salvation, healing, baptism (evidenced by tongues), and the Lord’s return.” This is what gave the Revival its perceived special purpose and mission in salvation-history, one that fostered the very radical experiential primitivism they so passionately espoused.

What needs to be acknowledged in attending to this very aspect of historical pentecostal theology is a specific ecclesiological ramification that resulted for some. As I wrote elsewhere about this aspect of their latter-rain eschatology, some Pentecostals held to a radical distinction between Christ’s Body and His Bride:

166 Wacker, Heaven Below, 252.
Because this "restoration" was only taking place among a small fraction of Christendom, some prominent Pentecostals interpreted this move of the Spirit as preparing a remnant of true believers from among a largely apostatized Church. The aforementioned Charles Parham, for instance, a key figure in earliest Pentecostalism, wrote the following: “Adam's rib was a rib taken out of his side; the second Adam Christ's Bride will be a small company. One Hundred and Fourty-four [sic] Thousand, taken out of His Body (the Church)...The Bride is a distinct company from the Church. Christ does not marry his own Body as many teachers would have you believe.”

In such an interpretation, the truly Spirit-filled make up the Bride who will be caught up to meet Christ in the air, while the rest of the established (unfaithful) church must go through the tribulation. This apocalyptic self-understanding of the early Pentecostals unfortunately led some to a theology that saw the Church as an infidel and themselves as the "true" bride of Christ.

Apart from partially explaining why early Pentecostals did not bother to articulate a formal ecclesiology, the remnant theology held by Parham appropriated the Latter-Rain heilsgeschichte in a specific mutation that depicted the Pentecostal identity as at best a sectarian movement, or at worst an ‘anti-church’ movement that understood the Bride of Christ to actually constitute those who have been rescued out of the visible or institutional (and, in this view, wholly apostate) church. Parham was not the only one with such a remnant theology. Faupel points to Frank Ewart, another early pentecostal writer, as a voice for the movement’s tendency toward a remnant theology:

---


Yet, while the church was ‘hopelessly corrupt’, the Pentecostals maintained that God had a 
faithful remnant both within and without the visible church. Frank Ewart noted: ‘From this 
period on through the Middle and Dark ages, the Early Rain diminished from a mighty and 
universal downpour into periodic effusions, which persisted right up to the beginning of the 
twentieth century.’

However, as popular as it seemed, this view was certainly not representative of the movement 
as a whole, nor did it last very long as the formation of their own denominations attests to. 
But it certainly did exist and therefore does demonstrate one theological trajectory that came out 
of the particular dispensational worldview that undergirded the early Pentecostal gestalt. If the 
whole church could not be restored, then God would choose a remnant to call out of it to be the 
Bride for His Son.

Another noteworthy pentecostal modification of the dispensationalist scheme pointed out 
by Wacker is “a dramatic reconception of the period running from the Day of Pentecost to the 
present.” While other dispensationalists referred to this epoch as the Great Parenthesis, 
“because it represented an interruption of the divine plan for history,” Pentecostals, “in contrast, 
called that same period the Age of the Holy Spirit. They reasoned that it represented not an 
interruption but a fulfillment of the divine plan for history, particularly in its beginning and

172 Faupel, *Everlasting Gospel*, 36-37. Faupel cites no fewer than seven Pentecostal writers besides Parham who 
articulated a remnant view of church history. Jacobsen also examines how Myland, in *The Latter Rain Covenant*, 
made a distinction between two groups of Christians: “There is the ekklesia, those called out, and also the eklektos, 
those called the second time, called out from the called ones,” 118-119.

173 Dayton notes in passing that pentecostal pioneer Mary Woodworth-Etter ascribed the bride to the church, thus 
not outside of it or within it, *Theological Roots*, 28. Similarly, a Latter Rain diagram from Sister Aimee Semple 
McPherson in 1919 graphically refers to the peak of the Dispensation of the Holy Ghost as the “Perfect Church” 
holy-ghost-vision.jpg.

ending periods." This distinctive historical perspective is what set the table for their Latter-Rain covenant interpretation. It is also what facilitated their view, articulated earlier, that the restoration of the apostolic church was a gradual process which began with Luther nearly 400 years prior to the revival.

Besides Myland’s classic sermons on the subject, another early Pentecostal writer, the aforementioned George Floyd Taylor, also epitomized the modified dispensational scheme Wacker refers to, which heightened the place of the Latter-Rain covenant for the revival. As Jacobsen explains, Taylor believed that,

At crucial points in history, God had called out small vanguards of believers to become the carriers of the next revelation of spiritual truth. This was part of God’s grand plan of slowly bringing fallen humanity back into the full light of truth. The work had been long. Taylor told his readers never to “forget that the Spirit has always been in the world…[leading] the world by successive stages, through patriarch, law-giver, priest, judge, and prophet up to Christ.” In the post-biblical era, this pattern of incremental advance continued as Luther rediscovered the doctrine of justification by faith, Wesley recovered the experience of entire sanctification, and host of nineteenth-century figures reclaimed the doctrine of divine healing…Taylor believed that that pattern was in the process of repeating itself as God was “turning on [even] more light” through the pentecostal movement.  

Writing in 1907, Taylor, who also held to a similar opinion as Parham about the meaning of the Bride as a remnant, thus held that the Pentecostal Revival was now the culmination or climax

of the latter-rain move of the Holy Spirit that had been building for some time. As Wacker comments,

Since the Lord had designed Palestine to serve as a “miniature world in itself”, its meteorological pattern would be spiritually replicated in the “church at large”. Taylor allowed that the latter rain had been “foreshadowed” in the Protestant Reformation, and the holiness revivals of the 1890s qualified as “preliminary showers”. But the current movement marked the beginning of the full deluge.178

Taylor thus provides the representative voice for the modified pentecostal Dispensationalism identified by Wacker.

This modification, which Wacker states is “by far [the] most important,”179 was actually crucial for Pentecostals in that it also served to theologically accommodate their place for the miraculous in this particular (unprecedented) outpouring of the Spirit. In short, the supernatural manifestations of the Spirit experienced by Pentecostals, such as speaking in tongues, were the tell-tale signal that the Latter Rain had now come. Wacker explains:

The proof, the hard proof, that the current revival betokened the long-predicted latter rain lay elsewhere. To begin with, close students of the Bible knew that miracles marked the beginning and the end of dispensations…More important, the kind of miracles that marked the beginning of a dispensation always marked its end. Miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost had swept the apostolic church, and they were sweeping Holy Spirit-filled churches today. What else could it mean? So when J. W. Welch, an early chairman of the Assemblies of God, witnessed the “glorious manifestations of divine power” in the current revival, he knew that the “last days” had

178 Wacker, Heaven Below, 254. The quotations from Taylor come from The Spirit and the Bride, 1907.
179 Wacker, Heaven Below, 254.
come. Such events proved that “God’s time-piece [had] reached the dispensational hour” in which the Lord would “pour out His Spirit in Latter Rain significance.”

This significant point is eloquently echoed by Donald Dayton, when he writes:

But beyond indicating the special task to be performed in the “last days” by the rise of Pentecostalism, the Latter Rain doctrine also explained why the gifts and miracles should reappear after such a long “drought”. Mrs. Woodworth-Etter explained: “God says before Jesus comes, these same ‘signs and wonders’ shall come to pass; the sick shall be healed, devils cast out, people shall speak with tongues – just before he comes.” These “signs and wonders” not only tie the eschatological themes into the whole complex of the four-square gospel, but the Latter Rain framework makes the great apologetic problem of Pentecostalism into a major apologetic asset. The long drought from post-apostolic times to the present is seen to be a part of God’s dispensational plan for the ages. What seemed to make the movement most illegitimate – its discontinuity with classical forms of Christianity – has become its greatest legitimation.

The Latter Rain Dispensationalism appropriated by the Pentecostal Revival was its most potent weapon against cessationism, initially. And it was a weapon they needed in those days. It would be many decades before the Charismatic Movement also eventually served to legitimate pentecostal pneumatology concerning manifestations of the Spirit. By that time, Latter-Rain Dispensationalism was already beginning to be hardly more than a memory in most cases. In fact, when a newer “Latter-Rain Movement” rose up in North Battleford, Saskatchewan in the

\[\text{Wacker, } \text{Heaven Below.} \ 255. \ \text{The quotations from J.W. Welch are cited from the introduction to Lawrence, Apostolic Faith Restored.} \]

\[\text{Dayton, Theological Roots, 28.} \]
fall of 1947, claiming that it was the real latter-rain outpouring of the Spirit—the previous revival had not been—it was rejected by the established Pentecostals of that time.\textsuperscript{182}

Initially, however, the Latter-Rain doctrine of early Pentecostalism served not only to legitimate their expectation of the supernatural works of God and their view of the baptism of the Holy Spirit marked by glossolalia, but also, as has already been noted, to serve the Revival with a very specific mandate and purpose in salvation-history. As Fauple states it, “The motif was used to disclose the Pentecostal movement as standing at the apex of history.”\textsuperscript{183} This mandate was theologically intertwined with the historical-eschatological matrix the Latter-Rain thinking provided, and was comprised of two further defining characteristics or doctrines that need to be highlighted here: the imminence of Christ’s return, and empowerment for mission.

### 3.2 Imminency of the Second Coming

Intrinsic to Latter-Rain Dispensationalism, as is already apparent, was the unwavering, passionate conviction that these were the last days before the premillennial return of Christ. Both the aforementioned Taylor and Myland emphasized this in their respective expositions of the Latter Rain prophetic covenant. Returning to the earlier statement about Taylor’s conviction that God was “turning on more light” through the Pentecostal movement, he believed further that “The new focus of revelation was “the Baptism of the Holy Spirit and the evidence of Pentecost” and the conflict was immense, so much so that Taylor thought that this had to be the last and

\textsuperscript{182} Cf Atter, \textit{The Third Force}, 141-144.

\textsuperscript{183} Fauple, \textit{Everlasting Gospel}, 34.
final contest for truth.”\textsuperscript{184} For him, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, visibly evidenced by speaking in tongues, was “an eschatological experience that ushered the recipient into the end-times company of bridal saints.” Consequently, this “bridal company of pentecostal believers would be raptured out of the world as the end of the age approached and would be miraculously brought up to heaven to be with Christ.”\textsuperscript{185} The purpose of the Latter Rain, according to Taylor, was to fill those who were willing to accept and seek the experience of the ‘full gospel’ with the baptism of the Holy Ghost, so that they could join the Bride of Christ in the imminent rapture of the saints. Consequently, the purpose of the baptism of the Holy Ghost was to be the marker of those who were part of the remnant that God would rapture.

The eschatology of Myland has been characterized as more cautious than other Pentecostals, but he also firmly believed “that the pentecostal revival itself was one of the surest signs that Christ’s return was near.”\textsuperscript{186} Like Taylor, he also pointed to apparent climate change in Palestine as another spiritual sign which confirmed that God was sending the latter rain, which “was then understood as a reference to the end-time revival of pentecostal faith and experience that would take place just before Christ’s return.”\textsuperscript{187} Myland also agreed with Taylor that “The experience of pentecostal fullness was preparation for participation in the first-rapture bridal company of saints, and it was the only way to be included. That was the spiritual goal toward which Myland sought to encourage all Christians with his eschatological exhortations.”\textsuperscript{188} Both

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{184} Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 102.
  \item \textsuperscript{185} Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 103.
  \item \textsuperscript{186} Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 124.
  \item \textsuperscript{187} Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 125.
  \item \textsuperscript{188} Jacobsen, \textit{Thinking in the Spirit}, 127.
\end{itemize}
of these early Pentecostal theologians thus held to an imminent eschatology that understood the arrival of Pentecostalism (as the Latter Rain) as a sign that the return of Christ was very near.

Of course Pentecostalism was certainly not the only movement in church history to hold to such an imminent, apocalyptic eschatology, and it bears repeating that key elements of this premillennial, dispensational apocalypticism were directly inherited from the preceding Holiness movement. What is significant for our purposes here is the particular manner in which the original Pentecostals understood their experience of the Holy Spirit to hold specific covenantal and eschatological significance in their unique reading of salvation-history. They were the People of God’s Presence, restoring the church to its apostolic glory in the last days before Christ’s return. This was the meaning of the Latter-Rain motif. In their unique appropriation of latter-rain covenant theology, Pentecostals did utilize a potent way to think proleptically. It enabled them to effectively look forward while simultaneously looking back. And they presented a full-blown model for doing so long before theologian Jürgen Moltmann came along to emphasize such a “messianic ecclesiology.”189 While the latter-rain motif perhaps no longer defines Pentecostals anywhere close to the extent it did at the inception of the Revival, this proleptic understanding of the Spirit’s Presence is valuable in their ongoing construction of a theology of the church that lives between the “now” and the “not yet.”

3.3 Power for Mission

The emphasis on imminency built into Pentecostal latter-rain eschatology also served to fuel their fundamental *missional* character by supplying the urgency of the incredibly important task to which they had been commissioned: to participate in the last great harvest of souls before Christ’s soon returning. This was, after all, why the Latter Rain of the Spirit was now falling. Spirit-baptism was not just a sign that one now belonged to the congregation of the faithful for whom Christ was returning. Its purpose was far greater than that. The Spirit was now being poured out in the last days to *empower* the saints to evangelize, to proclaim the Good News of salvation through the atoning work of Jesus Christ, to reach souls with the Gospel before time was up. This was the understanding of the meaning of Spirit-baptism from the very beginning, stemming from the study of Acts conducted by the students of Parham’s bible school in Topeka, Kansas. Wacker notes that, for them, “speaking in tongues *always* accompanied Holy Ghost baptism, first as an audible sign of the Holy Ghost’s presence, second as a tool for evangelism.”¹⁹⁰ This theology is also evident in the way William Seymour often exhorted those recipients of Spirit-baptism at Azusa Street by way of a ‘benediction’ at the end of a service: “Now try to get people saved!”

Myland also liked to refer to the pentecostal experience as “fullness of blessing and power for service.”¹⁹¹ The term “power for service” became a rampant one for Pentecostals when speaking of the purpose of Spirit-baptism. In his *Latter Rain Covenant* sermons, Myland emphasized that, “the purpose of Pentecost is to make you a witness. You cannot help it….God wants us as witnesses and pours upon us the subpoena of the court of heaven, immerses us in the

¹⁹⁰ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 5. Note the wording describing the first purpose.

Holy Ghost…”

Jacobsen affirms that for Myland, “Enthusiasm for missions, combined with the Spirit-empowered ability to do it, was another very important sign of pentecostal faith and experience.” On this important emphasis Myland was again representative of the Revival’s pervading theology.

So too, again, was Taylor. However, Taylor went further in understanding Spirit-baptism as empowerment for mission in relation to our present concern with envisioning the church as the People of God’s Presence. As Jacobsen explains, “He argued that the activity of the Spirit needed to be manifested through a physical human body because God in the person of the Spirit, unlike God the Father and God the Son, did not naturally possess a body. The Spirit had to use the bodies of willing Christians to establish its own mediated physical presence in the world.” While Taylor’s notion of the ‘need’ for each member of the Trinity to possess their own body is certainly questionable at best, the idea of the Spirit’s Presence as being embodied through the Spirit-baptized People of God who are then witnesses to His loving, redemptive activity in the world is a crucial piece in the ongoing construction of pentecostal ecclesiology. Although Taylor was extreme in that (like Parham) he stubbornly continued to hold to tongues as xenolalia, he did also exude the broader Pentecostal stress on Spirit-baptism as “a missionary sign,” a baptism that endues recipients with power for mission (Acts 1:5). Intrinsic to their

utilization of the Latter-Rain motif was the pentecostal belief that the purpose of Spirit-baptism was empowerment to witness to the Gospel in an unprecedented manner in the Last Days.

Latter-Rain eschatology was crucial to early Pentecostal self-understanding in that it supplied the specific purpose and place for the revival within salvation-history; it facilitated the logic of their belief system and legitimated their unique, apostolic experience of the Spirit’s Presence. As Faupel puts it, “The Latter Rain motif provided the broad framework in which the Pentecostal world-view could be constructed. With salvation history as Pentecostalism’s theological center, the motif directed adherent’s focus toward the role that the Pentecostal movement would play in the culmination of that history.” Their unique appropriation of the latter-rain covenant was a key part of the pentecostal ‘genius’ in that it allowed them to be particularly effective in simultaneously look forward while looking back; to be highly eschatological while being highly primitivistic at the same time; to be progressive and creative in evangelism and missions without being ‘modern’ or humanistic.

To repeat, this motif no longer operates on nearly the same scale, though its influence does remain. Leonard Lovett, an African-American Pentecostal scholar, declared as late as 1975: “Belief in the Latter Rain theory presupposes a ‘faith’ stance. I share and embrace such a stance unashamedly.” Whether or not the Latter-Rain remains viable for them, in their ongoing wrestling, theological construction, and development Pentecostals will need to find a way to have a historical-eschatological matrix that allows them to look ahead while looking back in a similarly effective manner to what they once did.

197 Faupel, Everlasting Gospel, 35-36.
4 Full-Gospel Rubric

Another defining element of early Pentecostal theology was the “Full-Gospel” rubric they used to organize and declare their core beliefs in a Christological manner. Chief among the reasons why this rubric was significant is that it anchored a Holy Ghost revival movement to the person and work of Jesus Christ; thus allowing a highly pneumatological movement to simultaneously remain highly christocentric. I will identify the implications of this for ecclesiology below.

The Full-Gospel rubric followed either a four or five-fold articulation. In its later, more common four-fold form it proclaimed Jesus as Saviour, Healer, Baptizer and Coming King. The earlier five-fold version added ‘Sanctifier’ to this list, which had actually been formulated by preceding Holiness groups\(^{199}\). Vinson Synan notes that Parham, Seymour and the Apostolic Faith Mission, and the first Pentecostal denominations held to the “five-fold gospel” version\(^ {200}\). It is the five-fold version that Steven Land uses to define Pentecostalism’s identity in his dissertation, \textit{Pentecostal Spirituality}. He notes that each of the five-fold works of Christ denotes a creedal statement for Pentecostals: Justification by faith (Saviour), Sanctification by faith as a definite work of grace (Sanctifier), Healing of the body as provided for all in the atonement (Healer), the pre-millennial return of Christ (Coming King), and the baptism of the Holy Spirit

---

\(^{199}\) I.e. A. B. Simpson, founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, is known to have taught a “four-fold gospel” of Christ as “Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer and Coming King” in the late nineteenth-century, cf. Dayton, 22. Pentecostals thus added “Baptizer” to Simpson’s four-fold gospel, in reference to the Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

evidenced by speaking in tongues (Baptizer). On the other hand, Aimee Semple McPherson named the denomination she founded in 1927, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, in reference to the four-fold version she championed so effectively. Across the Atlantic, George Jeffreys founded the Elim Foursquare Gospel Alliance denomination in Great Britain in 1915, so-named for precisely the same reason. When comparing the two versions, Dayton asserts, ‘Though the five-fold pattern was historically prior and thus has certain claims for our attention, the four-fold pattern expresses more clearly and cleanly the logic of Pentecostal theology.” Dayton is referring to a four-fold Pentecostal rubric of Christ as Savior, Healer, Baptizer and Coming King; thus replacing Simpson’s “Sanctifier” with “Baptizer” in the Holy Spirit.

Either way, this Full-Gospel rubric contained the seeds for an inherent ecclesiology that Pentecostals could claim for their own. Indeed, a conference of current Pentecostal scholars on ecclesiology, which took place in Wales at the end of June 2010, used this rubric as their theme, as papers were organized around each part of the rubric (which, in this case, was the five-fold version). The conference was promoted in the following manner:

This international conference on Pentecostal Ecclesiology, a topic that has of yet received little attention, will focus on the ecclesiological implications of the five-fold gospel seeking to envision the church as Redeemed Community, Holy Community, Empowered Community, Healing Community, and Eschatological Community. Each of these presentations will focus upon the connection with the relevant element of the five-fold gospel (Jesus Is Savior, Sanctifier, Spirit Baptizer, Healer, and Coming King) and incorporate the way in which each of these elements is signified by a sacramental Sign (from a Pentecostal perspective): Water Baptism,

201 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, esp. 18.
202 Dayton, Theological Roots, 21.
Footwashing, Glossolalia, Anointing with Oil, Eschatological Banquet - Eucharist, respectively. \(^{203}\)

One of the conference organizers, John Christopher Thomas, had much earlier suggested that a Pentecostal ecclesiology be centered on the Full-Gospel rubric. \(^{204}\) The significant ecclesiological ramification for the Full-Gospel, as articulated by the Wales Conference outline, is how it functions as the anticipated experiential rubric for the Church—it clearly dictates what is expected to all those who are part of the corporate gathering of saints. The Church is thus (however loosely) ordered around the actualization of each of the four or five central Christ-events in a person’s salvific experience. An individual’s journey to wholeness or spiritual formation is effectively mapped-out according to this rubric, and thus the Church is, in effect, defined as the primary context, the community, where these events take place. This being the case, as the Wales Conference suggested, using the five-fold Full Gospel rubric the Church is a Redeemed (Saved) Community, a Holy (Sanctified) Community, an Empowered (Spirit-baptized) Community, a Healing Community and an Eschatological Community. \(^{205}\)

Another ecclesiological implication of the Full-Gospel rubric was, as stated earlier, the way it grounded the actions of the Holy Spirit in the work of Christ Jesus. This could be understood to be a creative and unique way of expressing the theology of Irenaeus, that the Word and Spirit represent the “two hands of God”. Jean-Jacques Suurmond has demonstrated how

\(^{203}\) Taken from unnamed document announcing the Conference. The papers from this Conference are scheduled to be published sometime after the completion of this dissertation.


\(^{205}\) Unnamed Conference Document.
pentecostal worship reflects the “Word and Spirit at Play.” This occurs, in part, because of the prominence and manner in which both the Word and Spirit are active in the convictions and devotion of pentecostal worshippers. The theological foundation for this play between Logos and Pneuma was the full-gospel rubric. Inherently, the Church is thus understood to be where Word and Spirit co-operate to bring the dynamic, immanent Presence of God to the lowly in miraculous, life-transforming ways. The Spirit, as Jesus promised his disciples, acts as the dynamic agent to continue the work of Christ following the ascension.

The Full Gospel Christological rubric functioned as a primary theological identifier for early Pentecostals; it summarized their core beliefs, and provided the template for what the church proclaims and what is expected to take place within the corporate gathering. Thus, any attempt at distinctly Pentecostal ecclesiological reflection must take this rubric into account, as the Wales Conference demonstrates.

5 Social Equality

A further ecclesiological root of earliest Pentecostalism was a unique and radical emphasis and praxis of social equality. At its inception, this was a Revival that was radically egalitarian for its time period. Though it sadly did not last, the Azusa Pentecostals managed to briefly preach and advance towards Joel’s inclusive vision of a church where male and female, young and old, slaves and free could partake of the same Spirit’s outpouring on level ground (Acts 2:17,18, cf. Joel 2:28,29).

The Azusa Street revival was famously a place where black and white (along with much smaller numbers of Hispanic and Asian) male and female seekers of the Holy Spirit worshipped,
prayed, testified, hugged and spoke in unknown tongues together, as equals. This caused eyewitness Frank Bartleman to exclaim, “The color line was washed away in the Blood.” Historian Mark Noll states the following about the revival: “One of its most prominent features was the full participation of women in public activities. In an America that still took racial barriers for granted, Azusa Street was also remarkable for the striking way in which blacks and whites joined to participate in its nightly meetings.” In fact, these racial and gender mixtures were apparently too much for Charles Parham when he came there to visit his former student, Seymour. He ended up denouncing the revival sparked by his own teachings, principally on these grounds. The fact that he did so demonstrates just how unusual—even shocking—this level of social equality was. It was, after all, a revival led by a black, half-blind son of a slave, who was partially assisted by a group of women, both black and white.

Upon identifying Azusa as a beacon of social equality, it is also necessary, however, to qualify the limits of this without dismissing the notable advances that were made at that time. While Seymour notoriously allowed women full participation and the “colour line was washed away”, he did also eventually impose limitations on the leadership offices held by both women and whites in the Mission for both theological and practical reasons. Nonetheless, in its historical context, Azusa was certainly a unique social community.


207 Cf. Wacker, Heaven Below, 232. It should be noted that though Parham directed his criticism at the egalitarian ethos of Azusa, another motivation for his denouncement was the failure of his attempt to take over leadership of the revival.

208 Cf. Edith Blumhofer, Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture (Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 172. Seymour “narrowed the sphere” of women’s leadership in 1908, and by 1915 would allow only Blacks to serve on his Board.
One of the catalysts for this radical egalitarianism was, of course, the pentecostal theology of charismatic giftedness drawn directly from their own Acts 2 experience. Joel’s vision had literally been fulfilled for them. Christ Jesus showed no preferences in whom He baptized with the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit showed no preferences in whom He gifted with charismata. This latter-rain outpouring of the Spirit was truly upon ALL flesh. Wacker also makes this point:

It should be stressed that women, blacks, and children assumed a visible role in public worship, not because pentecostals suddenly came to believe that Galatians 3:28 (“In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female”) formed the core of the Gospel, nor because they suddenly grew politically progressive. Rather these otherwise disenfranchised groups spoke freely and commanded respect in these settings because saints assumed that the Holy Spirit spoke through them. It ill-behoveled anyone to interfere with the Lord’s chosen vessels.209

The experience of Spirit-baptism and the operation of charismatic gifts (i.e. healing, miracles, prophecy, and interpretation of tongues) among different kinds of people was a powerful, supernatural leveler among social classes.

As part of this leveling, there was also a profound empowering. Most of the original Pentecostals came from marginalized groups: those who were poor or from the lower-classes, African-Americans who were children of former slaves, those from rural areas, those with little formal education, immigrants, etc. On their own, they had little that provided them with the ability to transcend their socially disadvantaged state. That is, until they experienced Pentecost. Suddenly, they were now participants in the climax of salvation-history. They had received the

209 Wacker, Heaven Below, 105.
empowering presence of the Holy Spirit that supplied them with a new voice to be witnesses to the atoning work of Christ (cf. Acts 1:8), a grandiose purpose, a vision that allowed them to transcend and not merely cope with their lowly circumstances. Now they could perform miracles, speak in or interpret tongues, preach under “the anointing”, prophecy, receive and/or dispense healing through prayer. Most surely, they were now God’s own chosen, the Bride of Christ, the company of the elect. They were operating on the same plane the Apostles once had. They were the People of God’s Presence. This empowerment contributed to the social leveling that initially took place among the participants of the revival.

The indiscriminate charismatic giftedness among these marginalized people therefore enabled a new and unique manifestation of Luther’s vision of the priesthood of all believers. Because only the Holy Spirit was thought or declared to be in charge, there was no explicit hierarchy, and quite obviously the operative model of worship and ministry was radically participatory. In a service, anyone could testify, and were encouraged to do so. Anyone could lead in intercession. As they had all been baptized into one body the same Spirit, they were all enabled to contribute to the edification of the rest of the Body (cf. 1 Cor. 12:13, 14). To repeat an earlier point, early Pentecostals held to a form of restorationism that, although articulated in the form of the Latter-Rain, understood the trajectory of the Revival as the culmination of what had begun with Luther and the Protestant Reformation. As such, the Lutheran vision of the priesthood of all believers was certainly conducive to the new-found Pentecostal interpretation of the Prophet Joel’s and Apostle Paul’s vision of ‘all flesh’ receiving the same Spirit.

Further to their Pauline theology of the Body, another factor in the original egalitarian ethos was a new and powerful outpouring of love as the fruit of God’s Presence. Myland articulated this well. Jacobsen provides the following quotes:
Myland said: “Pentecost is not simply for me, not merely to satisfy my feeling, but to get floods on the dry ground; to make me a medium, a transmitter.” Being even more blunt, he wrote: “God sent this latter rain to gather up all the poor and outcast, and make us love everybody, feeble ones, base ones, those that have been cast out of human society; no one wants them, all the outcasts of India and China; these are what God sent the latter rain people to pick up.” That kind of love for others was a sure sign that the Spirit of God was powerfully present in any particular Christian believer.  

Here is a point that is difficult to overemphasize: the Presence of God experienced by the original Pentecostals was at times signified by a new vision of love for the unloved. The practice of this love then organically led to greater social equality, albeit temporarily. This love replaced prior prejudice in dramatic ways. Wacker recounts one case where a white Methodist minister named Jonathan Perkins, who had previously criticized Pentecostals for failing to keep blacks in their place, received the baptism of the Spirit at a “predominantly black revival in Wichita in 1923. ‘I had to wade through a whole camp meeting of them when I got the Baptism.’ Perkins wrote. ‘God surely broke me over the wheel of my prejudice.’” Originally, the Baptism of the Spirit was not just about power alone, but power to love others with the love God had shed abroad in their hearts. Hence Seymour’s famous quote: “The Pentecostal power, when you sum it all up, is just more of God’s love. If it does not bring me love, it is simply a counterfeit.”  

The unfortunate reality is, of course, that the radical social equality that marked the beginning of the revival did not last. The movement did divide along racial lines as soon as

210 Jacobsen, _Thinking in the Spirit_, 130.  
211 Wacker, _Heaven Below_, 65.  
The equation of Spirit-baptism with love eventually was eclipsed by greater emphasis on power. But historians of the Revival will point out that this work of the Spirit was originally a radically egalitarian one, and this characterized the original pentecostal vision of the church as unique in this regard. It is imperative that any construction of distinctly pentecostal ecclesiology makes a concerted effort to recover this original vision.

6 Church as Holy

The traditional marks of the church were not attached to Pentecostal theology in an explicit manner until fairly recently. However, as a product of the nineteenth century Holiness Movement, Pentecostals did inherit and imbibe an innate understanding of the holiness of the Church. As we have seen, this understanding was not monolithic and led to significant diversions concerning areas such as the meaning of the Church as Bride. Across these diversions, however, was an inherent view concerning holiness as constitutive of the ‘true’

---

church, when placed under the umbrella of personal sanctification. Walter Hollenweger, foremost scholar of Pentecostalism, affirms that this was the understanding of holiness operative in “earlier Pentecostal ecclesiologies, in which clear lines of demarcation were drawn based on criteria of personal and social holiness.” Holiness as a “mark” of the Church was determined by the lack of sin in its members; who had received or were seeking a Wesleyan “second blessing.”

Within this Wesleyan/Holiness mentality, however, were the seeds of another crucial aspect of perceiving the Church’s Holiness, which stems directly from the incipient pentecostal ecclesiology of the Church as the People of God’s Presence. As those who inherited and embraced only the more radical ‘three-works’ Holiness theology of the blessings of Conversion, Entire Sanctification and Spirit Baptism, Pentecostals experienced the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit in markedly supernatural fashion. The Baptism of the Holy Spirit signified that the empowering presence of God now resided within these believers in an even greater dimension. They were now filled with the Spirit of Holiness in a manner rarely seen since the 120 in the Upper Room. Consequently, what makes the Church Holy from this Spirit-baptized perspective is that the Church is the Temple of the Holy Spirit in a literal, tangible manner. The dynamic, immanent Presence of the Holy Spirit among the Spirit-baptized congregation is what constitutes the Church as Holy. This is what Newbigin perceived nearly half a century later. Although this thought was not expressed among the first theologians of the Revival (they were not yet concerned with a Pentecostal re-visioning of the traditional marks of the Church as they were

---

trying to restore the Apostolic Church), their pneumatology certainly steered them in this
direction.

7 Conclusion

I have attempted to identify key elements of the original pentecostal vision of the
Christian life, and the Church, for the purposes of understanding the ecclesiological roots of their
gestalt, so that I can proceed to take those elements from this gestalt which should still rightfully
belong in a distinctly pentecostal ecclesiology for the twenty-first century. In particular, I have
singled out specific practices they sought to restore to the church in their primitivist efforts, and
examined their Latter-Rain eschatology, the Full-Gospel rubric, their initial efforts at
egalitarianism, and their Wesleyan-holiness influences which revealed their rudimentary
ecclesiology. Through all of this, the theme of presence has been recognized as foundational to
pentecostal spirituality and practice. Robert Anderson succinctly captures this historical
grounding for pentecostal ecclesiological thinking:

The Pentecostals sought to recreate a primitive New Testament community of saints,
emphasizing individual religious experience, spontaneity, and the free life of the Spirit. For them
the only genuine religion was the “religion of the heart” in which one felt the immediate presence
of God and lived a life under the direct guidance of the Spirit.\(^{215}\)

\(^{215}\) Robert Anderson, Vision of the Disinherited, 156.
While Pentecostals also greatly valued doctrinal truth\textsuperscript{216}, for them God’s sovereign ‘latter-rain’ led to a profound experience of this presence of God’s Spirit. It is thus apparent that the pentecostal approach to a theology of the church should be based upon this principle of the immanent presence of God in the Person of the Spirit, so cherished by the movement.

I began this chapter with a quote from Frank Macchia identifying the need to develop the implicit ecclesiology within the Latter-Rain theology of the earliest Pentecostals. I conclude this chapter with another quote from Macchia that serves as a bridge to this present task:

Throughout their history “from sect to church” pentecostals harbored the vision of themselves as essentially a movement gifted by the Holy Spirit in the latter days to help prepare the world for the coming of the kingdom of God. Such a vision needs to be applied critically to their sometimes hierarchical and patriarchal institutional development as established church denominations. Is such an ecclesiastical development consistent with the early pentecostal vision of the church as an end-time missionary fellowship, structured and ordered by the liberating and empowering grace of God? At the same time, can this early vision be sustained and revised in the service of prophetic criticism toward society and the churches, including pentecostal institutional structures and priorities? Can pentecostals start again to be the blessing to the church and the world they hoped to be at the beginning?\textsuperscript{217}

While Macchia’s application of the typologies of sect-church to pentecostal history would be contested by Troeltch and Durnbaugh (as seen in Chapter One), he nonetheless asks important questions for the movement going forward. Do the ecclesiastical structures of


\textsuperscript{217} Macchia, “Pentecostal Theology,” \textit{NIDPCM}, 1138.
pentecostal denominations facilitate the prevalence of the early pentecostal vision? Or is something else occurring? In order for this early vision to be, as Steven Land has called for, “re-visioned” effectively, Pentecostals will need to continue to critically develop their ecclesiology. In doing so, they will need to retrieve something in the ethos of early Pentecostalism that will allow them to continue their mission with the vibrancy they have enjoyed in the past. Faupel states at the conclusion of *The Everlasting Gospel*, “for Pentecostalism to remain a vital force into the twenty-first century, it must look to its origins as a source for theological and spiritual renewal.”

That has been the attempt of this chapter.

While it is neither compulsory nor prudent to try to recapture *all* of the defining characteristics of earliest pentecostalism at this point in the evolution of the movement—some things must and should inevitably change—it is still fruitful and responsible to identify and understand those fundamental elements of the early pentecostal ethos that rightfully belong in the ongoing construction of a distinct pentecostal theology. In order to do so, it may be necessary to some extent to “drink the water where you came from”. Specifically, this present task is aimed toward providing a vision of the church that may help it, as Macchia says, once again “be the blessing” the early Pentecostals strove for.

---

Chapter 3
Constructing a Contemporary Pentecostal Ecclesiology

In Chapter One, I reviewed the broader status questionis of work on Pentecostal ecclesiology, with a focus on past works. In doing so, I endeavoured to demonstrate that a distinctly Pentecostal understanding of the Church should not glibly follow the most common past understandings of where to situate Pentecostalism ecclesiologically, either merely as a subset of evangelicalism or just another expression of Free Church. This is most often demonstrated in Pentecostal textbooks on systematic theology or even on ecclesiology. Rather, the one programmatic characterization of the movement that is most accurate and helpful in terms of what it says about the Church’s essence and visibility is that of Lesslie Newbigin’s Household of God. The other set of characterizations to be reckoned with stem from the diagram taken from Donald Durnbaugh’s The Believer’s Church.

Chapter Two set out to identify and explain the crucial aspects of implicit ecclesiological beliefs generally held by most Pentecostals at the earliest phase of the Revival. It is widely acknowledged by historians of the movement that Pentecostalism began as a restorationist, latter-rain, apostolic faith movement consisting of believers coming out of various other churches who, in light of their baptism in the Holy Spirit, held to a unique theological worldview that caused them to proleptically look back to the apostolic church even as they simultaneously looked forward to the imminent, glorious return of Jesus Christ: Savior, Healer, (Sanctifier), Baptizer in the Spirit and Coming King.
Given that Pentecostals later formed denominations which adopted a curious array of polities and governing systems, and given further that, correlative, a curious array of ecclesiology has been offered or adopted by pentecostal scholars (and scholars of Pentecostalism), it then remains to attempt to identify a central, unifying ecclesiological principal that distinguishes pentecostal ecclesiology within the Christian spectrum. The rest of this work, then, is an attempt to unpack the thesis of the Church as the People of God’s Presence. The theological notion of the Presence of God made palpable through the charismatic work of the Holy Spirit among God’s People is posited here as the foundation for constructing a pentecostal ecclesiology for the twenty-first century, which is appropriately faithful to the original identity of the movement, found within all authentic expressions of Pentecostalism globally, and yet conducive and useful to being shared ecumenically with the other great church traditions of Christianity. This notion is represented by the biblical image of the Church as Temple.

Before embarking on unpacking this thesis, however, it is necessary to survey more closely the most recent contributions to constructing pentecostal ecclesiology offered by several scholars within or for the movement. What are other contemporaries saying about this topic that we must be aware of before adding to the conversation? Initially, though, I wish to draw brief attention to perhaps the original proto-pentecostal ecclesiology offered in modern times.

1 Seth Cook Rees' *The Ideal Pentecostal Church*

An American Quaker who became a Nazarene pastor and later formed the “Pilgrim Holiness Church,” Seth Rees (1854 -1933) penned the short work, *The Ideal Pentecostal Church* (1897). Although not a classical Pentecostal himself, Rees managed to capture the restorationist vision discussed in the previous chapter shortly before the Revival began. Since it is a blueprint
for the very topic of this thesis, it is worth identifying those points which Rees saw as fundamental for an “ideal Pentecostal church.”

As the title would indicate, Rees imbibed the same apostolic, restorationist vision of the church as the Pentecostal Movement in that he took his ecclesiological blueprint directly from Acts 2. He most certainly believed that the same “baptism of fire” experienced by the 120 in the Upper Room was meant to be experienced in his day as well. Moreover, this baptism—this divine, life-transforming encounter with the Holy Spirit—was meant to form the church’s identity and be its life-source. Following in the developing trajectory of Jonathan Edwards and Charles Finney, Rees believed the church was literally dead without the ‘fire’ of the Holy Spirit present within it. This is because Rees firmly believed the Spirit, as the Third Member of the Trinity, is the presence and power of God Himself made manifest in human lives that collectively form the church.

Rees identified the ‘marks’ of an ideal Pentecostal church, one that has the same fire of the Spirit as the Apostolic church did, as: a church composed of regenerated souls, a church made clean by entire sanctification through the Spirit’s baptism of fire, a church where the power (dynamis) of the Spirit is plainly operable, a church that proclaims or witnesses to the Gospel, an egalitarian community, one that gives liberally to the poor, one that is demonstrative in its worship, one that has the magnetic fire of the Spirit attracting people of all kinds, one that convicts people of their sin, and one that effectively disciples their converts. Through all of these, the pervading theme is of a revival church in which the fire and power of the Spirit are bearing real fruit instead of reliance upon human methodologies. The contrast between the two is made throughout. Perhaps most representative of the thesis of Rees’s essay are the following words:
“Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.” There can be no success without power. Power is the very condition of success. It is the all-important need of the people of God, for by its presence failure is placed beyond the range of possibility… The strength of the church does not consist of brains, or numbers, or culture, or rhetoric, or schools. It does not reside in dignities, titles, scepters, thrones, stocks or bonds. The strength of the ideal Pentecostal Church is the Holy Ghost himself. He and no other is the power of this great army of the Lord. He is not a mere influence; he is not the breath of God, he is not an emanation from Deity; he is not the abstract power of God. He is God himself, the third Person in the trinity. He comes into the church by coming into the individual members, and thus by his omnipotent energy he purifies, electrifies and endues her with power.²¹⁹

We have here therefore, just at the outset of the beginning of modern Pentecostalism, a theology of the Church as the Fire-baptized saints who follow the direct leadership of the empowering person of the Holy Spirit. Another aspect of the significance of this proto-pentecostal ecclesiology is its striking similarity to Newbigin’s characterization just over 50 years later. Though Rees never became a classical Pentecostal after the movement began, he did describe beforehand the essence of what makes the church Pentecostal in a way they themselves, along with at least one notable observer in Newbigin, would informally echo once it became their own experience. With this proto-pentecostal ecclesiology in mind, I now turn to contributions on the subject made by current scholars who are, or who greatly influence, contemporary Pentecostals.

²¹⁹ Seth Rees, The Ideal Pentecostal Church. 1897. Obtained at http://www.raptureready.com/resource/rees/rees.html. This quote comes from Chapter Four: “A Powerful Church.”
2 Survey of Contemporary Writers on Pentecostal Ecclesiology

2.1 Miroslav Volf: Free Church Ecclesiology

In his book, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*, Volf—the son of a Croatian, Pentecostal pastor and a one-time ordained Pentecostal minister himself—brings the Free Church ecclesiology of “the first Baptist” John Smyth into dialogue with the ecclesiologies of the Catholic Joseph Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), and the Orthodox John Zizioulas. His expressed purpose in doing so is, “to demonstrate in a much more modest fashion that a Free Church ecclesiology can be dogmatically legitimate, can be commensurate with contemporary societies, and, for that reason and under certain conditions, can prove to be superior to other ecclesiologies.”

This *major* ecclesiological proposal may be boldly summarized as envisioning the church as a “polycentric, participative” community imaging the perichoretic, symmetrical nature of the trinitarian persons of the Godhead. In contrast with Ratzinger and Zizioulas, the “constitutive presence of Christ” through the Spirit in the Church is mediated not by office or by connection to a greater institution, nor *merely* through sacraments (though these “belong to the *esse* of the church”\(^\text{221}\)), but rather by the faith and obedience of the whole congregation. Indeed, it is the “public confession of faith in Christ through the pluriform speaking of the word” that is “the *central constitutive mark of the church.*”\(^\text{222}\)


\(^{221}\) Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 152. Volf goes on to explain, “There is no church without sacraments; but there are no sacraments without the confession of faith and without faith itself.” (154)

\(^{222}\) Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 150 (emphasis his).
At the same time, Volf is also striving “to counter the tendencies toward individualism in Protestant ecclesiology and to suggest a viable understanding of the church in which both person and community are given their proper due.”\textsuperscript{223} Thus, from his reading of Matthew 18:20, he also presents the church as the instrument of faith. The church is the “mother” in that “the transmission of faith occurs through interpersonal ecclesial interaction;” so that “it is from the church that one receives the content of faith, and it is in the church that one learns how faith is to be understood and lived.”\textsuperscript{224} However, the motherhood of the church is not executed through the priestly office, but rather the “universal priesthood of believers.”\textsuperscript{225}

What is also significant for our purposes here is how Volf formulates the structure of this congregational ecclesiology through the \textit{charismata}. For the Free-Church Volf, as for the Catholic Hans Küng, the church is inherently charismatic. The charismata are linked to “Christ’s constitutive presence in the church by the Spirit,” and to the church’s confession of Christ as Savior and Lord.\textsuperscript{226} As the One whose presence constitutes the church, the Holy Spirit orders the church by way of His sovereign bestowal of His gifts on whomever He chooses. Further, it is through the exercising of the charismata that the church lives out this polycentric-participative model.\textsuperscript{227} It is the truly Charismatic Church that allows everyone a place of ministry (through the differentiation of persons reflected through the pluriform gifts), while simultaneously being

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{223} Volf, \textit{After Our Likeness}, 2.
\item \textsuperscript{224} Volf, \textit{After Our Likeness}, 162-163.
\item \textsuperscript{225} Volf, \textit{After Our Likeness}, 166.
\item \textsuperscript{226} Volf, \textit{After Our Likeness}, 228-229; cf. Hans Küng, \textit{The Church} (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976), esp. 236-250.
\item \textsuperscript{227} Volf, \textit{After Our Likeness}, 226-227.
\end{itemize}
unified through the One Spirit who reigns and operates in such a way as to edify the whole body rather than exalt individuals.

In addition to the pneumatological (Trinitarian) orientation of Volf’s Free Church proposal, it is also highly eschatological. The church participates or lives presently in communion with the triune God through its confessed faith in Jesus Christ in “anticipation of the eschatological gathering of the entire people of God” in His new creation. Of special note here is Volf’s defining statement: “Wherever the Spirit of Christ, which as the eschatological gift anticipates God’s new creation in history (see Rom. 8:23; 2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:14), is present in its ecclesially constitutive activity, there is the church.” While he does not reference Hans Küng here, by calling the Spirit the “eschatological gift,” Volf refers to His presence in the Church in precisely the same manner. As with Küng, Volf’s eschatological “framework” connects well with this parallel impulse embedded in authentic Pentecostalism.

Other prominent, theological features of Volf’s Free Church proposal stem directly from his understanding of the Trinity. His perichoretical, “symmetrical,” trinitarian theology (inherited from Moltmann), so fundamental to his vision of church, communion and personhood, would require thorough examination on its own to determine more completely the scope and limits of its usefulness in ecclesiological construction. This is especially true of his “Correspondences” and “Limits of Analogy.”

228 Volf, After Our Likeness, 128-129.
229 Volf, After Our Likeness, 129 (emphasis his).
230 Volf, After Our Likeness, 128.
231 Volf, After Our Likeness, 192-200.
Perhaps what is most controversial about Volf’s articulation of the relationship between Trinity and Church surrounds the person of Christ. Specifically, his claim that the Pauline “Body of Christ” image for the church is only a metaphor would be cause for heated debate. Correspondingly, his rejection of the notion of *Christus totus, caput et membra* also does the same as will become evident later below. Because Pentecostals generally have not reflected much on this relationship (at least before *After Our Image* was published), these provocative points by Volf can give them needed food for thought.

Another crucial area for reflection, particularly for Pentecostals (and especially in light of their identification with Evangelicalism, cf. Hodges), is Volf’s presentation of the “Ecclesial Character of Salvation.” It has been generally observed that the pentecostal distinctive of Spirit-baptism, at least in the West, has fallen prey to individualism. In practice, church is there to serve one’s personal relationship with Christ, and to provide a place where they can be filled with power from on high. The dual challenge directed to soteriology and ecclesiology by Volf’s assertions both that, “Salvation and the church cannot be separated,” and that “The church is not a means, but an end in itself, it is a necessary mode of the life of faith” is one that pentecostals must seriously consider if they are to have enduring effectiveness in the North American context specifically.

---

Another striking feature of Volf’s ecclesiology is not what it contains, but what is glaringly absent: the *mission* of the church. Though at the outset of his own constructions he defends the focus on the church’s ecclesiality as “that which supports and shapes the entire life and mission of the church,” and then repeats the same for his final chapter on catholicity, the church’s mission is simply not treated. This may be explained by his attention to the church’s relationship to the Trinity rather than to the world, but it neglects the correspondence that should be evident (as it is in the NT): that the church *images* the Trinity not merely in its interior life and organization, but also by its proclamation and service to the world God wishes to redeem.

As I noted in Chapter One, this seminal work on ecclesiology from a son of the Pentecostal movement has attracted significant attention from a number of those scholars concerned with the direction pentecostal ecclesiology might go. For this reason, it is included here. While it has played a large role in causing Pentecostals to think about their own ecclesiology in relation to Volf’s, it is certainly not without its challenges, both on its own merit and as a possible anchoring point for Pentecostals. To repeat what was said in Chapter One, adopting Volf’s position could easily lead to the perpetuation of identifying Pentecostalism as merely a charismatic sub-group within Evangelicalism. As impressive as Volf’s work is, and as helpful as it may be at certain points, I would submit that his is not the most favourable option for the movement going forward.
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2.2 Simon Chan: “Mother Church”

At the other radical end of the spectrum of possible templates for pentecostal ecclesiology is the proposal by the Asian pentecostal scholar Simon Chan. He seeks to address the concern regarding the church’s practices by calling Pentecostals to the process of “traditioning.”238 Convinced as he is that, “The Pentecostal reality cannot be effectively traditioned without grounding it in ecclesiology,”239 he ventures to provide his own response to the question of “whether this corporate understanding of the Christian life is better served by a hierarchical or a ‘free church’ type of ecclesiology.”240 In contrast to Miroslav Volf, Chan does not see the ability of the Free Church model to effectively facilitate the “play of Spirit and Word” that “is crucial for structuring Pentecostal spirituality.”241 His assessment is summarized by the following: “The Free Church tradition has justly drawn attention to abuses whenever the church attempts to domesticate the Spirit and Word. Yet, for its part it has never quite succeeded in taming its centrifugal voluntarism, due largely to its failure to ground Word and Spirit in ecclesiology.”242

Chan then immediately responds to the proposal offered by Volf in After Our Likeness. He comments, “Even though Volf’s approach has succeeded to some extent in reconceptualizing the church as an organic unity, it is not without its problems as far as traditioning is
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concerned.” These ‘problems’, according to Chan, include: “first is his rejection of the hierarchical understanding of the Trinity in favour of the social, egalitarian structure of the Trinity;” second is the transference of the role of officers to the whole body of believers as a charismatic community, producing a “fluid conception of ministry” unlikely to “preserve the order of the church;” and “Third, Volf’s rejection of the Christus totus concept can only result in a loosening of the relationship between Christ and church, and hence in a loose conjunction of Christ, Scripture and Tradition.”

By way of an alternative, Chan then begins to spell out his own vision of a Pentecostal Ecclesiology through identifying three important characteristics. The first of these is titled “A Dynamic Catholic Community,” and concerns the ongoing and dynamic action of the Spirit in the church. This dimension of the Spirit’s activity is recognized at the eucharistic celebration, and in the realization of the “transcending wholeness” which defines the catholicity of the (local) church. The second is the church as “A Healing Community,” where “the Spirit that creates the eucharistic community transcending all social cultural and historical boundaries also implies that this community is characterized chiefly by its work of reconciliation and healing.” Two facets of this work are expressed in praying for the sick as “a regular part of the Pentecostal church’s liturgical life,” and in being sent out “in the power of the Spirit to offer healing and reconciliation to the world” as the church’s mission. The third characteristic is “A Truth-
Traditioning Community,” in which the Spirit who constitutes the church dynamically “also makes the church the place where truth exists dynamically.” Chan explains this in the following manner:

This means that connection between Christ the Truth, the Head of the church, and the tradition of the church is far more profound than is usually acknowledged in Protestantism. Christ who is the truth is not just an individual, historical person, but is also truth in relation to the church as his Body. The church is therefore an extension of Christ the truth [here he footnotes Zizioulas]. The on-going traditioning in the church of Christ the truth is made possible by the action of the Spirit…Christ as the truth in the church is realized in the eucharist where he is sacramentally present. Christ the truth is made present in the church by the action of the Spirit in the preaching of the Word and in the sacrament.

It is plain from the presentation of these characteristics that Chan (influenced by Zizioulas, it would seem) is calling Pentecostals to adopt a sacramental (eucharistic), liturgical ecclesiology governed by a more hierarchical structure. Given that the vast majority of classical Pentecostals have been markedly Protestant evangelicals (as Hodges’ book clearly demonstrates), this is a radical proposal to say the least.

What is interesting is that Chan’s hierarchical model, like Volf’s Free Church model, is grounded in the recognition of the eschatological Spirit. The Spirit of the ‘last days’ is present in the church as a foretaste, orienting the church towards its future in God. As in Volf, this same eschatological Spirit is also the Spirit in history. Chan states, “The Spirit who drives us forward to a hope beyond history also drives us back into history, challenging us to take our historical
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existence with utmost seriousness.”\textsuperscript{250} The church lives in the tension between “now and not yet” through the Spirit who is active in both.

Also important for Chan in this eschatological-pneumatological foundation for his ecclesiology is his insistence that “the Spirit is present in the church in a way that he is not present in the world.”\textsuperscript{251} He rails against the concept of \textit{Creator Spiritus} as one that would potentially undermine the ecclesiality of the Spirit if wrongly appropriated. It would seem that driving this concern are the problems this concept has produced in the Asian context.\textsuperscript{252}

Two other matters which Chan addresses in his chapter on “Pentecostal Ecclesiology” are the church’s mission to the world, and the relation of corporate worship to everyday life. On the issue of mission, following Newbigin and Hauerwas, and in tension with liberation theology (and, one would guess, the religious right in the U.S.), Chan posits that an “ecclesiological pneumatology will seek to engage the world in a different way” other than by attempting to “manipulate its power structures.”\textsuperscript{253} Instead, “the church can only commend the gospel to the world by its own consistent character and proclamation.”\textsuperscript{254}

On the topic of worship, Chan draws on the former Pentecostal, now Dutch-Reformed theologian Jean-Jacques Suurmond’s work on worship as \textit{play}. For Chan, there is no tension between the structure and order of liturgy, and the freedom and spontaneity of pentecostal
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worship as play. Rather, they complement and hold each other well. Thus, “Pentecostal worship has all the characteristic features of play, with the potential to forge a coherent and effective traditioning community.”\textsuperscript{255} Additionally, the play of pentecostal worship “helps us to relate better to ordinary life.”\textsuperscript{256} But this conviction then brings Chan back to his main thesis, that in order for the Pentecostal reality to function in “the larger context of the ‘ordinary’ Christian life,” it surely “must always be interpreted within the larger Christian spiritual tradition where the ordinary and extraordinary, the predictable and unpredictable are woven together to form a coherent and rich tapestry of life with God the Father, in Christ through the Spirit.”\textsuperscript{257} For Chan, this necessitates the embracing of a “hierarchical” ecclesiology to ground their experience sacramentally and dynamically in the historic, Christian tradition.

More recently, Chan has broadened this call for the adoption of a liturgical theology of the church to all Evangelicals.\textsuperscript{258} In his chapter on “The Ontology of the Church” in \textit{Liturgical Theology}, Chan expresses many of the same ecclesiological convictions found in \textit{Pentecostal Theology}. Specifically, he again defends (contra Volf) the \textit{totus Christus} concept of the organic unity between Christ the Head and his body the church;\textsuperscript{259} calls for the church to be a truth-traditioning community; emphasizes the eschatological tension of future and history (“now and
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not yet”); and defines the church’s mission broadly in terms of its calling to “be itself, which is to be “Christ” for the world.”

What is newly articulated in Chan’s ecclesiology here is his identification of the church’s ontological status in terms of its relationship to creation. Based on a particular reading of the “canonical narrative,” Chan concludes the following:

The church precedes creation in that it is what God has in view from all eternity and creation is the means by which God fulfills his eternal purpose in time. The Church does not exist in order to fix a broken creation; rather, creation exists to realize the church. To be sure, the church’s coming into being does require the overcoming of sin, but that is quite different from saying that the problem of sin is the reason for the church’s being. God made the world in order to make the church, not vice versa.

The implications of this priority which the church holds over creation cause Chan to firstly defend the *totus Christus*, and secondly to call the church a “divine-humanity,” which means it is not purely creaturely. Indeed, its existence in history is “brought about by the action of the Holy Spirit.”

This identification of the church as “divine-humanity” then leads directly to Chan’s treatment of the three major biblical images of the church: the people of God, body of Christ, and temple of the Spirit. For Chan, “to call the church the people of God is to recognize that it
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exists in continuity with the ancient covenant people of God, the people of Israel.”

The implications of this first metaphor are that it underscores the priority of the church for God over creation, that it recognizes the church as a pilgrim church or a church on the way, and that the church is distinguished by its “marks” or core practices.

The church as the body of Christ, however, is (contra Volf) “more than a metaphor,” but is rather an “ontological reality.”

The church is a “divine-reality” because it is indeed Christ’s body “between the ascension and the parousia;” it is the _totus Christus caput et membra_. This has consequences for how we view both _communion_ (Eucharist), and _tradition_, both of which Chan champions for Evangelicals as passionately as he has done for Pentecostals.

Lastly, the church as the temple of the Spirit “in a most decisive way completes the other two images as people of God and body of Christ” in that it expresses the work of the Holy Spirit who brings these identities into effect. Chan essentially spends the rest of the chapter discussing the extent to which the Spirit acts in and through the Church to effect God’s purposes for it—through tradition, sacraments (i.e. through _anamnesis_ and _epiclesis_), and mission as well as by being the eschatological foretaste or pledge (_arrabon_), and the Spirit of Truth.

These latest additions to Chan’s articulation of a liturgical ecclesiology for evangelicals only further enrich and expand on what he has initially proposed for Pentecostals. His conviction for the place of this model among those who have generally recoiled from it has seemingly only intensified. Pentecostals and Evangelicals must appropriate more of the
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Catholic/Orthodox heritage if they are to remain effective in furthering the Christian tradition, and (more importantly) in being the church for the world.

As attractive as this model may sound to the more theologically sophisticated among Chan’s target audiences (and it most certainly has attractive traits, in the opinion of this author), there would seem to remain a trenchant skepticism as to its plausibility in western culture, in particular. This either signals that it misses the boat, or that the boat itself is more off course and in more urgent need of these sails than most within these camps are able to recognize.

2.3 Amos Yong

In his book, The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh, pentecostal scholar Amos Yong follows a chapter on “holistic” soteriology with a chapter on the church. His concern is to bring Spirit, salvation and Church together theologically, which is something Yong notes Pentecostals have done little of academically. The thesis which he suggests is “central to pneumatological ecclesiology” is stated thus: “the church is an organic, dynamic and eschatological people of God called after the name of Jesus and constituted in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.” The rest of the chapter unpacks this definition from a pentecostal perspective.

Yong begins by exploring the question “What is the church?” as it has been addressed within Pentecostalism, on the general contemporary theological scene, and then in “the broader

266 Yong: “Standing within both the free-church and pietist traditions for the most part, pentecostals have also tended to talk about soteriology apart from ecclesiology; if they have talked about ecclesiology at all, it is usually as an afterthought.”, The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 121.
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historical context of the Christian theological tradition.”268 In the Pentecostal context, Yong claims that congregationalism has been the favoured route; though various forms of presbyterian and episcopal structures do function (most black Pentecostal churches are episcopal in governance, though Yong does not mention this). The greater concern has been not with forms, but with mission and evangelism. It is here where Yong refers to Melvin Hodges’ work. In doing so, he makes much the same observation made above in this thesis that Hodges fails to “develop fully the ecclesiological implications of his pentecostal perspective.” The result for Yong is, “while Hodges’s understanding of the church is practical (motivated as it is by the church’s missionary mandate) and realistic (emergent as it is from the actual missionary experiences of the church), it assumes uncritically the free-church ecclesiology and inherits thereby all the problems that go along with it.”269

Next Yong turns his attention to the two major proposals offered by Simon Chan and Miroslav Volf (whom he includes for his influence on Pentecostals), which he merely summarizes. Upon surveying the work of these two, along with Hodges, however, Yong reaches five conclusions about the state of pentecostal ecclesiology:

First, Pentecostalism in general does not have its own formally developed ecclesiology per se; rather, pentecostals have in general drawn uncritically from the free-church tradition. Second, pentecostal ecclesiology has been inevitably bound up with missiology; the nature of the church is essentially its missionary task. Third, pentecostal ecclesiology is inherently pneumatological; the church is founded by the Spirit, nurtured as a fellowship of and in the Spirit, and empowered by the Spirit to spread the gospel. Fourth, future pentecostal ecclesiology can no longer be attempted apart from the ecumenical conversation; the relationship between the Spirit and the sacraments, not
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to mention the ministry, will need to be reconsidered. Last (but not least), though this is often only subconsciously assumed and hardly ever explicitly stated, pentecostal ecclesiology is intimately connected with its doctrine of salvation.\(^{270}\)

What is mysterious about this list is the absence of the influence of eschatology, which is a key feature in the three writers he has surveyed. One might speculate it is implied in the identification of the soteriological influence. It is also curious that he does not include Newbigin at this point (though he does later in the chapter).

Building on his main concern to articulate the relationship between soteriology and ecclesiology, Yong then turns to identify four contemporary views on this relationship: The classical view (extra ecclesia nulla salus); the Free Church view; the church as spiritual body (mystical view); and Postliberal ecclesiology (church as alternative vision of way of life). The reality that all four of these models have merit in them, yet none should be adopted uncritically, further forces the question as to how to understand the church theologically in the twenty-first century.

Yong proposes that “the way forward is the way back,”\(^{271}\) to the four creedal marks of the church, especially for pentecostal ecclesiological reflection. Thus, he treats each of these marks (unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity) from a pentecostal and pneumatological perspective.\(^{272}\) With regard to unity, Yong observes that “Pentecostals certainly would affirm
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the unity of the church. They would deny, however, that any one episcopate constitutes that unity.”

He then briefly discusses what he calls “pentecostal sacramentality,” which is “an experiential and incarnational logic that acknowledges the Spirit’s being made present and active through the materiality of personal embodiment and congregational life.” Examples of this type of the Spirit’s activity mentioned include tongues, healing, the shout, and the dance. What this pentecostal sacramentality means for their understanding of the unity of the church is that it “comes about through the eschatological work of the Spirit. The Word made flesh and the Spirit breathing and making the Word real in and through the community of saints together constitute the one work of the triune God.”

Therefore, the unity of the church is to be understood spiritually instead of institutionally or structurally.

The holiness of the church, Yong writes, is to be understood as both an eschatological gift, and an eschatological goal. As for a distinctive Pentecostal contribution to understanding this mark, he suggests it would be “a pneumatologically robust notion of sanctifying transformation.” Such a notion understands the church’s holiness as referring not to “the accomplishments of its members but the authentic presence and activity of the Spirit of God directed toward the eschatological kingdom.”
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On the church’s catholicity, Yong observes that, “If Catholicism tends to err on the side of universality, Pentecostalism does on the side of locality.”\(^{278}\) Nonetheless, “The ties that bind pentecostals together around the world are their experiences of Jesus in the power of the Spirit” so that they “experience Christian unity precisely through the universality of the Spirit’s presence and activity.”\(^{279}\) Through their global, missionary endeavours, Pentecostals have seen this experience of the Spirit of Jesus “accommodated, acculturated, and assimilated into local contexts” in a manner which would deeply inform their understanding of catholicity.

Finally, with regard to the apostolicity of the church, Yong draws attention to Kärkkäinen’s proposed “conciliar understanding” for pentecostals and their fellow ecumenical theologians, which draws on seven irreducible minimums for the meaning of apostolicity. Yong is not sold on this, however. Reflecting on the original, biblical context, he notes that “Pentecostals have therefore generally understood the ongoing apostolic office or function (1 Cor. 12:28; Eph.4:11) to be the Spirit-empowered ministry of missionizing, evangelizing, church planting, and discipling.”\(^{280}\) It is, ultimately, the role of the Spirit—as it was for the original apostles—to illuminate the Scriptures so that the church may “retrieve, reappropriate, and reinterpret” them “in accordance with ecclesial experience” in a Spirit-sanctioned manner.\(^{281}\) And it is through this same Spirit that “the church is apostolic not only in terms of its foundation,
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its authority, and its message but also regarding its eschatological gathering around the throne of God (Revelation 4-5).”  

Yong ends the chapter with a further constructive section on “The Future of the Church: Elements of a Pneumatological Ecclesiology,” in which he “discusses pentecostal Spirit ecclesiology in relationship to other pneumatological ecclesiologies that have also emerged fairly recently and sketches the basic features of a pneumatological theology of baptism and the liturgy in dialogue with recent sacramental and liturgical theology.” He takes as his starting point the “incarnational ecclesiology” of Johann Adam Möhler, whose goal was “to mediate between a living, affective piety and the visible, historical, and hierarchical church.” Although Möhler began to move toward a fundamentally pneumatological ecclesiology, his concerns over authority stopped him short of doing so. Yong notes that the recent proliferation of pneumatological ecclesiologies across the spectrum (from Hans Küng in the Roman tradition to John Zizioulas in the Orthodox, to Wolfhart Pannenberg and Jürgen Moltmann in the Reformed church to James McClendon in the Baptist, to Newbigin and to contextual ecclesiologies emerging from Africa and elsewhere) show that such a Spirit-oriented doctrine of the church can and should be done. He reveals: “My own attempt to develop a Christ-centered and Spirit-driven theology and ecclesiology is inspired in part by Möhler’s uncompleted project. The result is what I have elsewhere called a shifting foundationalism that recognizes all truth claims as
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historically embedded without having to locate their ground on any one undeniable foundation.”

From here he moves on to discuss baptism and liturgy specifically. He identifies “key elements of a pentecostal and pneumatological theology of water baptism:” 1) that it should be centered on the invocation of the Holy Spirit; 2) that baptism represents our reception of the gift of the Spirit; 3) that foot washing should be linked to baptism in a sacramental way; 4) that gifts of the Spirit should also be linked to water baptism; and 5) that Pentecostals should understand baptism more explicitly as sacramental (instead of just an ordinance as many pentecostal denominations articulate it). Similarly, the Lord’s Supper can be understood pneumatologically in five dimensions: 1) “the Supper is a physical act wherein the word of God is consumed by the body of Christ through the working of the Spirit;” 2) it is where we are made present to Christ by the Spirit’s doing; 3) it represents true fellowship brought about by the Holy Spirit; 4) “the Supper is a political and prophetic act;” and 5) it is also an eschatological act (remembrance).

Out of this examination of Yong’s work on a pentecostal ecclesiology, the major features of his construction can be identified. The first is his thesis that “pentecostalism can contribute something substantive toward the idea of the church not only as the people of God and the body of Christ but also as the ‘charismatic fellowship of the Spirit.’” Here he is echoing the reading of Kärkkäinen’s own survey of pentecostal ecclesiologies. He is also (implicitly, it would
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appear), following the seminal conviction of Newbigin, in this regard. The church is understood primarily in terms of the presence and action of the third Person of the Trinity.

Secondly, Yong is envisioning a pneumatologically-sacramental community. He explains this in the following manner:

A pneumatological ecclesiology that recognizes the church as constituted by the pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit will grant that the church itself is sacramental insofar as it consists of structures, institutions, practices, congregations, and individuals, all inspired by the Spirit of God for the purposes of establishing the kingdom of God. Further, the sacraments are mediators of grace insofar as they provide ecclesial venues for the Spirit of God to accomplish the purposes of God among the people of God.  

In dialogue with the historic, Christian tradition, Yong wants to re-appropriate water baptism and the Lord’s Supper as defining events for the church’s identity in light of Spirit-baptism, or the “pentecostal reality.” As such, he clearly seems to be following Chan’s lead here, although he curiously makes no direct reference to doing so.

Finally, he wants an ecclesiology that “has extended the reflections on pneumatological soteriology…within an ecclesiological framework.” The result of this soteriological ecclesiology is a pneumatological approach to the church which “emphasizes the holistic (multidimensional), transformative, dynamic, and eschatological dimensions of what it means to be the people being saved by God.” Through this we see that Yong shares some of the key concerns found in the other proposals by Volf, Chan and even Newbigin: he wants an
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ecclesiology that is designed to contribute to the ecumenical dialogue, he wants a more ecclesial understanding of the nature of salvation to address the individualism of evangelicalism/congregationalism, and he wants to do justice to the manifest and mysterious presence of the eschatological Spirit in the church.

Like Volf (and perhaps even Chan), there is not a strong emphasis in this chapter on the mission of the church, which has been a penultimate concern for pentecostals in the past as Yong himself noted, and as a work like the aforementioned Hodges’ clearly reflects. This is partially explained by the bigger picture of Yong’s global theological enterprise, which reaches out to other religions. Thus, to evaluate the full implications of this ecclesiology within that larger context would be outside of my scope here.

2.4 Frank Macchia: Toward a Spirit-baptized Ecclesiology

Even more recent than Yong’s work has been that of Frank Macchia, who includes a long chapter on the church within his work on *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*. Macchia’s is another attempt to do something very similar to Amos Yong, which is to present a holistic vision of a general theology re-oriented around the pentecostal reality, which Macchia names Spirit-baptism. Like Yong, Macchia sees the urgent place of ecclesiology within this greater vision and therefore gives substantial attention to it. Macchia’s overriding concern is not just to help Pentecostals re-envision their own identity, but also to contribute to the global, ecumenical enterprise. Both also want to make original contributions to a pneumatological ecclesiology. Macchia, however, is concerned more strictly with the connection between pneumatology and ecclesiology from a Trinitarian perspective than from Yong’s soteriological perspective (whereas Volf appears to want to address both). He states his central thesis as “that
Spirit baptism gave rise to the global church and remains the very substance of the church’s life in the Spirit, including its charismatic life and mission.”

The first part of Macchia’s chapter works to establish the communal nature of the Holy Spirit’s work in humanity, thus the need and the place of the church. He does this by first theologizing on the relationship between the Spirit and koinonia, and then by writing “toward a Spirit-baptized anthropology,” which is inherently relational in character. In so doing, the identity and role of the church are established:

The church participates in the liberating reign of God evident in Jesus’ ministry through Spirit baptism. From a broader perspective we may say that the love and koinonia at the heart of the kingdom both constitute the church and are embodied and proclaimed through the church to the world by the baptism in the Spirit.

The theologically strong relationships between Spirit-baptism, koinonia, the kingdom of God and the church in a Trinitarian context are therefore foundational for Macchia’s ecclesiology. It is in these areas of pneumatological koinonia and Spirit-baptized, relational anthropology that Macchia repeatedly references Volf’s *After Our Likeness* as an influence (as he does throughout the chapter).

Continuing to address his concern for the place of the church in God’s overall programme, Macchia goes on to tackle “the pluralist challenge,” which is essentially a
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christological discussion on the uniqueness of Christ as determinative for the uniqueness of the church. His concluding statements summarize his position here:

The Spirit’s unique attachment to the crucified and risen Christ as the Spirit-baptizer and inaugurator of the kingdom of God means that the church is the church by the grace of God and must live in a way that lifts up Christ and not itself as the one who inaugurates and perfects the kingdom of God in the world….The Spirit-baptized church as the sign of grace in the midst of the gracelessness in the world lives from the kingdom as its chief living witness…The church is the natural result of the outpouring of the Spirit and the breaking in of the kingdom of God, but the church cannot simply be identified with the kingdom. Only Christ’s witness is identical without qualification with the kingdom of God. Only in him is the Spirit given without measure.  

The distinction between church and kingdom made in the above quote serves as the topic for the following section, “Toward a Critical Dialectic.” In a quest to avoid the two polar extremes of dualism and synonymous identifications (an “over-realized eschatology”), Macchia follows Barth in calling the church a witness or sign. This is unpacked by “grounding it in the theological priority of Christ, the Spirit, and the kingdom to the church.” Specifically, Macchia prioritizes Spirit-baptism above the church in that it administers the church instead of vice versa, it is “what brought the church into being in the first place,” and therefore “constitutes the church as the church, defining the very core of the church’s essence but also transcending the church as it reaches for the new creation.” The church is the dwelling place of the “Spirit/kingdom of Christ” and as such “is at the vanguard of the transformation of creation into
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the dwelling place of God.” In grounding this identity of the church as being constituted by Spirit-baptism, Macchia appears to be building on Newbigin’s ground-breaking work in such a way as to make a truly original contribution to ecclesiology in an explicitly Pentecostal way.

Also of note here is Macchia’s agreement with Volf’s rejection of the “total Christ” concept, which is “transferring the subjectivity of Christ to the church, forming a collective subject,” and his endorsement of Volf’s alternative “juxtaposition” between Christ and the church that “precisely as such is constitutive of their unity.” Like Volf, Macchia prefers to understand the Trinity perichoretically, and this is employed in navigating the dialectic between kingdom and church.

A final point that Macchia also makes in this regard is found when he states, “An important component of understanding the role of the Spirit as the dialectician of the church is to view the church as both a pneumatological/eschatological reality and a fallen/historical reality.” This is particularly significant for Pentecostals, as Macchia goes on to explain:

Pentecostals need to think about the general issues of the eschatological and historical realities of the Church’s existence, since restorationism and primitivism make them vulnerable to an idealistic and implicitly timeless understanding of the ideal church empowered by the Spirit…A more realistic understanding of the primitive churches in all of their tensions and limitations might help Pentecostals view the living witness of the Church less triumphalistically. It might help them to recognize the voice of the Spirit more profoundly within the history of the church’s witness and, today, among many different Christian communions.

---

In other words, instead of perceiving themselves in an anti-historical manner as a leap back to an ideal, apostolic church, Pentecostals need to see the NT church less perfectly, as well as gain a greater appreciation for the Spirit’s work throughout church history and in other traditions today.

Macchia then goes on to very briefly treat the three same major biblical models, or metaphors, used by Simon Chan in “The Ontology of the Church:” People of God, Body of Christ, and Temple of the Spirit. A detailed comparison between the two cannot be accomplished here, but a cursory observation shows that, in treating the People of God model, Macchia articulates the relationship between the church and Israel in a different manner than Chan, in that the church is ‘superior’ to Israel because it is Spirit-baptized. Macchia also treats Body of Christ metaphorically (following Volf), emphasizing the implications of unity and diversity from 1 Corinthians 12 in contrast to Chan’s stress on the church as “divine-humannity”. The Temple of the Spirit denotes the concepts of the church’s dependence on Christ, the priesthood of all believers, and the church’s prophetic witness to the world.

What does Macchia say about the Spirit’s presence in the church? As it turns out, he makes several references to it. Prior to addressing the Temple of the Spirit, Macchia speaks generally of “the Spirit’s presence in and through the church” and the church as “the central locus for the life of the Spirit,”299 phrases that commend the Temple as an appropriate image to depict the Church as the dwelling place for the Holy Spirit. This presence is referred to in various other ways by Macchia: “divine presence,” “redemptive presence,” “redeeming
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presence,” “God’s own presence,” and simply “the presence of the Spirit.” Though it is anchored to Spirit-baptism, this presence of the Spirit in the church may be experienced in various ways, all of which are to be theologically understood as christocentric: “the Pentecostal connection of Spirit-baptism with charismatic experience says something profound about the diverse and polyphonic way the Spirit makes Christ present in the church.”

Spirit-baptism is also significant, at least in the book of Acts, for its role in establishing the church as a charismatically-gifted body because it is such a significant manifestation of God’s presence:

    Spirit baptism understood as a communal dynamic can help Pentecostals theologically integrate their concomitant emphases on Spirit baptism and the gifted church. Spirit baptism as a relational dynamic is essential to its role in birthing the church as a diversely charismatic body. It is interesting to note that Spirit baptism is described by Luke in relation terms, as a divine “clothing” (Luke 24:49) or “infilling” (Acts 2:4) with the divine presence...The Spirit embraces us or fills us with the divine presence in order to sanctify us and empower us to be living witnesses to Christ as the Son of God and the Spirit Baptist. When God surrounds and fills us with the divine presence, it is so that we can give of ourselves back to God in worship and witness...“God pours God’s presence into us in order to receive it back along with the fullness of our renewed spirits in flaming tongues of praise and witness (Acts 2:4).

There is a continued emphasis on the connection between the manifest operation of the Spirit in the church and the presence of Christ, anchored in Spirit baptism: “Spirit baptism thus “incarnates” the presence of Christ in a body of believers that involves many different cultures

300 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 32.
301 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 159 (italics his).
and faith expressions.” It is thus the power of the Spirit visibly operating within the diverse body that makes Christ present in the church, rather than just through the Word or sacraments.

Not surprisingly, Macchia also speaks of presence in the sub-section on the image of the church as Temple of the Spirit. Here, his emphasis is again to cast Spirit baptism in a Trinitarian framework:

The church comes into being as a Spirit-baptized people filled with the very presence of God (Acts 2:4). Filled with the Holy Spirit, the church is a holy temple with Christ as its foundation (1 Cor. 3:11)...Spirit baptism is a symbol of dependence on Christ and ultimately the Father as the source of life in the Spirit...In Christ, the Spirit-baptized church draws from his fullness as his body, drinking together from the Spirit in him (1 Cor. 12:13)...God’s presence poured into us through Christ flows back from us to Christ and to the Father in praise and service.

...The church is the temple for the sake of the world and for God’s glory, and not primarily for its own sake. It is a temple that seeks to discern the presence of God within the realm of the profane and that prays and works for the renewal of creation and the realization of its destiny in God. The church is to be a sign of grace in an all-too graceless world.

Macchia moves to a far lengthier treatment of the four creedal marks of a Spirit-baptized church. In his prologue, Macchia notes how “Pentecostals have tended to highlight a charismatic/missionary ecclesiology,” and suggests that the early pentecostal fivefold gospel of Jesus as Saviour, Sanctifier, Spirit-baptizer, Healer and Coming King can be seen as ecclesiological “marks” in themselves. He also introduces the four traditional marks as
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“eschatological gifts of the Spirit bestowed by Christ,” which are also “goals in which we are constantly to be renewed and toward which we strive.”  

Understanding the church as one, holy, catholic, and apostolic in this eschatological sense, as operating in the tension between now and not yet for the church, while also from his Spirit-baptized perspective, underlies Macchia’s approach to this exercise as a whole. Thus, “Spirit-baptism unifies the church;” the “holiness of the church is secured by the presence of the Spirit,” indeed “Spirit-baptism is a mighty filling with the very presence of a holy God;” “Spirit-baptism on all flesh has the richness and breadth of catholicity implied within it;” and “Spirit-baptism makes apostolicity a missionary characteristic and, therefore, a characteristic of the entire church.”

What is significant is how Macchia discusses *forms* or models of ecclesiology under the topic of apostolicity. Specifically, he compares the hierarchical model with the congregational. While conceding that “both have at least some element of truth from the New Testament,” Macchia ultimately favours the congregational model. Interestingly, his principal sources for doing so are Miroslav Volf and Hans Küng, whom Macchia observes have “much in common” in their view of the church. After having done so, however, he goes on to take a sympathetic view towards the issue of the Petrine office. He writes:

As a Pentecostal, I am open to be inspired by the symbolic significance of the Petrine office as a pointer to the possibility that the church in all its diversity and uniqueness might one day be one around Jesus as the Spirit Baptizer and as one who commissioned disciples to further his witness. I think more recent definitions of the Petrine office from *Ut Unum Sint* and beyond that highlight the

service of love and unity have brought us all further in a constructive direction in discussing this important issue.\textsuperscript{308}

Here, Macchia shows his ecumenical sensitivity through his genuine respect of, and openness to, the greater Tradition of the church.

Macchia concludes his chapter on Spirit-baptized ecclesiology with an important discussion of what he deems further “marks” of the church: preaching, sacraments and charismatic gifts (“fullness”). With regard to spiritual gifts, Macchia (as one would expect) emphasizes the charismatic structure of the church, the biblical teaching of how the charisms are to ultimately bear grace and love in and through the church to the world, and how the gifts of the Spirit are an important part of Christ’s presence in the church. Indeed, “The Spirit is thus the divine presence in and through many persons.”\textsuperscript{309} Under the heading of preaching, Macchia stresses the dynamic relationship between the Spirit and the scriptures in the church, so that “the canonical witness through the Spirit inspires, empowers, and guides us all in our gifted praise and service.”\textsuperscript{310} Macchia ends with a longer treatment of the sacraments – baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Like Amos Yong, he notes a “special relationship between water and Spirit baptism.”\textsuperscript{311} This is understood in that, “Ultimately, Spirit baptism fulfills conversion and baptism to bring about the resurrection of the dead and the new creation.”\textsuperscript{312} With the Lord’s
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Supper, Macchia is more similar to Simon Chan (whom he references) in that he pays special attention to the link provided between *anamnesis* and *epiclesis* by Jesus the Spirit Baptizer. He finishes by saying, “In the light of these marks, Spirit baptism constitutes the church as the body of Christ and remains a source of renewal not only for individual lives but for the life and witness of the entire church.”

The chapter is concluded by the summarizing affirmation that “the baptism or outpouring of the Spirit can be the organizing principle for a Pentecostal ecclesiology that is responsive to distinctive accents of Pentecostalism as a global movement as well as to a broader ecumenical discussion.” Significantly, he points here to the 1976 Report of the Pentecostal-Catholic dialogue and its mention of presence, along with the 1978 Report of the Catholic-Lutheran dialogue, which also referred to “modes of presence.” The eucharistic mode of God’s presence, though special, is continuous with all other modes, whereby the *koinonia* of the Spirit allows us to be filled with the Spirit, so that we can give of ourselves to the Spirit in return. It is clear from what he says elsewhere in this chapter that the sacramental mode of presence, which he calls “intense,” should be seen to co-operate with other modes of the Spirit’s presence, of which Spirit baptism would be most defining for the church’s identity.

Though he may not have consciously intended to, we may understand this effort of Macchia’s to be a more thorough working out of Newbigin’s conviction of the manifest presence

---

of the Holy Spirit among believers as that which constitutes the Community of the Holy Spirit. As such, this is a significant and valuable source towards the ongoing development of pentecostal ecclesiology in the ecumenical setting.

2.5 Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen: Church as ‘Koinonia’

Dr. Kärkkäinen, a professor at Fuller Seminary, is another Pentecostal scholar who has written several articles related to ecclesiology and Pentecostalism. For our purposes here, a good place to begin surveying his contribution is with his own look at Newbigin’s “third-stream” description. Kärkkäinen aptly summarizes Newbigin’s chapter on The Community of the Holy Spirit in the following manner:

For Pentecostalism, the third stream, the Christian life is a matter of the experienced power and presence of the Holy Spirit today. Neither orthodoxy of doctrine nor impeccability of succession can take its place. If one asks Pentecostals, “Where is the church?” one must ask in fact, “Where is the Holy Spirit recognizably present with power?” (pp. 94-95). Pentecostals are not content with looking primarily at the continuity nor at the preaching or sacraments if the experience of the Spirit is missing. This is the contribution that the third stream of Christendom brings to the impasse of the Catholic-Protestant debate…On the one hand, the narrow Protestant emphasis may lead to a Christian life in terms of precisely formulated doctrinal statements. On the other hand, the church may be defined as an apostolic succession. This is for Newbigin nothing less than defining the church by purely natural standards – in other words, without any reference to the presence or absence of the Spirit (pp. 102-4).³¹⁸

³¹⁸ Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, An Introduction to Ecclesiology, 156.
The third-stream description of Newbigin’s is significant for Kärkkäinen because of his intense interest in the Pentecostal/Roman Catholic Dialogue. It is primarily through this Dialogue that he sees Pentecostal theologians forming their own identity ecclesiologically. His own thoughts on Pentecostal ecclesiology are thus clearly aimed toward ecumenical usefulness.

Kärkkäinen’s suggestion for identifying the distinctive center of a Pentecostal theology of the church is *Koinonia*, or the Church as a Charismatic Fellowship. He states that Pentecostals “have always favoured fellowship language for the church.” He goes on to observe:

Decades before ecumenical theology began to hark back to biblical and patristic roots to revive the ancient theological understanding of Christian community as *koinonia*, Pentecostals lived fellowship among Spirit-filled sisters and brothers. Pentecostal spirituality and theology have almost from the start appreciated fellowship language over “institutionalized church” (as hierarchical structure).

He continues by quoting an unpublished paper by Peter Kuzmic and Miroslav Volf, who suggest “Pentecostal soteriology and pneumatology point…unmistakably in the direction of an ecclesiology of the fellowship of persons.” He illustrates the contrast of this model with the other two streams (following Newbigin) by calling the traditional Protestant model a “lecture room” where the focus is on the pulpit, the Catholic model a “theatre setting” where the emphasis is on the drama of the Eucharist, and the Pentecostal model a “fellowship” where the
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emphasis is on a community gathered together for mutual edification. He states the Pentecostal position in the following manner: “Without wanting to exclude the elements of preaching and sacraments, they suggest that in the New Testament the fundamental characteristic of worship is mutual sharing in the fellowship.”

In a collection of Kärkkäinen’s articles published together in book format under the title, *Toward a Pneumatological Theology: Pentecostal and Ecumenical Perspectives on Ecclesiology, Soteriology, and Theology of Mission*, Part Two concerns Ecclesiology. Throughout these articles or chapters, Kärkkäinen affirms the suggestion of the Church as a Charismatic Fellowship, as he addresses various ecclesiological issues more specifically. Again, the construction or articulation of pentecostal theology is here approached in the context of strong ecumenical concerns; and again, the Roman Catholic-Pentecostal Dialogue is prominent in applying and addressing these concerns.

In the chapter, “Free Churches, Ecumenism and Pentecostalism,” Kärkkäinen draws upon a statement from the first phase of the RC-Pentecostal dialogue, called “Essence of Pentecostalism.” The statement begins by defining this essence as follows: “It is the personal and direct awareness and experiencing of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit by which the risen and glorified Christ is revealed and the believer is empowered to witness and worship with the abundance of life as described in Acts and the Epistles.” Kärkkäinen then responds by commenting, “This is a good starting point, since it shows that Pentecostals understand
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themselves first and foremost on the basis of their particular brand of spirituality.”323 We see implicit in the opening sentence of the “Essence” statement an allusion to the encounter of the ‘direct’ or manifest presence of the Holy Spirit in a transformative, empowering manner as that which defines Pentecostal experience and theology. This is something Kärkkäinen appears very comfortable with.

In keeping with his ecumenical desire, Kärkkäinen points out that traditional ecclesiologies have either followed Ignatius of Antioch, who anchored the church to Christ’s presence, or Irenaeus, for whom “what is decisive is the presence of the Spirit of God: ‘Wherever the Spirit of God is, there is the church, and all grace.’”324 While the title of the book itself clearly indicates which approach Kärkkäinen takes, he is quick to point out (as Irenaeus himself did) that “Christology and pneumatology must be seen as simultaneous rather than exclusive,” even while “the later history of ecclesiology testifies to a continual struggle in finding a theologically satisfying balance between these two rules.”325 It is this very balance that he wants to address even as he writes “Toward a Pneumatological Ecclesiology.”326 After appreciatively surveying the approaches of John Zizioulas (Eastern Orthodox), Wolfhart Pannenberg (Protestant), and Karl Rahner (Roman Catholic), Kärkkäinen affirms the necessary coexistence of both the christological and pneumatological orientations of the church’s essence. He stresses this as biblical: “In the New Testament, Christology is never depicted apart from the Spirit. In

324 Kärkkäinen, Pneumatological Theology, 83. The quote of Irenaeus is from Adversus Haereses, 3.24.1.
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their own distinctive ways, the Gospels present Christ as the Spirit Bearer before he is to be the Spirit Giver. He is given the Spirit without measure (John 3:34). Christ conceives and fulfills his ministry in the Spirit.”

He goes on to declare:

A pneumatological orientation is needed to overcome the age-old dilemma between “charism and institution.” The work of the Spirit lays foundation for both structure and charism. Instead of seeing these two as opposites, we must seek a “charismatic structure.” The Church, as the Body of Christ, is a charismatically structured fellowship, a charismatic fellowship. It is not enough to argue for the necessity of charismatic structure if the pneumatological orientation to the foundations of ecclesiology is missing.

Thus, here Kärkkäinen lays the theological foundation for his own ecclesiology in conversation with the other great traditions. In doing so, he makes a brief, concluding case for a distinctive pentecostal contribution to pneumatological ecclesiology:

Theology of the Spirit is a lived experience. The emergence of charismatic gifts, the release of the whole people of God into the ministry by the power of the Spirit, a manifold charismatic testimony by word and deed, a new enthusiasm for evangelism, etc. are but examples of the new vigor of life given by the Spirit to the whole church. Here the enthusiastic, dynamic contribution of Pentecostalism, the Charismatic movements and a host of more recent Free Churches have to be taken into consideration. Their vivid experience of the Spirit points to a crucial dimension of life in the Spirit.

_________________________
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What is also evident here in Kärkkäinen’s effort toward a pneumatological ecclesiology of charismatic fellowship is that he is aiming for an ecclesiology that does not merely state what the church is, but what the church lives and does. His is an experiential ecclesiology. Theology and spirituality must be mutually reflective. So he stresses in a subsequent chapter on Trinitarian theology:

_The_ distinctive Pentecostal contribution could be the accent on baptism of the Holy Spirit with accompanying charismatic manifestations (speaking in tongues, prophecy, word of knowledge, etc.) which, as was stated at the beginning of the chapter, brings the doctrine of the Trinity into the _experiential_ level. This is more in tune with the New Testament emphasis.  

The key chapter for our purposes here is Chapter Eight: “The Church as Charismatic Fellowship,” in which Kärkkäinen more directly addresses his own constructive proposal, though he makes clear “Nothing like a comprehensive Pentecostal ecclesiology is attempted in the confines of this chapter.” After confirming that ecclesiology is a much under-developed area for Pentecostals, and that their propensity to focus on praxis rather than theological reflection has resulted in “a variety of ecclesiological options,” he once again points to the RC-Pentecostal Dialogue as an event that has spurred more concentrated consideration of a theology of the church on the part of the Pentecostal participants, observers and analysts.

To intentionally call the Church a “Charismatic Fellowship” is to obviously suggest that there are two defining qualities of the church from a Pentecostal perspective. Thus, Kärkkäinen
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treats each of these in turn. The ‘Charismatic Structure of the Church’ section specifically addresses the aforementioned issue of charisma and institution. That ‘charismatic’ comes before ‘structure’ in the word-order for Kärkkäinen intentionally betrays his Pentecostalism. Comparatively, he observes, “Pentecostals are seeking for balance between charisma and structure whereas Catholics look for balance between structure and charisma.” This balance, tricky at the best of times for any church, has been particularly challenging for the Spirit-driven Pentecostal movement, as our description in the previous chapter should make obvious. Kärkkäinen confirms that, “As a young revival movement, it has had hard times in seeking to find a balance between its passion for the free moving of the Spirit and the inevitable need for order and institution.” As the third phase of the RC/Pentecostal Dialogue reported, “Pentecostals tend to downplay the importance of office and authority because they desire to have direct access to the Spirit and his workings.” Furthermore, “Pentecostals do not agree among themselves concerning how Church structures and institutions should be made up…For Pentecostals there is no single criterion to indicate the “true nature” of a given church.” Structures, when they became absolutely necessary with the formation of denominations, certainly did not reflect distinctive Pentecostal ecclesiological convictions but rather were mostly adopted and adapted from the familiar polities of the leaders’ previous church affiliations.

For Pentecostals, then, structure must serve charism. Because this is the order of priority, the specific type of structure is not as crucial, as long as it facilitates the work of the Spirit rather than quenches it. Structure does not determine the church’s identity for Pentecostals, it merely functions as the organizational realm in which the true essence of the Church, the charismatic presence of the Holy Spirit, operates. This partially explains why the full spectrum of governance models all exists under the banner of Pentecostalism.

Identifying a favourable model for Kärkkäinen, however, then leads him to (again, following Volf and Kuzmic) turn to an ecclesiology of koinonia or Fellowship. One of the key attractions of this model for him is because of “its strong biblical attestation.” In the NT, “The Church is a communion in the Spirit, with also a specific Christological expression (2 Cor. 1:5; Phil 3:10), even Trinitarian.” It is from this basis that patristic communion ecclesiology is founded, he points out. This is also the basis for the highly influential Being as Communion by Zizioulas. Against this background is where Volf and Kuzmic’s pentecostal proposal fits in logically. The Church as a Charismatic Fellowship is a “pneumatologically constituted reality.” It is not an abstract ecclesiology but a living experience. Kärkkäinen explains, “This fellowship is something to be experienced, a shared experience, in the everyday life of the community. In this sense the question “Where is the Church?” cannot be answered without reference to the living presence of the Spirit.” Kärkkäinen thereafter provides the pivotal words of Newbigin’s Household of God to this effect, which Volf and Kuzmic also quote in their paper.
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The picture of fellowship offered here is thus one that is inherently *participatory*. Indeed, Kärkkäinen titles the next sub-section, “Toward a Participatory Ecclesiology: Promise and Challenge.” Again following Volf and Kuzmic, he outlines first how a biblical charismatic fellowship stresses the universal distribution of the NT gifts (cf. 1 Cor. 12). He observes how, in this respect, “Pentecostals would certainly welcome the *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM)* document’s principle according to which the church lives ‘in the power of the Spirit…characterized by a variety of charisms.” 340 This manifests another example of how Kärkkäinen wants a pentecostal ecclesiology that is ecumenically useful. Secondly, the Pauline picture of interdependence and complementariness among the fellowship of charismatics, or the ‘unity-in-diversity perspective’ 341 in a context of love is also stressed, drawing upon both Moltmann (Reformed) and Karl Rahner (Roman Catholic) on this same point. Thirdly, the gifts are distributed “just as the Spirit wills” (1 Cor. 12:17). The Spirit is the sovereign imparter and distributer of the gifts. We do not control nor dictate the “how and when.” 342

Kärkkäinen continues on by looking now to Volf’s *After Our Likeness*. He states, “Volf is of the opinion that the real ecclesiological challenge of the Pentecostal movement for other churches lies in motivating them to take seriously the implications of the priesthood of all.” 343 There is, however, no source given as to where Volf shares this opinion. Volf’s continued vision of the pluriform gifts of the Spirit in *After Our Likeness* is consistent, though, with his previous
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proposal of the Church as a Charismatic Fellowship. While Kärkkäinen points to Volf’s proposal as an extant articulation of his own vision, he recognizes that one difficulty in doing so is in reconciling this obvious Free Church ecclesiology with Roman Catholicism, with whom Kärkkäinen desires to continue to dialogue for mutual edification. At some point, he seems to concede, one has to choose between the two. It would appear he ultimately sides with Volf.

Finally, Kärkkäinen observes that if one does wish to adopt Volf’s model as a template upon which to develop pentecostal ecclesiology (as others have also suggested), then this does present a challenge to his desire for an experiential ecclesiology:

But Pentecostals are too left with challenges. Along with the (necessary) institutionalization and (not so always necessary?) bureaucratization of the movement, one must ask: how well is the idea of church as charismatic fellowship, where all the Spirit-empowered members are functioning to the well-being of the community and to the mission to the world, realized in typical Pentecostal communities? If not, then what are the possible reasons for this? Are the reasons theological or pastoral, or both?344

Examining Kärkkäinen’s exploration of church as Charismatic Fellowship via Volf, but also with an eye constantly on the Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue, typifies the quandary that Pentecostal scholars appear to be in ecclesiologically. Can the movement diversify and go both ways: towards congregation and towards sacramental/hierarchical? Do they ultimately have to choose a side? Or should they attempt to forge a “third-stream” theology of the church clearly distinct from the other two? What is the movement’s true identity at the ecumenical table? In

344 Kärkkäinen. Pneumatological Theology, 121.
light of these questions, Kärkkäinen maintains that both ‘charismatic’ and ‘fellowship’ are the two essential qualities of a truly Pentecostal church:

The Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue has both challenged and enriched Pentecostal reflection on the church. Whatever will be the future of the emerging Pentecostal ecclesiology, one thing must not be forgotten: the category of community/communion has been critical since the beginning of the Pentecostal movement. In the Two-Thirds world it still is. The community provides the adherents a safe haven against cultural, religious, and sometimes even political oppressions and anomalies. For Pentecostals, charismatic and fellowship belong to the essence, not just to the well being and benefit, of the faith and spirituality.\(^{345}\)

Late in the following chapter on “Spirit, Laity, Ministry,” Kärkkäinen returns to this theme of the Charismatic Structure of the Church, stating “The church lives through the participation of its members, the laity and the ordained, and is constituted through them by the Holy Spirit.”\(^{346}\) Again, he draws heavily upon Volf to express this theme, this time within the context of the ability of this vision to effectively facilitate the priesthood of all believers to a degree that other ecclesiologies seemingly cannot. Now he turns to *After Our Likeness* and Volf’s articulation of the ‘pluriformity’ of the charismatic gifts. While Volf’s own proposal stands in contrast to Zizioulas and Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI), Kärkkäinen insists that there is an ecumenical consensus regarding this pluriformity, as evidenced by a revival of the ancient Orthodox principle of *sobernicity*\(^{347}\), which is their
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corresponding term for ‘catholicity’ in the sense of universality, as one of the four creedal marks of the Church. Thus, while “all the churches embrace the overall idea of the charismatic structure of the church, its implications regarding the equality of all members are not accepted by all.”

Kärkkäinen’s concern here is clearly for the true practice of the priesthood of all believers, and for him the Charismatic Structure of the Church is the biblical way to actualize this. From this concern to see the full participation of the congregation in exercising the gifts of the Spirit as a defining ecclesiological principle, he turns to Volf as a leading voice. Yet, while he is again here obviously favouring a Free Church ecclesiology, he holds out the hope that the older churches can utilize existing internal resources to adopt an authentic charismatic structure within their traditions.

What seems nearly absent to this point of the chapter, then, is the question of whether or not Pentecostalism can contribute anything towards this model. This is perhaps evident in that, when Kärkkäinen goes on to quote Frank Macchia, he introduces him as a “Free Church theologian.” Furthermore, when communicating the need to see the participatory nature of the Spirit’s operation in the church beyond Word and sacraments, it is Clark Pinnock whom Kärkkäinen quotes to provide the most Pentecostal-sounding perspective:

As well as receiving the sacraments for the Spirit, we need to cultivate openness to the gifts of the Spirit. The Spirit is present beyond liturgy in a wider circle. There is a flowing that

\[\text{\footnotesize 348} \text{ Kärkkäinen, } \textit{Pneumatological Theology, 132.} \]

\[\text{\footnotesize 349} \text{ Kärkkäinen, } \textit{Pneumatological Theology, 133.} \]
manifests itself as power to bear witness, heal the sick, prophesy, praise God enthusiastically, perform miracles and more.\textsuperscript{350}

Kärkkäinen concludes by repeating the significance of Volf’s proposal partly because it “takes seriously the role of the Spirit in ecclesiology…”\textsuperscript{351} He then lists what this means for Catholics, for Orthodox, for Protestants and for Free Churches. It is presumed that Pentecostals are here again subsumed under the Free Church banner. We are left to postulate that Kärkkäinen’s Charismatic Structure ecclesiology is one that is \textit{not} distinctly Pentecostal, even if it is intended to be pentecostal-friendly. That it is left to a Charismatic Baptist to bring up the presence of the Spirit in the church in a more pentecostal-sounding way unfortunately shows the limitations of Kärkkäinen’s contributions to Pentecostal ecclesiology, as worthy as they might be.

This would seem to be confirmed in the next chapter on “The Spirit and the Lord’s Supper,” whose focus is “namely, the role of the Spirit in the mediation of Christ’s presence.”\textsuperscript{352} While the Eucharist is the context here, it seems if there was ever an opportunity to communicate a Pentecostal theology of the Spirit’s presence in the church, this would be it. Instead, what is said about a Pentecostal view of the Eucharist is in the context of the Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue, where the main point of agreement is in the Lord’s Supper as an avenue for healing:

Now it should be noted that Pentecostalism, as an ecclesial newcomer, clung to the ancient belief and practice of the Christian church even though the purpose of the new movement was to

\textsuperscript{350}Kärkkäinen, \textit{Pneumatological Theology}, 133.

\textsuperscript{351}Kärkkäinen, \textit{Pneumatological Theology}, 134.

\textsuperscript{352}Kärkkäinen, \textit{Pneumatological Theology}, 137.
free the church from “rites and rituals” which were believed to be not only meaningless but also a hindrance to the understanding of the Gospel. Pentecostals, understandably, have not devoted much energy to formulating their doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. This is in line with the movement’s accent on spirituality rather than on doctrine, and its preference for oral rather than discursive theologizing.

Yet, both Catholics and Pentecostals agree that the Lord’s Supper may indeed be an avenue for healing...Pentecostals avoid speaking of “sacraments” in the area of healing. But for them, too, the meaning of the death of Christ is central, to be commemorated each time the Lord’s Supper is celebrated.  

What Kärkkäinen states here is absolutely true. But is there nothing more to say about how the Spirit mediates Christ’s presence for Pentecostals? Is it possible to augment the necessary understanding of the Spirit’s presence in anamnesis and paraclesis with something along the lines of what Pinnock suggests above? That these questions are not addressed by a pentecostal scholar, even within his ecumenical purview, perhaps again demonstrates a limited view of the potential for Pentecostalism’s distinct contribution to these ecclesiological issues.

About the same time that these chapters on ecclesiology were published, another article of Kärkkäinen’s appeared in ERT (2001), concerning Pentecostalism and the claim for Apostolicity. Here, again, Kärkkäinen associates Pentecostals with Free Church ecclesiology, and contrasts it with the episcopal tradition, drawing heavily once more upon Volf’s After Our Likeness. What seems missing here is the recognition of those Pentecostal churches that are episcopal in governance. This oversight is all the more troublesome when we are reminded that

353 Kärkkäinen, Pneumatological Theology, 143-144.
many (though not all) of the episcopal Pentecostal denominations are African-American. He characterizes the Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue, for example, as a Free Church-established church dialogue.

While his characterization of Pentecostalism as merely Free Church seems unsatisfactory, however, his treatment of Pentecostal apostolicity is much more helpful. It will be drawn upon below when that issue is addressed more specifically in light of the constructive proposal being offered here. Though he communicates well the reality that Pentecostals have their own unique understanding of apostolicity, this does not lead to a more developed identification of their understanding of ecclesiality. His ecumenical sensitivities lead him toward more conciliar conclusions that eclipse any focus on developing the Pentecostal identity. This is certainly not wrong—indeed it is admirable—but seems to undermine the potential Pentecostals have for contributing their own visions to the greater theological enterprise.

Finally and more recently (2007), Kärkkäinen has contributed yet another journal article on Pentecostal Ecclesiology. In this one, he returns to the same theme of Church as Charismatic Fellowship but comes at it differently. Noting that ‘communion ecclesiology,’ an approach that starts with the church as a fellowship that reflects the inner-trinitarian relations, is popular among various traditions today, Kärkkäinen rightly asks, “does it even make sense to speak of any kind of Pentecostal communion ecclesiology?” This question is legitimized by the ad hoc nature of Pentecostal theology, the “strongly restorationist” character of the movement, and


the diverse forms of structures that operate in Pentecostal churches.\textsuperscript{357} He points to recent developments, however, upon which he attempts to provide a “tentative outline and discussion of Pentecostal ecclesiology of \textit{koinonia}.”\textsuperscript{358} Not surprisingly, the first place he turns is again to the Catholic-Pentecostal Dialogue and the Final Report from the third quinquennium (1985-1989), \textit{Perspectives on Koinonia}. \textit{Koinonia} is appealing to Pentecostals for its biblical basis, and because they prefer to see the Church as a fellowship rather than an institution. Church is a place where Pentecostals ‘meet’ with God and each other, rather than just hear the Word or witness the drama of the Eucharist. Turning yet again to the dialogue’s position paper by Volf and Kuzmic, Kärkkäinen emphasizes how, for Pentecostals, this fellowship or meeting together for mutual edification in the presence of God must therefore be charismatic in its dynamic. He writes,

Consequently, worship experience with the deep desire to ‘meet with the Lord’ stands at the heart of the Pentecostal church life. Even when spiritual manifestations such as speaking in tongues, word of wisdom, or healings are missing, there is both openness to and expectation of those tangible signs of the presence of God in the communion of the saints.\textsuperscript{359}

Here is where Kärkkäinen finally connects his \textit{koinonia} ecclesiology with what I suggest is the true heart of Pentecostalism: the Church as the People of God’s Presence meet to fellowship with the expectation that this presence will be made tangible in their midst and for their mutual edification, so that they will be empowered to participate in God’s activity in the

\textsuperscript{357} Kärkkäinen, “The Church as the Fellowship of Persons” 2.

\textsuperscript{358} Kärkkäinen, “The Church as the Fellowship of Persons” 3.

\textsuperscript{359} Kärkkäinen, “The Church as the Fellowship of Persons,” 5.
world. In an accompanying footnote to the above statement, Kärkkäinen says more about the Pentecostal idea of presence:

There is obviously a connection here with the sacramental principle of traditional churches: whereas sacramental churches consider sacraments as the preferred way of securing the divine presence, along with the preached word, for Pentecostals the emphasis is on the gifts of the Spirit. There have been attempts by some Pentecostal theologians to find commonalities between Pentecostal spirituality, especially its emphasis on glossolalia, speaking in tongues, as a way of ‘securing’ the divine presence and sacraments as ‘signs’ of the divine presence. While there are some connecting points, I also think the differences are so dramatic that at the most one can only point to some common underlying motifs behind glossolalia and, say, the Eucharist.  

While there is some comparison to be made between Pentecostal and sacramental conceptions of the divine presence in the Church, the Pentecostal view is distinct. It is this distinct view that provides the foundation for a uniquely Pentecostal ecclesiology, even a unique Pentecostal communion ecclesiology. The Church as koinonia from a Pentecostal perspective must be a Charismatic fellowship. The sharing in the trinitarian life takes place primarily and constitutively through the receiving of charisms from the Spirit for mutual edification and as a witness to the unbeliever (1 Cor. 14:22-25). This is “the Pentecostal self-understanding as an eschatological, charismatic fellowship of persons.”

Of course, Kärkkäinen points out that certain aspects of the Pentecostal notion of koinonia have also been rightfully challenged through the Dialogue. There remains a pervasive individualism, as well as a lack of theology of the Universal Church or visible unity thereof,

360 Kärkkäinen, “The Church as the Fellowship of Persons,” 11-12, footnote 11.
despite the ecumenical openness demonstrated by their participation in dialogues. The results of these shortcomings are obvious:

This of course creates a major inner tension in Pentecostal ecclesiology and ecumenism; with all the enthusiastic embrace of fellowship language, emphasis on the church as the body of Christ, and the need for daily empowering of the Holy Spirit, the Pentecostal-Charismatic churches’ life has been an experience of endless divisions and splits; furthermore, Pentecostals and Charismatics have caused a number of divisions in relation to other churches. This is not to put blame on one party: the opposition to and harassment of Pentecostals by older churches in various parts of the world is too well known a fact to be ignored. Rather, this is a call to mutual repentance and self-examination.  

Kärkkäinen goes on to list and discuss potential attributes of an ecclesiology of koinonia that Pentecostals can embrace and other churches can also benefit from. It is a dynamic concept that can help both Pentecostal and older churches develop a full-orbed view of the divine-human partnership which constitutes the Church. Communion ecclesiology is also a call to holiness, which is close to the heart of the Pentecostal conviction that this mark of the Church is represented through the sanctified lives of its members. Furthermore, and perhaps most significantly, “Being a dynamic concept, the koinonia is also a reminder to all Christian churches about the need to be empowered by the Spirit. Pentecostals speak of this dynamic empowerment in terms of Spirit Baptism. As a work of the Holy Spirit, there is a definite communal element to Spirit Baptism.”

Kärkkäinen here draws upon the Final Report of the fourth quinquennium of the Catholic-Pentecostal dialogue, “Evangelization, Proselytism, and Common Witness,” which

speaks of Spirit Baptism as the “presence of the Spirit” shown through charismatic gifts, which build up the *koinonia.*[^364] He goes on to suggest, “Early Pentecostals were onto something when without much theological sophistication they turned to the book of Acts for their paradigm of the church.”[^365]

This leads to the next critical point, which is that “The church as the fellowship of persons, empowered by the Holy Spirit, is not a communion for its own sake. It is ‘open to the world’.”[^366] In addition to the Pentecostal emphasis on mission as evangelism, this openness inherently means that “Part of the church’s life as a sent communion is to share in the sufferings of the world and alleviate poverty, injustice, and other social ills.”[^367] This entails an investment in the present world that was not part of the original Pentecostal vision, as eschatologically-charged as it was. But the original Pentecostal idea of empowerment to participate in God’s activity in the world opens the door for the social justice work that is being called for here.

Kärkkäinen concludes this crucial article by re-iterating,

Pentecostalism since its inception has embraced something that is at the heart of the biblical vision of *koinonia,* namely, the presence of the Spirit in the church and in an individual’s life as an eschatological reality. The presence of the Spirit as the Spirit of *koinonia* and the *eschaton* makes the church’s existence to be essentially an eschatological community.[^368]


[^366]: Kärkkäinen, “The Church as the Fellowship of Persons,” 9. Here he is borrowing a phrase from Jürgen Moltmann’s *The Trinity and the Kingdom.*


This is both a potent description of the original Pentecostal vision of church we found in Chapter Two, as well as a programmatic statement upon which a uniquely Pentecostal ecclesiology can be constructed even now. At last, from the perspective of this thesis, Kärkkäinen has tapped into the kind of description that Rees foretold and Newbigin first explicitly introduced. This is all the more significant in that this new way of speaking for Kärkkäinen comes at a more recent point than all of the contributions we have surveyed here so far.

2.6 Shane Clifton: ‘Concrete Ecclesiology’

Shane Clifton is an Australian Pentecostal scholar who wrote his doctoral dissertation on the developing ecclesiology of the Assemblies of God of Australia (AGA). Clifton argues for a particular methodology when addressing the topic of Pentecostal ecclesiology: a “concrete ecclesiological method.”369 This proposal stands in contrast to ‘idealist ecclesiologies,’ which specifically includes both “the restorationist orientation of Pentecostals” and communion ecclesiologies such as Volf’s.370 Regarding the former, Clifton astutely observes,

The problem, in respect to ecclesiological method, is not only the failure to account for the cultural and social distance between the Early Church and the Church of today; it is also that this approach misunderstands the ecclesial diversity and developments that are apparent in the New Testament writings…This is not to say that the Scriptures are not central to the Church and ecclesiological method. Indeed, biblical ideals, metaphors and models should remain foundational. Yet it is to observe that the ecclesiologist needs to adopt a broader approach.371

370 Clifton, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” 214-216.
Regarding communion ecclesiologies, Clifton asserts “Trinitarian models generally fail to differentiate adequately between divine and human persons and relationships, and this idealism leads to conclusions that are abstracted from church history and praxis.” To illustrate this point, Clifton points to the fact that communion ecclesiologies are used to support Catholic, Orthodox and Free Church structures, as the works of Pope Benedict, John Zizioulas and Volf indicate. Thus, the “radically different nature of the ecclesial conclusions suggests that there are factors other than the doctrine of the trinity determining their ecclesiology.”

As an alternative to these “blueprint ecclesiologies,” as theologian Nicholas Healy calls them, Clifton proposes a concrete ecclesiological method, which, in short, must tell the story of a specific church. He states, “Pentecostal ecclesiology will need to begin by narrowing its focus upon particular movements in particular locations.” This method demonstrates the fundamental convictions that theology cannot be abstracted from history and sociology, and that the Church in particular is “both a divine and human institution.” Since a concrete ecclesiology analyzes a specific church in its historical and cultural context, sociological typologies must be employed. Thus, Clifton surveys four sociological methods: positivism, functionalism, voluntarism or conflictualism, and intentionalism. He proposes that

---
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intentionalism, which he also calls the symbolic interactionist approach, is the one most applicable to the ecclesiological task. He then draws attention to Healy’s point about the need for ecclesiology to account for the reality of ecclesial sin\(^ {377}\). This leads to a further utilization of sociological paradigms, in which Clifton then identifies four “church anti-types” articulated by Neil Ormerod: classical conservative, neo-conservative, semi-progressive and totally progressive. In Ormerod’s appraisal, Pentecostalism is representative of the “neo-conservative” type, which is limited in its social dialectic but transcendent in its cultural dialectic. Pentecostal churches fit this category because “they display conservative theology and an innovative community life.”\(^ {378}\) Clifton validates this possibility, but not uncritically. He concludes his methodological proposal by summarizing,

> …a concrete ecclesiology will tell the narrative of a particular church’s (or movement’s or denomination’s) experience of the Spirit, describe the explicit and implicit ecclesial self-understanding that informs this narrative, and analyse ecclesial transitions…The goal is an analysis of what has been gained and lost in the process of ecclesial change…a concrete method does make it possible to talk about Pentecostal ecclesiology – to describe particular Pentecostal churches and movements and only thereafter to discern that which is common to all.\(^ {379}\)

Clifton therefore affirms the reality and necessity of identifying a distinct Pentecostal ecclesiology even as he proposes a different approach to the one taken here. I would agree with Clifton’s suggestion that a heuristic definition of the church is useful, however.

---


\(^ {378}\) Clifton, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” 229-231.

\(^ {379}\) Clifton, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” 232.
At the conclusion of Clifton’s dissertation itself, several important points are identified as being applicable to the wider task of Pentecostal ecclesiology. These mainly concern the state of those tenets which (as discussed in Chapter Two) have historically been central to the Pentecostal identity, but also concern the basic tensions that inevitably occur in most church structures. The first of these tensions is the inevitable institutionalizing that has occurred in what was originally a movement that served as a rebellion against, or a rejection of, traditional church structures. Every revival or restorationist or ‘breakaway’ movement in Christian history has experienced this same historical inevitability. For Pentecostals particularly, this tension is between the priesthood of all believers and what Clifton calls Charismatic Leadership. This specific tension is rooted in the Pentecostal theology of Spirit-empowerment. As Clifton explains, “Whatever else can be said about Pentecostal ecclesiology, it is apparent that the identity and mission of the movement is framed by the experience and theology of baptism in the Spirit…the implication of universal Spirit empowerment is that Pentecostal movements, in contrast to top down churches, have generally preferred grassroots approaches to church structure and life.” This is natural given how the movement began and what it sought to accomplish. Thus, the institutionalizing of the movement, particularly in the larger denominations, is most often seen as chaffing against the Pentecostal theology of universal Spirit-empowerment, or the priesthood of all believers (as well as against the direct leadership of the Spirit as described in Chapter Two). But Clifton, in concluding his analysis of the Australian Assemblies of God, attempts to assuage a completely negative outlook of such a process:
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In fact, the common assumption that institutionalisation is anti-charismatic or a necessary evil misses the fact that institutionalisation is a vital social development that intends to establish efficient and effective processes to achieve certain recurrent needs within communities. Institutionalisation need not prevent the work of the Spirit, although it might. The issue is not, is institutionalisation good or bad but, rather, what is gained and/or lost in particular instances of institutional development? That is, do particular institutional mechanisms encourage or inhibit the work of the Spirit in the church?\(^{382}\)

One of the implications of this suggestion is that Free Church governance “is not essential to Pentecostal ecclesiology.”\(^{383}\) This can be read as a welcomed response to the presumptions of those like Kärkkäinen who seem to equate Pentecostalism with Free Church ecclesiology, as well as a nod to the popular apostle-pastor leadership model in Australia. To quickly counter-balance this, however, Clifton concludes with a needed caution to the distortions of this more autocratic system:

…any Pentecostal movement needs to find ways of balancing the vital input of leaders with the recognition that leadership is subject to distortion. It is also to reassert the fundamental Pentecostal idea that the church itself is not constituted by the pastor (or Pope) – it is not “the pastor’s church” – but, rather, is the body of all Spirit filled believers whose head is Christ.\(^{384}\)

Here Clifton identifies a significant ecclesiological principle for Pentecostalism even while he affirms a theological allowance for the variances of governance systems that are found within it. In Pentecostalism, the Church is not defined by the type of leadership, i.e. episcopal,
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presbyterian or even congregational, but rather by the principle that the Church is the People of God’s Presence, and is made so by the indwelling of the Spirit who actualizes Christ’s Headship over it.

After addressing a need to re-cast a definition of ‘success’ for the church’s mission—not by numbers or efficiency or ability to “put on impressive services and events”—but rather by the degree to which the church incarnates the love of God to all people, Clifton briefly examines the place of the local church within the Kingdom of God. The local church should not be weighed down by unnecessary bureaucratization of a centralized system, but must also see its part in the greater global mission in partnership, fellowship and accountability with other churches, colleges and agencies. This is the task of balancing the tension between local autonomy with a “shared sense of mission.”

It is at this point that Clifton addresses what he calls cultural and theological values, which in this case are the distinctives or core defining beliefs of historical Pentecostalism. The problem he identifies is that these distinctives have either come to be ignored or remain undeveloped because of the pragmatic orientation of Pentecostal churches. They have been reticent to face critical reflection on their doctrines for fear that it will distract them from getting the job done. I would add that this is most apparent in the area of ecclesiology. As he explains:

Rather than debate the nuances of theology, Pentecostals have preferred to engage in the practical tasks of evangelism and church growth. Taken too far, however, pragmatic church cultures fail to recognize the extent to which the practice of ministry necessarily derives from and informs culture and theology. Indeed, the mission of the church is necessarily theological, being grounded in the proclamation of the good news of the Kingdom of God set out in the

---
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Scriptures and developed and transmitted via church tradition. Failure to engage this tradition gives birth to the danger of proclaiming a narrow and distorted message, a danger that is particularly acute for movements seeking to establish churches that are “relevant” and “contemporary”. This is not to deny the importance of contextualising the gospel, since the peril of irrelevance is equally or more significant than that of syncretism. Yet it is to assert that Pentecostal churches must pay attention to the theological meanings and values that constitute ecclesial culture.  

He continues to warn against the movement stifling its “prophetic edge, both by denying the importance of theory and theology and, further, by restricting the opportunities for input from diverse and sometimes contrary perspectives.”  

Rather than causing the movement to lose its identity, this kind of reflection can actually prevent it from doing so, for “at its best, faithful criticism is a vital element in mission, helping to ensure that the church continues to preach a message consistent with that of Jesus.”  

Specifically, Pentecostals need to reflect on the Fourfold Gospel, according to Clifton (we can see here in choosing the fourfold over the fivefold that already Clifton is engaging in a particular historical interpretation of the movement’s theology). Central to this reflection is the importance of the “experience and theology of the Spirit.” Clifton makes the significant ecclesiological statement that the baptism of the Spirit “is the one thing that enables Pentecostalism to be considered a ‘movement’, rather than a bewilderingly diverse and sectarian group of churches,” since it is this particular shared experience that has united Pentecostal
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After observing a decrease in emphasis on Spirit-baptism in his analysis of the AGA, Clifton responds:

…the problem is the potential danger of losing sight of a key element of Pentecostals identity, and a prime motivator for mission. What is necessary is for Pentecostals to ensure continuity with their heritage and, at the same time, to find new ways of understanding baptism in the Spirit in the ecumenically engaged context of the twenty first century global church.\(^\text{390}\)

Such a call to revision Spirit-baptism instead of discarding it obviously has significant ramifications for ecclesiology. Clifton goes no further on this point, but affirms that as Pentecostal ecclesiology continues to develop it must take its own history into account even as it looks to articulate itself anew in an ecumenical context. This, in turn, affirms the attempt being made here.

Clifton continues to identify the need for more intense reflection on the other four-fold areas of soteriology (Savior) and eschatology (Coming King). The particular danger with soteriology has been the influence of the prosperity gospel, while the concomitant danger for eschatology has also been an influence on earthly prosperity that has all but entirely eclipsed the once-fervent Pentecostal emphasis on Jesus’ return. Again, Clifton rightly expresses:

While we cannot hope for a return to the worldview of previous generations, unless the movement finds new ways of understanding and preaching the return of Christ, it is in danger of losing one of the key elements of its growth and outreach. Once again this requires theological

\(^{389}\) Clifton, *Pentecostal Churches*, 218.

\(^{390}\) Clifton, *Pentecostal Churches*, 218.
reflection, and an analysis of the implications of notions of the kingdom of God for the nature and purpose of the church today.\(^{391}\)

Once more, no specific solution is offered, but the need for proposals that revision the theological relationship between the church and the Kingdom which is both now and not yet is emphasized here. Clifton also stresses that the reason for this is because “the identity of the church is framed by its mission.”\(^{392}\) Pentecostalism, in the developed world particularly, is in danger of losing its mission because it no longer emphasizes the elements of the four or fivefold Gospel. This has left the movement susceptible to either having no ecclesiology at all, or adopting ecclesiologies which weaken their identity to the point where their ability to contribute to the global church the gifts God has bestowed on them is greatly hindered. If Pentecostals believe that God did raise up the movement to accomplish His divine purposes within history, they must, as Clifton concludes, engage in critical theological reflection on their distinctives on the plane of ecclesiology so that they may continue to participate in what God is doing now. As Clifton explains:

Churches of all persuasions exist to continue the ministry of Jesus and proclaim the good news of the coming Kingdom of God. This mission should drive the culture and structures of the church, by encouraging grass roots, local assemblies, and a shared inter ecclesial identity that reaches for denominational and ecumenical unity (unity in diversity)...Every Pentecostal church worldwide – indeed every church – needs to reflect upon the ways in which their social structures either serve or restrict and distort their mission.\(^{393}\)
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While Clifton utilizes a much different methodology, his work analyzing the AGA nevertheless tangibly demonstrates the pressing need for fresh proposals for Pentecostal ecclesiology that will have global and ecumenical applicability. These proposals must strive to connect with the original Pentecostal identity while simultaneously engaging in a new context a century on in the movement’s history. Pentecostals cannot try to be exactly what they were one hundred years ago, but if they do not revision what they were through critical theological reflection, Clifton’s analysis confirms that they will inevitably lose their identity, and therefore their mission, to a potentially crippling degree. This is not just a loss for them, but for the greater church as well.

2.7 Wolfgang Vondey: “Bread…and Wine at Play”

Another Pentecostal scholar who has written on ecclesiology in various forms is Wolfgang Vondey. Similar to Kärkkäinen, Vondey is also a scholar of Roman Catholic theologies (his dissertation was on Heribert Mühlen)[394], and therefore perhaps not surprisingly he is one to suggest a greater emphasis on the Eucharist. Having been raised Catholic himself,[395] he understands the potential for Pentecostals to develop their understanding of the sacraments within the church. He also shares Kärkkäinen’s concern for the ecumenical potential of pentecostal theology.

[394] Published as Wolfgang Vondey, Heribert Mühlen: His Theology and Praxis: A New Profile of the Church (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2004).

Vondey’s primary text concerning ecclesiology is his monograph, *People of Bread* (2008).\(^{396}\) As mentioned in Chapter One, it is curious that this work on ecclesiology by a Pentecostal is not an attempt to articulate or explore an explicitly pentecostal theology of the church. Rather, it is meant to propose an ecumenical vision of the church through the image of bread. Nonetheless, as such it does reflect one Pentecostal scholar’s attempt to image the church in a way that would be compatible with a pentecostal worldview. For our present purposes, what is most relevant is how Vondey utilizes the image of bread in relationship to the presence of the Tri-une God in the church. Throughout the book the image of bread is often synonymous with or at least symbolically connected to God’s “continuing presence”\(^{397}\) in the midst of His people (through the Son and in the Spirit), even as it is also used to image the mission, hospitality, unity, and eschatological vision of the church as well.

Central to Vondey’s ecclesial metaphor of bread and its accompanying picture of hospitality is the idea of *companionship*, which is also connected to the idea of presence. Hence, “In the breaking of the bread, the Church expresses itself as a companionship of the faithful formed by the hospitality of God, transformed through the companionship with God’s Son, and empowered by God’s Spirit.”\(^{398}\) The Church is the assembly of those who enjoy God’s redeeming companionship through the presence of the Son in the person of the Spirit (who is the Paraclete), and are therefore equipped and sent to extend this divine hospitality to the world. The Eucharist, where literal bread is broken, then powerfully serves to remind the congregation of


\(^{397}\) I.e. Vondey, *People of Bread*, 165,167,173,185, etc.

\(^{398}\) Vondey, *People of Bread*, 173.
this identity as the presence of the Spirit is invoked in the anamnesis: “In its sacramental function, the task of the Church is to help all participants to recognize and encounter the transforming and life-giving presence of Christ in the Spirit-filled companionship of the people of bread.” So it is clear that for Vondey, the ecclesiological concepts of companionship and hospitality, which are actualized in the act of the breaking of bread, are contingent upon an understanding of the Spirit’s presence in the church.

But is this divine presence only in the sacraments? If that were the case, this would obviously be nowhere near a ‘third-stream’ ecclesiology. Vondey goes on to affirm that the charismatic manifestations of the Spirit, what Acts 2:43 calls “signs and wonders”, are also a defining means of the Spirit’s presence among the people of God. In discussing this passage in Acts, he comments, “Luke continues to report those charismatic expressions in the following chapters in great detail. They are the consequences of a community that has become a witness to the hospitality of God and the continuing presence of Christ, inviting the world into a companionship that is transformed by the power of the Holy Spirit.”

Here the penny drops and we see that Vondey is able to fuse both a sacramental and charismatic understanding of the Spirit’s presence in the church in this ecclesiology of bread. This is confirmed by a later statement in which Vondey defines “the Eucharistic companionship as consisting of the experience of the whole life of faith, from conversion and exorcism to the baptism with water, to the anticipation of what Pentecostals have termed ‘the baptism of the Holy Spirit.’”
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companionship of the Holy Spirit is made visible in both the breaking of bread and in Spirit-baptism, and in these other defining events as well.

Thus, it would seem Vondey is skillfully able to subversively fuse a potential pentecostal ecclesiology with a sacramental one through his rich use of the image of bread. He does this by providing an equally rich understanding of the nature of God’s presence among His people. It is this presence which defines the nature and purpose of the church. This is summarized by Vondey in the following:

As such, the presence of the Holy Spirit is a constitutive element of the event of the cross not only in the history of Christ but also in the history of the Church. The Church, as the historical continuation of the companionship of Christ, is constituted by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which relates the Christian community to the resurrected and the glorified Christ and makes present throughout and beyond time Christ’s work of salvation. Moreover, by entering into the companionship of the Christian community, the Holy Spirit also obtains a history in the world and makes possible the tradition of the gospel and continuation of the messianic office of Christ. The presence of Jesus thus continues in the history of the Church through the presence of the Holy Spirit.402

The presence of the Holy Spirit is thus constitutive of the church’s existence, precisely because the Spirit’s presence, manifested in both eucharistic and charismatic avenues, continues the presence of Christ in His body into the world, so that the drama of salvation history may come to its eschatological fulfillment. The church participates in this drama not only at the table where the bread is broken, but also through experiencing the baptism of the Holy Spirit as on the day of Pentecost. Both are presented as vital aspects of the companionship of the Spirit with the

402 Vondey, *People of Bread,* 266.
church. Thus, even while affirming a more traditional view of the Eucharist in his ecclesiology, through the *People of Bread* Vondey offers a creative means for pentecostals and their proleptic eschatology to find a place within it. So a Pentecostal can then state, “The Church thus emerges as a sacramental community that upholds the bread as a sacred sign of remembering, anticipating, and participating in the fulfillment of God’s promises.”

Even more recently than *People of Bread*, which was quite obviously written with a broad audience in mind, Vondey has boldly ventured to challenge Pentecostals specifically toward adopting a more eucharistic ecclesiology. In an article in *PNEUMA* in 2010, Vondey repeats the same concepts of companionship and hospitality in proposing that Pentecostals aim for an ecumenical account of the church through a greater focus on the Eucharist. As he states, “I propose that for Pentecostals the notion of eucharistic hospitality provides a starting point for a genuine Pentecostal ecclesiology that emerges both from a pneumatological praxis and in dialog with ecclesial traditions.”

He immediately qualifies this term in this context, explaining that “For Pentecostals, eucharistic hospitality refers less likely to a sacramental ritual than to the sharing of a common meal that must be integrated in a larger context of companionship among the churches.” This is further qualified as a radical proposal, given that “the Lord’s Supper occupies no central place in Pentecostal ecclesiology to this date.”

---
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After demonstrating the significance of discernment at the Last Supper in patristic theology and their exegesis of scripture, and the issue of the lack of discernment as the root of the Corinthian problem that Paul had to correct, Vondey addresses this central concept of *spiritual discernment* and the Lord’s Supper constructively for Pentecostals. Building upon the foundational pneumatology of Regent colleague Amos Yong, Vondey sees the communal nature of discernment taking place at the celebration of the eucharist, through the recognition that the Spirit’s presence at the Table represents the continuing presence of Christ, which is therefore also found “in the other,” and thereby acknowledges “the other as a member of the one body.”

Here it is obvious that Vondey is applying the same principles in *People of Bread* to the Pentecostal context.

The exercise of spiritual discernment at the Lord’s Supper, then, is the co-operation of human minds with the Spirit of God who “is the foundation of truth, holiness, and unity in the church.” Both work to bring about the unity of the church. At the same time, exercising discernment obviously takes place away from the table of the Lord as well. Companionship, hospitality, unity and the Spirit’s presence can and do manifest themselves at other times among the faithful. Therefore, a broader view of eucharistic hospitality is in mind here, as Vondey points out:

…to emphasize that the eucharistic meal goes beyond the realm of institutional structures of the church to include the whole life of the faithful. This understanding of the Lord’s Supper would be much closer to a Pentecostal perspective of the Christian life. At the same time, there is no need to divorce this eucharistic ecclesiology from a liturgical framework…Pentecostals

---
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might agree that a companionship that continues the life and teaching of Christ cannot be limited to the spatial or temporal realm of the meal.\textsuperscript{409}

This broader view then opens the door for a greater and perhaps less formal and therefore more acceptable context for ecumenical companionship between Pentecostals and “strangers.” Once an openness to this companionship becomes acceptable to a Pentecostal ecclesiology, a number of implications for constructing such an ecclesiology arise: church, like the eucharistic meal, is not a passive event that “happens” to those gathered in companionship, because discernment is an exercise between the Spirit and ALL those gathered; second, like the eucharistic meal, church is a reflection of self-giving of Christians in continuation of the self-giving of Christ; third, like the eucharistic meal, church creates and represents a sharp contrast to the isolation, exploitation, and suffering of the world order; fourth, like the eucharistic meal, church is a liberation of the whole of life that cannot stop at the boundaries of faith and praxis created by today’s churches and denominations; finally, church and universal companionship extends also to ecological hospitality.\textsuperscript{410}

While these are very astute and useful observations, it is not immediately clear how directly they coalesce with the Pentecostal ethos. Therein lies the shortcoming of the whole article. There simply needs to be a stronger connection established between eucharistic hospitality and Pentecostalism.

\textsuperscript{409} Vondey, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” 51.
\textsuperscript{410} Vondey, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” 52-54.
Most recently, Vondey has written a monograph entitled *Beyond Pentecostalism: The Crisis of Global Christianity and the Renewal of the Theological Agenda* (2010). Not surprisingly, there are chapters each on liturgy and on church. The chapter on liturgy, “Beyond Ritual,” highlights both the twin pneumatological and eschatological orientations of Pentecostal liturgy, and the defining concept of liturgy as *play*. What Vondey calls Pentecostal liturgy evolved first from the worship practices of African-American slaves, for whom “The presence of God’s Spirit was perceived as a liberating occurrence of freedom, experienced temporally in the prayer grounds and nurturing a vision of ultimate freedom in the future.”\(^4\)\(^1\)\(^1\) \(^4\)\(^1\)\(^2\) For them, “Liturgy was not a ‘confining structure’ but an ‘open arrangement’ oriented along the necessities of the situation and the possibilities provided by the presence of God’s Spirit.”\(^4\)\(^1\)\(^2\) The key to understanding this non-European way of doing liturgy is summarily described by Vondey:

> The orientation toward nature, the pneumatological imagination, and the broad array of kinesthetic responses to the spiritual awareness of God’s presence undoubtedly emerged from African antecedents. The experience of the presence of the Holy Spirit provided a contrast to the performance-oriented work environment of the day. The pneumatological and eschatological setting of African American worship provided a refuge from the harsh realities of everyday life and offered a sense of empowerment and freedom. Here, the slaves were free to engage God in the fullness of their being and affections.\(^4\)\(^1\)\(^3\)

The evolution of this liturgy continued with the rise of Camp Meetings after the American Civil War. There, “liturgy was not ‘performed’; the whole event rather “played out”


\(^4\)\(^1\)\(^2\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 121.

\(^4\)\(^1\)\(^3\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 122.
as the circumstances permitted and where the Spirit of God led."\(^{414}\) The outdoor, rural setting facilitated the informal character of the ‘liturgy’ of these meetings, which were the forerunners to the revival gatherings of early Pentecostalism.

Vondey continues to trace this evolution by stating next that “the liturgical framework of the camp meetings was kept alive in the urban environment” of the Azusa Street Mission, where the Pentecostal revival is recognized to have really taken off.\(^{415}\) Thus, Vondey summarizes, “In the urban environment of the early twentieth century, the mixture of African American worship and camp meeting tradition was transformed into a new, Pentecostal liturgy, radically dissimilar from the traditional Anglo-European structures.”\(^{416}\) Vondey quotes Cecil Robeck’s identification of the elements at the heart of this new liturgy as consisting of “worship through prayer, song, singing in the Spirit, preaching and discussion, gathering at the altar, testimony, deliverance and conversion, sanctification, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit.”\(^{417}\) Having traced the evolution of this new liturgy, Vondey summarizes its character:

…the Pentecostal liturgy emerged as a destructuralizing, flexible, oral, participation-centered, and pneumatically oriented ‘open arrangement’ of worship, prayer, and praise. Liturgy, in a broad sense, was seen as the free response to an encounter with God rather than a structure provided for the possibility of that encounter.\(^{418}\)

\(^{414}\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 123.

\(^{415}\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 126.

\(^{416}\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 127.

\(^{417}\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 127.

\(^{418}\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 128.
To further describe the unique essence of this liturgy, Vondey significantly turns to the metaphor of *play*. In so doing, he is following after Jean-Jacques Suurmond and Simon Chan, who have also applied this same metaphor to Pentecostal worship.\(^{419}\) From this perspective, “the purpose of the liturgy consists of the fact that it is to be understood as the play of God’s children before their God.”\(^{420}\) Spirit baptism and the accompanying practice of glossolalia are singled out as a prime example of a liturgical practice that demonstrates this character of ‘play.’ Spirit baptism “makes possible ecstatic displays of the presence of the Holy Spirit,” while “Glossolalia accents the free, dynamic, and unpredictable move of the Spirit of God.” Thus, “in this suspended structural environment, the liturgy is open to the playful invention of new behaviour, freedom of expression, spontaneity, and enthusiasm that characterize Christian behaviour as play.”\(^{421}\) With these assertions Vondey is tapping into the potential of Pentecostalism to make a distinct contribution to a theology of the church. The unique juxtaposition of the particular pneumatological and eschatological orientation of this playful liturgy marks out a third-stream understanding of the church. Thus,

From a Pentecostal perspective, the church exists as a pilgrim in the liminal realm of the liturgy amidst the expectation of the coming of the kingdom of God that transcends the performative world of meaning...Liturgical action, conceived as the people of play, directs the attention away from the (no longer ritual) activity itself and opens the church to participation in the eschatological kingdom of God.\(^{422}\)


\(^{420}\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 131.

\(^{421}\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 135.

\(^{422}\) Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism*, 136.
It is clear from Vondey’s description of Pentecostal liturgy that the “people of play” are those who are liberated to respond to the presence of God in their midst in ways other than what had been previously prescribed for them. One of the challenges at this point in the movement’s history is therefore to revision pentecostal practices such as glossolalia from a dogmatic tenet (such as the expected initial evidence of Spirit baptism) to a welcomed, playful liturgical ‘sacrament’ that demonstrates the interaction of the eschatological Spirit of God among the people.

Another important feature of this play in the presence of the eschatological Spirit is how it facilitates the “continual transformation” or semper reformanda (though Vondey does not use this term) character of the church. Vondey quotes Amos Yong, Margaret Poloma and Simon Chan in highlighting how the “playful atmosphere” of Pentecostal liturgy produces “eschatological openness” which “continually calls for more of the presence of God.”423 This is what has given Pentecostalism its elasticity, or its “remarkable adaptability” to different contexts around the globe. Sociologist David Martin has concluded much the same thing in his own study of global Pentecostalism.424 As such, Pentecostalism challenges traditional views of liturgy from a Western, rationalistic perspective. As Vondey explains:

Nonetheless, theology from a liturgical perspective has yet to identify the realm of nonrational, kinesthetic, linguistic, and aesthetic responses to the presence of God that may characterize Christian worship in a global context. Pentecostalism suggests that the ritual field, sounds, and sights of theological practice are easily confined and restricted by structures that do

423 Vondey, Beyond Pentecostalism, 137.
not respond to the presence of the Holy Spirit in the community…The play of the liturgy is an
event that embraces all of life. 425

Drawing upon other Pentecostal scholars, Vondey presents a theology of the liturgy as
play in the presence of the eschatological Spirit of God. In doing so, he has utilized an effective
way of conceptualizing worship that is highly conducive to the idea of the church as the People
of God’s Presence.

The concept of play is further applied to ecclesiality in the next chapter, “Beyond
Church.” Traditional notions of ecclesiality and its place in ecclesiology, however, are
formidably challenged by Vondey in the first part of the chapter. In terms of methodology,
Vondey demonstrates the weaknesses of traditional comparative ecclesiology, and proposes
instead a “cultural ecclesiology.” This means no longer thinking of the church in structural
terms, as has been done in the “ecclesiology of Christendom.” This has been the root of the
problem of how to understand Pentecostalism ecclesiologically, as discussed in Chapter One.
Vondey explains:

As such, classical Pentecostalism is identified as an add-on to the landscape of North
American church history, an addition at the end of the ecclesiastical line, an outgrowth of the
Holiness movement, an example of the Evangelical and Free Church traditions, or, more
generally, the most recent expression of Protestantism and the Reformation movements. Granted
ecclesiological status, Pentecostalism has become one entity among others, a movement in the
church but not characteristic of the church. Thus integrated into the established ecclesiological
paradigm, Pentecostalism, as much as any “new” community in the history of the church, is
swallowed up by the competitiveness of the ecclesiological scheme and destined to be overcome
by subsequent additions that continue to add to the diversity of ecclesial existence in the late

425 Vondey, Beyond Pentecostalism, 138.
modern world. Among the pluralism of ecclesial communities and cultures, the understanding of what constitutes the essence of “church” is lost.  

Such a problem—as what drives this thesis—also drives Vondey to propose that Pentecostalism be understood ecclesiologically as a Post-Christendom Movement (or “Movements” as he will later qualify), rather than a “church.” This goes beyond the more traditional ‘church-sect’ designations (as in Troeltsch) from ‘Christendom ecclesiologies.’ It also more accurately expresses the eschatological self-understanding of the early Pentecostals, with their restorationist and revival impulses. As Vondey explains,

Pentecostalism as a movement was not the fulfillment of God’s work but the work itself, not an organization or institution but a tangible “forward moving” expression of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the forming of the church as an eschatological community through history and the world…More precisely, Pentecostals understood themselves as becoming church…Pentecostalism was seen as a movement of the Spirit that swept across the church and thus became the church.  

Vondey reads the history of Pentecostalism as a movement that became churches in the institutional, ecclesial sense, which became denominations because of their rapid growth and missionary efforts. Thus, their ecclesial identity dramatically changed, and not necessarily for the better ecclesiologically as the eschatological ‘becoming’ had effectively halted.

Utilizing the term aggiornamento (“bringing up to date”) from the Second Vatican Council document Gaudium et spes, Vondey then seeks to propose an ecclesiology of the Church.

---
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as the Playground of Cultures, or a cultural ecclesiology. The consistent Pentecostal emphasis on orthopathy, which is “the location where culture is brought into dialogue with orthodoxy and orthopraxy,” also functions as a “carrier of the imagination” which therefore “opens up the church to the playfulness of the affections and the critical, countercultural function of the liturgy.”\textsuperscript{428} But for Vondey, the practice of the liturgy in cooperation with the essential practice of spiritual discernment (emphasized in the previous article as well) allows the church to be contextualized as it seeks not only to redeem some hopeful aspects of its situated culture while rejecting other sinful ones, but also to be herself transformed by the culture. In such a proposal, “The concept of church has no priority over the notions of salvation, redemption, liberation, transformation, and renewal. Ecclesiality is not defined in an ecclesiocentric manner but through what might be called a ‘cultural ecclesiality.’”\textsuperscript{429} Concrete examples of this kind of relationship between church and culture are found in Korea (with the Pentecostal appropriation of minjung), India (with the Pentecostal ministry among the Dalit caste) and Latin America (with the Pentecostal equivalents of base communities), according to Vondey. It is at this point that Vondey concludes that “It is more accurate to speak of Pentecostal ecclesiality as “movements”, in the plural.”\textsuperscript{430} This paradigm shift from a restorationist, revival Movement to diverse, culturally-defined movements for pentecostalism is described by Vondey as follows:

Classical Pentecostalism upheld the idea of the indigenous church as a self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating entity that proclaims an unchanging gospel to all cultures and contexts. The global expansion of Pentecostalism has turned the focus instead to the contextualization of ecclesiality on the grassroots level and to an experience of being church that

\textsuperscript{428} Vondey, Beyond Pentecostalism, 160.
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seeks to be relevant and meaningful in a particular context while being fundamentally shaped by its culture…Put differently, the ecclesiality of the “movements” is gained not by an expansion of (classical) Pentecostal origins but by the birth of new Pentecostal communities from within different cultural contexts and as a result of particular cultural phenomena…Their theological imagination finds expression through cultural agency and relational transformation that form the very essence of their ecclesiality. To be sure, “church” is invested with theological meaning. However, this meaning is “cultivated,” to use Eugene Halton’s idea, not in the church as an abstract and figurative religious system but in the living reality of personal, social, economic, and political relations.  

Spiritual discernment, then, is about identifying the necessary and fruitful ways in which church and culture can transform or contextualize each other. This is an absolutely critical point for Vondey. He states, “From a pneumatological perspective, the Holy Spirit is seen as present not only in the church but in some way also in the environments of cultures, societies, and religions. Spiritual discernment as an ecclesiological tool is thus located both in the church directed toward culture and in the culture directed toward the church.” The suggestion of the Spirit’s presence being found outside the church is a challenging one. While Vondey affirms that “church” is invested with theological meaning, he does not specify what that meaning is. It is not altogether clear, then, in this contextualizing relationship exactly what the identity of the church is apart from the ecclesiality that is formed and therefore determined by the culture. This is where the ecclesiological proposal of Simon Chan would vastly differ from Vondey’s cultural ecclesiology, even though both emphasize the playfulness of the liturgy.

431 Vondey, Beyond Pentecostalism, 164.
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Vondey turns to Paulo Freire’s notion of “conscientization” and briefly connects it with the work of several other Pentecostal scholars who have expanded it, linking it to Pentecostal liturgy. It is the process of being conscious of and acting upon reality in a transformative way, and the informal, participative and playful nature of Pentecostal liturgy is seen to facilitate this process effectively. He concludes, “Therefore, Pentecostal liturgy is revolutionary, serving for the conscientization of the people of God.”

Although it could be spelled out more, Vondey is here salvaging some theological identity for the church as the ‘people of God’ for whom the liturgy, and not just the culture, is the playground before God. This is where the particular work of the Spirit, or the nature of the presence of the Spirit, needs further elaboration. Vondey does state at this point that, “From a Pentecostal perspective, pneumatology drives the church toward the kingdom of God and already actualizes the presence of that kingdom in the world through the manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit.” This is as far as he goes, but it does provide an ecclesiology that is not totally culturally-determined. The presence of the Spirit made manifest through the charismatic gifts shape and move the people of God’s presence to discern how the church and culture can transform each other, since the Spirit is also “in some way” present in that culture and outside the church.

But in defining the church as movement and as the playground of cultures the accent is clearly on moving all this away from “an ecclesiocentric perspective.” Drawing upon the work of colleague Amos Yong, Vondey again emphasizes:

…the church exists as a community of discernment, but it is not the exclusive realm in which discernment takes place. Yong envisions the task not as an in-house dialogue of a restricted

---
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community disengaged from the world but as the courageous and charismatic engagement of God’s Word and Spirit in the public square, inviting others into the arena of discernment and thereby building the church in the particularity of the cultural situation. Discernment is not an ecclesiastical performance but takes place in the interplay of church and world.\textsuperscript{435}

It is at this juncture that he turns to Suurmond, who describes the church as a “liberated community in which the world is invited to play with the Word and Spirit.” He sees Suurmond as also moving away from an ecclesiocentric view of the Gospel in much the same way as he is proposing. Interestingly, he also references Chan on the image of play—though Chan’s ecclesiology is starkly different from his and Suurmond’s.

Finally, Vondey concludes by curiously turning to the concept of \textit{koinonia} as part of his attempt at “a linking of church, culture, and charisms in defining the nature of the church in the world.” Koinonia seems to be the bridging concept between the church as both the playground of the Spirit’s charisms and the cultural playground. For Vondey, “the global Pentecostal landscape suggests that the contemporary task of ecclesiology is faced with a definition of the church as both charismatic and cultural fellowship…At the heart of the ecclesiological debate therefore stands the question of the structures of the church in a particular cultural context.”\textsuperscript{436} By turning briefly to \textit{koinonia}, Vondey appears to be attempting to connect his cultural ecclesiology to one that sounds much like Kärkkäinen, though he does not make this explicit.

At the heart of what Vondey proposes here is a novel way of defining ecclesiality based on Post-Christendom structures that are determined by particular cultural contextualizations.

\textsuperscript{435} Vondey, \textit{Beyond Pentecostalism}, 167.

\textsuperscript{436} Vondey, \textit{Beyond Pentecostalism}, 169.
The church is really a bunch of movements that are shaped by their interplay with the Spirit’s charisms and the culture in which it exists. There are therefore only Pentecostal ecclesiologies. As Vondey stresses, “Global Pentecostalism does not propose one particular (Pentecostal) structure but suggests that ecclesiality is experienced most concretely in a diversity of liturgical rhythms where church and culture meet in a mutual movement that shapes the ecclesial community in that particular context.”\textsuperscript{437} The radical move here is that the theology of the church is not ecclesiocentric.

There is certainly something about Pentecostalism’s ability to contextualize that is significant to its global growth and vitality, and therefore Vondey is attempting to capture that in this proposal and make it a defining ecclesiological principal. The obvious concern is in stressing the authoritative role of culture to shape and define the church. More must be said about God’s direct role in doing so. This is where the Spirit and the charisms come in for Vondey, and that is where I would suggest the real heart of Pentecostalism’s contribution to ecclesiology should be focused. While Vondey’s examples of Korea, India and Latin America may very well be accurate and therefore deserve attentive consideration, it is also equally true that in North America the cultural influence upon the church has been in the range of questionable to downright disastrous. One could easily make the case that cultural contextualization, which has most often turned to accommodation, has actually been one of the slow killers of Pentecostalism (and broader Christianity) on this continent. Thus, while much of what Vondey suggests about the interplay of church and culture deserves respectful reflection in light of Post-Christendom and global diversity, I would humbly suggest something more must

\textsuperscript{437} Vondey, \textit{Beyond Pentecostalism}, 170.
distinguish and define church apart from culture, in any context. Specifically, when Vondey mentions the people of God, this term must come to have a greater theological meaning. Although he most certainly contributes much to the construction and understanding of ecclesiology from a Pentecostal perspective in this and in his other writings, we are still left with fundamental questions about the nature in which God constitutes the community of those whom He has gathered.

2.8 Steven Land: Eschatological Missionary Fellowship

A much earlier but important contribution to pentecostal ecclesiology came in a more implicit form in Steven Land’s *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom* (1992). While the primary aim of Land’s dissertation is to, as the title indicates, revision Pentecostal Spirituality for the Twenty-First Century by examining its roots in the first years of the revival, sprinkled throughout this work are several (often bite-sized) references to a Pentecostal understanding of a theology of the church. Many of these references are consistent in communicating the essence of Pentecostalism as a dwelling in the presence of the eschatological Spirit. What characterizes Pentecostals, Land writes, is “a continuous, joyous exclamation of the inbreaking presence and soon to be consummated kingdom of God. I have observed this on five continents over the last fifteen years. To that extent there is a remarkable continuity from Azusa to Seoul, to Glasgow, to Managua, to Santiago, to Durban, to Moscow.”

This presence and its eschatological nature are thus seen to be defining for Land’s expressions about the church, as they are about Pentecostal theology and spirituality as a whole. Indeed, as Land states, “For

---

Pentecostals, the starting point [in theological science] for such an undertaking is the Holy Spirit who is ‘God with us.’ The God who was present among Israel and in Jesus Christ is now present in the Holy Spirit.” It is the presence of the Holy Spirit that then also is the starting point for pentecostal ecclesiology as well. This is also made plain by Land:

The presence of the Holy Spirit constituted the church. As on the day of Pentecost, the message, structure, faith and order might all be in place; but it took the power of a new age, the last days’ outpouring of the Spirit, to constitute the church a missionary fellowship which would witness in words, power and demonstration of the Holy Spirit. The church lives from the Spirit of Christ unto the glory of the Father.

If God is the living God, the God who in Trinitarian communion is spirit, if the church is a living organism of charisms and signs; and, if salvation is a living relationship with this God among these people who live in last days’ expectancy and urgency – if all this is the case, then theology must be a discerning reflection upon this living reality, these divine-human relations… The community of the Spirit and Word functions as a worshipping, witnessing, forming, reflective whole; but at the heart of all this is the liturgical life of the community.

There is plainly here a deep ecclesiology centered on the presence of the Spirit, who cooperates with the Word in liturgy and charisms to empower the church to witness to the work of the Tri-une God. This comes several years before many of the other Pentecostal scholars we have surveyed, who all take one or more aspects of what Land presents in this work. The ‘active reigning presence of the Spirit’ is the locus through which Land constructs a theology of spirituality, in which the church is highly placed.

---
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Land also significantly describes this presence of the Spirit repeatedly as the *transcendent* presence of God, the eschatological presence or eschatological Trinitarian presence, apocalyptic presence, divine presence, as well as the vivid presence of the Spirit, along with other descriptions as well. This is sufficient to see that Land understands the encountered, empowering presence of the Spirit in measurable form as that which stands at the core of Pentecostal theology and experience. While it is the presence of the Spirit, Land makes clear that it is also the Spirit of Christ, affirming the core belief of original Pentecostalism that this move of the Spirit was a move toward the Son of God: “The powerful sensed presence of the Spirit led to a clear testimony focused on Christ as Savior, Sanctifier, Healer, Baptizer in the Spirit and coming King… The ‘five-fold gospel’ was Christocentric because of the witness, power and presence of the Holy Spirit.”^441 Thus, the presence of the Spirit in the church was/is not, as Vondey might suggest, the same presence of the Spirit in the culture; the manifest work of the Spirit in the community of faith has a distinct Gospel which defines its worship and mission.

And it is this Gospel that the church is called to proclaim to the world that God so loved, in this manifest power of the gift-giving Spirit. So the eschatological Spirit of Christ propels the church into mission as the Kingdom is being inaugurated. As Land describes:

…the eschatological presence of God in, among, and through these Pentecostals resulted in a heretofore unseen recovery of the universal call to witness in the power and demonstration of the Spirit in order to carry out the universal mission of the church in the last days. The missionary, charismatic nature of the church, and therefore of the Christian life, was now a central normative issue and concern.^442

^441 Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 120,124.
Again, there is a high ecclesiology here that is based upon mission, eschatology, and the constituting presence of the Spirit of Christ.

While the mission, Gospel, and constituting essence of the Church are clear, another ecclesiological issue which draws attention from Land is the structure and apostolicity of the church. Here again, it is the presence of the Spirit which, no matter which polity is being used, divinely facilitates the priesthood of all believers. Land expresses it thus:

The church is not essentially a machine or organization created by humans; it is an organism. There is a fusion of clergy and laity, male and female, fruits and gifts, but a fission of church and world, and doctrine serves to define those limits. Without those limits there is no clear identity and health. Pentecostals developed different polities, but eventually all – whether congregational, Presbyterian or Episcopal – were qualified by the dynamic levelling of the Pentecostal presence who turned everyone into a priest, prophet, saint and witness. Offices of the church – ministry gifts such as pastor, apostle, teacher, prophet and so forth, were to be recognized by the body and could only be effective if the body confirmed the gift.443

This view of apostolicity as that which must be recognized by the assembly extends to a continued emphasis upon the communal nature of Pentecostal spirituality for Land, further evidence of a high ecclesiology in his presentation. But because Pentecostal spirituality is very much construed as a pilgrimage to the already inbreaking eschatological kingdom, the church is then conceived for its role in this pilgrimage. As Land explains in a section called The Community of the King:

443 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, 110.
The Pentecostal passion for the kingdom of God is formed and expressed in and through a Pentecostal community. This community exists in the pronounced eschatological tension of the already-not yet. The strategy of the Holy Spirit in announcing and previewing the kingdom is to form and sustain the community of the king. This strong tension explains why Pentecostals to this day have no strongly developed ecclesiology. In some way the church as a human organization, a polity with policies and procedures, is a great disappointment. This is a strength and a weakness.

It is a strength because it is an ongoing critique of the tendency of the church toward an involuted institutionalism. The church is a church on the way to the kingdom and is thus more a movement of the Spirit than a structure wedded to the present age. It is an obvious weakness, because it means that there are often not sufficient biblical and theological controls and directives worked out for the church’s life outside the worship and witness settings.\(^{444}\)

Land’s statement that the church is more of a movement of the Spirit is an obvious forerunner to Vondey’s. But while Vondey sees the movement shaped by its interplay with culture and its contextualization within a culture, Land’s notion of movement is by contrast purely eschatologically conceived, even though both ground it pneumatologically.

In the final chapter of his work, Land writes a brief subsection which explicitly spells out a theology of the church in light of all that he has said. For the rubric of this description, Land uses the four classical creedal marks of the church: one, holy, catholic and apostolic. These are recast in light of the church’s charismatic nature, and from a communion ecclesiology perspective:

The Church is a communion of diversity and unity in the Spirit. Just as God is one and three so the church is one and many in God. The church as eschatological Trinitarian fellowship is a

\(^{444}\) Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 178.
communion in God – a people of God, a body of Christ and thus a communion in the Holy Spirit. What is fellowship but participation? In this fellowship gifts and office coincide and theology is the discerning reflection of the whole as each offers his or her gift, recognizes the other’s gifts and is built up to disciple and love the neighbour.

The fruit of the Spirit is one because the Spirit is the sole source and the fruit is the character of God. But the church is the milieu or garden for that cultivation. The fruit is cultivated by the Spirit so that the church as a whole and each believer may be witnesses who represent something of the divine character and care of God in the world.

The gifts are diverse, differently applied, sovereignly distributed (not ‘discovered’ or ‘cultivated’ or ‘operated at will’), and different in each manifestation. But the gifts are for the whole body which is for the kingdom. Thus the gifts simultaneously serve an ‘inner’ edificatory function and an ‘outer’ evangelistic one.

The church that is caught up in the divine fellowship is one because of the same divine presence from whom it lives; the church is holy because that presence is the holy and only presence which sanctifies. To be set apart unto God, for believer and church, is to be set apart for union, for that which is joined to God is holy. To treat the church anywhere as profane is to profane the church everywhere. The holiness of the church demands unity. All who pray to and in the same presence are one, are holy and thus should strive to show the world how they love one another. But this church that is one in the divine presence and holy in divine union is apostolic and catholic in its power and universal mandate, respectively. The church in the Trinitarian eschatological presence of God moves into all the world toward the end. The apostolic power is authority and strength to proclaim the one gospel in word and demonstration of the Spirit.445

Significantly, this is immediately followed by another section on Mission, which although treated separately is also intrinsically connected to the nature of the church as an

445 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, 205-206.
eschatological charismatic fellowship. Again, there is much said here about the relationship of the church to the world that both compares and contrasts with Vondey:

The mission is to do justice, love mercy and walk humbly with God. In keeping with what was said before, the church is to recognize the divine presence at work in creation and providence as well as in the more immediate soteriological dimensions. This means that the sanctification of the believer and of the church is to be the motive and analog for the sanctification of the world, not by dissolving the church into the world but by calling the world to repentance and to righteousness. The church, where possible, must work to make structures more adequate to the life as righteously ordered and intended by God. Structures cannot be sanctified in the same way as individuals, but, since the Spirit is at work in all creation, discerning action of the church can bear witness to and participate in those activities which more nearly embody righteousness, dignity and love for people.446

While the church is constituted by the operation of the divine presence of the Spirit, Land also defines the church’s mission as discerning the work of this presence in the world and participating in it, without being “dissolved” by the world in the process. Thus, the mission of discerning acknowledging the activity of the Spirit outside the church foreshadow Vondey’s ecclesiology, while the mission of calling the culture to repentance and remaining distinct from the world distinguish Land’s thought from Vondey somewhat in this regard.

In an Afterword, where Land asks pressing questions for the Pentecostal movement going forward, the doctrine of the church is also raised. These questions are about the possibility of developing a viable ecclesiology that “could allow for ongoing change and debate without schisms,” and about “what structure of the church is best correlated to the shape of the Christian

446 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, 206.
life,” as it has been envisioned in his work.\textsuperscript{447} So, Land called for a formal ecclesiology that will address or hold together the great tension between structure and change (or \textit{semper reformanda}). Nearly twenty years later, although a great deal more work has been done to address these issues, it is not at all clear that this formal ecclesiology has yet come to fruition. While Land has the makings of a rich ecclesiology with his vision of the eschatological, missionary fellowship, he has not developed anything further in this area since. Nevertheless, the grounding of his ecclesiology in the constitutive presence of the Holy Spirit serves as perhaps the most hopeful foundation for the ongoing construction of an authentically Pentecostal theology of the Church.

\section*{2.9 Peter Althouse: Missional Communion Ecclesiology}

Canadian Peter Althouse is another Pentecostal scholar who has addressed the ecclesiological vacuum in Pentecostalism with a communion ecclesiology proposal that arises out of his own work on early Pentecostal eschatology. The resulting eschatological/missional flavour of his ecclesiology thus bears some resemblance to Land’s. Althouse argues from his research that classical Pentecostal eschatology was not originally or inherently as strictly dispensationalist as the Fundamentalist movement that some Pentecostal denominations later aligned themselves with. Instead, it is more accurate (as I tried to convey in Chapter Two) to describe it as ‘proleptic anticipation,’ “which demands our present, active participation for the kingdom, but also anticipates that the kingdom will break into the world as a sovereign act.”\textsuperscript{448}

\textsuperscript{447} Land, \textit{Pentecostal Spirituality}, 221-222.

\textsuperscript{448} Peter Althouse, “‘Left Behind’ – Fact or Fiction: Ecumenical Dilemmas of the Fundamentalist Millenarian Tensions within Pentecostalism,” in \textit{Journal of Pentecostal Theology} (2005), Vol 13.2, 202. It bears mention that Althouse also delivered a paper on the church as an eschatological community at the Wales Conference in 2010.
He then explains how this shift in conceiving Pentecostal eschatology has direct implications for Pentecostal ecclesiology. Drawing on fellow Pentecostal scholar Murray Dempster, Althouse specifically identifies that the “kerygmatic, koinonia, and diakonia ministries of the church hinge on this Pentecost/kingdom relationship.” The kerygmatic ministry concerns the proclamation of the kingdom, which shapes moral character and therefore leads to social change. Koinonia is forward-looking and is enacted by the Spirit’s work through both the charismata and the Eucharist, which produces a “counter-community that declares the world’s existing social structures corrupt and decayed. The church therefore bears a prophetic and at times revolutionary responsibility to the kingdom.” The diakonic ministry is where the church reaches out to the world to minister social welfare to the needy and suffering. A running theme here is that if Pentecostals conceive their eschatology in a more participative-transformative way—i.e. not merely waiting for the Rapture and avoiding the Great Tribulation but called to be active in the continued inbreaking of the now/not yet Kingdom of God upon Creation—this will clearly shape their mission to involve more than evangelism but include social action at every level of the church’s ministry.

In a more recent paper (2009), Althouse turned his attention directly to the theology of the church and proposed a type of communion ecclesiology for Pentecostals, again with a strong eschatological and missional thrust. His stated thesis is “that Pentecostal ecclesiology must start in the reflection of triune God, who constitutes the church as a sent and sending community. In triune contemplation the church lives out its mission as it participates in the missional life of

449 Althouse, “‘Left Behind,’” 204 (italics his)
450 Althouse, “‘Left Behind,’” 204-205.
The starting point, however, is describing the nature of the relationship between the church, the world, and the God who instituted both:

The church is the locale for the beginnings of the reign of Christ as the foremost sign and instrument of God’s kingdom. The church is missional because God has ordained its people to participate in the triune mission. Yet the church is not the focus of God’s redemptive activity per se, the world is. The church is the place where God engages and brings people into redemptive participation for the sake of the world.

This missional ecclesiology thus resonates with Vondey in that it, too, seeks to avoid being ‘ecclesiocentric.’

After tracing the general development of missional ecclesiology in the broader Christian theological world, Althouse ultimately turns to Lesslie Newbigin for his primary influence, though Newbigin’s lecture on Pentecostalism is not included here. Specifically, Newbigin’s suggestion that the church in her essence exists as a ‘sign,’ ‘instrument’ and ‘foretaste’ of what is to come, as God’s eschatological reign spreads throughout the world is a cornerstone piece to Althouse’s ecclesiology. The concept of the church existing to participate in the *missio Dei* (“mission of God”) is at the core here. Interestingly, all references in this section are to non-Pentecostal sources.

After receiving the missional aspect of the church from outside Pentecostalism, Althouse then turns his attention to integrating this into a pentecostal communion ecclesiology. In

---

particular, Althouse sees the perichoretic communion of the Trinitarian persons in their dynamic sending out as the model for the church. Thus, “The church reflects the community of God, in which people give in service for the other as they identify with Christ, as the Spirit sanctifies and makes them holy.”\textsuperscript{454} Most significantly, this reflection is enacted by the work of the Tri-une Persons through divine presence: “The Father’s renewing of the body of Christ Jesus, in whom we identify and participate as his body, is renewed by the presence of the Spirit who makes God present in the church.”\textsuperscript{455}

Althouse now finally turns to identify the recent work of Pentecostals (among whom he includes Volf and his After Our Likeness, along with Macchia, Chan and Yong). He then includes the documents produced by the major dialogues between Pentecostals and Roman Catholics, and Pentecostals and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, noting that these are where serious reflection “on the Trinitarian and ecclesial implications of the missio dei” have taken place.\textsuperscript{456} All of these resources have produced deeper reflection for Pentecostals on the nature and work of the Trinity, and its effect upon the nature of the church.

The same vision for the three-fold ministry of the church (kerygmatic, koinonia, and diakonia) is extrapolated here as well in the context of this communion ecclesiology and the missio Dei. While Pentecostals have equated the missio Dei (or simply ‘missions’ where that term is not known) with kerygmatic proclamation, Althouse argues that both koinonia and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{454} Althouse, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” 9.
\item \textsuperscript{455} Althouse, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” 9.
\item \textsuperscript{456} Althouse, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” 12.
\end{itemize}
diakonia are also very much an expression of this mission. Althouse ultimately stresses the perichoretic trinitarian theology found in Macchia and its correlative effect on the koinonia of the church and its mission to support this point. He then turns again to Murray Dempster to connect diakonic ministry to trinitarian mission as he did previously, believing that “tweaking Dempster’s ethical construction, in which the church is both personal and social moral agent(s) in the world, can be reconstituted to construct a missional ecclesiology reflective of the triune God.”\textsuperscript{457} Again, the church is a foretaste of the kingdom and therefore an alternative community to the world, demonstrated through all three areas as each engages in the mission of social justice.

Althouse concludes with a brief suggestion as to how the Pentecostal distinctive of Spirit baptism may be integrated into “an ecclesiology of participation in the missional life of the triune God.”\textsuperscript{458} He suggests that Spirit baptism is where the proleptical kingdom vision of the church manifests itself as a gift; where the infilling presence of the Spirit who was present at creation, raised Jesus from the dead, and is also the eschatological Spirit brings the past, present and future of salvation history into an ecstatic moment. He explains it thus:

The kerygma, koinonia and diakonia ministries of the church reflect the Trinitarian being and mission of God: the proclamation of the Word made flesh in Christ Jesus, who ultimately gives himself to the world for the world; the fellowship we have inside and outside the church for the other, founded in the perichoretic fellowship of God; and the service we give to the other reflected in the kenotic self-giving of God in Christ Jesus by the Spirit so that the world and the entire universe might be brought into communion with God. Spirit baptism assumes a Trinitarian structure in that like water baptism it looks back in mimesis to the death and resurrection of the

\textsuperscript{457} Althouse, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology”, 19.

\textsuperscript{458} Althouse, “Pentecostal Ecclesiology”, 19.
incarnate Christ and simultaneously forward in anticipation to the eschatological transformation of all creation, in which Christ is the first fruit and the Spirit the guarantee of resurrection. As such, creation, salvation and the eschaton are integrated into Spirit baptism.⁴⁵⁹

In these brief works, Althouse has laid a foundation for a potential Pentecostal communion ecclesiology in which the church is a foretaste or sign of the already-inbreaking eschatological kingdom of God through its kerygmatic proclamation, koinonia and diakonia ministry to the world. As such, the church is also defined by its perichoretic, trinitarian mission of bringing the qualities of the kingdom such as justice, love and peace, to creation. Pentecostalism can find itself within such an ecclesiology through an integration of the charisms of the Spirit, its original transformationist, proleptic eschatology with its accompanying view of salvation history, and through its strongly Trinitarian character, wherein their emphasis on the Holy Spirit led to a high christology. Although he does not place an emphasis on the notion of divine presence constituting the church as much as others, the Trinitarian, eschatological and missional character of his ecclesiology certainly provides fertile soil to develop this notion.

2.10 Clark Pinnock: The Church in the Power of the Spirit

The late Clark Pinnock was a Canadian, charismatic Baptist theologian who was invited to be the keynote speaker at the annual meeting of SPS in 2005. The topic of his keynote address turned out to be the promise of Pentecostal ecclesiology, though this was not the theme of the conference. He identified six themes that belong to a distinctly Pentecostal ecclesiology. The

first was the church as Anointed Herald of God’s Kingdom. This theme sounds very much like Althouse’s emphasis, though Althouse makes no reference to Pinnock. Pinnock states, “The church exists to proclaim and serve the kingdom. She is the community of the king and herself an anticipatory sign of the kingdom. In bearing witness, she experiences the powers of the age to come and, by living together in community, witnesses to the character of God’s reign.” The underpinning conviction in this, as in other similar expressions of the idea of the church as the sign of the already inbreaking kingdom, is that the earthly ministry of Jesus and the corresponding apostolic experiences are taken to be normative. As Pinnock explains,

The power of God that enabled Jesus to do signs and wonders is with us too. It is to our advantage, Jesus said, that he go to the Father because only then would the Spirit come upon the disciples and they would do even greater deeds than he did himself (Jn 14:12 16:7). What happened was, that on the day of Pentecost, the Spirit was transferred from Jesus to the disciples and they became successors in the charismatic ministry of the historical, Jesus on earth, in the healing of the sick and the expulsion of demons. This is the primary element in the promise of pentecostal ecclesiology. It is a power ecclesiology, in which believers are endued with power to serve as anointed witnesses to the kingdom of God. Pentecostals experience God as empowering and commissioning them for mission.

The basis for this ‘power ecclesiology,’ as Pinnock suggests, is the operating presence of the Spirit. The Spirit of Christ who charismatically endowed the ministry of Jesus, raised Him from the dead, then filled the apostles to carry on His ministry continues to do so with others today. In this sense, you could perhaps suggest that the real basis for apostolic succession is the charismatic presence of the Holy Spirit empowering believers to witness to the eschatological


Kingdom. Yet these witnesses are in community with one another and their ministry comes out from such. Again sounding very much like Athouse, Pinnock continues his description:

The church is a messianic community which is central in God’s plan. God calls a community to witness to the character of his reign and to serve as a medium through which God will expresses himself to the world. Church is a community where God is moving in the here and now with signs and wonders, a community of faith which is a new social reality and which, because of its Spirit-empowered likeness to Christ and its renunciation of the world’s values, reveals the nature of God’s kingdom. ⁴⁶²

Although the church is obviously central to God’s plan, Pinnock is also quick to establish that because the church exists as a witness or sign of the kingdom to the world, “The church must not make herself central. Her task is to point to the coming kingdom.” ⁴⁶³

This ecclesiology also presupposes a view of the Gospel that shapes its broad mission. The soteriology of such a church is determined by its experience of the eschatological Spirit, whose presence ushers in the inauguration of the Kingdom. Pinnock puts it in the following manner:

It amounts (I think) to a new paradigm of salvation which lifts up a Jesus who ministered in the power of the Spirit and identified with the broken and the outcast. A paradigm where church is the presence in history of the crucified and resurrected Lord and is swept forward by the Spirit into ever-expanding possibilities. Not only are all aspects of daily life in this paradigm situated in the realm of the Spirit; the risen Lord himself is here in the world manifesting divine power.

⁴⁶² Pinnock, “Church,” 5.
⁴⁶³ Pinnock, “Church,” 5.
The presence of the Spirit is a sign and foretaste of God’s reign which is even now breaking into our lives and our world.\textsuperscript{464}

Pinnock clearly views the manifest presence of the Spirit as the defining, constitutive element of a distinctly Pentecostal ecclesiology, a ‘power ecclesiology’ that witnesses to the Kingdom of God through the charismatic signs of the Spirit’s abiding activity amidst the community of faith.

Pinnock’s second theme is a Trinitarian Society. This is his term for a communion ecclesiology, or a church that images the perichoretic fellowship within the Trinity. Again, this second theme mirrors an emphasis in Alhouse’s subsequent proposal, as well as an approach handled by Chan, Kärkkäinen, and other Pentecostals influenced by Volf in one way or another. Pinnock defines it as a “vision of the church as an image of the triune God and of ourselves as living according to this pattern [of] trinitarian and ecclesial relations.”\textsuperscript{465} The church’s basis for community and fellowship is found in the inner-trinitarian communion between Father, Son and Holy Spirit. So Pinnock states,

If the very nature of God is communal and if God enters into covenant relations with creatures and seeks partnerships with them, then the nature of the church and its mission, far from being of secondary importance to the understanding the faith is quite central, even end for which the world was created. A redeemed and lasting communion between God and creation, a commonwealth of justice, reconciliation and freedom based on the grace of God. While flawed and always in need of reform, the church is nonetheless the real beginning of God’s new and inclusive community of liberated creatures reconciled to God and to each other and called to God’s service in the world.\textsuperscript{466}

\textsuperscript{464} Pinnock, “Church,” 5-6.
\textsuperscript{466} Pinnock, “Church,” 7.
That the perichoretic character of the Trinity also, as Pinnock mentions above, dictates the church’s mission along with its nature, leads directly into his third theme: “Oriented to Mission.” Although he does not use the term *missio Dei*, his description of the missional orientation of the church is tantamount to this concept. Here again, he finds kinship with Althouse in particular. Building upon the church as witness to the kingdom, the church’s mission actually directs it away from itself and towards the world, not for the sake of triumphal expansion, but rather in concert with the work of the Spirit. The church’s mission is participation with God’s divine, transforming work in the world. As such, “Mission is first of all God’s mighty act and not something at the disposal of the church. It is not merely a human plan for the expanding the church. The Spirit is sweeping us up into something very large. It is concerned more about the world than it is about the church.”467 This is perhaps not the precise way in which the original Pentecostals articulated their missiology, but as Althouse has demonstrated, it certainly is not incompatible. As a Latter-Rain, apostolic movement, Pentecostalism has inherently been about cooperating with the move of the Spirit, which was known to flow through the church and into the world.

Interestingly, it is within the theme of Mission that Pinnock anchors apostolicity. The church’s mission of participating in the Spirit’s work returns us to the charismatic activity of the Spirit in signs and wonders as a witness to the already-inbreaking eschatological kingdom. As with the apostles, the church’s mission is empowered by, and confirmed with, the supernatural activity of the Spirit. It is engagement in the same Spirit-driven mission as the apostles that

467 Pinnock, “Church,” 7.
constitutes apostolicity for the church. This, for Pinnock, is what makes Pentecostal ecclesiology a truly ‘third-stream’ ecclesiology. He proposes,

> Roman Catholics see the apostolicity (being sent) of the church in historical terms, that is, in the succession of bishops. Protestants (on the other hand) see it in terms of the restoration of apostolic doctrine. But pentecostals see it in the recovery of apostolic mission with signs following, a recovery of experiential apostolicity... Being apostolic means following the faith of the apostles and also, in consequence of this faith, following in the steps of the apostolic ministry. \footnote{Pinnock, “Church,” 8.}

The fourth theme is “Fellowship in the Spirit,” and it is here that Pinnock significantly repeats an emphasis on the constituting presence of the Holy Spirit as a defining principle for a Pentecostal theology of the church. Drawing upon Newbigin’s description, Pinnock again contrasts Pentecostalism as a third-stream ecclesiology on this very basis. Pinnock must here be quoted at length, for this is also a programmatic description like Newbigin’s that stands at the heart of this proposal:

A new model of church is rising where people gather, not to hear a well prepared lecture (the Protestant way) and not to witness a sacerdotal liturgy (the Catholic way) but to experience the presence of the living God. The meeting throbs with life. The power of the original event of Pentecost is prolonged ritually. God is experienced as doing new things. There is the expectation that God will move with power. Around the speaking and the singing, there is room for improvisation. Faces shine. There are shouts of joy. Gifts are in operation. There is broad participation. There is an empowerment of laity. It is not so much a theory of church as it is an experience of the church now charismatically alive [Newbigin is footnoted here].

Where is the church? The location of church in this model is where the Spirit is present in power. It is where there is a dynamic spirituality operates [sic] at the center of church life. It is
where people echo Jacob at Bethel: “Surely God is in this awesome place. This is no other than the house of God and this is the gate of heaven.” (Gen 28:16-17). This is a model of church where the prominent “mark” is manifestations of the presence of God. In the pentecostal model of church, the key and defining thing is to have a living experience of the Spirit. This does not exclude the Word and sacraments. They are God given and important and no one should demean them as means of grace. Indeed they abound. But the fellowship must transcend the merely institutional. The emphasis falls on the community which has gathered to share in the fellowship of the Spirit. Even more than through the proclaimed word and/or ritual activity, God communicates by the Spirit through one another in tongues and prophecy and in every way. Each believer has an opportunity to contribute to the life of the body through the gifts with which the Spirit equips them. This feature is of the very essence of this model of church. The dynamic of the fellowship is concretely lived out through gifts of the Spirit.

This model of church presupposes a lively faith in the Holy Spirit. Where God no longer a distant figure but a reality that is encountered. It requires that people know God, not just about God. Believers in this context do not speak of God in despairing tones. They know that they are loved. They have experienced the reality of Pentecost. They function “naturally” in the supernatural. In this atmosphere, God is not absent from the world. The secular paradigm is rejected. But it is not so much right thinking about God, as it is about a radical relationship with God. They speak of Jesus and God as someone who is not only very real but is a someone who can be counted on to help in the day to day struggle for life. It is easy to see why pentecostalism reaches the poor. It is because, in their churches, the poor and broken discover that what they read in or heard from the gospel is happening now in their midst. They discover that the Christian faith, when it is true to its origins, has the power to transform life, to give direction and energy to it, and to pass the experience along. I would say that they open themselves unreservedly to the presence of the Spirit in the midst.

Whereas at the Reformation, people responded to the word of forgiveness, today people are responding more to the Spirit in their midst. In the preaching and singing, with tongues and with dancing, with prayers and healing, and with the casting out of demons, they experience the touch of God and are grasped by a power that can put their lives together and support them in life’s struggle. If hearing the message of God’s forgiveness provided a dynamic faith for people centuries ago, today it is the experience of the presence of the Spirit of God in power that changes everything and gives life a new direction. The issue is not primarily a doctrinal one, as if it were just a matter of learning something that one didn’t know intellectually. The thrust is
thoroughly experiential - God is not a vague and distant figure but a reality which can be encountered. Church services provide the context for mystical encounter, for experiencing the divine and the inbreaking of the supernatural which overwhelms humans. It is not without checks and balances though, in that The [sic] God being encountered is no other than the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.\(^{469}\)

Aside from the original description by Newbigin, I suggest that what Pinnock portrays here captures the heart of what makes an authentically global Pentecostal theology of the church distinct from any other ecclesiology. Not only does it build on Newbigin’s third-stream characterization, it clearly distinguishes Pentecostalism from evangelicalism, and from being a mere expression of Free Church. It is its own unique expression of “church.” What remains is to build upon this description to account for particular pentecostal practices and to apply it to specific ecclesiological issues.

It bears observing that two of the most astute depictions of the potential for Pentecostal ecclesiology both come from non-pentecostals. This demonstrates that while this description of Pentecostal ecclesiology solidifies its uniqueness, it is not exclusive of others. The ecumenical potential of this way of understanding and doing church is starkly evident from the fact that it has perhaps best been perceived by ones who are (at least formally) outside the movement.

But Pinnock is not yet done with his themes. After describing this fellowship of the Spirit in emphatically charismatic ways (i.e. supernatural, spontaneous, mystical, experiential), he turns to what he added verbally as the bark that protects the life of the tree. Thus, the fifth theme is the “Continued Charismatic Structure” of the church. The emphasis of this theme is the

\(^{469}\) Pinnock, “Church,” 9-10.
effect of the charismatic or spiritual gifts in maintaining the priesthood of all believers in the church. This picture of the “gifted community” is, admittedly, more of a hopeful, idealistic one. Messes and abuses have surely abounded. But where Pentecostalism has practiced a healthy exercise of the *charismata*, the priesthood of all believers has functioned perhaps as well as in any church movement for its time. However, the irony in Pentecostal experience is often the need for strong leadership to manage the challenge of facilitating this healthy exercise.

Nevertheless, Pinnock maintains that in general Pentecostalism has been a model and influence on other churches in this area: “The church today has mostly the pentecostals to thank for the recovery of these truths which hold the promise of life and power for us all.”

The final theme continues the area of structure with the “Institutional Dimension”. Since there are numerous structural models within Pentecostalism, and since further the Charismatic Movement has taken hold in every kind of church, the issue is not “which one”, but “what kinds” of structure serve the church’s mission and charismatic nature. Pinnock identifies criteria to guide in determining this:

The main thing is to be careful that the forms we work with are appropriate. For example, be sure that they facilitate the work of the God. The church will need workable structures which are culturally viable and temporally flexible. And it will be important that the Spirit is not stifled by the traditions that we adopt. Key to remember is that the Spirit is much more fundamental for the church than structures. Charisma is what the church is about and points to what the church essentially is. Crucially (therefore) we must allow for openness to promptings of the Holy Spirit and give the Spirit primacy over structures and offices, even though they too are Spirit- given.

---

470 Pinnock, “Church,” 12.
Here again, Pinnock emphasizes the charisma as the defining element of the church, what makes the church, and therefore institutional forms are subservient to this principle. On this point, Pinnock echoes what Kärkkäinen has written (or vice versa). For Pinnock, the Spirit’s presence is given primacy over all other aspects and functions of the church.

While most or all of Pinnock’s six themes have been also identified or articulated in a similar manner by the other Pentecostal scholars we have surveyed, none has bundled them together and connected them to the central organizing principle of the Spirit’s presence quite as effectively as Pinnock has. This is why I have saved him for last. He comes closest to building on the core determining quality of a pentecostal ecclesiology first described by Newbigin as a ‘community of the Holy Spirit’. At a time when pneumatological ecclesiology has become much more in vogue, Pinnock has managed to use this trajectory to successfully show the real potential of pentecostal ecclesiology. The Church in the power of the Holy Spirit is an assembly of the People of God’s Presence.

3 Conclusion

What this lengthy survey of the options for a Pentecostal ecclesiology has done (besides more precisely situate the status questionis within contemporary Pentecostal scholarship) is to identify both the common pieces of the puzzle I want to put together, to identify that (as most of these scholars have themselves stated) there remains the need for further proposals that will lead toward a more full-orbed doctrine of the church for the movement, and to demonstrate that the notion of the Church as the People of God’s Presence has merit and support (whether explicitly or implicitly) within the body of work of those surveyed here.
In particular, from this survey there appear to be at least three essential or bedrock elements to the shape of a pentecostal ecclesiology. According to this survey, any ecclesiology claiming to be pentecostal must first necessarily be *pneumatological/charismatic* in orientation. This does not, in any instance of our sources here, mean that a Spirit ecclesiology is christologically-diminished, or that there is a Trinitarian deficit. In fact, the opposite rings true. Because the Holy Spirit bears witness to Jesus, and through his presence brings Christ’s presence to the church to endow it with the Father’s heartbeat for the world, a Spirit ecclesiology can and must remain highly christological and trinitarian in its theological foundation. Although most of the pentecostal scholars (Chan, Yong and Macchia) paid some attention to the tensions in various areas (i.e. baptismal formula) made manifest by Oneness Pentecostals, none deviated from a trenchantly trinitarian perspective of church. Yet the centrality or primacy of the *charisma* of the Spirit in defining the church is obviously essential from a pentecostal perspective.

Secondly, it must also be *eschatological* in perspective. Throughout these works, the charismatic presence and activity of the Spirit in the church could only be properly and proleptically understood in light of God’s future. The nature and mission of the church has to be viewed from the knowledge of the ultimate fulfillment of God’s redemptive plan in history, as the church witnesses to the already-inbreaking and yet still coming Kingdom of God.

Thirdly, it must be *missional* in orientation. While this is surprisingly not emphasized by all the scholars we have surveyed, it should be apparent that when it is not this is a shortcoming rather than normality. Just as the Pentecostal revival was as missional a movement as there has been in church history, and within the reality that nearly any and all contemporary discussion on ecclesiology has some focus (if not urgent preoccupation) on the missional dimension of the
church in the twenty-first century\textsuperscript{472} so must any proposal toward the further development of pentecostal ecclesiology grapple to articulate the mission of the church. From these three core elements, we see that the Pentecostal movement has the potential to articulate its own unique vision of the church in relation to God, to the Kingdom, and to the world.

It now remains to continue to build on this description, by drawing upon an image that, while not excluding other images for the church, is most suitable upon which to establish a biblical foundation for this ecclesiological proposal. For this I will now turn to an exposition of the Church as the Temple of the Spirit.

\textsuperscript{472} The current literature on the missional dimension of the church is far too vast to even begin to point towards here, with new works literally coming out every month. But missional thinking is found in nearly every major ecclesiological discussion currently, from the Emergent Conversation to Liberation Theology to church as polis or culture to the Seeker-sensitive movement, etc.
Chapter 4
The Church as the People of God’s Presence

Having just surveyed contemporary contributions to pentecostal ecclesiology, it has become readily apparent that there is notable diversity in approaches to defining the church among scholars of Pentecostalism in methodology, in sources and in theological construals. Understanding the importance of scripture to the movement, and in aiming to remain true to the core pneumatological, eschatological and missional dimensions of its theology, my own constructive proposal seeks to utilize the biblical image of Temple as a locus through which to describe the church from a uniquely pentecostal perspective as the People of God’s Presence.

1 Image of the Temple

I would put forward that the Temple image is one of the least utilized and least understood (or most misunderstood or misappropriated) biblical images of the church within Pentecostalism especially. You will observe from the previous chapter that contemporary contributions to pentecostal ecclesiology have generally ignored it, and the other biblical images in general. The exceptions are Simon Chan, who utilizes it in Liturgical Theology, which is specifically written to evangelicals, and Frank Macchia. In spite of this trend, I submit that a foundational biblical image is imperative to give needed scriptural direction to a central ecclesiological principle for the Pentecostal movement. Addressing a much different audience, George Lindbeck nevertheless offers sound advice when he suggests,

a view of the church must be biblically warranted. It must, above all, be consistent with the total witness of Scripture as this centers on Jesus Christ. Without this, it can be neither catholic nor ecumenical. In addition, correspondence with scriptural patterns of thought is normally
regarded as enhancing biblical backing…other things being equal, correspondence to what Scripture says is desirable.  

The church as Temple, therefore, attempts to achieve this correspondence with the biblical narrative. In doing so, it can also be useful for decoding the traditional ecclesiological marks of oneness, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity. The image of the Temple, while certainly not the only option and not intended to eclipse or replace the other NT images (i.e. flock, body, bride, vineyard, etc.), appears well suited to this task. Chan, in fact, states that “The church as the temple of the Spirit in a most decisive way completes the other two images as people of God and body of Christ.” Certainly Ephesians does explicitly attribute the qualities of unity or oneness (i.e. 2:15-16), holiness (2:21), and apostolic foundation (2:20) to this new Temple of the Spirit.

Despite its unpopularity and consequent neglect, the church understood as the Temple of the Holy Spirit is suitable ground from which to construct a distinctly Pentecostal ecclesiology centered on the People of God’s Presence. As a movement indelibly characterized by the immanent presence and work of the Holy Spirit, the church as Temple offers Pentecostalism a ‘natural’ place to develop the urgently needed ecclesial self-understanding. Unfortunately, this biblical idea of ‘Temple’ has usually been applied only to individuals in Pentecostalism. It is


interesting that during the Roman Catholic/Pentecostal dialogue, “Roman Catholics have rightly challenged Pentecostals to think of the whole community, too, as a "temple of God" in which the Spirit dwells (1 Cor 3:16).”

For Israel, the Temple was the center for the spirituality of the nation, and the ‘house' or dwelling place of the presence of God among His people (cf. “house of God”, Ezra 5:15,16, NASB). The church as the people who now collectively make up the particular abode for the Spirit’s presence and work can now be more clearly seen as the communal center for the moving of the Spirit in these last days. As Thomas Oden exclaims, “As temple the church is the place where the active presence of God is celebrated, where all in its precincts consent to become the sphere of Christ’s habitation.” It is also as the Temple that the church can be that which Pentecostals are more readily able to profess belief in as one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. Further, the Temple is that image that represents the story of the progression of the Presence of God in the biblical narrative, and therefore can be utilized to engage a fresh articulation of the pentecostal identity within salvation history in a way that is conducive to their history—neither merely recapitulating it nor ignoring it.

---


2 The Presence of God in the Biblical Narrative

2.1 Old Testament

The imagery of ‘holy Temple’ for the church intrinsically carries with it the OT understanding that the Temple represents the place where God’s very presence dwells among humanity. Prior to God’s chosen covenantal people occupying their promised land, Yahweh met the Hebrews, or was present to them, through various means and locales: pillars of cloud and fire (Ex 13:21-22), on a mountain top (Ex 24:15-18), then in a tent of meeting outside the camp (Ex 33:7-11), then a constructed portable tabernacle during the wilderness wanderings (Ex 40:34-38). Of this stage, Yves Congar observes, “It mattered little whether God was in this place or that, he wanted to be with his people. This is why he dwelt with them in a tent since they were a wandering people like the nomads. We are not yet told that God is in men, he wants to be with them.”

Following the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan, and the establishment of Jerusalem as the capital (2 Sam 5:6ff), a permanent Temple was eventually constructed there by Solomon (1 Kings 6-8). This Temple became the permanent home of the Ark of the Covenant, and its inner altar was the ‘Holy of Holies’ (cf. Hebrews 9:3). The Temple “bore manifold social, spiritual, political, economic, and cultural importance” for Israel, precisely because it was in its inner chambers that “the King of the Universe was known to dwell with an especially awesome

\[\text{Note the graduating proximity or nearness of God’s very presence to where the people were spatially. This pattern continues up to the climactic advent of the Spirit at Pentecost, where after the Spirit – God’s active Presence, now dwells in ‘all flesh’ who receive Him.}\]

\[\text{Yves Congar, } The\ Mystery\ of\ the\ Temple (Maryland: The Newman Press, 1962), 28-29, italics his.\]
presence." For centuries the life of this Temple as the “dwelling place” of Yahweh served as the ‘thermometer’ for the life of Israel: the glory of God filling the temple at its dedication in the time of King Solomon (and the corresponding fire from heaven consuming the sacrifice) was the high point of the nation (2 Chron. 7:1,2), with the dedication of its reconstruction in the time of Ezra another high point (Ezra 6:16-22); the two instances of its destruction (by the Chaldeans in 586 B.C. and by the Romans in 70 AD) signaled the darkest hours in Israel’s long history. In all of this, the Temple constituted the state of God’s relationship to His People, indeed their identity as His Covenant People. The historic designation of ‘Second Temple Judaism’ following the post-exilic reconstruction of the Temple by Ezra is a testament to this fact. Indeed, it remains so to this day as the Western Wall remnant of the Temple continues to be regarded as the holiest place on earth for practicing Jews. All through this lengthy time, “The presence of God separated Israel from all the other nations (Ex. 33:16).”

2.2 Incarnation

The revelation or self-disclosure of God to both His Covenant People and to the world took a dramatic and definitive step with the incarnation of the Son of God, Savior of the world, Messiah, the Christ (cf. John 1:14; Phil 2:6,7; Hebrews 1:1-3). This event also signaled the initial inbreaking of the eschatological Kingdom of God, and therefore was the Presence of God as the Word made flesh, now dwelling in the world in an entirely new way, through a human body. By his own testimony, Jesus expressed that he was ‘replacing’ the temple as the abode of

---


the divine presence (John 2:19-21), as he ushered in the messianic kingdom. God’s Presence was no longer connected to a building, but to a person; or as Edmund Clowney puts it, “God’s presence was no longer localized at the temple in Jerusalem, but in Christ himself.”\(^\text{482}\) Jesus was Emmanuel, God with us (Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:23). This is confirmed by the renting of the veil hiding the Holy of Holies in the Temple at the time of Jesus’ death (Matt. 27:51; Luke 23:56; Mk 15:38). So here a new and profound reality of God’s presence comes into being, what Congar calls “…the new and positive reality of God’s Presence in messianic times…the Most High does not dwell in temples made by men’s hands…”\(^\text{483}\)

Furthermore, the Word inhabiting human flesh was also anointed by the charismatic Spirit, so that the Holy Spirit was now indwelling human flesh during this incarnation as well. Roger Stronstad has shown that in Luke’s Gospel in particular Jesus’ ministry is depicted as a Spirit-anointed charismatic ministry, and then in Acts this same Spirit-anointing transfers to the disciples after Pentecost.\(^\text{484}\) As the Spirit-anointed Messiah, “Jesus fulfilled the symbolism of the temple.”\(^\text{485}\)

\(^{482}\) Clowney, The Church, 124.

\(^{483}\) Congar, Mystery of the Temple, 47.


\(^{485}\) Clowney, The Church, 44.
2.3 Pentecost

In moving to the Pentecost event, I will use the Lukan account for its prominence in Pentecostal thought. Now that Jesus had come and brought about a new covenant between God and creation through His substitutionary atonement, followed by the outpouring of His very Spirit upon all kinds of people, the physical Jerusalem Temple no longer functioned as God’s dwelling place in the previous manner. The Spirit did not fall there at Pentecost, but rather in a rented room some blocks away. Jesus, the divine presence incarnate, had now ascended back to the Father. What would constitute the permanent dwelling place of God’s presence now?

As Craig Van Gelder states, “The birth of the church opened a new chapter in God’s redemptive work. God’s presence in the world would no longer be mediated through a single nation nor located in the physical Temple in Jerusalem. God was constructing a spiritual building consisting of people from all nations.”

This construction either began or was inaugurated into a new dimension with the infilling of the Spirit experienced by the 120 in the Upper Room at Pentecost. It was here that the Spirit’s presence was observed in the sound of wind, the tongues of fire over the disciples’ heads, and their speaking in other languages. NT scholar Graham Twelftree explains the scriptural significance of these particular signs of the Spirit’s presence at this event:

As wind was thought to accompany the presence of God [2 Sam 22:16; Job 37:10; Ezek. 13:13], this image would have brought to mind God’s powerful and mysterious activity in the

---


487 I will not here engage the debate as to when the church was actually ‘born’. For my own treatment of that subject and its varied positions even among pentecostal scholars, see Robson, “The Spirit-Driven Church” (MTS Thesis, Wycliffe College, 2000). Most would agree at a minimum that Pentecost represents the beginning of a new era in salvation-history and correlatively the church’s role in that history, if not the actual birth of the church.
Old Testament [E.g. Ps. 147:18; Isa. 40:24; Ezek. 37:9-14; see also Eccl. 43:16, 20.]. The symbol ‘fire’ would have reminded Luke’s readers of the tangible, awesome presence of the pure holy God in the theophany on Mount Sinai (Exod. 19:18).

Van Gelder adds, “The spiritual Temple of God was being filled with the Spirit by his direct, indwelling presence. God’s redemptive reign was becoming visible in the world. The Spirit was creating the church.” It was this palpable, manifest, sensory-experienced presence of the Spirit that constituted the church as the new Temple on that significant day, and made it visible to the world. These “overpowering manifestations of the Spirit” are what the church’s self-understanding as the new covenant people of God were founded upon. Indeed, as Gerhard Lohfink puts it, “It is impossible to discuss the self-understanding of the early church without considering the consciousness of the living presence of the Spirit in its midst.” With the advent of the Spirit at Pentecost, those who experienced the infilling of this divine presence now took on a distinct identity as the People of God’s Presence, which was also expressed as the ekklesia of Jesus Christ. As Slovenian Pentecostal scholar Peter Kuzmic expresses, “The Pentecost event became crucial for the launching and the constitution of the Christian church, the new eschatological community bound together by their loyalty to the risen Lord and their common experience of the Spirit.” Furthermore, as Chan (following Robert Jenson) boldly

489 Van Gelder, The Essence of the Church, 104.
491 Lohfink, Jesus and Community, 82.
492 Peter Kuzmic, “Kingdom of God,” in DPCM, 525.
adds, “Pentecost is the birth of the church not as the people of God but as the body of Christ and Temple of the Spirit.” While some would heartily disagree with the first part of Chan’s statement (George Lindbeck immediately comes to mind), and I would also want to propose that Pentecost is precisely where the Church became the People of God’s Presence, he nevertheless identifies the significance of Pentecost for bringing about the new idea of temple that is henceforth presented in the NT. As Pentecostal scholar French Arrington summarizes in his study of 1 Corinthians, for example, “As God dwelt in the Tabernacle and Temple, in His Shekinah glory, so He dwells in His people by the Holy Spirit.”

3 New Idea of Temple: One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic House of God

It is within this all-important historical-theological framework that the church as ‘Temple’ can also be described as one, holy, catholic and apostolic. Through the prism of ‘Temple’, these marks derive their full meaning in this proposed pentecostal ecclesiology. As the Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue report, Perspectives on Koinonia, states: “Pentecostals believe that there is only ‘one holy catholic apostolic Church’ made of all believers (cf. Eph 4:4-


6), but differ from Roman Catholics (and others) as to how these marks are understood. Harold Hunter adds:

A certifiable pentecostal ecclesiology, now unavoidable in view of the pentecostal ubiquity, must cope with the remarkable summation captured in the original Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed when it sets off marks of the Church as "one, holy, catholic and apostolic" (One Faith #216-#241). Pentecostals have not always fared well when peering into this looking glass.

The image of Temple is potentially useful for re-visioning these classic marks in a way that respects the uniqueness of the pentecostal identity while attempting to connect this identity with the historical church also claiming these same marks long before Pentecostalism.

In Ephesians, the ‘oneness’, or unity of the previously divided peoples is imaged by the analogy of a holy Temple: with one foundation (the apostles and prophets), a single cornerstone (Jesus himself), and a lone inhabitant (God). This holy Temple is the one ‘household’ of God, to which those who were formerly ‘strangers’ and ‘aliens’ now belong as ‘citizens’ with the saints. The dividing wall between Jews and Gentiles has been removed, so that previously divided peoples have now been made one Temple (Eph 2:11-22).

However, the ‘holy Temple’ image, and the unity it conveys, does not intend to ignore the diversity of the church’s members existent within that ‘whole structure’. On the contrary, it recognizes that the building is made with many, varied stones. Yet it is still one building with

496 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #34.

one builder, the Holy Spirit. This is the emphasis that Steven Land had in his afore-quoted depiction of the church as the trinitarian eschatological fellowship. So it is that the ‘oneness’ of the church is a unity of diversity: of peoples—once divided, now reconciled and joined together as one; of gifts (“Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit”, 1 Cor 12:4); and of diverse members, now gathered and united in Christ.

As Land indicates, this unity of diversity which defines the church is also fundamentally a reflection of the divine fellowship of the Trinity. Ephesians clearly shows that the ‘oneness’ of peace that the church there now enjoys is penultimately the product of the cooperative effort of Father, Son and Holy Spirit—as powerfully imaged by the Temple analogy (2:14-22). As the members of the Godhead are one, so too now the believers have been made one church. This point is expressed theologically by Clark Pinnock:

When we confess that God is triune, we are affirming that the eternal life of God is personal life in relationship. We are saying that God exists as community and that the life of God is in essence self-giving love. The church therefore seeks to be a temporal echo of these trinitarian relations. We are the community which [is] called to be, on the finite level, the kind of reality that God is in eternity.

Pinnock, it will be recalled from Chapter Three, makes this statement while identifying the thematic element of a Pentecostal Ecclesiology, as “A trinitarian society.” As those who

498 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, 205.
499 Cf. Moltmann, CPS, 338: “The unity of the church is not primarily the unity of her members, but the unity of Christ who acts upon them all, in all places and at all times.”
500 Pinnock, “Church,” 6-7.
have been recipients of the Spirit’s baptism, Pentecostals (among others) have experienced in a physically-manifest way the blessing of the love of the Father expressed through the imparting of the promised gift of the Spirit which empowers us to be living witnesses to the liberating atonement of the Son. Being participants of this specific trinitarian activity, in addition to the salvific activity referred to in Ephesians 2, should naturally and theologically lead and enable Pentecostals to be the “temporal echo of these trinitarian relations,” as Pinnock calls for.

Elsewhere, St. Paul writes to the church, “Do you not know that you are God’s temple and that God’s Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God’s temple, God will destroy that person. For God’s temple is holy, and you are that temple.” (1 Cor 3:16-17). The Temple imagery used in the NT signifies the church as the dwelling place of the Spirit (not just individual bodies, though that is also in Paul’s view here), and as such speaks, among other things, to its ‘oneness’ also. So Miroslav Volf suggests that in the NT, “the unity of the church seems especially to come about through the indwelling of the one Spirit (and with it of the entire holy triunity) in every person. Accordingly, and in analogy to the Trinity, every person as a bearer of the Spirit participates in the constitution of unity.” With their distinctive emphasis on the infilling of the Spirit for every believer, Pentecostals can find accord with this statement, and feel a special affinity with the Temple image of the church—including how it conveys the sense of the church’s ‘oneness.’

So the pentecostal presence of the Holy Spirit, as the constitutive element of the church, is also the uniting element of the church by applying the work of Christ, who “is our peace” (Eph 2:14). The Spirit does this through His same indwelling in all peoples. It is the one Spirit’s

---

presence that unites us all in Jesus Christ, making us all to have the same fellowship with the Triune God, and consequently a shared fellowship through Christ with one another. Therefore, “the church that is caught up in the divine fellowship is one because of the same divine presence from whom it lives.”

The church is united in the bond of God’s love through the Holy Spirit.

This description of the church also resonates with the Azusa Street Revival, where whites and blacks, rich and poor, experienced the same outpouring of the Spirit, as evidenced by tongues, or glossolalia. A dividing wall of another kind was also (temporarily, as it unfortunately later turned out) broken down, and another ‘new humanity’ formed from the common experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Thus, Pentecostals can potentially identify with these words of Ephesians in a manner that not all can. Indeed, of course, it is the Pentecost event in the biblical narrative—and most specifically the impartation of new tongues by the Spirit upon the 120—that is recognized as being a divine, unifying corrective to the divisions created at Babel so long before. If the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon “all flesh” signifies the solidifying of one People of God’s Presence, then between this event and the image of Temple, Pentecostals have two powerful theological constructs upon which to understand the church’s oneness.

But for Pentecostals it is much more than utilizing these theological constructs, it is about understanding the ecclesiological significance of the social results of their own experience of the Spirit’s presence. This is where Yong conclusively turns in his own treatment of this particular mark:

---

504 For vivid descriptions of the ‘scandal’ of such an event in its time, see Suurmond, *Word & Spirit at Play*, 1, 5-6.
Here lies the significance of the pentecostal appeal to the eschatological Spirit as the one who mediates disunity into unity in a “sacramental” (pentecostal) sense. This paradigm of unity-in-disunity as reconciliation emerges from the pneumatic and charismatic intuitions derived from the pentecostal experience. The pentecostal experience at Azusa Street, which overcame gender, ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic barriers present in American life at the turn of the twentieth century, simply reembodied the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost and in the life of the early church. The pentecostal experience, then and now, brings sons and daughters together with menservants and maidservants – no small feat for a world ruled by patriarchy. It binds Samaritans, Ethiopians, and other Gentiles together with Jews – again, a major achievement in a world of ethnic and racial hostilities. It reconciles into one body the haves and have-nots through various means…it also emphatically demarginalizes those who for physical reasons were barred from the assembly (cf. Deut. 23:1; Isa. 56:3-5).

...And such unity is to be experienced in the Spirit, who brings those otherwise separated together in Jesus Christ in anticipation of the eschatological union before the throne of God...Put ecclesiologically, the church is one only even while she is being made one.505

In fact, it is from the amazing unity produced at Pentecost by the Spirit that Macchia finds scriptural impetus for Pentecostals to take the ecumenical journey more seriously. For him, this even goes beyond dialogue with other churches, which is already radical enough for many Pentecostals, but to those beyond Christianity. As he states, “In the ecumenical task, the “all flesh” of Spirit baptism demands that we also respect the others we encounter outside the Christian faith. Though I believe Christ to be the only Lord of all creation and salvation, I also regard him as more inclusive and expansive in significance through the witness of the Spirit than many of us wish to admit.”506 The global, inclusive vision of both Solomon’s temple and the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh challenge Pentecostals to a broad and complex...

505 Yong, Spirit Poured Out, 137-139.
506 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 221.
understanding of the church’s mark of oneness. As stated earlier, a distinctly Pentecostal perspective of this first creedal mark of the church may differ from that of, say, Catholics, yet they can make the same creedal affirmation in their own way through an understanding of the church as the one Temple inhabited by the special presence of the Holy Spirit.

It is also as Temple that the mark of ‘holy’ upon the church gets its fullest sense. In His divine plan, God has made the Church (the community of believers brought together to now be ‘one’) to be the ‘place’ of His dwelling; where His Presence may continually live and bring life. So it is ‘in Christ’ that the new people of God “are built together spiritually (literally ‘in the Spirit’) into a dwelling place for God” (Eph 2:21, NRSV). As the collective abode for God’s holy Presence, the gathered Christians are now themselves consecrated to be ‘holy’, even as the physical Temple was consecrated a holy place, by virtue of God’s indwelling presence. The Church, as recipients of God’s saving grace ‘joined together’, is now consecrated by the Holy Spirit for His residence. As this new Temple, Hans Küng states that “The Church is the place of God’s special presence on earth.” It is this very presence which consecrates the new Temple that is comprised of the assembly of ‘living stones’ that are disciples of Christ, and makes holy a collection of people comprised of those who were formerly “strangers and aliens” (Eph. 2:19). Macchia affirms with Küng that, “The holiness of the church is secured by the presence of the Spirit and all grace, thus transcending the personal holiness of its individual members.” This is also echoed by Yong when he writes, “The holiness of the church thus marks not the

507 Cf. 1 Cor 3:16-17; Eph 2:21; 1 Peter 2:4-10.
509 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 222.
accomplishments of its members but the authentic presence and activity of the Spirit of God directed towards the eschatological kingdom.”

Thus, the Pauline image of the church as one “holy Temple” is a meaningful starting point for re-visioning the second mark of the church for Pentecostals as well. Whatever their various views of the other marks may be, most Pentecostals would surely agree with the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed that the church is ‘holy’ precisely because scripture also designates this same ‘mark’ or virtue to the church (Eph 5:27, cf Eph 2:21).

As a people made holy through Christ’s atonement and by the sanctifying of the Spirit (1 Peter 1:1), there is now consequently impressed on the church a responsibility to go with this divinely-produced, ecclesial and soteriological identity. To be a ‘holy Temple,’ a dwelling place for God’s abiding presence in place of a single building, requires certain acts of our will. This is what is treated in the latter half of Ephesians: what does this new holy Temple look like, if it is no longer a physical structure but rather embodied through human community instead?

Throughout chapters 4-6, the writer of Ephesians spells out the practical, ethical activity implicated for those who constitute God’s dwelling place, which broadly include: remaining united by loving each other (4: 1-16); living as children of light instead of darkness (4:17-21; 5:8-14); changing our spiritual wardrobe (4:21-29), not grieving the Holy Spirit with our conduct (4:30-5:5); being wise to the will of the Lord (5:15-17); being continually filled with the Holy Spirit (5:18-20); relating to others in our household properly (5:21-6:9); and resisting evil (6:10-18). These actions do not in themselves make a church holy, but rather they reflect the holiness of a church already made to be God’s new Temple—the place of His Presence. Such behaviour

510 Yong, Spirit Poured Out, 142.
is presented as appropriate and necessary for the church to realize or actualize its divinely-imputed holiness. The church is ‘holy,’ then, because the Holy Spirit constructs it as the abode for God’s holy presence. Yet this bestowed or ‘constructed’ holiness is purposed to be evidenced by a radical change in the ongoing conduct of the church community.

For Pentecostals who have experienced the supernatural baptism of the Holy Spirit upon their bodies and in their gatherings, the biblical image of being God’s holy Temple is all the more ‘real’ or tangible. It is not an esoteric theological abstraction, or a mere literary metaphor. The essence of Pentecostalism is the physical awareness of the immanent presence of a holy God, through the person of the Holy Spirit. His Spirit is personally present within human flesh, and (perhaps more importantly) within human community. This divine Presence is not manufactured, attained by merit, or earned by status of any kind. It is simply received where it has been specifically invited by faith.

So there is, or should be, an innate awareness among Pentecostals that they, too, have been ‘brought near by the blood of Christ’ (Eph 2:13) into God’s household, and joined together to be built together in the Holy Spirit to be a dwelling place for a holy God. Indeed this was their desire, to be ‘holy’ in this very sense. As well, in keeping with the teaching of Ephesians 4-6, from the very outset of the movement it was always understood that the overwhelming blessing of the Spirit’s holy presence was given for the purpose of renewing the church to fulfill its bestowed identity as God’s holy Temple. Out of their experience of what scripture describes, then, Pentecostals are able to affirm what others teach about the holiness of the church.

This is where the ‘holy Temple’ image of the church functions as well. The physical Temple was where the people would present their sacrifices to atone for their sins; it was where cleansing would occur. Now that Jesus has made Himself to be our sacrifice “once for all” (Heb
10:10), and we ourselves are where the holy presence of the Spirit abides, the church community itself embodies this cleansed state—a state which is removed from the sin-infected, fallen world. So Clowney concludes, “The cleanness, the holiness, of the people of God must mark them as his. Now that the outward regulations have dropped away, the inner meaning applies with full force. Paul therefore contrasts Moses’ description of Israel with his own description of the church: children of God without fault, blameless and pure (Phil. 2:15; cf. Dt. 32:5).”

The catholicity of the church as Temple is a more difficult proposal, especially for Pentecostals and their historically restorationist, remnant, and even sectarian views toward the universal church. From the metaphorical standpoint, the Temple of the Holy Spirit is his dwelling place upon the earth, which now consists of all people who are Spirit-filled from a Pentecostal perspective. So the image of the Temple as the assembly of all those who have been made citizens in the household of God also makes the church universal or ‘catholic’ in this very sense. The Temple is therefore not restricted to one location but is made up of all the living stones globally that “are built together spiritually” (Eph 2:22). This obviously entails a view of the Temple as extended beyond the local church, which appears to be the immediate context for Paul’s use of it in Ephesians and 1 Corinthians. Yet, other references in scripture to this image imply a more universal application. Overall, the universality of the church for Pentecostals is determined by their experience of Spirit baptism, or the divine, life-transforming encounter with the palpable presence of the triune God. Yong affirms that, “The ties that bind pentecostals together around the world are their experiences of Jesus in the power of the Spirit…pentecostals experience Christian unity precisely through the universality of the Spirit’s presence and activity,

Clowney, The Church, 85.
which enable the confession of Jesus’ lordship amidst the peculiarly pentecostal congregations and liturgies.”

There is another understanding of catholicity proposed by a formidable Pentecostal voice. In his writing on Pentecostal ecclesiology, Simon Chan undertakes a different approach to this mark. In doing so, he (perhaps unconsciously) addresses more specifically a challenge identified by Volf, namely, “the discussion of catholicity always involves the fundamental question of the relationship between unity and multiplicity.” More specifically, how is the local congregation to be understood as related to the ‘universal’ church? Chan’s suggestion for dealing with this relationship revolves around appropriating a Eucharistic Catholicity for Pentecostals.

The logic of this novel idea is actually quite plain. His starting point is the fundamental presence of the Holy Spirit as the constitutive, defining element of the church (as in Newbigin), as this dissertation is also emphasizing. He then draws upon the function of the eucharist as calling on the Spirit to ‘fill’ the church once again through the Lord’s Supper. As he explains,

…the action of the Spirit in the church is on-going and dynamic. This is seen in the way the church understands the action of the Spirit in relation to the eucharistic celebration. The presence of the Spirit is regularly invoked in the eucharist. As Zizioulas has pointed out, it is when believers ‘come together’ for the Lord’s supper (1 Cor. 11:18) that they are constituted anew by the Spirit as the Church of Jesus Christ. In the New Testament the local congregation could therefore be described as ‘the whole church’ (Rom. 16:23) – which is what the word ‘catholic’ means –

512 Yong, Spirit Poured Out, 145.
513 Volf, After Our Likeness, 261. (italics his)
514 Chan, Pentecostal Theology, 102f: “A Dynamic Catholic Community”.
precisely because it is constituted ‘whole’ by the Spirit when the whole church gathers together in the name of Jesus Christ to celebrate the Communion.  

It is in and through the ‘eucharistic celebration’ that the church becomes ‘whole,’ and thereby is made ‘one’ by the one Spirit. This is Chan’s ‘eucharistic unity in the local church,’ and it is what makes the local church ‘catholic.’ He continues,

…what makes the church unique is that as an eucharistic community sharing the one bread and one cup it transcends all social and racial boundaries…It is this transcending wholeness which makes the local congregation ‘catholic’. Catholicity is a concept that is first applied to the local congregation before it becomes a universal concept.  

The ‘wholeness’ of the local church is grounded in the Lord’s Supper—not in the makeup of the congregation itself. This is where Chan sees the eucharist as a needed corrective for the Pentecostal movement:

…if catholicity has to do primarily with the wholeness of the local congregation that gathers together to share one loaf regardless of race, culture or sex, then the problem of catholicity is far more real and urgent. To the extent that the local congregation fails to transcend its ethnocentrism, it fails to ‘discern the Lord’s Body’ and, therefore, has fallen short of an essential quality: the church’s catholicity – a catholicity that we claim to believe in when we recite the Nicene Creed: ‘We believe in one holy, catholic and apostolic church….”

515 Chan, Pentecostal Theology, 102.
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517 Chan, Pentecostal Theology, 102-103. (italics his)
Chan then goes on to observe that, if Pentecostals were to experience and practice ‘eucharistic unity in the local church’, this would conceivably lead to a possible ‘eucharistic unity in the Pentecostal movement’—something he connects to William Seymour’s original ‘catholic’ understanding of the “real significance of the Pentecostal outpouring.” Once again, if it is the presence of the Holy Spirit which constitutes the church, and this presence of the Spirit is continually invoked afresh through the anamnesis of the eucharist, and furthermore it is this presence which marks the church as having an “all-transcending catholicity” (over and above race, culture, gender and any other socio-economic categories), then it is the eucharist which functions as that which continues the true ‘spirit’ of Azusa: the shattering of all social-cultural barriers in God’s one, holy, and catholic church. Chan relates how, historically, Seymour’s vision of the truly ‘catholic’ church as encapsulated by the Azusa Street revival was quickly lost on other (mostly white) leaders, both sociologically and theologically (something previously noted by Suurmond and others as well). Thus, he maintains, the eucharist is needed to recapture it.

In addition to this unity or wholeness, Chan continues to identify two other characteristics or fruits which a eucharistic catholicity would produce in the church, within Pentecostalism. One is healing. He writes, “the Spirit that creates the eucharistic community transcending all social, cultural and historical boundaries also implies that this community is characterized chiefly by its work of reconciliation and healing.” Belief in, and the expectation for, divine healing, has always been a noted Pentecostal distinctive. Yet, Chan suggests this ministry practice is best rooted in the eucharist, rather than in personality-centered events common in

518 Chan, Pentecostal Theology, 103.
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Pentecostal circles. The reason is that the latter “implies that the church needs some external human agent to carry on its work. Whereas to believe in the Spirit-filled church means that the *charismata* operate freely within the life of the church, especially in the eucharistic event when the action of the Spirit is particularized.”\(^{520}\) Chan therefore concludes that, “the holy communion should be the best occasion for prayers of reconciliation and healing to take place.”\(^{521}\) Indeed, there are Pentecostal churches that do practice healing prayer either before or after celebrating the Lord’s Supper.

The eucharistic event is also where the “all-embracing healing work of the Spirit” is recognized as central to the *mission* of the church, Chan points out. Traditional celebrations of the eucharist end with a ‘sending forth’ or ‘sending out’ of a church now fed and renewed to engage the world. By locating the presence of the Spirit in the eucharist, and juxtaposing it with the Spirit’s ‘sending out’ the church into the world, it appears Chan is (perhaps unconsciously), presenting a pentecostal catholicity that would parallel the ecclesiology of Karl Barth.\(^{522}\) In any event, given the distinctive prominence of divine healing in Pentecostalism, it is significant that he suggests “Gifts of healing are the fruits of catholicity.”\(^{523}\)

Finally, Chan sees the action of the Spirit in the eucharist as producing a “truth-traditioning community”. The eucharist is a historic event—a tradition that grounds the church in history. Likewise, Pentecost is also a historic event, and thus needs the practice of traditioning
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\(^{520}\) Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 105.
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so that the church may be grounded also in it. This is perhaps the lynch pin of Chan’s argument for eucharistic catholicity in Pentecostalism:

The Pentecost event cannot be divorced from history, or there would be no historical continuity of the vertical event. Herein lies the Achilles’ heel of Pentecostalism: by freeing the Pentecost event from its historical moorings, it has considerably weakened its capacity for traditioning. If truth can come directly from the Spirit, what need is there to check it against the historical Christian tradition? The way for Pentecostals to overcome this weakness is by locating their experience in the ecclesial life, especially in the context of eucharistic worship where the ordinary things are ‘transfigured’. Pentecostals would do well to appropriate the rich pneumatological resources in the Orthodox theology of the eucharist. If there is a sense in which the Spirit is especially present in the eucharist, could it not become the focal point of Pentecostal worship? Could it not be the occasion for prayer for a fresh in-filling of the Spirit for physical, emotional and spiritual healing?524

Simon Chan offers a challenging, tantalizing theological proposal for a Pentecostal understanding of catholicity rooted in the eucharist. It is attractive in that it connects elements of what Volf calls a “qualitative catholicity”525 (relational, eschatological, and missional) to an event which all are able to experience…much like Pentecost itself. It also springs from the source of the church’s identity as that which is constituted by the infilling presence of the Holy Spirit. We will deal with the Eucharist further in this ecclesiological proposal, but will keep in mind Chan’s notion of eucharistic catholicity.

When it comes to apostolicity, classical Pentecostals would first historically say that the Spirit-filled church, or the true Temple as it is being imaged here, is apostolic in its faith. Edgar

524 Ibid., 108.
525 Cf. Volf, After Our Likeness, 266f.
R. Lee, for instance, confirms what was established in Chapter Two, that “Pentecostals are frequently described as “restorationists” because of their efforts to return to the apostolic faith of the New Testament.” Macchia echoes this by writing, “If Pentecostalism is anything, it is “apostolic” by intention. Its original mission was dedicated to the “apostolic faith”, and many Pentecostal churches around the world since then have raised the banner of “apostolic” quite high.” Land also refers to the church’s ‘apostolic faith,’ in identifying apostolicity from a pentecostal perspective. This faith is the confession of Jesus as ‘Saviour, baptizer, sanctifier, healer and coming king.’ It is a confession of the “full-gospel” preached by the apostles in the New Testament. Yet, apostolic faith as a confession of this full gospel is not merely or fundamentally verbal consent or vague theological agreement; it is a lived experienced. This apostolic faith is nothing less than a personal encounter with the risen, living Christ proclaimed by the apostles, in the communal setting of an “eschatological Trinitarian fellowship.”

Secondly, from a Pentecostal perspective the church is also apostolic in its mission. This was the impetus for the giving of the Spirit to the apostles, as Newbigin writes: “When the risen Lord bestowed the apostolic commission upon the Church and empowered it to continue His

527 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 229.
528 Land, lecture notes from Pentecostal Spirituality for the Whole Church, Tyndale College/Canadian Pentecostal Seminary, June 17-21, 2002.
529 Cf. Kärkkäinen, Christology: A Global Introduction (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 16. Donald Dayton, of course, argues that the true Pentecostal confession dropped Jesus as “sanctifier”, in Theological Roots of Pentecostalism, as observed in Chapter Two.
530 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, 205.
mission, the very heart of His act lay in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit.” Pentecostals have largely understood their Spirit-baptism experience to be the same divine empowerment received by the apostles, to carry out the same mission, or commission, that was mandated to them by Christ (Mt 28:18).

Thirdly, if the church is apostolic in mission, then from a Pentecostal perspective it must also necessarily be apostolic in power. Gary McGee writes, “When applied to the church’s mission in the world, ‘apostolic’ has been used to refer to the faith and actions of the apostles…the church’s missionary task and the means of fulfilling that task, with the latter including the displays of divine power that accompanied the expansion of the church in the Book of Acts.” This meaning is also proposed by Steven Land, who writes, “But this church that is one in the divine presence and holy in the divine union is apostolic and catholic in its power and universal mandate, respectively. The church in the Trinitarian eschatological presence of God moves into all the world toward the end. The apostolic power is authority and strength to proclaim the one gospel in word and demonstration of the Spirit.” This authority and strength comes from the divine empowerment of the Spirit, as depicted at Pentecost. It is the same power as the apostles had, though it is not attained through political succession with them. Rather, it is found in experiencing the same baptism of the Spirit they experienced at Pentecost.

Thus, apostolicity for Pentecostals is a restoration not only of New Testament faith and mission, but also of the New Testament experience of the Spirit’s power, as demonstrated by

531 Newbigin, Household of God, 104.
533 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, 205, also echoed by Edgar R. Lee, He Gave Apostles, 7.
‘signs and wonders.’ Kärkkäinen, summarizing the observations of Michael Harper, calls this fruit of Pentecostalism, “the restoration of experiential apostolicity to the whole Church.”  He goes on to explain its distinctiveness from more traditional understandings of apostolicity:

The Roman Catholic Church has stressed its apostolic nature largely in historical terms, apostolic succession and all that. Protestant Churches moved the emphasis to doctrine in an attempt to restore the apostles’ teaching to the Church….The Pentecostal contribution has been in the restoration of the apostolic signs—healing, miracles, prophecy, speaking in tongues and so on.

Just as apostolic faith is an experiential faith, so apostolic power is an experiential power. It is demonstrated by the physical manifestation of the Spirit’s ministry, in the context of the mission of the kingdom. As the apostles saw their message confirmed “with signs following” (Mar 16:20) through the divine working of the Lord, so Pentecostals have experienced and expected the very same biblical phenomenon.

It is here, in the context of apostolicity as referring to power, that Howard Snyder uniquely suggests something which Pentecostals would very likely find affinity with: that a truly apostolic church must also be a prophetic church. He explains:

If its [the church’s] apostolicity is really empowered by the Holy Spirit, then it will be prophetic. Biblically, it seems the church is prophetic primarily in two senses: first, in being a community that visibly incarnates the prophetic message of justice, mercy, and truth found in the Old Testament as well as in the life of Jesus, and second, in proclaiming the good news of God’s

534 Kärkkäinen, An Introduction to Ecclesiology, 77.
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reign. This means different things in different historical contexts, but it always means being salt and light in the present world (Matt. 5:14; John 8:12, Phil. 2:15).\textsuperscript{536}

Snyder’s explanation of ‘prophetic’ would not be identical to that of many Pentecostals, but it is biblical, and thus is a helpful constructive insight to a distinctly Pentecostal understanding of apostolicity, particularly with reference to the empowerment of the Spirit that classical Pentecostals cherish.

Fourthly, apostolicity is also understood as referring to \textit{witness}. This is proposed by J. Rodman Williams, who states, “The church is apostolic because it is based on the witness of the New Testament apostles.”\textsuperscript{537} This is also echoed by none other than Moltmann, when he writes, “the church which in Christ is holy and catholic only encounters man in history through the apostolic witness.”\textsuperscript{538} In both cases, the meaning of apostolic witness is broad and in many respects encapsulates or is relatively synonymous with some aspects of apostolicity already identified—faith and mission, in particular. For Pentecostals, this appeal is supported by its restorationism. It pertains to the church’s faithfulness to the normative teaching or message (\textit{kerygma}) of the apostles. Perhaps it is helpful to see apostolicity as the church’s engagement in the mission of witnessing to the apostolic message of salvation in Christ through her faith in this Christ, and in the power of the Holy Spirit promised by Christ (Acts 1:5).

\textsuperscript{537} J. Rodman Williams, \textit{Renewal Theology: Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective, Volume Three: The Church, the Kingdom, and Last Things} (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 38.
\textsuperscript{538} Moltmann, \textit{CPS}, 357.
Fifth, and related to witness, apostolicity is also seen to refer to the **tradition of truth**. This, however, is understood in diverging ways, which are subtle but not minor. For Miroslav Volf, arguing for the Free Church ecclesiology, the church’s “loyalty to the apostolic tradition…comes about through direct access to the historically mediated apostolic scriptures.” This definition fits fairly comfortably with the restorationist ethos of Pentecostalism—though it would be even more so if the words ‘historically mediated’ were absent.

For Simon Chan, who on the other hand champions a Catholic or sacramental/liturgical ecclesiology, “The church is apostolic precisely because the Spirit guides her into all truth and preserves her from error by binding her diachronically to the apostles in an unbroken succession.” Chan’s “development of doctrine” is obviously a far more radical idea for Pentecostals. Whereas for Volf the church’s apostolicity is rooted more in sola scriptura, Chan puts more emphasis on historical tradition. Though both see apostolicity as referring to the tradition of truth, they have significantly different perspectives as to how this apostolic tradition is understood. Comparing these two ideas of apostolicity as tradition will be a crucial exercise in any future development of a thorough Pentecostal ecclesiology. Here, I would offer the hope

539 For instance, outside of the scholars engaged here, Oneness Pentecostal churches, especially African-American ones, claim the Apostolic label in their names to represent their hold on apostolic truth and doctrine, particularly the baptismal formula decreed by Peter in Acts 2:38. See David A. Reed, “In Jesus’ Name”: The History & Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals.” JPTS Sup Series 31 (Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2008), 229.

540 Volf, After Our Likeness, 275 (italics his). This is seemingly echoed by Charles Colson, The Body (Dallas: Word Books, 1992), 125: “apostolic = rooted and proclaiming the apostles teaching”.

541 Chan, “The Church and the Development of Doctrine” (paper delivered at Wycliffe College, Toronto, March 3, 2003), 11. This also appears to be echoed by John Wesley, Cf. Howard Snyder, The Radical Wesley & Patterns for Church Renewal (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), 76: “apostolicity is gauged by the succession of apostolic doctrine in those who have been faithful to the apostolic witness” (italics his), and by NPC, 10: apostolic = “the succession of apostolic truth throughout the ages”. 
that some sort of mediating position can be found, whereby the pentecostal emphases on Spirit and Word can be understood cooperatively through a kind of traditioning that comes organically out of the church in its *play*. The playful nature of pentecostal worship, as Suurmond has characterized it, entails that ‘rules’ must be respected even as the spontaneous, charismatic and ecstatic move of the Spirit is enjoyed in worship. These ‘rules’ to ensure joyful and responsible play (much like a sport or game) operate as the expression of the *regula fidei* of pentecostal faith, and can be developed from the authority of scripture as interpreted and applied (contextually, as Vondey would stress) in a traditioning process that is Spirit-led, in the community’s exercise of ongoing discernment.

Finally, mention must be made of the eschatological dimension of apostolicity from a pentecostal perspective. This is what Yong offers at the conclusion of his own treatment:

The point, after all, is not that apostolicity resides in abstraction in the church but that the apostolic message and witness are preserved authentically in ecclesial life and faith as directed toward the impending kingdom of God…the church is apostolic not only in terms of its foundation, its authority, and its message but also regarding its eschatological gathering around the throne of God (Revelation 4-5).\textsuperscript{542}

In sum, I have identified here at least six different ways in which the church is seen to be apostolic by pentecostal voices: faith, mission, power, witness, tradition of truth, and eschatological character. All have validity, so that they are complementary aspects of, rather than competing options for the meaning of apostolicity in a pentecostal ecclesiology. What remains is a method of conceiving apostolicity in a Pentecostal re-visioning, which can viably

\textsuperscript{542} Yong, *Spirit Poured Out*, 150-151.
connect these different ways together in one stream. Thus far, Pinnock presents a distinctly Pentecostal vision of apostolicity that perhaps offers the best attempt of doing just that, and so he has the last word on this mark:

Roman Catholics see the apostolicity (being sent) of the church in historical terms, that is, in the succession of bishops. Protestants (on the other hand) see it in terms of restoration of apostolic doctrine. But pentecostals see it in the recovery of apostolic mission with signs following, a recovery of experiential apostolicity. The apostles are dead but the mission remains. One the one hand, it requires agreement with the apostolic witness which points us to Christ. On the other hand, it involves continuing the mission in the service of the kingdom. Every believer has his/her own particular task, according to gifting. Being apostolic means following the faith of the apostles and also, in consequence of this faith, following in the steps of the apostolic ministry. Like the other marks of the church, apostolicity is not static. Like them, it has a historical dimension to be fulfilled ever anew in history. As Christians, we are the successors of the apostles. We must hear their witness, believe their message, and imitate their work. We must be and ever become believing and living members of the apostolic community.543

The image of the Temple, then, as a metaphor for the church as the People of God’s special presence (to use Küng’s term), with its dynamic quality of still being constructed (Eph 2:21, 22), depicts the church’s oneness, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity in a manner conducive to a distinctly Pentecostal ecclesiology. As Amos Yong has suggested, “pentecostal reflection on these traditional marks from a pneumatological perspective can not only help retrieve them for our time but also provide for an enriched understanding of the church’s self-definition.”544

544 Yong, *Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh*, 133.
4 Elements of an Ecclesiology of Presence: Church as Temple

In addition to the temple image conveying meaning for the creedal marks of the church, there are other defining elements which belong in a pentecostal ecclesiology which can also be represented in this particular biblical metaphor. These will be identified according to the church’s relationship to God, to the Kingdom, and to the world.

4.1 The God of Church

It is apparent from the survey of contemporary pentecostal scholars in Chapter Three that *communion ecclesiology*, or the manner in which the church is understood theologically to image the inter-trinitarian relations of the Godhead, is a concern of some of those contributing towards a pentecostal theology of the church. However, notable differences exist in how this is to be approached, and consequently we have seen that there is the legitimate question posed by some (such as Shane Clifton) over the viability or usefulness of this approach at all. Whether or not a communion ecclesiology is the template from which pentecostals should construct their own ecclesiology, their understanding of the church must at some point express the church’s identity in relation to God. The proposal here is that the church should be understood as the collective assembly in which the manifest presence of the Holy Spirit dwells in a transformative, empowering, charismatic fashion, which then makes the church visible to the world. There are a number of considerations stemming from this suggestion, which the Temple image can help communicate.
First, to repeat what has already been stated above, the church as Temple images a dwelling place for the divine presence. The Temple does not so much ‘image’ the Trinity as it does ‘house’ or embody the manifest presence of the Spirit, who shares divinity with both the Father and the Son. This does not at all diminish the church’s calling to reflect the character of her God; indeed, quite the opposite. Spirit and Word at play will transform both individual lives and the community, so that the People of God’s Presence are also marked as the People of truth, love, humility, grace, etc. The Temple must be holy, and will be holy because the Holy Spirit inhabits it, and the church’s fellowship should in some human manner be reflective of the communion in the Godhead, if the Spirit of God’s charismatic presence is permitted to bear the fruit God desires. This also does not take away from the church as an eschatological fellowship (see below). But the emphasis is moved from the church imaging the Trinity to simply being the assembly through which God’s presence is made manifest to the world. The church is of God in that it is constituted by the indwelling presence of His Spirit, but the church is not God in terms of any kind of metaphysical connection. The People of God’s Presence as the temple remains distinct from the God whose presence indwells them, as any ‘house’ is still distinct from its inhabitant, despite however close an association they may have. Or, as Robert Jenson states, “For though we rely on the church as on the presence of God, we do so just in that the church within herself directs us to a presence of God that is not identical with herself.” The church is rather a sign or a witness to the world that the presence of the eschatological Spirit continues to be poured out on all flesh.

545 Cf. Moltmann, CPS, 72-73.
Secondly, the church as the Temple or house of God is inherently a Trinitarian phenomenon. As Paul presents it, God is the builder (through the apostles and prophets), Christ Jesus himself is the cornerstone and the Spirit is the inhabitant (Eph 2:19-21, cf. 1 Peter 2:5). This therefore provides an appropriate ecclesiological foundation for trinitarian Pentecostalism, with its strong interconnection between the current works of the Spirit of Christ and the person of risen Christ as Savior, Baptizer, Healer (Sanctifier) and Coming King. The unique manner in which the early Pentecostals articulated this pneumatological christology finds a suitable ecclesiological image with the Temple, which is used for both the body of Christ (John 2:19-21) and the dwelling place of the Spirit (1 Cor. 3:16; Eph 2:21). It is through Christ that we have access to the Father in the presence of the one Spirit (Eph 2:18).

It is here that emphasis should be given to how the presence of the Spirit in the church is the presence of Christ in the church. If the body of Christ and the Temple of the Spirit are one and the same, it cannot be otherwise. This is how the modern pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit led to a christocentric movement—so much so that part of this movement became Oneness in its christology as a result of receiving Spirit-baptism.\(^547\) Though most Pentecostals are not familiar with the description of Irenaeus about Christ and the Holy Spirit being the “two hands of God,” trinitarian Pentecostal theology has operated with a very similar understanding in mind. Yet it is the charismatic ministry of the Spirit in the church that continues the ministry of Jesus, who inaugurated the inbreaking of the eschatological kingdom of God, so that the Spirit-filled disciples can do even greater works (John 14:12). Christ then continues to be Savior, Healer, Baptizer, Sanctifier and Coming King through the witness and testimony of the Spirit to the

\(^{547}\) I am indebted to a phone conversation with Rev. Dr. Ronald A.N. Kydd, a former pentecostal and church history scholar who pointed out this irony as an example of the ministry of the Spirit in directing our attention to Christ rather than to Himself.
world through the Temple that the Spirit indwells, the Temple which now consists of the People of God’s Presence. The ‘new’ Temple witnesses to the kingdom or “redemptive reign of God in Christ”\textsuperscript{548} on earth, even as the old Temple witnessed to the nations of the God of Israel, and Jesus witnessed to the mission of the Father in the incarnation. Macchia, for one, affirms the christological foundation of this image for Pentecostals when he writes, “The church as a Spirit-filled temple of God is founded on Christ as the man and bestower of the Spirit.”\textsuperscript{549} Similarly, Twelftree concludes that “The Church is Christ present in God’s people. In other words in experiencing and expressing the kingdom or powerful presence of God—now available through the outpouring of the Spirit—the Church maintains Jesus’ presence and ministry between Pentecost and the Parousia.”\textsuperscript{550} It is by the Spirit’s dynamic presence and activity that Jesus is exalted as Head of His Body, and Lord of the Church.

Another extraordinarily important function of the image of the temple in this ecclesiological proposal is that it situates the priority of the church’s relationship to God in and through His Spirit as its primary mission. The emphasis of much missional thinking in contemporary ecclesiology is either on the purposes of the church (i.e. “purpose-driven”), or on the missional character of the church as a community created by the Spirit to participate in the \textit{missio Dei}. While the latter of these trajectories is much more in line with this current proposal, the horse before the cart is the Spirit’s manifest indwelling in the community he creates, or the relationship of the People of God’s Presence who now corporately make up the new Temple with
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the Spirit who graciously indwells it. This relationship between the Spirit and the community He creates, or the Temple He ‘resides’ in, is established by His charismatic activity, or how He is especially “present with power” in a manifest way in the participative, *playful worship* of the community. As Asian Pentecostal scholar Tan Chow May Ling writes,

> Within the Pentecostal context, life in the Spirit is essentially a life of worship. Worship is a code term for the manifest presence of God and is the foundational Pentecostal ministry. The exhortation “Let us enter into the presence of God” is not heard as mere rhetoric, but as reality. For Pentecostals believe and expect that God will meet with God’s people. It is the Spirit who makes this experience of divine presence an existential reality. Life and worship in the Spirit is dynamically experienced and eschatologically oriented. What is distinctive about Pentecostal spirituality is that it is “christologically and pneumatologically fused”.

In this thinking, then, the primary mission or priority of the church is her relationship to the God of church, or her worship of the Transcendent God who graciously indwells her with His manifest, immanent divine presence. It is out of this prior or foundational mission towards God that God can then by His Spirit move the church out into the world to participate in His mission of redeeming it through the Son. The church’s primary mission is to have fellowship with the God whose passionate desire is to heal His creation. As Pentecostal scholar Terry Cross writes, “it is the very nature of God to move outward beyond the rich fellowship of the Trinity to the world itself-indeed to the alien and outcast. God is one whose fellowship between Father, Son, and Spirit overflows to the mission of creating the world and then redeeming the world. God is a missionary.” The proper way for a church to be missional, especially from a pentecostal
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perspective, is to conceive its mission as being the Temple that God indwells through the person of His Spirit, to worship before this God in a manner that invites Him to be “enthroned on the praises of Israel” (Ps 22:3) with His divine presence in the Temple. Since this indwelling God is also a missionary God to the world He created (missio Dei), fellowship with this God will organically result in being propelled out into the world God so loves.

This sequence or priority, I suggest, is what is pivotal to this proposed ecclesiology, is what Pentecostals can distinctly contribute to the broader ecclesiological conversation, and is what is reflected by the operation of God in the biblical narrative. It was while Isaiah was experiencing a supernatural, multi-sensory vision of the holy LORD that he received his cleansing and resulting call to carry out his prophetic mission, to which he answered “Here am I. Send me!” (Isa 6) It was only after the twelve disciples recognized and confessed the authority of Jesus confirmed by his miracles and in the context of intimate fellowship with him that they were commissioned to go out to witness about this to the world. It was only after the supernatural, multi-sensory encounter with the Holy Spirit that the 120 were sent out to proclaim and to model Spirit-driven community before the nations as their participation in the missio Dei, led by the previously cowardly but now Spirit-empowered Peter. Likewise, it was only after a divine, multi-sensory encounter with the Resurrected Lord and an infilling with the Holy Spirit that Paul received his apostolic calling (Acts 9:1-20). Furthermore, it was while the Antioch church worshiped the Lord and fasted that the Holy Spirit spoke directly to them, instructing them as to the enterprise of sending out two missionaries to the Gentiles, in what would be one of the most significant missional events in history (Acts 13:2,3). Thus, the biblical model clearly seems to indicate the sequential pattern of divine, empirical encounters with the manifest presence of God as the providential context out of which the missional endeavours of the church (or covenant people of God in the OT) are birthed and launched. The modern Pentecostal revival
saw this pattern continue, as it was directly out of a similar divine outpouring of the Spirit that a significant missional movement was birthed and launched as well.

Conceiving the church as Temple, therefore, reinforces and images this pivotal understanding of the nature and mission of the church, which is called to worship before and while it is called to witness. Further, it is in the church’s playful, participative worship that the Spirit operates charismatically in a manner that an unbeliever or “uninstructed” (Greek: idiotai) may have the secrets of his heart disclosed and thereby declare, “God is really among you!” (1 Cor. 14:23-25) Likewise it was as the apostolic church practiced Spirit-driven koinonia as well as “signs and wonders” or miracles, and “spent much time together in the temple” worshipping that the Lord added to their number daily (Acts 2:42-47). The playful, participative worship of the People of God’s Presence serves as the primary mission of the church, because it is only then that they will experience the divine empowerment of the Spirit’s infilling to passionately witness and be a foretaste of the inbreaking of God’s reign through Spirit-created community. It is as the new Temple that the church functions in this Spirit-driven manner. The Temple is the house of worship because it is the house of God. There the people are consecrated for God’s use in the presence of His Glory. As Gordon Fee explains, “At the same time, the Spirit’s presence, including his charismata, helps to build up the believing community as its members gather together to worship God…The Spirit, who forms the body and creates the temple, is present with unity and diversity, so that all may participate and all may be built up.”

Consequently, the missional identity and dimension of the church can only be realized to its fullest potential if this priority of edifying, charismatic worship is understood and honoured by a pursuit towards it. It

is as the worshipping community that Pentecostals most embody their identity as the People of God’s Presence, for it is in the context of corporate worship that they experience this Presence in dramatic ways. It is here that their restorationist understanding of the church best serves the movement, for as Graham Twelftree concludes in his study of the church in Luke’s writings:

Moreover, in going to use this story as the model and template for later followers of Jesus, Luke establishes the coming of the eschatological Spirit as the defining event and experience of the Church. Christians are people of the Spirit. Thus, if Luke was asked what determined and characterized Christianity or the Church he would probably say that those who are part of it are people of the Spirit: they have had, and continue to have, experiences of the Spirit of God that are ecstatic and obvious...Luke is likely to draw to our attention his expectation that Christian meetings would involve dramatic encounters with God. In these, God was experienced as tangibly present to fill those present with his Spirit or give direction of some kind.554

Likewise, French Arrington notes that in the NT, “The church was essentially a worshipping community where the Lordship of Christ was acclaimed and the Holy Spirit worked.”555 The church as Temple of the Holy Spirit will first be a worshipping assembly, because that is what first results from the Spirit’s indwelling presence. As Pinnock states, “Spirit incites us to give God praise as his holy temple (Eph 2:22; 1 Pet 2:5).”556
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4.2 The Church and the Kingdom

In keeping with the prioritizing of the church’s reasons for existence, God creates the church as a particular people among whom His special presence dwells in the person of His Spirit, constructed upon the cornerstone of Christ. He does this so that His presence will be made visible to the world, as the church witnesses to, is a sign of, and a foretaste of His eschatological kingdom or reign,\textsuperscript{557} which is already breaking upon the earth but awaits future consummation. In this sense, the church is represented well by the image of the Temple. So, while the church exists first to worship the God who indwells her with His charismatic presence, she exists secondarily to point to and model the nature and character of God’s already-but not yet Reign. God’s church as His earthly dwelling place thus exists for God’s kingdom (basiliea).

The church as Temple reveals the now/not yet Kingdom by making visible the Presence of the eschatological Spirit to the world. As has often been stated, the Church is not the Kingdom, for the Kingdom exists outside of, above and beyond the church, even as the Spirit’s presence is outside of and beyond the church. Yet the Church as Temple also enjoys a favoured position in the Kingdom as it demonstrates the Reign of God upon the earth. If the Kingdom is the name of the realm of God’s reign, and ‘church’ the realm of God’s immanent presence, then an intrinsic relationship is apparent while the distinction may not be as evident. Temporally, the church exists in the present but also lives in \textit{anticipation} of its future: within the fullness of the kingdom. The Kingdom, meanwhile, was inaugurated through the incarnation (Matt 12:28) and mobilized further at Pentecost, but its culmination is yet to come. Thus, the church is on a continuing pilgrimage toward the kingdom that is yet to fully come. The pilgrimage toward the

\textsuperscript{557} Cf. Van Gelder, \textit{The Ministry of the Missional Church}, ch. 1.
kingdom is imaged by the temple that is still under construction (Eph 2:21; cf. Phil 2:12). This is in light of what Gordon Fee observes, that “the kingdom of God is an *eschatological* term, belonging primarily to the category of ‘time’ rather than ‘space’.” It is from this eschatological perspective that the church understands itself as foretaste, which is also imaged in a Pauline manner described by Moltmann: “The charismatically enlivened ‘body of Christ’ sees itself as a ‘down payment’—as the advance pledge and beginning of the new creation of all things, so that in this way it is ‘the temple of the Holy Spirit’.”

The church as Temple inherits this mission of the kingdom from its Head and Cornerstone, Jesus Christ, and does so in the empowerment of the Spirit outpoured at Pentecost (cf. Acts 1:5). Peter Kuzmic has a lengthy but particularly potent description of this aspect of the church’s identity following this pivotal event:

The coming of the Spirit, the kingdom power, at Pentecost, marks the transfer of Jesus’ kingdom to his followers. In ways similar to Jesus at his baptism, the empowerment from above results in public witness, the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom, which is accompanied by signs and wonders. The Spirit-filled community becomes a witnessing, missionary-oriented movement, battling against the forces of Satan and extending God’s rule among the nations. The Book of Acts portrays a church that is essentially a community of the Spirit, experiencing at its very inception an apocalyptic-like harvest and taking the gospel to the ends of the world…It is a spontaneous Spirit-driven and Spirit-controlled movement proceeding from the nature of the Spirit-filled community.

---
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Kuzmic stresses the Spirit’s role as transferring the “kingdom power” from the now ascended Messiah to the People of God’s Presence. It is as this people who are filled with the Spirit that church can demonstrate the kingdom’s inbreaking to the world. Pentecostal ecclesiology simply holds that the church today is meant to have the same identity since it has had, or can have, the same experience of the Spirit. This aspect of their restorationism still holds to any authentically Pentecostal theology of the church, for “As in the apostolic days, the Holy Spirit is the very life of the church and its mission, not replacing but always exalting Christ the Lord.”

An integral and significant part of the church’s mission to witness to the kingdom is the task of passing the faith on to the next generation. The unbelieving world is not the church’s only ministry subject. Rather, the children and youth who have been born and either dedicated or baptized or simply brought into the church (though few Pentecostal groups practice paedobaptism) are as well. Pentecostalism is generally recognized for its priority, passion and ability to minister to children and youth. I would suggest that it is the pentecostal conviction that the constituting immanent, supernatural presence of the eschatological Spirit is poured out on all flesh, including sons and daughters specifically (Acts 2:17, cf. Joel 2:28), that provides the theological impetus for this ministry priority.

Ecclesiologically, this is a woefully underemphasized aspect of the church’s witness to, and interplay with, the kingdom. The church as Temple perpetuates the tradition of faith by bringing the next generation into the manifest presence of God, and in so doing lives in the perpetual hope of the kingdom that is both here and yet to come. Though the story of twelve year-old Jesus remaining behind at the Temple, engaged with the teachers at an astonishing level,
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is primarily intended to reveal His particular identity as the Son “going about His Father’s business” (Luke 2:49), it also nevertheless fuels the conviction that even our sons and daughters can experience the presence of God in a manner that increases their understanding. It is a story which seemingly validates in a momentous way the engagement of the young within the Temple ministry. The church as Temple lives within and points to the kingdom precisely when it passes the faith on to emerging generations by bringing them into God’s manifest presence.

Finally, the image of Temple not only connects the church with the story of God’s presence in Israel, but it is also an inherently eschatological image, as evidenced by its repeated reference in the book of Revelation (mentioned 16x). This affirms that the church as Temple is a foretaste of, and is on a journey towards, the eschatological kingdom of God’s eternal reign. In John’s apocalyptic vision, the kingdom of heaven is imaged by the ‘opening of the temple’ there (Rev 11:19), which is filled with the glory of God much like Solomon’s was on the day of dedication (Rev 15:8; cf. 2 Chronicles 7:2;). Once the seven bowls of wrath have been poured out, and the New Jerusalem comes out of heaven to replace the old, the temple is no longer, for Almighty God and the Lamb are its temple (Rev 21:22; see also Zech 2:4-562). In other words, God’s eternal, direct presence is permanently manifested in the new city as His People are gathered from all times and nations, so that no temple is needed to function as His dwelling place. The Temple that was the church now lives in this direct presence, now dwells in his direct, eternal reign, so that John observes that no physical temple exists any longer. There is no temple as there is no church. There is only the eternal kingdom. God’s glory will be all in all, as

the kingdom comes to its fullest realization with the direct presence of God permanently established. All of this is the culmination of the Spirit’s work in leading the pilgrim church to this end (as evidenced by the Spirit speaking to the seven churches in Rev 3). In light of this, as Simon Chan summarizes, “to speak of the church as temple of the Spirit is also to recognize its essentially eschatological character, since the Spirit is the Spirit of the ‘last days’.”

This eschatological vision of the end of the Temple also affirms the priority and purpose of worship for the church, for worship is what will take place in the New Jerusalem when we see God’s face, and worship is the called response for the hearers of the vision even as it was John’s response to experiencing it (Rev 22:4, 8). The church as Temple lives out its purpose of foretaste precisely when it playfully worships in the charismatic presence of the eschatological Spirit, according to its eternal destiny. It has been suggested, “The purpose of worship is not just to deepen piety, however. The purpose of worship is to transform Christians’ self-perception and their perception of the world….Through worship, Christians escape the predominant ideology of their culture and enter the reality of God.” If this is true, then the playful worship of the People of God’s Presence is the exercise of making present this future glory, as the Kingdom that is yet to fully come is breaking upon the earth even now through the charismatic operation of the eschatological Spirit. Roger Haight echoes this: “When pentecostal experience is actualized as in worship, it is a participation in the reality of the kingdom of God in the sense of Zizioulas, a participation in the reality of the kingdom beyond history, the eschata, an experience of
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transcendence, something beyond the self.”\(^{565}\) It is thus in the context of her relationship to the Kingdom that the church as Temple is also, as Land (whom Haight references in his statement above) puts it, an “eschatological missionary fellowship.”

Simon Chan takes pains to include the eucharist as a pivotal part within this very picture of worship as foretaste of the kingdom’s coming in fullness. The Lord’s Supper is not merely remembrance of the past atoning sacrifice of Christ’s incarnate body, but is inherently an eschatological event as well. He explains:

In the eucharistic worship of the church, the Spirit actualizes the past through remembrance (anamnesis) and anticipates the future (prolepsis) when created things are transfigured (or “transubstantiated”, if you like). In this anticipation, something of the future --a foretaste--is realized as the Father is “called upon” (Greek epiclesis) to send the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist. Anamnesis and prolepsis are the two poles held together in the present as the church invokes the Spirit’s presence in its eucharistic celebration.\(^{566}\)

Given the proleptical and restorationist nature of the original Pentecostal worldview (they looked forward even as they simultaneously looked back), this articulation of the eucharist within the context of the church’s exercise of worship as a foretaste seems fitting within a pentecostal ecclesiology. When the eucharist is understood as part of the worship of the church in the presence of the eschatological Spirit, its place is more logically appropriate than past generations of Pentecostals would have recognized. It is the bedrock distinction of the church as the People of God’s Presence made manifest by the Spirit’s coming to carry on the inauguration of the kingdom by Jesus that makes this possible, for as Chan concludes, “For it is in the
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eucharistic celebration itself that the already-not yet tension is actually upheld by the whole church as it invokes the Spirit as *arrabon* [pledge].”

In sum, a pentecostal understanding of the mission of the church in relation to the Kingdom, then, is to see the contemporary church as continuing the mission of the apostolic church in proclaiming and demonstrating the good news of the Kingdom’s inauguration through the person and work of Jesus Christ, the Savior, Healer, Sanctifier, Baptizer and Coming King. This can only be done effectively through the power of the Holy Spirit. Gordon Fee summarizes this position well:

As with them, so with ourselves. The kingdom has come; it is still to come. With Jesus the time of the future, the day of salvation, has been inaugurated. But the empowering was the work of the Holy Spirit. What Jesus began “both to do and to say” is now the ministry he has left his church until he comes again. The mission is that of Jesus himself-God’s kingdom has having come as good news for the poor. But the empowering for the kingdom, as then, is the continuing work of the Spirit.

4.3 The Church and the World

Finally, the church as Temple also helps to image the church’s mission to the world. As stated earlier, the church’s mission is a surprisingly underdeveloped aspect of pentecostal ecclesiology among contemporary scholars. Even among those who address it, there is certainly not a monolithic view between them; quite the opposite is the case. Yet given that the seeming obsession in contemporary ecclesiology concerns the relationship between church and culture,


something definitive should be attempted within pentecostal ecclesiology to address it. I strategically place it third, behind the church’s mission towards God and towards God’s kingdom. This is not because the church does not ultimately exist for the benefit of the world; in fact it surely does. But the church can only effectively serve the world, love the unloved, heal the hurting, proclaim the gospel with faithfulness, be a redeeming agent of grace, and most importantly, bring others into the presence of God insofar as it is empowered by the Holy Spirit to do so, and is propelled by the Spirit into this mission out of the prior context of playful, charismatic worship. It is God who made the world and it is God who so loved it that He gave His Son up for it. An authentically worshipful relationship where this God’s presence is palpably experienced will lead to an authentically missional church towards the world that God so passionately desires to transform. As I have demonstrated from the biblical narrative, this is what results of a supernatural experience with the immanent presence of God encountered by those whom He calls into mission by calling them into His presence first. The heart of God towards His entire creation will be imbibed by those among whom His divine presence indwells. Cooperation with the missio Dei results most naturally from encounter with God’s special presence.

In this configuration, then, the church as Temple ultimately exists for the benefit of transforming creation precisely as the special dwelling place of God’s presence. Mission, therefore, is paramount to the church’s purpose even though it functions as its third priority. Though the chief end of the church is worship in the indwelling presence of God, this also results in an overwhelming missional purpose since the God of church will direct her attention to the task of seeing the Kingdom break upon the world for its salvation and healing. This has a metaphorical sounding even in Solomon’s dedicatory prayer of the first Jerusalem Temple, when he asked God to hear and answer the prayers of the foreigner there, “in order that all peoples of
the earth may know your name and fear you” (2 Chronicles 6:32, 33). Similarly, just as God instituted a covenant-relationship with Abraham’s seed so that “all the families of the earth shall be blessed” (Gen 12:3), God inhabits the new Temple of the People of His Presence in a particular covenant manner through the charismatic presence of His Spirit for the same ultimate end: the blessing of all the families of the earth. The greatest effort to articulate a missional ecclesiology, to most effectively make the church to be a passionate and humble servant of all families of the earth, I suggest, is actually to make the world the tertiary priority of the church. For as the church moves toward the manifest presence of God, and consequently moves toward the inbreaking of God’s kingdom, it will then find itself “inherently motivated” and organically moved out into the world in humble service to it. This is, I propose, a faithful theological and ecclesiological reading of the modern Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit. It is also the framework within which a healthy understanding of the Pentecostal doctrine of Spirit-baptism as empowerment for mission can be articulated. Jesus baptizes His followers with the Holy Spirit in the context of loving communion with them, as a witness to the inbreaking Kingdom before the world, empowering the receivers to boldly proclaim the Gospel with the final goal of bringing others into this same Presence that has so transformed them.

Thus, in this configuration, the church as Temple relates to the world not as having total priority over it, as in Chan; or in being contextualized into it, as in Vondey; or in somehow merely imaging trinitarian communion, as in Volf and others; or primarily in engaging in
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ecumenical, inter-religious dialogue, as in Yong,\textsuperscript{573} though this may indeed be one significant forum for the church’s mission. There may be strains of truth to each of these articulations, but the church as Temple relates to the world foremost as the humble agent of healing and transforming love, propelled and empowered by the eschatological Spirit to model the reign of God through a demonstration of His immanent Presence. Or, to draw on the Apostle Paul, the church’s mission is to operate in the charismatic presence of the Spirit so that unbelievers acknowledge, “God is really among you!” The church as Temple makes visible the kingdom of God to the world by being the dwelling place for His empowering presence, not from a position of dominance or superiority, but from a place of humility, service and love. Twelftree describes this mission in terms of its embodiment of Luke’s ecclesiology:

[Luke would] “say that mission is not simply speaking about Jesus but also demonstrating the powerful presence of God through the performance of signs and wonders…The portrayed strategy of mission in Luke-Acts is not devoid of care for the physical needs of outsiders. That care is in the form of miraculous healings and exorcisms – signs and wonders taken to be evidence of God’s powerful presence… the church per se has as its mission helping people experience the powerful and transforming presence of God to enable them to receive salvation and then join other believers.”\textsuperscript{574}

Yet, as a sign of the kingdom, the church as Temple does not merely amalgamate with culture, or accommodate it either; though some integration is bound to take place, particularly in expressions of worship and ministry. The church seeks to transform culture, not through the pre-pentecostal political force of Christendom, but through being the “alternative community” where

\textsuperscript{573} Yong, \textit{The Spirit Poured Out on all Flesh}.
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Spirit-driven *koinonia* in the abiding presence of the Most High God contrasts with the broken world in a magnetic manner. A community edified through the *charismata* (1 Cor 14:3-12) will be an effective witness to the healing grace of God to the world.

This emphasis on the missional role of the charismatic, supernatural presence of the Spirit through the church may bear resemblance to the “power evangelism” of Fuller Seminary’s late adjunct, John Wimber, for example. Admittedly, there are congruencies in understanding the charismatic work of the Spirit as confirming the Gospel to the world through “signs and wonders” such as divine healings, prophecies and exorcisms. For instance, when Wimber writes:

The Church should announce and demonstrate the Kingdom of God. Kingdom evangelism involves power evangelism: that means evangelism that transcends the rational through the demonstration of God’s power in signs and wonders and introduces the numinous of God. This involves a presentation of the good news of God’s reign accompanied with the manifest presence of God. Power evangelism is spontaneous and is directed by the Holy Spirit.

This sounds very much like a pentecostal way of describing the nature of the church’s mission to the world, because of the acknowledged pentecostal influence on Wimber and other Third Wave charismatic evangelicals. The historic distinction has been on the heightened view of glossolalia as the initial evidence of Spirit baptism on the part of Pentecostals, which Third Wavers do not
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share. Nevertheless, this idea of the church’s mission to the world involving demonstrations of God’s authority (*exousia*) over sin, sickness, evil, etc. is what led Clark Pinnock to call pentecostal ecclesiology a “power ecclesiology.”

There is also agreement on the spiritual reality that while the church serves the world as a foretaste of the kingdom of God, she inevitably comes into conflict with other kingdoms, including “rulers” and “powers” that are opposed to Christ (Cf. Rom 8:38; Eph 3:10, 6:12; Col 1:16, 2:15). The mission of the People of God’s Presence to the world inherently includes acting as a liberating instrument against the forces of darkness that Christ has already conquered and will vanquish at the eschaton (cf. 1 John 3:8). One of the very few times Jesus is recorded as mentioning the church (*ekklesia*) is when he uttered the promise that He would build it, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it (Matt 16:18). This statement infers conflict between the journey of the church and other powers that would seek in vain to overpower it (cf Eph 6:10-12). In a pentecostal ecclesiology that is based upon the conviction that the church is “the ‘Temple of the Spirit’, the special locus of the Spirit’s presence,” such a theology operates in a cosmology which recognizes that there is more than one kind of spiritual presence in the world.

In this important respect, I suggest that a full-orbed pentecostal ecclesiology in its articulation of the church’s relationship to the world must involve seeing the church’s mission as going up against forces of darkness operating in the world, in a similar manner to ‘power evangelism’ theology. A significant aspect of the church’s mission to the world in demonstrating God’s presence is to liberate those in captivity to the conquered forces of evil, as
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part of the inbreaking of the Kingdom upon the world. This is something that is curiously not made explicit in nearly all of the pentecostal scholars surveyed in the last chapter, but is intrinsic to the traditional pentecostal worldview. Pentecostals are, after all, characterized in part by their shared conviction with St. Paul that “the kingdom of God depends not on talk but on power.” (1 Cor 4:20) That was how the apostolic church related to the culture, and it rightfully belongs in a contemporary pentecostal ecclesiology as well. The proclamation of the kerygma inherently involves and is accompanied by demonstrations of the Spirit’s manifest presence to verify God’s intention and ability to bring liberation to the sick, the oppressed, and the sinful; much like Moses demonstrated God’s power to the Egyptians when he called for Pharaoh to “let my people go” (Ex 7:8-12:32).

More closely, the church as Temple continues to demonstrate the inbreaking kingdom to the world in the same way Jesus did. For as Fee explains, “In his healing the sick, casting out demons, and eating with sinners—and thereby showing them God’s unlimited mercy—the people were to understand that God’s great eschatological day had finally dawned.”

The church in the power of the Spirit of Christ dispenses God’s mercy to the world with humility as Christ did, even as it manifests this power supernaturally at times as the agent of God’s kingdom, which has already conquered the kingdom of darkness. But this demonstration of the Holy Spirit’s power is not merely to win a fight, though that is what is involved in the struggle with forces of evil, but to continue Christ’s ministry of liberation for the ‘families of the earth,’ or as T.F. Torrance puts it, to see “the transformation and renewal of all human social structures…when society may at last be transmuted into a community of love centring in and

sustained by the personalising and humanising presence of the Mediator,\textsuperscript{580} who is Jesus Christ: Savior, Healer, Baptizer, Sanctifier and Coming King.

Again, this is not an ecclesiology oriented toward warfare for its own sake, but one that simply cannot be ignorant of the spiritual reality of engaging forces of darkness while it carries out the mission of seeing the Spirit poured out on all flesh. Twice, Israel’s defeat was completed with the destruction of the Temple, so the image of the Temple in some sense stands for the gauge of victory or defeat at the hands of the enemies of God’s People. Given the promise of Jesus, the church as the Temple of the Spirit is guaranteed victory as long as it remains His dwelling place; but spiritual conflict with other powers and principalities is also guaranteed as well while the church engages the world in service as it demonstrates the Spirit’s presence.

5 An Ecclesiology of Presence

I now want to apply an ecclesiology of the People of God’s Presence, which has been thus far represented by the biblical image of the Temple, more specifically to various aspects of the church’s mission and ministry. In particular, how does an ecclesiology of presence apply to the practices of the church? Before doing so, I want to briefly articulate with more focus what has been said to this point about the nature of this divine presence that constitutes the church as the People of God’s Presence.

First, as has been alluded to all along up to this point, the divine presence which constitutes the church and defines it as the People of God’s Presence and the Temple of the Holy

Spirit is the presence of a divine *person*. In a distinctly pentecostal ecclesiology, the church is defined by the manifest indwelling and charismatic operating of the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, who is also the Spirit of the LORD, the Spirit of Christ, and the eschatological Spirit. This Spirit, although He goes by the name of *Pneuma* (‘wind’ or ‘breath’), is not an impersonal force, or a thing, or an ‘it’, or a utility that simply brings empowerment (as He has too often been unconsciously reduced to in Pentecostal theology). This divine presence is a personal presence, the person of the Holy Spirit operating and indwelling in a manifest, perceptible way among those whom He gathers to shape into an eschatological missionary fellowship. By ascribing “Personhood” to the Holy Spirit, I mean a distinct member of the Godhead who possesses those characteristics that define it as a “someone”—i.e. a will, opinions, actions, traits, etc, even as He shares full and complete divine essence with the Tri-une Godhead. In the case of the Holy Spirit, His personhood relates to his distinct identity within the Godhead, while also sharing full divinity and communion with the Father and the Son. The *Statement of Fundamental and Essential Truths* of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada states this about the Spirit: “His personality is shown by the fact that He has personal characteristics and that individuals may relate to Him as a person.”

This demonstration of the personhood of the Spirit in the church is what is narrated in Acts, and is therefore at the essence of a healthy pentecostal restorationism. The Holy Spirit is a distinct character in the biblical narrative, even as He is the Spirit of God. As Newbigin described, then, what makes the church the church is where this Person of the Spirit is noticeably present with power. This involves more than just glossolalia or miracles (‘theophanic
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presence’), though it also includes these, and more than just a sacramental presence (as in the Lord’s Supper), though it also includes this, but also the direct leading (i.e. Acts 8:39; 13:4; 16:6,7; 20:22), encouragement or comfort (Acts 9:31), speaking and responses of the Spirit (both positive—i.e. Acts 15:28, and negative—i.e. Acts 5:3) as other examples of personal, immanent interaction with the assembly of called-out ones (ekklesia) as well. It is, therefore, the special, direct activity of the Spirit as He personally indwells a collective of people as the promised Paraclete (Jn 14:16) that defines the church. All of the practices of the church, then, are shaped in large part in response to, or in cooperation with, this manifest divine activity on the part of the person of the Spirit, as it was in Acts. As Chan declares, “The key to understanding the Spirit in the church is to see the Spirit in his own right as the Third Person of the Trinity.”

As stated above, however, it is precisely in the demonstration of His own personhood that the Spirit makes the assembly the church of Jesus Christ: Savior, Healer, Baptizer, Sanctifier and Coming King. Again, Chan affirms this when, in emphasizing the personhood of the Spirit in the church, he states, “The Spirit’s coming constitutes the church by uniting the church to its Head, making it the body of Christ.” This is why, as we saw in Chapter 2, a pentecostal scholar like Dale Coulter can describe Richard Spurling’s ecclesiology by utilizing the words of the Orthodox theologian John Zizioulas: “Christ institutes the church, the Spirit constitutes the church.” There is a definite sense in which the inherent pentecostal understanding of the cooperation or synthesis (to use Zizioulas’ word) between the persons of Christ and the Spirit in
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forming the church can find some manner of significant affinity with, in this case, Orthodox ecclesiology on this point at least.

It is thus as a divine Person that the recognizable or discernible presence of the Spirit makes the church what it is, the living Temple constantly under construction as it houses the divine presence in a transforming, empowering manner that then gives witness to the world of who the triune God is. As I have been pointing out all along, one of the crucial ways the Spirit demonstrates this personhood in the church is through His exercise of the *charismata*. Here, Chan, writing to evangelicals, is helpful again:

Paul’s use of the analogy of the body with many different parts to explain how the *charismata* should be exercised in the church highlights another aspect of the Spirit as Third Person. The Spirit is distinguished as the Third Person not only as the *gift* from the Father that the risen Christ “poured out” on the church (Acts 2:33) but also as the *giver* of gifts (1 Cor 12:7-11), making the whole church a charismatic community. It is largely to the credit of Pentecostals that this dimension of the Spirit’s work in the church is now receiving the attention it deserves.  

The operation of the charismatic gifts in the participative, playful worship of the Temple, both for the edification of the body, and to make visible God’s presence to the unbeliever, is the active working of the Spirit in a way that manifests His Personhood to all. This is why the operation of the *charismata* is one of the chief defining practices of the Pentecostal church, as it was for Paul, and plays a fundamental role in pentecostal ecclesiology. It is in the operation of
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these spiritual gifts that the person of the eschatological Spirit bears witness to the inbreaking of the Kingdom through the church.

This is also where the pentecostal emphasis on glossolalia may be construed ecclesiologically in a helpful way. Rather than merely being the initial evidence of individual Spirit-baptism (a strictly utilitarian function), glossolalia should be seen as a sacramental practice of the church which demonstrates the nearness of the presence of the transcendent person of the Holy Spirit, who is sent by Jesus the Baptizer. This is where Macchia’s sacramental characterization of glossolalia as theophanic presence is useful.\textsuperscript{586} It is picked up by Max Turner, who helpfully suggests:

\ldots it is the distinctly new Christian phenomenon of invasive glossolalia which most strongly marks the transcendence of the Spirit. In this gift, the Spirit is the theophanic presence of the redeeming God, which inspires joyful doxology. At the same time, however, invasive glossolalia paradoxically underlines the remaining sharp distance between humankind and God (the ‘tongue’ inspired is incomprehensible!), while perhaps pointing forward to the eschatological renewal of language in the final reconciliation. It is this understanding of invasive glossolalia as a sacramental sign of deep and joyful encounter with the mysterium of God, and its paradigmatic nature for Pentecostalism, that prompted Maloney and Lovekin to speak of the movement in terms of Troeltsch’s third sociological class of religious movements – not ‘Church, nor ‘Sect’, but ‘Mysticism’. In making this observation they were pointing to the fact that Pentecostalism is marked out less by the pattern of its relationships to (or withdrawal from) society, and more by the way its institutions and activities as a group are primarily shaped by the drive for encounter with God. While this does not give adequate account of the mission

\begin{flushright}
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orientation within Pentecostalism, it is a good measure of the degree to which the Spirit is perceived as the transcendence of God in the worshipping community.\(^{587}\)

By understanding glossolalia as a sacramental ‘mark’ of the theophanic presence of the transcendent Spirit which the pentecostal community encounters instead of merely ‘initial evidence,’ pentecostal tongues now takes on a far greater ecclesiological significance, as opposed to a strictly utilitarian purpose. While Paul later preferred the Corinthians to exercise prophecy over tongues, especially tongues without interpretation, for its greater ability to edify, he did call tongues a sign of the presence of God for the unbeliever in that context, where the Corinthian believers were already aware of tongues (1 Cor 14:2-25).

Along with and through the charismatic gifts, including glossolalia, the Spirit also demonstrates His presence as a divine person through the ongoing declaration of Truth in the church. A defining role of the church’s mission is stewardship of the truth, which is a preceding necessity to proclamation of the truth in Spirit-empowerment. This is modeled to a degree by the apostolic church in that the operation of the person of the Spirit inspired the church to articulate and hold fast to the *kerygma* of apostolic proclamation in His dynamic empowerment (i.e. Acts 2:14-26, 42; 3: 12-26; 4:8-12, 24-30; 5:30-32; 7:7-53; 8:35; 10:36-43; 13:16-41; 17:22-31; 26:2-3). Chan calls this personal action of the Spirit the “living tradition,” because it leads to what he has elsewhere called the ‘development of doctrine.’\(^{588}\) Truth is intrinsic to the ontological personhood of the Holy Spirit, for “The Spirit is the Spirit of truth, who embodies the Truth in


the church as well as guides the church into all truth to Christ himself (Jn 14:26).”

Therefore, the People of God’s Presence in the indwelling of the person of the Spirit must also be a people of Truth, who tradition truth through the dynamic inspiration of the Spirit of Truth in their ongoing pilgrimage to the culmination of the Kingdom’s manifestation. It is interesting that, according to the Fourth Gospel, Jesus twinned the name of the Spirit of truth with that of the Paraclete (Jn 14:16,17). Because ‘truth’ is therefore not a commodity, but is actually in the ontology of the Persons of the Trinity, it will be a living, dynamic reality in a church that is truly the Temple of the Spirit.

Another characteristic of truth as grounded in divine personhood rather than as a commodity is that truth is not merely propositional claims, but foremost is grounded in narrative. The Spirit is driving the church along God’s story, along salvation-history, moving it towards the eschaton in a proleptical manner. Truth is grounded in story because it is grounded in personhood, and that is what makes the church’s stewardship of truth a dynamic or living enterprise. The church continues to tell God’s kerygmatic story in the power of the Spirit even as it continues to live it in the Spirit’s fullness. This solidifies the church as the Temple in which the Spirit ‘resides,’ for as Chan adds, “The story of the church is what it is because it is the story of the Spirit who constitutes it, the continuation of the triune economy of salvation. Ecclesiology and pneumatology therefore cannot be separated.”

All of these areas are examples of constituting activities of the presence of the Spirit which demonstrate His Personhood in and through the church. It is therefore the personal,
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experienced presence of the Spirit in these ways (as well as others which cannot all be enumerated or discussed here) that reflect the church as the Temple of the Spirit, which is made up of the People of God’s Presence.

I now want to say more about the specific nature of the Spirit’s presence in the church itself, building upon these tangible examples of how it manifests in ecclesially-defining ways. All throughout this work, I have been referring to this divine presence in a multitude of ways, and have also utilized a bevy of descriptions used by scholars with regard to it. Some call it ‘special presence’ (Küng), ‘unmediated’ or ‘immediate presence,’ ‘mystical presence,’ ‘miraculous presence,’ ‘indwelling presence,’ ‘powerful’ presence, ‘supernatural’ or ‘preternatural’ presence, ‘tangible presence,’ ‘dynamic,’ ‘manifest’ or ‘eschatological,’ along with many other adjectival expressions to try to describe the experienced divine activity of the Holy Spirit in the church that is the hallmark of Pentecostalism. Notably and curiously, the same pentecostal experience of the Spirit’s presence has been independently called both ‘transcendent’ and ‘immanent.’ I would suggest these two descriptions should be fused to more fully describe the phenomenon of Pentecostalism as the immanent experience of the transcendent
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God through the charismatic activity of the divine person of the Holy Spirit. God the Spirit draws near to us to indwell our collective gathering and our individual consciousness, and in doing so makes us aware that He who is immanently present is the Transcendent Lord above all. Or, as Ralph Del Colle states, “Interiority and immanence are marks of the Spirit’s work and personal presence. The transcendent God is present to us and in us by the Holy Spirit, and that presence is more interior to our psychological consciousness than we might think.”

Another significant description of the pentecostal experience of the Spirit’s presence, which here is understood to function as ecclesially-constituting, is the word “reality.” Simon Chan writes of the “Pentecostal reality” when referring to this phenomenon, while Pinnock refers to the “reality of God” encountered in the context of charismatic manifestations. Richard Baer, when comparing pentecostal glossolalia with Quaker silence and Catholic Liturgy, refers to “a deep movement of the human spirit as it encounters the Spirit of God, the presence of the risen Christ, the reality of the Holy Spirit.” This, he suggests, can be common to all three contexts of worship. I would heartily agree. But this ‘reality of the Holy Spirit,’ while manifested in all three settings in a comparable manner (in Baer’s thesis), is understood to be ecclesially-defining in a unique manner for Pentecostals. The particular point here is that there is an experienced manifestation of the divine presence of the person of the Spirit that can be
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described as a *reality* that then determines other realities by its existence, including the reality of the church as the People of God’s Presence.

The other crucial point that bears repeating when attempting to describe the specific nature of this divine presence is how it belongs to the person of the Spirit, but, as Baer states in his description above, is thereby also the presence of the risen Christ. Here, the charismatic Catholic scholar Ralph Del Colle is helpful. In attempting to answer the question, “What is the presence of the Holy Spirit?”, Del Colle is led to address the relationship between the Spirit’s presence (*Spiritus praesens*), and Christ’s presence (*Christus praesens*) because they cannot now be understood apart from each other. This is in large part because “It is characteristic of the Holy Spirit then to move beyond its own Person toward the other,” as has already been noted above. The presence or reality of the Spirit in the church manifests the nature of the inner-trinitarian relations of the Godhead. The Spirit’s presence ‘represents’ Christ’s presence as He is Head and Lord of the church. Thus, “Christ is present in the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit is the agent of the risen Lord’s presence…Therefore, we cannot artificially separate the presence of the risen and exalted Christ from that of the Holy Spirit…They are distinct but not separate.” The distinction, he later notes, is in their relationality only. Again, this is why a church that is constituted by the palpable presence of the Spirit has consequently been characterized by its Christology of Jesus as Savior, Healer, Baptizer, Sanctifier and Coming King.

Writing within the sacramental tradition, Del Colle concludes the following about the Spirit’s presence in the church: “The presence of the Holy Spirit is constitutive for the presence
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of Christ in the Eucharistic meal. And this Eucharistic presence is constitutive along with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit for the congregation to go forth from the assembly as the Body of Christ and the temple of the Holy Spirit. Herein lies the crucial distinction between Catholic and pentecostal ecclesiology in light of the Temple metaphor. Del Colle acknowledges the Spirit’s presence explicitly in both the eucharistic meal (epiclesis), and in “the manifestation of the giftedness of God in the lives of believers” or charismata, as would nearly all of the pentecostal scholars surveyed in the previous chapter. Yet, for Del Colle and all Catholics, the eucharist would be the primary venue of the Spirit’s presence, whereas for Pentecostals the opposite would be the case. This distinction is simply one of experience and the respective history of both churches.

5.1 Charismata and Order/Structure

The issue of charismata and institution is an inevitable one that is ubiquitous to all revival movements, and has been a topic as old as the church itself. Terry Cross, responding to Clark Pinnock and referring to Avery Dulles, frames the question of this issue as one of the foremost that a pentecostal ecclesiology must attempt to answer. Space does not permit an exhaustive

605 Terry Cross, “A Response to Clark Pinnock’s “Church in the Power of the Holy Spirit,” 176: “How do we allow the freedom of the Spirit to enter the church and flow through the institution in a dynamic, living manner?” The short answer of this dissertation, in line with Kärkkäinen, is that it is the ‘flow’ of the Spirit that is itself the constituting element of the church, so that the question should be, how do we structure the church around the Spirit’s dynamic presence?
treatment of it here, but something must be said about how the pentecostal church as Temple of the Spirit and as the People of God’s Presence understands herself theologically around this point so as to navigate the tension between the freedom of the Spirit’s surprising presence, and the order that is necessary and biblically mandated (i.e. 1 Cor 14:26-40) to keep the church’s playful worship ‘within the rules.’ It is a tension that has often been avoided. Elim Pentecostal minister John Lancaster observes that, “Generally speaking, the average Pentecostal church has a comparatively loose structure.”

A good place to start addressing the tension is with 1 Corinthians 14 itself, where Paul looks to address certain Corinthian abuses of the charismata. His instructions are self-explanatory, and as they are inspired by the Spirit himself, demonstrate that the Spirit of God who is “not of disorder but of peace” (v. 33) would not operate in such a way as to be the author of harmful confusion in the church. The tension, then, does not originate with the person of the Spirit, who is revealed throughout the biblical narrative to be an agent of justice, peace and order (as seen by His participation in the process of creation, for example), but with the dynamics inherent within human organization. Here again is where pentecostal ecclesiology can follow a developed or mature pneumatology to avoid a dichotomy between freedom and spontaneity over against order and structure.

The works of Suurmond, Pinnock and Kärkkäinen are also helpful here in that each has also tried to orient the relationship between the surprising life of the Spirit with ecclesial structures. Suurmond does this effectively in his aforementioned theology of playful worship. Worship as play allows for freedom of individual expression, outbursts of joy, spontaneity,
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surprises, and creative participation by all in their own unique ways, etc. But for any play to accomplish this in healthy, productive (as in recreational) ways, there always must be rules to the play. This is universal to all play, whether it is a group of children at the playground, a hockey match, or a pentecostal worship event. Playfulness as recreational, celebratory and communal can only be achieved in a context of structure and order. Playful worship as the primary mission of the Temple of the Spirit must take place within certain ‘confines’ of this Temple, that merely sets an order that will not stifle the Spirit or the human players.

Pinnock refers to the common analogy of structure being the bark that holds the life and growth of the tree and protects it. The Spirit brings life, but order and tradition protects this life and allows it to continue to flourish and be nurtured over time. Thus it is in fact necessary for the church to operate as an institution to the degree that this is accomplished. He refers to this ‘bark’ as the “Continued Charismatic Structure” of the pentecostal church, and then ends his piece discussing further the “Institutional Dimension” of a pentecostal ecclesiology. That the structure is charismatic means that it operates according to spiritual or divine giftings rather than by man-made structures. The church is ordered according to the distribution of the charismata by the Spirit instead of a human corporate model. This allows for unity in diversity, for balance between various types of giftings (ie. spontaneous prophets and organized teachers is the example Pinnock uses), and ideally leads to a culture of humility and service rather than competition and hierarchy (cf. 1 Cor 12). The Spirit has already provided for checks and balances, and structure to maintain a healthy body of Christ. Thus, the task of the body is to recognize and practice these gifts properly. That is where the institutional dimension then enters.

In a similar approach to Kärkkäinen, Pinnock stresses the value of institution insofar as it serves its purpose of continuing the mission of the church and facilitates the ongoing encounter of the presence of God by the people. Therefore, “It is not so much a question whether the church has an institutional dimension but of what kind.” The array of vastly different polities operating within global Pentecostalism demonstrates that the question truly is “what kind” and not “which one.” Pinnock’s answer “from a biblical point of view” are ones that are “functional,” “culturally viable,” and “temporarily flexible.” He stresses the primacy of the Spirit over structure, and, though he does not use the term, also emphasizes the principle of *semper reformanda* in that all structures are not permanent and will need to change over time to maintain the ongoing dynamic renewal of the Spirit in His Temple. This principle, I suggest, is vital to any and all churches, but must be intrinsic to the character of pentecostal ecclesiology. Though it is a restorationist movement, Pentecostalism is clearly in need of its own reform after a century of existence. Like any revival movement, its institutionalizing is prone to squelch its incipient power unless the principle of *semper reformanda* is grounded into the structures and leadership of the many denominations that the movement is now comprised of. This is especially true where the movement is older and ‘colder,’ such as in the West.

It will be remembered from the previous chapter that Kärkkäinen, in portraying the church as a Charismatic Fellowship, also stressed the primacy of the charisma over institution for essentially the same reasons as Pinnock. This reflects the pentecostal ethos. While the original Pentecostals were passionately averse to any structure, traditioning or even order at

---

611 Kärkkäinen, *Toward a Pneumatological Theology*, 111ff.
times, as any revival movement matures the inevitability of institutionalizing is accepted, begrudgingly or not. After the Azusa revival waned, even William Seymour drew upon the AME handbook and other materials to produce his own constitution, *The Doctrines and Discipline of the Apostolic Faith Mission*, to help govern the churches he had planted. What authentic, mature pentecostalism is characterized by is not the aversion to structure, but the prioritizing of charismata or the experience of the palpable presence of God over structures, so that the structures serve this greater, ecclesial-constituting event. What is often lamented by Pentecostals is the loss of the “fire” of God’s Presence when it appears extinguished by the clericalism or institutionalism of denominational politics. Thus, it bears repeating that charismata and structure or order should not be dichotomized ecclesiologically, but put in proper perspective and priority within the framework that both are equally works of the Spirit in the church and will function best under the Spirit’s leading. The Corinthian situation and Pentecostalism both testify to the propensity of abuses of spiritual gifts, and the need for some institutional structure to facilitate their healthy use. But the same Spirit of God, who is the author of order rather than confusion, is as equally concerned with guiding the church into the right structure as He is with distributing gifts. The ordered description of the early church following Pentecost in Acts 2:42-47 seems to confirm this. The phenomenon of Pentecostalism demonstrates that a variety of structures can be used, and this fact bears witness to the ecclesiological principle that it is how the structure is employed, rather than which particular one it is, that matters most.

5.2 Presence and Koinonia

It is also from Kärkkäinen (and others) that the biblical picture of church as koinonia is addressed from a pentecostal perspective. The bottom line in this regard is that it is the Spirit who creates authentic fellowship in the church. He does so through distributing the charismatic gifts without discrimination to any and all willing recipients. It is this charismatic structure in which the experience of the Spirit bonds people to one another in the highly participative, playful worship of the People of God’s Presence that founds the basis for a uniquely pentecostal experience of biblical koinonia. This is affirmed by Paul Lee when he observes as a Catholic, “The concept of fellowship is indeed highly valued in the Pentecostal understanding of the Church. Their awareness of the complementarity of the spiritual gifts that each receives, establishes a fellowship among the members.”613

This unique premise of koinonia established by a common experience of the Spirit’s presence stands in stark contrast to current Western ecclesiologies which see ‘community’ as something manufactured through programs and resources. Contrary to this popular opinion is an ecclesiology which sees genuine care in fellowship among diverse peoples as a direct fruit of encountering the preternatural presence of God (Acts 2:44-46). Earlier I suggested that a church constituted as the Temple of the Spirit, where the tangible presence of the Spirit shapes the church as it fellowship with Him in playful worship, will also be a missional church in that this presence will also propel the church into the world to serve it with His grace. A church that encounters the divine, infilling presence of Spirit-baptism in pentecostal fashion will also be driven by the indwelling Spirit to care for one another, as the apostolic church did. The koinonia
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that marked the Acts 2 church came as a direct result of the Acts 2 experience in the Upper Room. When the Holy Spirit is encountered in this way, the sanctifying grace of God in His spiritual Temple draw the People of God’s Presence in love toward one another, even as He empowers them to witness to the world. This koinonia is in itself a crucial part of His empowerment to witness to Himself to the world. It is interesting that in Acts 2, the church did not initially grow daily as a result of planned missional efforts or strategic evangelism; but as they were together and had all things in common, the Lord added to their number daily—no doubt those who were yearning to belong to such a community of love.

A trite personal anecdote may help to illustrate this point. When I received an infilling or baptism of the Holy Spirit and began to speak in tongues for the first time, the first action I remember doing after spending time in joyful, ecstatic worship before God was to turn and embrace the young man next to me. He had also just experienced the same event at the same time. We were both older teens who were not at all prone to hugging our male friends. Yet it was the most natural thing to do in that moment. We had become so full and so aware of God’s love for us that it was just natural to direct it toward other people. This appears to be what Luke’s account describes. The koinonia enjoyed by the apostolic church did not come about through human means, at least that quickly. Their pentecostal encounter with the Spirit’s divine presence in their midst transformed their orientation and priorities toward one another and then out into the world.

The modern pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit at Azusa Street also bears testimony to this suggestion of Spirit-driven koinonia. In Chapter Two we noted how the social dimension of this phenomenon was one of the most radical characteristics of the revival at the time: interracial worship in a segregation era; women participating in leadership; rich and poor worshipping and
encountering the divine presence together; the washing away of the color line, etc. There was a radical koinonia experienced there that could only be attributed to the divine work of the Holy Spirit; a new koinonia that matched the description of Paul to the Ephesians: that in reconstituting the Temple, the dividing wall of hostility had been broken down (Eph 2:14), if even for a short time.

With the divine source of true koinonia established, the ecclesiological question for Pentecostals then concerns their understanding of koinonia with regards to both the locality and visibility of the church. Traditionally, Pentecostals have emphasized the local church, and the invisible church. This is understandable for a persecuted, restorationist revival movement which has experienced the Holy Spirit in its own unique way. The presence of the Spirit is encountered by particular local assemblies, but has also been poured out on all flesh around the globe. The ecclesiological challenge at this point in the movement’s history is to address the question of koinonia with other churches. Specifically, if they hold to the theology of the church offered here, that the church is the People of God’s Presence, can other churches that have experienced the presence of God in quite different ways, or cannot be said to be genuinely experiencing this presence at all at the moment, also be called ‘churches’ and thereby have a basis for true fellowship with Pentecostals? Does this basis for ecclesiality allow for a broader view of koinonia? If so, what is the basis for this more universal fellowship?

It was made explicit in Chapter One that one of the objectives of constructing a distinctly pentecostal ecclesiology is to empower the movement ecumenically. That is, one of the chief benefits of having their own ecclesiology is to be able to contribute a valuable piece to the ecumenical puzzle. Clearly, in having this objective I am already operating out of the presupposition that there is such a thing as a more universal koinonia between Pentecostalism
and other churches. So now how do we reconcile a distinct ecclesiology of divine presence as that which constitutes the church with an ecumenical objective of koinonia? Of course, an identical or similar challenge is faced by all distinct ecclesiologies. The beginning of addressing this challenge here is in reminding ourselves that this ecclesiology (along with potentially any other), as distinct or unique as it attempts to be in its articulation, does not entirely negate the recognition of other ecclesiologies or forms of church as legitimate. All ecclesiologies are only partial in that, however developed they may be, they do not fully encompass all that the church potentially is or even has been historically, as much as they may attempt to do so.

To be more specific, the idea of the church as the People of God’s Presence attempts to define the essence of church from a pentecostal perspective. In doing so, it emphasizes a crucial aspect of what makes the church visible—in this case, the tangible presence of the Spirit as encountered by the ekklesia in certain, ‘visible’ ways such as charismata, Spirit-baptism, playful worship, etc. But Pentecostals have also retained, for the most part, a Protestant conviction that the Word rightly preached is also a vital part of the church’s existence and essence. It has even been stated that, “For Pentecostals, the central element of worship is the preaching of the Word.” As several scholars have noted, they have also (perhaps unconsciously most times) embodied the distinctly Lutheran ideal of the priesthood of all believers. They have also presumed that everyone must make a personal confession of faith to be converted and be part of the Bride of Christ. These three examples alone are in large part why Pentecostalism is often

characterized ecclesiologically as a subset of Protestant evangelicalism on one hand, and as merely another (radical) expression of Free Church or Believer’s church on the other, as noted in Chapter One.

As our survey of contemporary scholars’ writing on pentecostal ecclesiology also confirmed, there is a prevailing concern among pentecostal theologians to give a much larger place to the sacraments within Pentecostalism. The diversity of polities found within the movement also testifies to its broad understanding of the church’s many legitimate expressions of governed life. All of these aspects, and many more besides, allows Pentecostals to, for example, engage in formal dialogue with Roman Catholics and the Reformed Church for mutual benefit and for some greater form of koinonia.

In fact, the report of the third quinquennium of the Catholic/Pentecostal dialogue was of course entitled, “Perspectives on Koinonia.” Through this formal dialogue with a historic church that has often been viewed as apostate by the restorationist movement, Pentecostal views on unity with other churches through the prism of koinonia were explored and challenged in various ways. There, the following was acknowledged at that time:

…the Pentecostal Movement is less than a century old and has had little opportunity to engage in sustained theological reflection on ecclesiology. Although Pentecostals do not possess a developed ecclesiology, they do embrace a variety of ecclesiological polities, and they hold strongly to certain basic ecclesiological convictions (e.g. the importance of the local congregation). These convictions have been brought to bear on the various issues discussed.615
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Aside from identifying the pentecostal emphasis on the local church, the dialogue report also affirmed that koinonia with others in the global church is conceived to be based upon a *common experience of the Spirit’s presence* for the movement. On this point the report states:

As believers continue to be filled with the Spirit (*cf.* Eph 5:18), they should be led to seek greater unity in the faith with other Christians. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of unity (*cf.* Acts 2:1ff.). Just as the Spirit fell on Gentiles and showed the Church to be a universal community, made of both Jews and Gentiles (*cf.* Acts 10), so also today God is bestowing his Spirit everywhere on Christians from different churches, promoting unity around our common Lord. The common experience of the Holy Spirit challenges us to strive for greater visible unity as we reflect on the shape God wants this unity to take.  

The reality reflected by this statement of this dialogue, and of Pentecostalism’s communion with other churches, then, is that the charismatic renewal in the Roman Catholic and other churches, followed by the Third Wave in other evangelical churches, has been the catalyst for the possibility of visible koinonia between Pentecostalism and others in a way not conceived of beforehand. Another statement in the dialogue seems to confirm this fact: “Wherever the Spirit is genuinely present in the Christian community its fruit will also become evident (*cf.* Gal 5:22-23). Genuine charismata mentioned in Scripture (e.g. 1 Cor 12:8-10, 28-30; Rom 12:6-8; etc.) also indicate the presence of the Spirit.” The fact that the manifestation of the Spirit’s charismatic presence is now mutually recognized and experienced by Catholics (and others) has opened up new doors of koinonia between Pentecostals and others who also affirm this presence.
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This is, in fact, theologically and spiritually healthier than the efforts in previous decades of Pentecostal denominations to attain fellowship with Fundamentalist alliances, and is healthier than current trends in North America where numerous local Pentecostal churches are adopting wholesale the methodologies of newer mega-churches (i.e. “seeker-sensitive” and “purpose-driven”). While the common experience of the Spirit’s presence may still seem like a narrow basis for ecumenical communion, it is far more preferable to these other phenomena. A further statement in the report, which could either confuse or broaden the possibilities of koinonia with others, occurs shortly thereafter to reflect the prior pentecostal stress on fundamental doctrines:

Pentecostals tend to view denominations as more or less legitimate manifestations of the one, universal Church. Their legitimacy depends on the degree of their faithfulness to the fundamental doctrines of the Scripture. We both agree that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of unity in diversity (cf. 1 Cor 12:13ff.) and not the Spirit of division.  

While the emphasis on a standard of truth and doctrinal faithfulness to the kerygma is necessary and positive, the manner in which the movement historically acted on this is now generally regarded as regrettable. At a minimum, it is therefore essential that Pentecostals continue to find ways to define koinonia theologically which will incorporate a healthy fusion of these two criteria (experience of the Spirit’s presence, and doctrinal fidelity) in the proper configuration to guide their (hopeful) continued efforts at greater spiritual communion with other church bodies. One such attempt at this could be read into a later statement in the report, found within a section concerning koinonia and water baptism: “Pentecostals do not see the unity between Christians as being based in a common water baptism, mainly because they believe that the New Testament

618 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #34.
does not base it in baptism. Instead, the foundation of unity is a common faith and experience of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior through the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{619} The identification of both faith and experience which is articulated in terms of the synthesis between christology and pneumatology is able to capture the heart of pentecostalism in a way that also allows for common ground with many other church groups, including Catholic and Orthodox.

Another significant, possible means of establishing communion ecclesiologically with other churches for Pentecostalism is through a theology and practice of the \textit{Lord’s Supper}. This was yet another perspective on koinonia treated in the dialogue’s report, and its conclusion was an encouraging surprise at the time:

Both Pentecostals and Roman Catholics recognize that believers have a share in the eternal life which is koinonia with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ \textit{(cf. 1 John 1:2-3)}, and a communion in the Holy Spirit whom God’s Son, Jesus Christ, has given to them \textit{(cf. 1 John 3:24; 2 Cor 13:14)}. This, the deepest meaning of the koinonia, is actualized at various levels. Those who believe and have been baptized into Christ’s death \textit{(cf. Mark 16:16; Rom 6:3-4)} have \textit{koinonia} in his sufferings and become like him in his death and resurrection \textit{(cf. Phil 3:10)}. The next step is the Eucharist or the Lord’s Supper. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation \textit{koinonia} in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation \textit{koinonia} in the body of Christ?" \textit{(1 Cor 10:16)} All believers, furthermore, who have \textit{koinonia} in the eternal life of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and who have koinonia in Christ’s death and resurrection are bound together in a \textit{koinonia} too deep for words. We look forward to the day when we will also have \textit{koinonia} in his body and blood \textit{(1 Cor 10:16)}.\textsuperscript{620}

\textsuperscript{619} "Perspectives on Koinonia," #55.

\textsuperscript{620} "Perspectives on Koinonia," #70.
The eschatological dimension of the eucharist, in particular, allows for an understanding of this practice that connects Pentecostals with Catholics and others around the table of the Lord, even as they will at the marriage supper of the Lamb (Rev 19:9). This does not ignore the significant differences in their respective theologies of the eucharist, but it does establish a hopeful connection upon which to nurture koinonia between the churches.

Yet ultimately it is the operation of the divine presence of God along with the human response to it that constitutes koinonia in the church; and most importantly, this is something that Pentecostals can find partners to affirm, as this dialogue has shown. As one of the more important statements in the reports says, “For Roman Catholics and Pentecostals koinonia in the Church is a dynamic concept, implying a dialogical structure of both God-givenness and human response. Mutuality has to exist on every level of the Church, its source being the continuing presence of the Holy Spirit.” As long as there are churches that believe this, Pentecostals can happily establish communion with them.

On a practical level, however, this brings back questions concerning church structures and offices, which the report goes on to address. The pentecostal perspective communicated in this section of the report reveals or confirms three characteristics of the movement, two of which have already been identified earlier in this present work. First, that ecclesiality for Pentecostals is not based upon a particular kind of governance (as it is for Roman Catholics) since Pentecostalism reflects the same diversity found among the NT churches in this matter (#84). Second, Pentecostals have operated on a certain view of ordination and its function in the church, again based on their reading of the NT:

621 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #73.
Although Pentecostals do not limit celebration of the sacraments and leadership in the Church to the ordained ministers, they do recognize the need for and the value of ordination for the life of the Church. Pentecostals do not consider ordination to be a sacrament. Ordinarily Pentecostals recognize that a charism of teacher/pastor is recognized or can be given to a person at the laying on of hands, but they do not consider that at ordination the power of the Holy Spirit is bestowed to the person being ordained. Instead, ordination is a public acknowledgment of a God-given charism which a person has received prior to the act of ordination.622

It will be noted from the survey in Chapter Three that ordination is not an addressed topic among any of those doing work on a Pentecostal theology of the church; a fact which in itself reveals a great deal about pentecostal ecclesiology. Certainly the above statement is accurate in terms of the common view. From the perspective of this dissertation, the fact that Pentecostals do not limit the presiding of the Lord’s Supper to ordained clergy or consider ordination a sacrament is appropriate, since the essence of Pentecostalism is that which joyfully lives in the era in which the Spirit has been poured out on all flesh, and all distinctions of charismatic contributions—age, gender, socio-economic status, etc. have been eliminated (Acts 2:17-18; cf. Joel 2:28, 29). The concept of the priesthood of all believers inherent within this era of the new Temple where all are ‘living stones’ does not functionally allow for a hierarchy of clergy over laity, or a restriction of ministry to certain offices.

At the same time, it has always been acknowledged in Pentecostalism that certain individuals are divinely called to be pastors or shepherds over God’s flock, just as in the NT there were always formal leaders of some kind, whether they be apostles, elders, overseers or pastors. Thus, ordination, as well described in the above report statement, has been a part of Pentecostal churches since their inception. In fact, the necessity of ordination was a driving

622 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #85.
factor in the formation of Pentecostal denominations. While ultimate leadership was proudly attributed to the direct work of the Spirit in their midst, as noted in Chapter Two there was always a human leader in the assembly, just as there was always a human leader over God’s People throughout the biblical narrative. Ordination for Pentecostals, then, functions as an official, public acknowledgement of an individual’s calling to serve in this capacity of oversight or pastoral leadership of the local assembly. This reflects the mature Pentecostal view towards structure and order discussed above. While the original Pentecostals eschewed such things in favour of the revival tide of the Spirit operating without any constraints, now there is a recognized need, as St. Paul taught, for defined structure to allow the gifts of the Spirit to operate in an orderly, edifying way. The dialogue report, in fact, contains two full paragraphs articulating the Pentecostal perspective on the need for structure and (by association) recognized leadership offices. Also affirmed within these paragraphs are that church order “can legitimately take different forms,” 623 and a statement of agreement that “the offices and structures of the Church, as indeed every aspect of the Church, are in a continual need of renewal insofar as they are institutions of men and women here on earth.” 624 While this statement is far from unexpected, it reflects an attitude that embraces the Reformed conviction of semper reformanda (something you would not anticipate Catholics to adhere to), but in so doing, recognizes that structures are always necessary to facilitate the work of the Spirit in the church. Since structure and leadership forms are bound together, Pentecostals carry a view of ordination as a necessary but subservient function to the operation of the Spirit in the assembly.

623 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #105.
624 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #106.
This leads to the third point, where the report unfortunately confirms a bias among mostly white Pentecostal churches towards certain structures: “On the whole, Pentecostals propose that presbyteral and/or congregational ecclesial models express better the mutuality or reciprocity demanded by koinonia.”

This is a questionable statement given that there are several Pentecostal denominations, including some of the largest, that employ an episcopal or semi-episcopal form of government. To repeat, since many (but not all) of the episcopal Pentecostal churches are black, a statement such as this becomes socially troublesome, even beyond the point that it shows a disparity within Pentecostalism ecclesiologically.

Another potential point of communion identified by the report was, surprisingly, in the comparison of the two views of the mission of the church, or the relationship between the church and the world (through the kingdom). On this point, the report states:

Though Pentecostals do not accept the Roman Catholic understanding of sacraments and the Roman Catholic view of the Church as "a kind of sacrament," in their own way they do affirm that the Church is both a sign and an instrument of salvation. As the new people of God, the Church is called both to reflect the reality of God's eschatological kingdom in history and to announce its coming into the world, insofar as people open their lives to the in-breaking of the Holy Spirit. In Pentecostal understanding the Church as a community is an instrument of salvation in the same sense in which each one of its members is both a sign and instrument of salvation. In their own way, both the community as a whole and the individual members that comprise it, give witness to God's redeeming grace.

---
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That Pentecostals can share with Catholics and others a similar understanding of the church as a sign and instrument of the kingdom for the sake of the world is also a means for the movement of entering into a broader koinonia with other churches.

Yet another significant point of commonality that Pentecostalism can share with other churches is sinfulness, as also recognized in the report in the following:

We agree that because of sin, the Church is always in need of repentance. It is at once holy and in need of purification. The Church is a "holy penitent," and is ever in need of renewal both in its persons and in its structures. Both Catholics and Pentecostals recognize the fact that their respective theologies of koinonia are all too seldom reflected in the empirical reality of the life in their respective communities.  

Pentecostal churches, despite the operating presence of the Spirit as their constituting element, are broken and reflect human fallenness in their corporate lives and structures, as do all other churches. In this crucial manner, all churches have the same problem in common and therefore can see this unfortunate similarity as a point of unity, rather than condescension, superiority or accusation toward the other. The confession of and repentance from corporate sinfulness is something churches can engage in together as an act of koinonia before the one God of redemption through His Son Jesus Christ. Thus, what breaks or mars true koinonia in the Spirit can potentially lead to agreement and a sense of solidarity before the Lord whose glory the churches have all fallen short of. It is this view of the sinfulness of the church, couched in the hope of forgiveness and cleansing by the God of Church, that can be utilized by Pentecostals to attain koinonia with the universal church.

---

627 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #103.
Thus, as “Perspectives on Koinonia” assists in identifying, there are several possible theological grounds by which this pentecostal ecclesiology gives shape to a theology of a visible, universal church in which at least spiritual unity is desirable (Cf. Eph 4:3-6). Again, one of the objectives in articulating a distinctly pentecostal theology of the church is to assist the movement in having an identity that can then be shared in koinonia with other churches. This becomes more difficult when there is a lack of ecclesial self-identity. Of course, the hermeneutical circle for Pentecostals is that their own ecclesial identity has been partially shaped, at least in the academy, by and through dialogue with other church groups, as reports such as “Perspectives on Koinonia” demonstrate.

5.3 Presence and Corporate Ethics

It has also been a phenomenon of historical ecclesiology that churches develop and/or articulate their identity through certain ethical convictions. The Anabaptist or Radical Reformation movement would be a perfect example of this. While this is not precisely the case with Classical Pentecostalism, it does demonstrate that ecclesiology and ethics are meant to be intertwined, as scholars such as John Howard Yoder and Stanley Hauerwas have trumpeted.\(^{628}\)

Thus, in an ecclesiology of the People of God’s Presence, who are collectively the living stones of the Temple of the Holy Spirit, the ethical convictions of the church are directly shaped by the indwelling presence of the Spirit in their midst. This could easily command a whole work

---

\(^{628}\) See, for example, Arne Rasmusson, *The Church as Polis: From Political Theology to Theological Politics as Exemplified by Jürgen Moltmann and Stanley Hauerwas* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995).
in itself, but any Spirit who is named “Holy” is directly concerned with the ethical behaviour of those in whom He resides. An ecclesiology of presence, therefore, must be passionately given over to the corporate ethics of the assembly.

More specifically, since worship is the primary mission of the church, the church’s obedience to the moral directives of her God is of paramount importance, since “to obey is better than sacrifice” (1 Sam 15:22), and the LORD requires justice instead of festivals, offerings and songs (Amos 5:21-24). Additionally, the playful worship of the People of God’s Presence will not only observe the ‘rules’ of this worship, but also the ‘rules’ of conduct in all of life’s relations. Furthermore, as the church also engages in the subsequent mission of serving the grace of the Gospel to the world, it will aim to do so in the power of the Holy Spirit and thus in a manner that upholds the integrity of this Gospel witness (cf. Titus 2:8), and has the “goodwill of all the people” (Acts 2:47). Tan Chow May Ling quotes Steven Land as reminding us on this point: “After all, the church cannot very well ask the world to consider the justice, peace, unity and love of God if it is not itself living out of practising these things with visible zeal.”

Thus, the church as the Spirit-filled People of God’s Presence will be a people vitally concerned with the ethics practiced by the community.

This is where, as Macchia contends, the split between Wesleyan and non-Wesleyan Pentecostals has produced a weaker pneumatology among the latter group. When Spirit baptism is reduced to the means of empowerment for witness and is consequently divorced from sanctification, then the passionate concern of the Spirit for the qualitative dimension of the

629 May Ling, Pentecostal Theology for the Twenty-first Century 52 (quoting Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, 208).
630 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 28-33.
church’s spirituality can be (unintentionally, I believe) eclipsed.\textsuperscript{631} The Spirit does not indwell the Temple merely for empowerment to perform only one task without the intention of transforming life in all its dimensions.\textsuperscript{632} Moreover the church cannot truly be consecrated as a dwelling place for the presence of the Holy Spirit without having her collective conscience deeply affected by this Presence. Her ethical sensitivities will undoubtedly be heightened, so that there will be conviction of sin, and a desire for purification (cf Isa 6) as well as liberation from the “old self” (Rom 6:6-14).

The Acts narrative that Pentecostals cherish so much as the template for ecclesiology actually confirms how the Spirit shapes the ethical life of the church through His charismatic operation in the worshipping community. Examples of this are found in the episode involving Peter’s handling of the deception of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11), the apostolic response to the Hellenist complaint (Acts 6:1-7), the respective visions of Cornelius and Peter along with the Spirit baptism of Gentiles (evidenced by glossolalia) that led to the integration of previously excluded Gentiles into the church (Acts 10), the Antiochan collection for the famine victims in Judea (Acts 11:27-30), and the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15, esp. v. 28). In each of these events, the guidance of the Paraclete is either implicitly or explicitly demonstrated as involved in the church’s ethical decisions. Luke’s narrative, then, makes plain that the Holy Spirit was doing much more than empowering for witness, but was also concerned with both the general and specific ethical actions of the community towards one another or other groups of people, so that they would be obedient to the expressed desires of the God of church.

\textsuperscript{631} Examples of this divorce can be read into Stronstad and Menzies.

\textsuperscript{632} See Jürgen Moltmann, \textit{The Spirit of Life} (1992), and \textit{The Source of Life} (1997), both of Fortress Press.
As the People of God’s Presence, then, the church lives in careful and passionate obedience to both the Word and Spirit at play. They will be shaped by the interplay of the manifest presence of the Spirit with the living Scriptures as the Word of God. The Spirit who inspired the Word will allow its dynamic quality of truth to continue to be embodied as the authority of life and faith for the pentecostal community. Thus, the ethical life of the church is neither wooden nor open-ended, but determined by the real presence of the Spirit indwelling the community as the Paraclete who reminds the church of the teaching of her Head, Jesus Christ. In this way, both the universal commands of scripture and the situational decisions made by the community via its leaders or structure are presided over by the Spirit who is present in the Temple. This is where both the restorationist bent of Pentecostalism toward the narrative of Acts, and the truth-traditioning suggestion of Simon Chan can actually coalesce rather than contradict. The dynamic operation of the Spirit’s presence can continue His actions from the church’s past narrative, and in so doing build on these actions to create an ongoing tradition which guides the church’s ethics. Because the nature of this traditioning is itself living and dynamic as it derives from the personhood of the Spirit, it can guide the church’s ongoing reformation (*semper reformanda*) rather than prevent it, as when a church holds to a tradition without the living presence of the Spirit.

As the Spirit who inspired the Word, the church’s ethics as grounded in the divine presence in the church will be historically reflective of the narrative from which it originates and finds its roots. Additionally, as the eschatological Spirit, the church’s ethics will be teleologically reflective of its future destiny and therefore its identity as the foretaste of the coming glorious fulfillment of the kingdom under the Spirit’s leading. In this vein, Murray Dempster states, “From an ethical perspective, the mission of the church is to witness to the
reality of what life looks like when humans respond to God’s eschatological reign.”

In all cases, the divine presence will guide the church’s ethic to be ontologically reflective of the nature and character of the Triune God of church. Each of these key elements in the church’s ethics will most often be shaped by the playful worship of the People of God’s Presence. For in the play of worship, the people will encounter the character of God as His transforming Presence inhabits them. In the joyful Sabbath rest and reflection of God as the I AM, the community will be shaped after His character and thus be transformed and empowered to model it by His sanctifying grace. It is thus by this divine presence that, for instance, a culture of honesty, humility, selflessness, love, grace, justice and courage can serve as the ethical parameters and purposes for the People of God’s Presence.

5.4 Presence and Scripture

The interplay of Word and Spirit as the formative ethical force in the church therefore leads to the particular relationship between the dynamic, operating presence of the Spirit and the role of the Scriptures among the People of God’s Presence. In a distinctly pentecostal ecclesiology, this interplay is most often demonstrated by the ongoing illumination and revelation of the Spirit’s prophetic word, and through ‘anointed’ or Spirit-empowered preaching of the Word. As Pentecostals have been known to say, the Bible is the authoritative Word of God, but it is not the only word from God. The Spirit continues to speak prophetically today afresh and anew, though never in conflict or contradiction with what has already been spoken in Scripture. The presence of the Spirit of Christ, who is also the Logos, ensures that this Word

---

continues to be spoken out of resurrection and pentecostal power, even as the Spirit continues to prophetically speak the word of God now by way of His charismatic action in and through the church. Thus, Roger Stronstad makes the following bold claim:

   The church is to be a community of prophets. But from the post-apostolic period to the present it has not functioned as a prophetic community which is powerful in works and word. In fact, in too many places the church views itself as a didactic community rather than a prophetic community, where sound doctrine is treasured above charismatic action. Indeed, the preaching and teaching of the word displaces Spirit-filled, Spirit-led and Spirit-empowered ministry. The Spirit of prophecy has been quenched and the gifts of the Spirit have been sanitized and institutionalized.634

Stronstad makes this claim as a NT scholar himself. He is not discarding preaching or sound doctrine, but sees the church as hearing from God in charismatic ways beyond (as in an augmenting of Holy Writ) and yet in dynamic conjunction with the Scriptures.

   Secondly, the living presence of the Spirit indwelling the temple which is constantly under construction means that the Scripture continues to be read as story instead of, say, as a manual. The core narrative quality of scripture is nurtured as it continues to be written by the operating presence of the Spirit in the church. Just as the stories of scripture often come alive through pentecostal preaching, the church as the ongoing story of the immanent presence of the eschatological Spirit who is demonstrating the inbreaking of God’s kingdom upon the world He

has already liberated through His Son is made palpably real through the charismatic experience of the Spirit amongst the playful worship of God’s People.

This then leads to the question of hermeneutics and how the Scriptures operate in the church as Temple. Again, this could command a whole work in itself, for Pentecostalism is known, both for better and for worse, for its inconsistent treatment of scripture for homiletical purposes. While early Pentecostals aligned themselves with Fundamentalism in a strict, literal interpretation of scripture, they simultaneously have also often liberally engaged in typological and allegorical treatments through their animated sermons. While this has been repeatedly criticized by fundamentalists (and others) whom Pentecostals so badly wanted to be in alliance with at one time, it has also been recognized as a ‘strength’ and even as a kind of ‘magical’ quality about the movement’s use of scripture, most often in preaching, but also in testimonies, etc..  

While remaining steadfastly conservative in their belief in the historicity of the Bible, they have also most often lived in the freedom of allowing the Bible to be more than merely historical in its potential for application. I would argue here that this freedom (abuses notwithstanding) has actually come from being a People of God’s Presence. The nearness and operation of the Spirit of the living word has resulted in a sometimes quirky but often effective manner of allowing scripture to have allegorical meaning without losing its historical mooring. For all its warts, one of the mainstays of Pentecostalism has been the power of its ‘anointed’ preaching of the bible text in a way that makes it come alive for the contemporary hearer; not just in the dramatic retelling of the events themselves, but in the typological applications of those events for the church in the here and now. While technical exegetes might sometimes be

---

635 This phrase comes from an unrecorded address by Rev. Dr. Earl Creps at a PAOC seminar on missional ecclesiology in Toronto, November 2010.
stretched beyond the limits of their agreeable acquiescence, and are therefore urgently needed to ensure fidelity, few would deny the power and personal impact of authentic pentecostal preaching to connect an ancient text with a hearer’s personal journey in an often life-transforming way. This, I would suggest, is made possible by the fact that the Spirit who authored the ancient text is now palpably present in the current moment of preaching to speak directly to those in the assembly.

Thus, the manifest presence of the Spirit in the church both confirms the authority of the Scripture as the *regula fidei*, while simultaneously allowing the freedom to let it speak in a sometimes allegorical manner to achieve its purpose of reproving, correcting and training in righteousness (2 Tim 3:16). Just as the indwelling of the Spirit makes present the resurrected Christ who is also the *Logos* of God, so does He also make present the ancient scriptures in a life-transforming manner in the church.

It should also be noted that, while Pentecostals place a high premium on anointed preaching, to the extent that Catholic observer Paul Lee states “The preaching of the Word is of prime importance in the Pentecostal understanding,”¹ they also value the operation of the Word in individual and group study, and understand the Spirit to help illuminate the scriptures in these contexts without the oversight of a professional interpreter. In this sense they are much more evangelical than Catholic. The Spirit as the Paraclete guides both individuals and the church into discerning the Word so that the church might not err in matters of doctrine especially. God’s Word is therefore made alive apart from the pulpit through the dynamic work of the personal

---

presence of the Spirit in and through the church and its individual adherents. As “Perspectives on Koinonia” states,

Pentecostals also believe that God has given special gifts of teaching to the believing community (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:12). But, because Pentecostals hold that Scripture is clear in all essential points, they believe that each Christian can interpret Scripture under the guidance of the Spirit and with the help of the discerning Christian community. Thus, Christians can make responsible judgments for themselves in matters of faith and practice through their use of Scripture.637

Pentecostals are unmistakably people of the Book, but they are also the People of God’s Presence, which means they are marked by their experience of the Spirit’s infilling presence in a direct way. Their experience and their interpretation of scripture therefore have a reciprocal relationship in a manner unique to most church groups. It is this experiential dimension of their relationship to God through the Spirit that provides a distinct ecclesial context for the operation of the Scriptures in the church, as an authority—but not the sole authority. The scriptures operate authoritatively in conjunction with the moving of the Spirit in charismatic fashion to speak God’s word to the church. In this regard they resemble Paul’s instructions to the Corinthians to have not only hymns and scripture, but a revelation (prophecy) or tongues and interpretation (1 Cor 14:26). The charismatic gifts of prophecy, wisdom or tongues and interpretation are expected, welcomed and sought together with the reading and expounding of scripture to hear and encounter God’s Word. Thus, the Scriptures are understood to operate within the charismatic structure of the church that is constituted by the indwelling presence of the Spirit, even as they also guide this structure. Frank Macchia explains:

637 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #26.
Because of the living breath of God, the gospel of the Scriptures bursts forth with signs of life in the charismatic structure of the church. Within the charismatic structure of the church, the Spirit functions through the Scriptures as a living book of both freedom and order to guide our gracious interactions with one another and our mission in the world. In fact, the Scriptures themselves are a universally relevant and binding gift of the Spirit to the church in order to guide the particular and diverse charismatic structure of the church in its ongoing life, confession, and mission.  

It is because of this interplay between experience of the Spirit and Scripture that it has astutely been suggested that at this point in the movement’s history, a maturing pentecostalism could benefit from the method of Wesley’s quadrilateral: Scripture, experience, reason, and tradition. I would concur that this has great potential within a pentecostal ecclesiology, since this quadrilateral is in a unique position among methodologies to articulate the equally unique relationship pentecostals already have between scripture and experience, and then become useful in integrating their growing tradition and increased use of reason into this relationship as well.

5.5 Presence and Sacraments

Article VII of the Augsburg Confession states that the church “is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel [or Word] is rightly taught and the Sacraments are rightly administered.” I have briefly touched on the Word, and so now will address the Sacraments

638 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 244-245.

639 For example, see Winfield Bevins, “A Pentecostal Appropriation of the Wesleyan Quadrilateral,” paper delivered at the 34th annual meeting of SPS, Virginia Beach, March 2005.

more specifically (though they have already cropped up at various points above). Pentecostals, of course, have most often passionately eschewed any sacramentalism in the past, preferring instead to call water baptism and the Lord’s Supper ‘ordinances,’ or rites “that the Lord has commanded his Church to perform.”641 Two South African Pentecostals have gone so far as to say, “…the notion of sacramentality is foreign to Pentecost.”642

However, as seen in Chapter Three, most pentecostal scholars today are espousing a more sacramental theology, with several freely referring to the baptism and eucharist as sacraments in the church. There is, in fact, a remarkably consistent witness toward the need for a pentecostal ecclesiology to be sacramental in nature. Though this is perceived and nuanced differently among our authors, they all desire to incorporate a Spirit-filled understanding of water baptism and the Lord’s Supper as part of the esse of the church. No doubt, this witness is a product of increased dialogue with the historic churches and a desire on the part of most of these scholars to see the movement reach its ecumenical potential. For a pentecostal ecclesiology to be effectively ecumenical, i.e. taking the historic tradition seriously, the sacraments must take on a larger, more foundational role. There is also the more helpful foundational suggestion by Amos Yong that pentecostal ecclesiology should see the church itself as a sacrament:

A pneumatological ecclesiology that recognizes the church as constituted by the pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit will grant that the church itself is sacramental insofar as it consists of structures, institutions, practices, congregations, and individuals, all inspired by the Spirit of God for the purposes of establishing the kingdom of God. Further, the sacraments are mediators of grace insofar as they provide ecclesial venues for the Spirit of God to accomplish the purposes of God among the people of God…pentecostal “sacramentalism” is itself empirically established,

641 “Perspectives on Koinonia,” #41.
642 Clark & Lederle, “What is Distinctive About Pentecostal Theology?”, 47.
founded on the reality of the Spirit’s manifestation in the material and embodied experiences – for example, glossolalia, the dance, the shout, and healings – of the gathered community of faith. 643

Thus, given the momentum toward this more sacramental understanding of the church and even pentecostal practices in the church, the ongoing construction of pentecostal ecclesiology is likely to see a continued trend towards a much higher place for the ‘sacraments’ of baptism and the eucharist. That is something this constructive proposal also wishes to do here.

First, I will look at Baptism. In a landmark paper delivered at the 1988 meeting of the Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue, Pentecostal participants Jerry Sandidge and Cecil Robeck attempted to envision baptism within an ecclesiology of koinonia. In so doing, they noted early on that “Baptism has an ambiguous role among Pentecostals.”644 To be more specific, they spelled out the common stands on baptismal issues in the movement but stressed that these positions are not at all unanimous:

Most North American Pentecostals argue for and seek to justify biblically the case for baptism (a) as ordinance rather than sacrament, (b) to be applied to believers rather than infants, (c) to be accomplished by immersion, (d) to be rightly celebrated through a single immersion rather than multiple (three) immersions, and (e) to involve the invocation of the trinitarian formula of Mt.28:19 rather than the invocation of the name of Jesus Christ as was done in some early Christian baptisms. Most North American Pentecostals – and probably most Pentecostals aligned with the Pentecostal World Conference – would argue that this is the Pentecostal

643 Yong, Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh, 156.

position. This position, however, is not inclusive of others taken by many Pentecostals around the world when they address the subject of baptism.\(^\text{645}\)

Within the Canadian context in which I was raised and served as a minister, I eventually came to see baptism, which was an ordinance performed by believers through single immersion using the trinitarian formula (just as described above), as an equivalent to Confirmation in historic churches, or to the rite of Bar Mitzvah in Judaism, in that it is an event which publicly symbolizes the believer taking on personal responsibility for the faith they confess, and publicly testifying to their lifelong commitment to this faith, a faith which was claimed for them when they were “dedicated” as infants by their parents in front of the whole church (in a parallel manner to paedobaptism or circumcision). It is therefore not in itself a means of grace for Pentecostals,\(^\text{646}\) though it remained an outward sign of an inward grace already willfully received by the candidate at a previous point. Yet, it was also not a rite of passage into the community,\(^\text{647}\) in that the candidate may or may not have already taken formal membership in the local church. There was simply no connection between baptism and membership, or theologically between baptism and koinonia. It was simply an act of obedience to a biblical command, and a demonstration—albeit a significant one—of one’s testimony of having embraced the new life of salvation offered in the Gospel (cf. Romans 6). This, along with the
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\(^{645}\) Robeck & Sandidge, “KOINONIA and Baptism,” 509 (italics theirs).

\(^{646}\) This is somewhat disputed by Steven Land, who writes of the early Pentecostals, “Baptism was not a converting sacrament of initiation, but it was a means of grace in that it represented walking in the light, public witness, remembrance and following Christ in public solidarity with the church.” Pentecostal Spirituality, 115.

\(^{647}\) Here my own experience of Canadian Pentecostalism differs radically from what is stated by Myer Pearlman: “Water baptism is the rite of entrance into the Christian church,” Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible, 353.
fact that there is striking diversity among Pentecostals globally on each of the above five positions, are what causes the ambiguity identified by Robeck and Sandidge.

Yet another source of an accompanying “ambivalence” to this ambiguity is over the apparent inconsistency of Pentecostal understanding of any distinction between ordinance and sacrament. Robeck and Sandidge demonstrate through several examples, including one from the official literature of the PAOC in years past, as well as Duffield and Van Cleave’s *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology*, that Pentecostal churches often describe their stance on water baptism in sacramental terms that appear most similar to Calvin and Augustine, most likely without at all realizing it.\(^{648}\) More recently, as mentioned, there have been Pentecostal scholars who are treating water baptism more as a sacrament. One example is a British Elim writer who “suggests the act of water baptism may be understood as a ‘sacramental encounter such that the moment of baptism becomes a moment of encounter with the Divine.’”\(^{649}\) It would appear from this statement that God’s Presence is therefore mediated through the baptismal event. This notion is certainly one with affinity to the proposed ecclesiology here, and may help to sanction the idea of ‘sacrament’ where ‘ordinance’ is still much-preferred.

The theological result of this inconsistency between ordinance and sacrament is described by Robeck and Sandidge in the following manner: “Ambivalence on the sacramental nature of baptism by Pentecostals, though, brings with it an ambivalence over its importance in both individual and community terms.”\(^{650}\) This ambivalence is heightened by the lack of academic

\(^{648}\) Robeck and Sandidge, “*KOINONIA* and Baptism,” 520-524.

\(^{649}\) Cited by Keith Warrington, *Pentecostal Theology*, (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press, 1998), 163, who only identifies the writer by the last name of Dyer.

\(^{650}\) Robeck and Sandidge, “*KOINONIA* and Baptism,” 522.
writing on the subject by Pentecostals, at least until fairly recently.\(^\text{651}\) Thus, it is in this context that Robeck and Sandidge attempt to biblically connect baptism to koinonia for Pentecostals. The starting point for them is the unanimous understanding within the movement that baptism “speaks to the issue of a vertical relationship between the recipient and God – the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It symbolizes the \textit{koinonia} between God and the person who is baptized.”\(^\text{652}\)

They then state:

> What most Pentecostals fail to take as seriously as the witness to an individual’s identification with Christ in this act is the testimony it contains to identification with the Christian \textit{koinonia}, to corporate identification, to the relationship between the person being baptized and all others who have been baptized and who share in their identification with Christ.\(^\text{653}\)

There is therefore “a failure to understand fully the corporate nature of this unique event.”\(^\text{654}\) It is this failure, and their accompanying underdeveloped ecclesiology that has contributed largely to an underdeveloped theology of baptism among Pentecostals.

What is most relevant for this present proposal is that Robeck and Sandidge aim to conceive water baptism in relation to the presence of Christ in the church. Because Pentecostals have (naturally, for them) understood this presence to be manifest most clearly in the charismatic operation of the Spirit and most acutely in Spirit-baptism, they have failed to recognize it in

\[^{651}\text{See Robeck and Sandidge, “\textit{KOINONIA} and Baptism,” 524.}\]
\[^{652}\text{Robeck and Sandidge, “\textit{KOINONIA} and Baptism,” 525.}\]
\[^{653}\text{Robeck and Sandidge, “\textit{KOINONIA} and Baptism,” 525-526.}\]
\[^{654}\text{Robeck and Sandidge, “\textit{KOINONIA} and Baptism,” 526.}\]
water baptism. In short, the Pentecostal emphasis on Spirit-baptism has theologically eclipsed water baptism because the divine presence is empirically evident in one (as in glossolalia) but not the other. But Robeck and Sandidge propose that this divine presence can also be understood to operate in a meaningful way here as well, as a form of *anamnesis* (“remembrance”) within the context of *koinonia*:

…if baptism points to the essential koinonia that exists between the person being baptized with Jesus Christ, the head of the Body of Christ in whose death and resurrection the candidate is identified, then the act of baptism may be seen in terms of *anamnesis*; the Risen Lord is present through the Holy Spirit who comes to indwell the new believer. Baptism then becomes sacramental by bringing reality to the presence of the one who died and was resurrected, the one who underwent the judgment of God on our behalf, the one who is risen and, through the Spirit, is now present in the church. Baptism within the context of *koinonia* allows the church to act out and thereby bear witness to God’s judgment, to Christ’s death and resurrection, and to newness of life in the Holy Spirit. It points us to the living Sovereign who is present and who makes a difference in our lives.\(^{655}\)

Further, the identification of dying to self and rising again with Christ to new life is itself a corporate identification, in that salvation, while being personally applied, also means incorporation into the Body of Christ, or the People of God’s Presence. Even Pentecostals understand that water baptism is an ecclesial event, performed with and by the assembly as witnesses and supporters. They agree that the vertical koinonia with God that is symbolized in baptism is meant to be lived out in the context of horizontal koinonia with God’s People. Because baptism takes place before and with the People of God’s Presence, the indwelling Spirit is also present in a significant manner here as well.

\(^{655}\) Robeck and Sandidge, “*KOINONIA* and Baptism,” 527.
The significance of baptism as an expression of koinonia in which the Spirit is present among God’s people as they witness and support one’s identification with Christ through this act then leads to the question of whether this act can then be efficacious for infants. Robeck and Sandidge attempt to argue that it can, on the basis of the efficacy of the faith the congregation in whom the candidate is in potential koinonia with, on a parallel basis with the efficacy of the faith of the community for the healing of one who is sick. Given the fundamental Pentecostal belief in divine healing, this presents an interesting analogy. Yet, I return to the parallel practice common within Pentecostalism of infant dedication. While dedication is not a means of grace and is certainly not the equivalent of Spirit-baptism (as infant baptism is in Roman Catholic theology), and therefore not an event that declares saving faith upon the infant at that moment, it is a significant and comparable act of faith on the part of the family and church to dedicate the child to God’s providential care, thereby trusting that the individual will indeed come to saving faith by their own volition at an early age.

The question then becomes whether or not infant baptism could be similarly ‘efficacious’ to dedication, and could be practiced as a parallel act of faith on the part of the family and church. While I would suggest this as a possibility, I would also remain in the acute awareness that the distinctions over ‘means of grace’ and Spirit-baptism, along with the trenchant and, in my opinion, orthodox convictions concerning believer’s baptism and immersion common within the movement are enough to prevent this from materializing. Instead, the parallels between the two, and the ecumenical sensitivity towards the practices of the historic churches, both Catholic and Reformed, should be enough for Pentecostals to accept as baptized those who received it as infants, and not insist on rebaptism for them, as some churches unfortunately do. This is also a
point stressed by Robeck and Sandidge.\textsuperscript{656} I agree with them when they state, “We believe that the parallels that exist between the Pentecostal practice of infant dedication and the Roman Catholic practice of infant baptism hold great promise for mutual understanding and appreciation.”\textsuperscript{657} Infant dedication is not a Pentecostal distinctive, of course, but a practice inherited from other Protestant bodies.

Another perspective on water baptism is offered by Frank Macchia, who primarily seeks to establish a connection between it and Spirit baptism. He insists that a “special relationship exists” between the two in that the experience of Spirit baptism “cannot be defined apart” from conversion and baptism as, taken together, they all stem from embracing the God of the Gospel which is then effected in our lives through the same Spirit in each of these events. This is supported by the descent of the Spirit on Jesus at his own water baptism.\textsuperscript{658} Macchia also draws on charismatic scholars who ascribe sacramentality to Spirit baptism, and therefore connect it to water baptism in this way.\textsuperscript{659}

Amos Yong also is helpful in that, beyond connecting water baptism to Spirit baptism, he suggests Pentecostals can find affinity with the brief mention of the need for the invocation of the Holy Spirit as part of baptismal practice found in the ecumenical document, \textit{Baptism},

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textsuperscript{656} Robeck and Sandidge, \textit{KOINONIA and Baptism},” 531.  \\
\textsuperscript{657} Robeck and Sandidge, \textit{KOINONIA and Baptism},” 531.  \\
\textsuperscript{658} Macchia, \textit{Baptized in the Spirit}, 248-249.  \\
\textsuperscript{659} Macchia, \textit{Baptized in the Spirit}, 70-75.  \\
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Regarding the theological significance of this statement from a pentecostal perspective, he writes “This invitation identifies the ritual as explicitly Christian and locates its sacramentality not in the materiality of consecrated water but in the presence and activity of the Spirit of the Living God.” Here is a way for the People of God’s Presence to appropriate the practice of water baptism into the overarching, constituting framework of the Spirit’s operation in the church. Curiously, not all Pentecostal churches include this invocation (I do not recall it ever occurring, though I have heard it has been done), but a greater pneumatological and ecclesiological view of baptism would allow it be organic to their ethos.

There is, then, no pressing need for Pentecostals to change their own practice of baptism (as diverse as this may be globally), other than their treatment of those already baptized by other churches. What is urgently needed, however, is a deeper ecclesiological understanding of baptism as it relates to koinonia, and, consequently, as an event in which the Spirit is significantly present in the Temple which is the People of God’s Presence. The suggestion of conceiving this event within the scope of anamnesis is a plausible one, as is seeking to connect the presence of the Spirit in water baptism with His own pentecostal baptism, though neither one is a precondition for the other. This entails an openness (which is already occurring at least in the academy) to both loosen and clarify the distinction between ordinance and sacrament, or lack thereof. If pentecostal ecclesiology is able to produce a deeper communal view of water
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661 Yong, Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh, 158.
662 J. Rodman Williams, “Baptism in the Holy Spirit,” in NIDPCM, 360-361. Curiously, there is no dedicated article on water baptism in the NIDPCM.
baptism, then this will also bear ecumenical fruit as this baptism by one Spirit into one body will lead towards a unifying understanding of the global church (1 Cor 12:13).

The Lord’s Supper or the eucharist is thought to be a much larger issue for pentecostal ecclesiology, and has garnered more attention recently among scholars in the movement in comparison to the woefully underdeveloped area of water baptism. Keith Warrington describes well the historical position of the movement:

Pentecostal beliefs and practice concerning the Lord’s Supper may be traced to the Reformation theology and practice of Zwingli and Calvin via Congregationalism and Brethren traditions. Fundamentally, Pentecostals adhere to that which they perceive to be a Zwinglian rather than a Lutheran form of the Eucharist. In reality, Zwingli anticipated more than retrospection and remembrance but also and because of the former acts, a realization of the presence of the Lord. However, for most Pentecostals, it is fundamentally a celebration of a past event though in recognition that it is destined to redundancy in heaven (1 Cor. 11:26).

It could therefore be said that contemporary efforts of the part of Pentecostal scholars to bring a more sacramental understanding of the Supper to pentecostal theology are actually filling out a more developed Zwinglian understanding. More recently, we have already seen how Simon Chan, for instance, has presented the eucharist as the means of catholicity within a pentecostal ecclesiology. The eucharist is also an event which has been more intrinsically connected to the divine presence in the church, and as such it is therefore an event that Pentecostals must explore more closely in the construction of their ecclesiology. Here is where

663 Cf. Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 252.
664 Warrington, Pentecostal Theology, 165.
665 Chan, Pentecostal Theology, p. 102f: “A Dynamic Catholic Community” (see 18f above).
Macchia is again helpful, in that he connects the “mode of presence” that comes from the *epiclesis* (invocation of the Holy Spirit) of the eucharist with other modes of presence, such as the charismatic presence of the Spirit, since it is the same Spirit present in both cases, in either mode. Drawing upon the work of Tom Driver as well as various dialogue reports, he states that the “eucharistic mode of God’s presence” is therefore “continuous” as well as “mutually interactive” with the other modes of God’s presence in the church.\(^{666}\) This is a crucial point of connection for perceiving the value of the eucharist as a sacrament within a pentecostal ecclesiology. The Church as the People of God’s Presence can partake of the Lord’s Supper not merely as an act of obedience to a command, or even as an act of remembrance (anamnesis)—as important as that is—but as an act of partaking of the sacraments of wine (or juice in many cases) and bread which are made effective by the Spirit’s presence upon them (*epiclesis*). For, as Pinnock states, “The sacraments do not work automatically but derive their effectiveness from the presence of the Spirit in relation to faith.”\(^{667}\) The presence in this case is sacramental rather than charismatic, but it is still the presence of the same divine Person and therefore ‘continuous’ and ‘mutually interactive,’ as Macchia points out. Once this is acknowledged, Pentecostals as the People of God’s Presence can then be open to “the concrete manifestations of the Spirit

\(^{666}\) Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 255.

\(^{667}\) Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 127. Pinnock makes a distinction between sacramental presence and charismatic presence, but seeks to “recover the two-dimensionality of charism and sacrament original to Christianity,” 120, in solidarity with others such as Kilian McDonnell and George Montague, and Robert Webber. This model of confluence is therefore clearly a form of restorationism, which makes it a potential template for Pentecostals, who have traditionally been unaware of the early church’s sacramentalism. The connection between the Spirit’s presence in both modes is also established by Pinnock in that both have equally suffered at the hands of modernity, 128.
found in the historic liturgies.”

It is this approach to the eucharist for Macchia that allows him to also regard the practice of glossolalia in the church as sacramental.

Kärkkäinen echoes something very similar with regard to the Spirit’s experienced presence in the Supper. Noting that there has been a general shift of attention “from a mechanistic to a more personalistic-dynamic view of the Lord’s presence in the meal devoted to his memory,” he also points to the epiclesis as vital for its “pneumatological potential.”

He explains that it is the coming of the Spirit in response to the epiclesis that enlivens the anamnesis of the Lord’s Supper in a manner that empowers them for mission:

The Spirit makes the remembering a dynamic process that overcomes the distinction between the past, present and future by anticipating the final consummation of the Kingdom of the Slain Lamb. The Church acknowledges its dependence on the Lord by continuous prayer for the coming of the Spirit. The epiclesis entails the whole celebration, not just the moment of “consecration”. Through an earnest prayer-cry the celebrants are empowered by the Spirit of him who raised the crucified Son from the dead. The people of God rise from the Table to spread the good news of reconciliation to the ends of the earth.

This description of the Supper has great potential for “pentecostalizing” the event by framing it as a dynamic process that melds past with future and understands the Spirit’s presence at the meal to be one that empowers for the mission of bringing the world into God’s salvific presence.
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668 Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 129.
670 Kärkkäinen, *Toward a Pneumatological Theology*, 145.
671 Kärkkäinen, *Toward a Pneumatological Theology*, 145.
It also helps in this respect that it reflects the shift he identifies from the debates about the nature of “Christ’s presence in the elements to a more personalistic view of the Supper where the focus is on the nature of Christ’s presence among his people gathered around the table.”  The latter view of this crucial distinction is obviously much more organic to an ecclesiology of the People of God’s Presence. Warrington affirms such when he states from a pentecostal perspective, “Any benefit gained is due to the person of Christ not the elements themselves.” By focusing on how the Spirit mediates Christ’s presence through the epiclesis rather than on the nature of the substance of His presence in the elements themselves, Pentecostals find a venue into opening themselves to the sacramental presence of Christ by way of the Spirit whose presence they understand as constituting the church.

Kärkkäinen also astutely describes in a Johannine way how the Spirit’s presence at the Supper makes the anamnesis dynamic in nature, for “The Holy Spirit comes at the cost of Christ’s departure.” At the Last Supper, Christ told His disciples that He must go away so that the Paraclete will come (John 16:7). The act of remembering Christ’s death, resurrection and ascension is made all the more effective by the real presence of the Spirit indwelling the People of God’s Presence gathered around the Table now.

In addressing the epiclesis prayer specifically, Kärkkäinen also notes the biblical observation of Zizioulas that “in primitive Pauline Churches charismatic manifestations took

672 Kärkkäinen, Toward a Pneumatological Theology, 136.
673 Warrington, Pentecostal Theology, 168.
674 Kärkkäinen, Toward a Pneumatological Theology, 138.
place during the eucharistic gatherings (cf. 1 Cor. 11-14).” This supports the continuity and mutual interaction between the sacramental and charismatic modes of the Spirit’s presence identified by Macchia and Pinnock. Again, he also observes that the epiclesis invocation of the Spirit’s presence is not so much directed toward the elements “as upon the people of God gathered around the Table.” The distinction between the two modes is characterized by Kärkkäinen as the Spirit’s “actual” presence in response to the epiclesis, in distinction from His “real presence” which is active in the gathering before the epiclesis. It is the Spirit’s response that makes the Eucharist both a transformative and an empowering event in the lives of the participants. Additionally, it is this eucharistic experience of the Spirit’s presence that can fuel the task of unity between Pentecostals and other churches, since the Table is an eschatological sign of the unity of the Spirit.

Another venue for unity related to the eucharist is the connection between the Lord’s Supper and divine healing. Pentecostals have long implicitly connected the two, as it is a common practice in the Movement to have prayers for healing directly after partaking in the Supper. In the knowledge that “by his bruises we are healed” (Isa 53:5), Pentecostals have understood physical healing to be provided for in the atonement as part of our salvation. Thus, as part of the anamnesis of the bruised body of Christ broken for our salvation and for our healing, healing prayer is often practiced with the Lord’s Supper. The connection between

675 Kärkkäinen, Toward a Pneumatological Theology, 139, quoting Zizioulas, Being as Communion, 193.
676 Kärkkäinen, Toward a Pneumatological Theology, 139.
677 Kärkkäinen, Toward a Pneumatological Theology, 139. I must confess I find this unpacked manner of distinction less than completely helpful. Land claims that for the early Pentecostals celebrating the Lord’s Supper, “The real presence of God was never an issue,” Pentecostal Spirituality, 115. Warrington states Pentecostals celebrate the ‘realized presence’ of Christ through the Spirit instead of the real presence in the emblems, Pentecostal Theology, 168. This makes more sense to me.
healing and the Eucharist is evidence of an implied view of the Eucharist as a sign of the inbreaking of the kingdom of God. Murray Dempster confirms this when he states, “Through the eucharistic celebration, the Holy Spirit bears witness to the unseen Host of the table and invites symbolic participation in his kingdom ministry-his table fellowship that portrayed God’s mercy for sinners and his healing of the sick, the weak and the infirm.”678 This is a crucial point of eucharistic practice that Pentecostals can then share with other churches which believe likewise, according to Kärkkäinen.679

Pentecostals as the People of God’s Presence can therefore develop a theology of the eucharist as an event in which the sacramental presence of the Holy Spirit invoked by the epiclesis brings the presence of Christ the Savior, Healer, Baptist, and Coming King to those participating at the table in a transforming, empowering, unifying and healing manner that is in continuity with the charismatic structure and character of the church, which is the Temple of the Holy Spirit. Since the anamnesis can be seen as more than just a remembrance, but also as an eschatological act as well (“until he comes,” 1 Cor 11:26), looking forward to the marriage supper of the Lamb, the practice of the eucharist as performed in the sacramental presence of the eschatological Spirit can also allow the People of God’s Presence to recover the eschatological fervour they once heralded. When the sacramental presence of the eschatological Spirit at the eucharist is recognized as that which is in continuity with His other modes of presence in a mutually interactive way, it makes theological sense of how the early Pentecostals


679 Kärkkäinen, Toward a Pneumatological Theology, 144. He cites as an example the Final Report of the Dialogue between the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and Some Classical Pentecostals 1977-1982, #40.
had expectations not only of healing, but of other works taking place at communion services. Land describes this in the following manner:

Persons could be converted, healed, sanctified and filled with the Spirit in conjunction with the Lord’s Supper because it was a part of the ongoing missionary worship and witness of the body. But it was definitely not ‘the mass’ or the *sine qua non* of Christian existence. The Lord’s Supper was important because Jesus was present keeping the Passover and promising the parousia in the Holy Spirit.680

Wolfgang Vondey has also championed a heightened sacramental understanding of the Lord’s Supper. He has primarily done so, however, through his more generic work on an ecclesiology as the People of Bread, as discussed in Chapter Three. In also emphasizing the work of the Spirit to bring Christ’ presence as “host” of the meal, Vondey thereby also stresses that, “…a continuing Pentecost, or outpouring of the Holy Spirit, is integral to the effect of the Eucharistic meal on the Christian community and in the life of the individual.”681 Pentecost and the eucharist are not only connected by the presence of the same Person of the Spirit (albeit in different ‘modes’), but then consequently by the need for their continual mutual interaction in the church until the Parousia. There is, in this sense, no eucharist without Pentecost (the breaking of bread in Acts 2:46 occurs after the outpouring of the Spirit in the Upper Room). The Spirit received in the elements of the Lord’s Supper is also meant to be experienced in His pentecostal outpouring as well. The eucharist comes to its fullest expression in conjunction with the pentecostal infilling of the Spirit. In doing so, the Lord’s Supper is mean to continue the kind of inclusive, egalitarian fellowship that was created at Pentecost (Acts 2: 17, 18). This is precisely


681 Vondey, *People of Bread*, 192.
what Paul chided the Corinthians for in their failure to do this (1 Cor 11:17-34), although he points not to Pentecost but to the Last Supper. That is because, as Dempster observes, “Similarly, the eucharistic celebration with its “open” table fellowship mimes the eschatological banquet that Jesus enjoyed with the mixed membership of his messianic community, including sinners and tax-collectors.”\(^682\)

Finally, the last word about Presence and eucharist must be its place in the playful worship of the People of God’s Presence. Suurmond likens it, along with baptism, as the two ‘rules’ to keep the “game” of worship fair, safe and free from chaos. They are something like the two rails which allows the train the freedom to move as it should. Vondey has echoed a similar thought, though for him even the “structure of play” is itself a “free response to an encounter with God.”\(^683\) The Lord’s Supper is fundamentally a celebration of the new life in the Spirit purchased for us through the victorious substitutionary atoning death of the Son of God. While it is often somber and reflective, and the most formal part of Pentecostal worship, it remains a celebratory reminder of what God has done for us through Jesus Christ by His boundless love. The eucharist is a practice which allows us to encounter the sacramental or ‘realized’ presence of Christ by the invoked Spirit, while at the same time reminding those who feed on the elements of how this encounter became possible in the grand salvific narrative of God. It is a communal act that pays tribute to the means of our liberation into the Spirit-filled life. The retrospective (1 Cor 11:24,25), introspective (v.28), collective (v 33), transformative and anticipative (v. 26) aspects of the meal all accomplish the purpose of what it means to be the People of God’s Presence.

\(^682\) Dempster, “Evangelism and Social Concern,” 29.

\(^683\) Vondey, Beyond Pentecostalism, 128-129.
5.6 Presence and Social Concern

Here I am briefly attempting to affirm a theology of divine presence in the church as that which empowers the church towards acts of service and justice that go beyond mere proselytism and/or evangelism. While it is true that Pastor Seymour’s oft-given benedictory charge at the Apostolic Faith Mission was “Try to get people saved!”⁶⁸⁴, authentic Spirit-filled, Spirit-driven churches are also agents of God against the repressive structures of the world, as the social dynamics of the Azusa Revival Seymour led demonstrated. I have touched on this earlier in the chapter, but want to identify it here directly with the manifest presence of the Spirit in the church.

Murray Dempster has been the primary Pentecostal scholar to emphasize the connection between social concern and Pentecost. This is meant to be reflected in both the koinoniac and the diakonic ministry of the church (see section on Peter Althouse in Chapter Three). While Pentecostal churches globally have at times been intensely involved in social action in response to their conditions, pentecostal ecclesiology and anthropology have traditionally been more one-dimensional in the mission to “try to get souls saved.” Dempster has tried to articulate a biblical theology of church mission as reflecting kingdom anthropology, which is: “…all persons are entitled to respect, are to be treated with dignity, and are deserving of justice because they share the status of God’s image-bearers. Such actions and social practices that embody love, justice

and shalom constitute the normative moral structure in a social ethic reflective of God’s kingly rule.⁶⁸⁵

In terms of social concern being manifested in the koinoniac ministry of the church, Dempster conveys this in terms of the church’s identity in relation to the kingdom of God:

Given the essential eschatological and ethical character of church mission from the Pentecostal/kingdom perspective, the social witness born by the church in its fellowship is to demonstrate that the new social order of God’s reign is constituted by the basic moral virtues, obligations, and values of love, peace, justice, generosity, and respect for persons as God’s image-bearers.⁶⁸⁶

It is also supremely necessary for the church to bear this social witness for the sake of the credibility of the Gospel it proclaims, or what Dempster calls the kerygmatic ministry of the church. He draws upon Newbigin’s term that this responsibility to demonstrate this new social order is a “hermeneutic of the message” of God’s reign.⁶⁸⁷ Of fundamental importance here is the proposition that only the Holy Spirit can create and sustain such a community. He does so through the generous outpouring of His pentecostal Presence into the life of the People of God’s Presence, and by constituting the charismatic structure of the church whereby such a community can be continually built up.

As for the diakonic ministry of the church, the church as the People of God’s Presence are called to manifest the kingdom to the world through “moral deeds” and (I would add) Spirit-

inspired prophetic declaration of God’s passionate desire for social justice through the kingdom. The Spirit, as Pentecostals fundamentally believe, empowers the church for service (diakonia) in both of these areas. The church witnesses to the kingdom in deed and word as it ministers God’s care to the widow, orphan, prisoner, outcast, and sick. Yet she also does so through efforts to “change the system” where it has fallen short of kingdom values. Dempster states, “The church as a social institution needs to desacralize the state and its system of laws as the ultimate source of human rights by reminding political authorities of their God-given obligation to guarantee justice for all peoples.”

The mission of the church in bringing the liberation of the Gospel to the world is to therefore engage in ministry that will, first, treat people in this described manner, and secondly, influence and compel the political and social structures in which the church finds itself to do the same. In these ways does the temple of the Spirit witness to the presence of the Spirit who causes the inbreaking of the kingdom upon the earth. Dempster concludes:

By caring for the welfare of persons who need the basics of life, by redressing unjust social conditions, by desacralizing political power of human governments, by critiquing institutions that demean human dignity, and by establishing institutions of social transformation within the system, the church aims to be an agent manifesting God’s eschatological intention to transform the world.

A Full Gospel christology should also produce a Full Gospel anthropology which then ecclesiologically compels the church’s mission to be towards the whole person, and towards

social justice for all persons, both inside and outside the church. Anything less is a reductionist understanding of what the eschatological Spirit drives the People of God’s Presence to do.

5.7 Presence and Identity

An ecclesiology of the People of God’s Presence as having a mission of social justice that is integral to the Full Gospel they preach then leads to the connected area of personal identity within the Temple of the Holy Spirit. In Chapter Two we identified one aspect of the implicit ecclesiology of early Pentecostalism as radical social egalitarianism within the new People of God’s Presence, as a restoration of the fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy and reversal of Babel which Pentecost originally signified. Fundamental to the significance of Pentecost was a re-ordering of the social and religious sphere, and the inauguration of a new era of the Kingdom where the People of God’s Presence were no longer stratified into kings, priest, prophets and the rest, and where Jew and Gentile had the dividing wall of hostility removed. The change brought by the pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit experienced by the 120 in a multi-sensory way was immediately identified by Peter, speaking in the empowering inspiration of the Spirit, as the fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy that the eschatological Spirit was now being poured out upon all flesh.

Thus, the community that comprises the People of God’s Presence are not only marked by a new empowerment for witness, but by a radically new social order; a “new social reality.”690 This, then, must be a fundamental characteristic of authentic pentecostal ecclesiology. Paul Lee notes, “The original Pentecostal ethos transcends race, class, and

690 Pinnock, “Church,” 5.
denomination, as in the Pentecost-event itself, uniting all in the experience of the freedom of the Spirit.691 The restoration of the experience of the apostolic power of the Holy Spirit sought by early Pentecostals is not merely about a new ability to preach the Gospel and perform miracles and speak in tongues. One of the greatest miracles which both the biblical and modern Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit brought about was a community where old and young, sons and daughters, slave and free, Jews and Gentiles could all equally participate in the new charismatic structure of the Temple of the Spirit. It is this radical egalitarianism that constitutes the new identity of a community which is itself constituted by the pentecostal presence of the eschatological Spirit. Strangely, this is not a point of emphasis among those we surveyed in the last chapter, but any faithful ‘restoration’ of the apostolic faith cannot miss this fundamental element of the church’s identity. It is this kind of community which the Spirit longs to form, and it is this kind of community which will witness to the inbreaking of the eschatological kingdom more than any other.

Perhaps most importantly, it is this kind of community which must be experienced by the emerging generations if they are to receive the faith from us appropriately. This means, in addition to the removal of distinctions of gender, ethnicity and socio-economic status, the barrier of age must also be removed. Our sons and daughters must be allowed to fully participate in the charismatic operation of the Spirit’s presence of the new Temple.

The Spirit poured out on all flesh is a pentecostal phenomenon which gives rise to the foundational ecclesiological principle that the community which is constituted by the charismatic presence of the eschatological Spirit can be no less than a radically egalitarian fellowship where

all social barriers are removed, most notably in the realm of mutual ministry in the charismata.

As John Lancaster states, “The truly Pentecostal Church is a community in which “all flesh” is caught up in the momentum of the Spirit: sons and daughters prophesy, young men see visions, old men dream dreams, men-servants and maid-servants experience the outpouring of the Spirit (Acts 2:17,18) and thus the barriers of age, sex, and social status are forgotten.”

5.8 Presence and Suffering

It is a point of fascination to this modern Canadian that the last of Luther’s Seven Marks of the Church was suffering, or “holy possession of the sacred cross.” I have imagined what would happen if a Canadian church had the following phrase on its lawn sign: “Come Suffer With Us!” Somehow I doubt a seeker-sensitive church, much less any other kind of church today, would adopt this as a growth technique. Yet the narrative of the apostolic, pentecostal church both in the first and twentieth centuries clearly demonstrates that Luther was definitely on to something. The People of God’s Presence, as the new Temple of the Spirit of the Most High God and even as a foretaste, sign and anointed herald of the coming eschatological kingdom of justice, are not immune to suffering. In fact, quite the opposite seems to be the case. Instead the church as the body of Christ must endure suffering even as their incarnate Head did when He proclaimed the inauguration of the kingdom of heaven.

---
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Canadian Clark Pinnock is the one scholar of those surveyed who explicitly identified this theme. It is precisely because the church is *not* the kingdom that it suffers. Pinnock states, “The church must not make herself central. Her task is to point to the coming kingdom. The church (in fact) is weak and provisional and weighed down with many cares.”694 Despite being the dwelling place for the special presence of God, the church is not God. Despite being the foretaste of the kingdom, the church is not the kingdom. Yet even God suffered for our sake; so must the church suffer for His. A female Pentecostal writer from a bygone era once penned the following on this subject:

God is calling this company to deaths oft; the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us…God has wonderful ways of killing us out. When He took some of us at our word and began to kill us out in public, we did not like it; but Christ died in public and this company must take the same route…We may have a thousand deaths to die and God may humble us until we would rather hide away than be heard of or seen, but God is going to have His way in bringing forth the Christ.695

The church as a community that suffers in identification with her Savior remains humbly dependent on the sustaining presence of the Spirit. She is a pilgrim church, on the way to the eschatological fulfillment of the kingdom, living in the time between the times. On this theme, Pinnock writes the following:

Now it would not be right to focus solely on stories of glory and exaltation and mountain top experiences because the experience of Christ through the Spirit is an experience of suffering also. We all will experience a tension between life as it is now, and life as it will be. As Paul puts it: “Those who have the first fruits of the Spirit groan inwardly as we wait for adoption, the

redemption of our bodies.” (Rom 8:23) This may explain among other things how Paul could make such an impact on poor people who were struggling with the harsh realities of life, including slaves and the despised of his day. It was because the Spirit does not take believers out of such situations but sustains them in them and gives meaning to what could otherwise be destructive experiences. The way to Easter has always been via Gethsemane and Golgotha. Perhaps we need to be asking whether our corporate life reflects Good Friday or only Easter and we must never forget it.  

The church as the People of God’s Presence lives in the realization that her liberation from the fallenness of creation is not yet consummated, though it is assured. She lives in the hope and expectation that Jesus is the Coming King, and “eagerly awaits” the return of her Savior, as Paul wrote from prison (Phil 3:20). As the bride of Christ, she must endure this wait before the bridegroom comes (cf Matt 25:1-13). Yet while she waits and in the midst of inevitable suffering, she carries out her mission in hope and thereby demonstrates hope to the world. The courage and grace by which the People of God’s Presence live in the midst of their suffering will demonstrate the source of her hope and life, the Gospel of Jesus as Savior, Healer, Baptizer, Sanctifier and Coming King made manifest through the special presence of the Holy Spirit.

6 Summary

In presenting a constructive proposal for a pentecostal ecclesiology as the People of God’s Presence, I have chosen to use the biblical metaphor of the Temple as a focal point to

image a “third-stream” ecclesiology in which the church is constituted by the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. It is through this image that the church as one, holy, catholic and apostolic can be affirmed from a pentecostal perspective. I then looked at the theological bases for such an ecclesiology relationally with respect to God, to the kingdom of God, and to the world. Finally, I began to apply an ecclesiology of presence to various specific ecclesiological areas in an effort to work towards a full-orbed theology of the church that is distinctly Pentecostal in that it retains appropriate elements of their incipient restorationism, Full-Gospel rubric, eschatology and experiential character. In doing so, I have built upon the contemporary efforts of those who have contributed significantly to this topic in smaller scopes. As the Korean Pentecostal scholar Young-Gi Hong wrote some years ago on this very topic:

The church is the temple of the Spirit and carries forward the mission, ministry and messages of Jesus who identified them with the kingdom of God….The Pentecostal contribution to contemporary ecclesiology may come from an understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit as constitutive of the church. The Spirit is there in the church to actualize the presence of Christ, and to lead the church to the kingdom of God. The church is called to serve the world in line with the will of God, and by the power of the Holy Spirit. Pneumatology is not just one dimension of the nature of the church but its essence. The role of the Spirit, kingdom and holistic mission are inseparable in the purpose of the church.697

The objective here has been to demonstrate that Pentecostalism does indeed represent a distinct ecclesiology of its own and therefore is not merely a subset of evangelicalism, as much as it may share some affinity with it. As a ‘third-stream’ ecclesiology built upon the organizing principle of the Spirit’s powerful presence, Pentecostalism therefore has its own distinct

contribution to make to the universal church and the ecumenical enterprise. In the concluding chapter, I will deal more specifically with how this constructive proposal can contribute to the movement’s place in this enterprise, and to its own maturation and/or recovery of its ideal identity.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

In this last chapter I conclude by looking briefly at two more themes in relation to an ecclesiology of presence that result from the proposal issued here: ecumenism and the future of Pentecostal identity. These areas are very much related on different levels, but will be examined individually first.

1 Presence and Ecumenism

Paul Lee, who was quoted in the first chapter for asking the legitimate question as to the plausibility of speaking of a Pentecostal ecclesiology, nevertheless suggests that the movement should develop one for ecumenical usefulness. This is all the more necessary in that the original Pentecostal Revival very much had an ecumenical vision: to see the outpouring of the Holy Spirit they were enjoying be experienced in all willing churches. Therefore, Lee suggests:

The original Pentecostal ethos/spirituality was to reconcile the different Christian denominations through their common experience of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit enabled Christians to receive the gifts of conversion, sanctification, and Spirit-baptism so as to sanctify and unite the children of God and to evangelize the world. For the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements to prove themselves as a current of grace and to be faithful to their prophetic vocation, they must re-commit themselves to their original ecumenical spirituality. The original Pentecostal ethos transcends race, class, and denomination as in the Pentecostal event itself, and unites all in the experience of the freedom of the Spirit. Just as they have contributed to a greater
visibility of the invisible and forgotten God, i.e. the Spirit, it will be equally important for them to give a greater visibility to the one Church.  

This one church is the universal church that all groups belong to and find when they meet with one another. Thus, in a more general sense, Lee also posits the following:

The Church is a chosen sign and instrument of salvation in and for the world. Instead of seeking one’s identity as a Church in contradistinction to other Christians, one must first concentrate on the God-given characteristics of the Church, one must first concentrate on its unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity, with the intention of growing together in the full realization of these four marks of the Church. In meeting Christians of other traditions one finds members of the same Body. Without doubt, ecclesiology is inseparable from ecumenism.

This has been one of the driving convictions of this dissertation. Pentecostals have their own distinct ecclesiological principle that they can share with the rest of the Church. This has been the story of the twentieth century and continues on today. However, neither their own ecclesiology nor their ecumenical vision has been properly developed, even after more than a century. No doubt these two problems are interconnected. In recent decades more and more scholars from both inside and outside the movement have recognized both the ecumenical potential and ecclesiological uniqueness of Pentecostalism. For the sake of its own health and the health of greater Christianity, the distinctly pentecostal vision of the church as the People of God’s Presence needs to be developed and shared. Coming from the Catholic perspective, Lee nevertheless concludes:

---

698 Lee, Pneumatological Ecclesiology, 133.
699 Lee, Pneumatological Ecclesiology, 17.
The “essence of Pentecostalism” is a gift of God which belongs to the universal Church. The Church that is fully conscious of the presence and empowerment of the Spirit, or simply, the Church fully alive in the Spirit, is the object of a pneumatological ecclesiology. The task of a pneumatological ecclesiology is to articulate the inseparable, organic relationship of the Spirit and the Church as the Body of Christ.  

This is obviously what this work has tried to address, particularly through utilizing the image of the Temple.

1.1 Official Dialogues

Lee drew his assessments from his own dissertation, which examined the pneumatological ecclesiologies in the official Roman Catholic/Pentecostal dialogues. The dialogue report which most deals with ecclesiology, Perspectives on Koinonia, has already been examined in Chapter Four under the theme of koinonia. It has been in the process of this dialogue, and one with the Reformed church, that Pentecostal leaders and scholars have been compelled to address their undeveloped ecclesiologies with these historic churches. Although more obscure, some of the Pentecostal position papers at these dialogues attempted to briefly address pentecostal ecclesiology, in the context of the greater recognition that the universal church is much larger than the movement. The participants in the dialogue between Pentecostals and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) noted this at the outset of their official report:
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They noted that those who are disciples of Jesus Christ are all members of one Church. They were concerned, however, that this reality receive attention not merely at an abstract theological or ideological level, but that it receive some attention at the practical level where churches of the Reformed tradition and the churches of the Pentecostal movement touch the lives of one another directly.701

One of the immediate ecclesiological self-identifications evident from the outset of this dialogue, as the above statement makes clear, is that Pentecostalism sees itself as a movement, while the Reformed churches refer to themselves as a tradition. What was also established through this dialogue was that in discussing pneumatology, the affirmation was made that, “If there is a center to the Pentecostal message, it is the Person and work of Jesus Christ. From the beginning of the Pentecostal Movement, its central message as referred to Jesus Christ as Savior, Sanctifier, Spirit Baptizer, Healer and Coming King.”702 While this particular five-fold rubric is unique to the movement, the christological center of Pentecostalism allows and compels it to explore greater koinonia with other Christian churches.

More directly, the Pentecostal/WARC dialogue was able to affirm the following ecclesiological statements: “The Church is the Creature of the Word and Spirit,” “The Church is the Community of the Holy Spirit’s Leading,” “The Church is the Community of the Spirit’s Gifts,” and “The Church is in but not of the World.”703 That these two churches could jointly assert these five aspects of the church demonstrates that, while they may surely be understood
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and/or nuanced differently in each case, pentecostal ecclesiology owes much to, and shares much with, the older church traditions that were once spurned in favour of the restorationist cry, “Back to Pentecost.” At the same time, the movement does have a distinct ecclesiology within these greater emphases which carries the unique ecclesial self-understanding that “Each Pentecostal community, formed by the outpouring of the Spirit and shaped by the Spirit’s gifts, discerns what the Spirit is saying to the Church through the Word and is thereby shaped by the Spirit in conformity to the Word.”

Another significant area of theological consensus coming out of the Pentecostal/WARC dialogue was in the area of “Spirit and Kingdom.” The two parties composed joint statements of agreement in this area which indicate considerable ecclesiological compatibility. These statements specify the distinction between the church and the kingdom, and mission of the church. Perhaps the most significant point is the following:

Reformed and Pentecostal churches agree that the Church is birthed by the Spirit and serves as an instrument of the kingdom that Jesus Christ proclaimed and inaugurated. The Church is called to serve the Kingdom rather than be self-serving or an end in itself. The Spirit’s role in ushering in the kingdom relates to its presence in the Church.

While I would personally object to calling the Spirit an “it”, the reference to the Spirit’s presence in the church as that which ushers in the kingdom is a substantial ecclesiological point of agreement which shows great potential for Pentecostalism to contribute to an ecclesiology of presence that, while distinct to the movement in its articulation here, would perhaps find a
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broader receptivity by other church traditions. But this is more likely to come to realization if increased genuine interaction takes place between Pentecostals and other Christians. As the Pentecostal WARC dialogue concluded: “Genuine ecumenism begins when Christians find each other and learn to enter into the lives of one another.”  

1.2 Back to Newbigin

This brings us back full-circle to Newbigin’s chapter from nearly sixty years ago. It remains significant both for its description of the ‘third-stream’ ecclesiology inherent within Pentecostalism, and for its recognition of the ecumenical potential, and need, of this ecclesiology in the broader church. He understood the historical validity of the Catholic ecclesiology of apostolic succession, and the Protestant ecclesiology of the doctrinal orthodoxy, but also observed the biblical validity of, and present need for, a pneumatological ecclesiology of, what I am calling here, presence.

This is echoed by something Sean O’Neal has written:

Historically, the Pentecostal church is a movement that holds the power of God being present in the lives of people as a high core value of their faith. Even for early Pentecostal believers experiencing God was not a dry, solemn event, but a living relationship where the individual felt the power and presence of God in their worship.
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Similarly, British Elim Pentecostal writer W.G. Hathaway has stated:

In the full-orbed Pentecostal Church where the gifts of the Spirit are in operation the wonder-working power of the Triune God will be in evidence. The power behind these supernatural manifestations in the Church is the same power which brooded over the waters in the beginning and brought forth order out of chaos; the same power which brought again from the dead the Lord Jesus – the power of the Holy Spirit. In these operations of the gifts of the Spirit we come to the summit – to the experience of the very fulness of God’s power manifested among men. In the true Church where God the Holy Ghost is allowed room to work we shall always find the wonderful expression of God’s mighty power.\(^{709}\)

An authentic Pentecostal church is defined by the presence of this “wonder working power” of God manifested and therefore experienced by those gathered by the Holy Spirit. This ‘resurrection power’ is that which provides life to the church from a pentecostal perspective.

Finally, South African Pentecostal scholars Matthew Clark and Henry Lederle, while not explicitly referencing Newbigin, characterize pentecostal ecclesiology in the following manner:

It is neither doctrine, tradition, nor ideology, which makes Pentecost what it is. It is the presence of God in and among his people in a manner which is readily evident to participator and bystander alike… Consequently, if it is asked, “why does a believer attend church services?” or “what is the purpose of getting together?” the Pentecostal answer is distinctive. Simplistically stated, where the Roman Catholic might answer “to receive sacramentally mediated grace, and to worship”, and the Protestant might say “to gather around word and sacrament, and to worship”, the Pentecostal would say “to encounter the power of God in Jesus, and to worship”, where “encounter” must be interpreted in the active and passive sense (“blessing others, and being blessed by others”) and includes word and sacrament, among other elements… What is peculiar

to the Pentecostal notion of the church, and what relativises the contributions so that in the end there is a priesthood of all believers, is a two-fold emphasis: i) every Spirit-filled believer has a contribution to make; and ii) every contribution is only valid insofar as it can be traced back to the dynamic activity of God.\(^{710}\)

It is this theology of “encounter” (a phrase also used by Keith Warrington), which distinguishes pentecostal ecclesiology from others, and it is this distinction that is perhaps Pentecostalism’s greatest potential contribution to the wider church. By defining the church charismatically (instead of adding charisma to a previous church structure or ecclesiology), Pentecostalism offers a unique template for the priesthood of all believers through its participative, playful worship as the Temple of the Holy Spirit. The People of God’s Presence are therefore a radically egalitarian community that enjoys Spirit-driven koinonia with God and with each other. The Spirit-filled church is one that is characterized by its worshipful relationship to the Triune God, which then empowers it to be a foretaste of the eschatological kingdom of Jesus the Savior, Baptist, Sanctifier, Healer and Coming King to the world it is called to humbly serve.

2 Presence and the Future of Pentecostal Identity

2.1 Dealing with the Warts

Obviously, as a constructive proposal this work naturally is open to the accusation of others such as Nicholas Healy and Shane Clifton that it is a “blueprint” or idealistic ecclesiology that does not sufficiently account for a century’s worth of flaws and ‘warts’ present within Pentecostalism. Every constructive proposal and nearly every ecclesiology stands in this
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precarious place. The task of systematic theology is to attempt to apprehend, discern and communicate the truth about the Being and Story of God to a flawed humanity and a flawed church. Constructive ecclesiology walks an especially thin line in that it aims to project a definition of the church as God intends it, a church which is also a concrete sociological reality consisting of real human beings with names and stories of their own that unfortunately often testify to a failure to live out a divine identity as much or more than a success at doing so. Therefore, inasmuch as ecclesiology must offer a real template of God’s design for the church so that she understands her identity, so too must it also contend with the church as she actually is in her concrete, earthly existence. So this ecclesiology must, in this concluding portion, deal with the warts of the Pentecostal movement.

In attempting to construct another option for Pentecostal ecclesiology in the midst of several other (smaller) options already proposed, this work has not intended whatsoever to naively idealize Pentecostalism or suggest that it is anything like a more pure form of Church. My own personal story of my time as an ordained Pentecostal minister is itself a brutal testimony to the cruelty, callousness, injustice and sin that are far too prevalent in Pentecostal churches. In that respect I have no choice but to be among the first to acknowledge the failure of Pentecostalism to be the People of God’s Presence far too often.

Yet, in the midst of the very real warts and sin that abide within this movement, as they do in all churches, there is also the historical reality of a genuine Revival over the last century, comprised mainly of poor, uneducated and marginalized people from various parts of the world, which continues to reconfigure global Christianity. Given that Pentecostalism is, to repeat what was said in Chapter One, one of the more rapidly growing religious movements in human history, it is only responsible as a theologian and ecclesiologist to try to discern what God has
done through this phenomenon, personal experience aside. There are horrible abuses in all churches including the Pentecostal, and given the often hyper-spirituality and restorationist purity the movement has exuded, along with the superiority claimed by their doctrine of tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism, these abuses appear especially ugly when dressed in Pentecostal garb.

Furthermore, there unfortunately is always a tension between the spiritual identity of the People of God’s Presence in their covenant-relationship to the I AM, and their humanity which is still prone to sin and failure despite their claim to be recipients of the divine presence. One immediately thinks of the sins of Moses, Samson, Saul and others who experienced the supernatural, charismatic work of the Spirit of God manifesting through their lives, only to fall into sin. The biblical narrative teaches us the unfortunate fact that experiencing the divine power operating through one’s participation in the mission of God does not guarantee that the same participant is immune to temptation, corruption or even a dichotomous existence which fails to allow the Spirit’s empowerment to also bring transformation and sanctification of their hearts and minds. Episodes from the revival starkly illustrate that leaders who were “Spirit baptized” and spoke in tongues were also capable of ungodly behaviour. Charles Parham, Florence Crawford, up to Jimmy Swaggart and many others all typify this incongruous reality.

This is also true on a corporate level. The biblical narrative and church history also attest that the covenant People of God, who have experienced His blessings and miraculous signs of His love, are also prone to flagrant hypocrisy despite direct prophetic admonition against this. God eventually had to release Israel and Judah into exile because this was a lesson they had great difficulty learning. In one of the stories that comprise Bocaccio’s *Decameron* from the thirteenth century, a spiritual seeker makes a pilgrimage to Rome to attempt to find God. He does find
God, but only because he witnesses deplorable hypocrisy there, and ironically concludes that a church so corrupt and morally bankrupt could only continue to exist by the grace of a real God. The People of God’s Presence are made the church not through their own merit or faithfulness. They are made so by the constituting divine presence of the Holy Spirit in their midst, who works in and through them despite their flaws, warts and sinfulness. It is so in every church, and it is so in Pentecostalism despite the puritanical airs they have exuded in the past.

2.2 Cross Pollination and Confluence

This brings us to a place of suggestion as to where this proposed ecclesiology can be useful. It is impossible that Pentecostalism remain isolated in the twenty-first century global village. It has influenced, and been influenced by, other churches both for better and for worse. A developed ecclesiology will therefore aid the movement to navigate the future both in terms of retaining its own identity and sharing this identity in healthy mutually-beneficial ways with the greater church.

If this happens, my own hope would be an increased cross-pollination of healthy emphases between Pentecostalism and other churches. Now that the movement is in its second century and is coming to grips with its own tradition, it will benefit from the positive influence of other, older church traditions that therefore have something to contribute to Pentecostalism’s maturation. A primary example of this would be the sacramental tradition, which can teach Pentecostalism how to appropriate a richer understanding of the eucharist within an ecclesiology of Presence. Or, the Reformed tradition can perhaps continue to assist Pentecostals to be faithful exegetes of the Spirit-inspired Word. Not to be ignored, the Eastern Orthodox Church has been recognized by many to be pregnant with potential to supply Pentecostalism with two millennia
worth of theological richness upon which to continue to develop areas such as the synthesis between the presence of the Spirit and Christ in the church, or how the church functions in deification, etc. Our survey in Chapter Three demonstrates that several Pentecostal scholars are grappling with one or more of these possibilities already.

In turn, as the Charismatic Movement has demonstrated, Pentecostalism can continue to influence older churches with the expectation and longing for the palpable experience of the Spirit of God bringing life, transformation and empowerment to His People. Even someone as theologically far from Pentecostalism as Marcus Borg has significantly observed, “Congregations that are full of God are full of people.”\footnote{711} Pentecostals have and can continue to share an ecclesiology of presence with the rest of the Church, so that the whole church will be “full of God” through the charismatic presence of His Spirit.

Thus, even while current denominations and traditions can continue to exist as they are organizationally, greater spiritual unity between them is possible through this increased confluence. Pentecostals can be made more catholic through a suitable appropriation of the sacramental tradition and still be Pentecostals as long as they maintain an ecclesiology of presence. Likewise, older churches can maintain what is best about their traditions while enjoying a similar operation of the Spirit in their midst as Pentecostals have enjoyed. Pentecostalism was perhaps never meant to replace or supplant other churches, though their expression of restorationism sometimes gave this impression. The earliest Pentecostals were

seeking the baptism of the Holy Spirit for themselves, then looking to bring it back to their churches. When this was rejected they formed their own congregations and denominations. Given that some, such as Clark Pinnock, have articulated a different kind of restorationism that seeks to revive not only the apostolic charismata but apostolic sacramentalism as well, Pentecostalism’s future can perhaps be seen with greater clarity. It can offer one side of this equation while learning to appropriate the other from the historic churches. This vision of confluence fits with the suggestions of others.  

Coming from the other side of the coin, if Pentecostalism does NOT develop its own ecclesiological identity with the aim of sharing it for the purposes of cross-pollination, it stands vulnerable to an array of dangers resulting from an identity crisis. Such dangers are powerfully illustrated in a parallel manner for evangelicalism by Canadian theologian John G. Stackhouse: “When we, the church, are confused about who we are and whose we are, we can become anything and anyone’s.” This is already clearly evident in North America. Pentecostalism is being swallowed up into “generic evangelicalism”, losing its distinctiveness, eschatological vision and fervour, and has adopted methodologies of newer churches (i.e. “seeker-sensitive,” “purpose-driven”) instead of practicing the playful, participative worship of the People of God’s Presence in which the Holy Spirit operates in charismatic fashion. Consequently, the question of “what is Pentecostal?” today has become more difficult to answer than at any other time in the history of the Movement. This is not all bad and is part of the maturation process. There are aspects of original, classical Pentecostalism that perhaps need not be perpetuated for their own
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sake. The principle of *semper reformanda* applies to this movement as well as any other. The proposal here has therefore been to understand the Pentecostal church as the People of God’s Presence, imaged by the Temple of the Spirit. The true ethos of authentic Pentecostalism, as Newbigin identified, is to see the church as the dwelling place for the manifest presence of the eschatological Spirit which transforms and empowers lives in the context of Spirit-formed koinonia celebrated in the playful, participative worship of the ingathered community. The church becomes “empowered for mission” in genuine Pentecostal fashion only as it lives in this manifest presence in its playful worship, where Charisma, Word and Sacrament can mediate this divine presence in polyphonic, complementary ways.

### 3 Conclusion: Aiming for a Church that Powerfully Loves

Newbigin answered the ecclesiological question of “Where is the church?” from a pentecostal perspective with the answer, “Where the Holy Spirit is present with power.” It is the dynamic presence of the Holy Spirit experienced in tangible ways by the gathered community that constitutes the church from the perspective of a distinctly pentecostal ecclesiology. The final question, then, is “why?” Why does the Spirit indwell ordinary people with His extraordinary Presence? One theological answer given in this dissertation, following the answer of several others, is to make the church a foretaste of the eschatological kingdom to the world God so loves that He gave His Son to make atoning sacrifice for their sins. Thus, love is the ultimate bottom line for the purpose of the church’s existence. Love is the reason why the church continues to live on. The Spirit is not present with power in the church for the purpose of domination, triumphalism, or showmanship. The supernatural gifts are not demonstrations of
power for power’s sake, but for the sake of edifying the community and proving to the unbeliever that “God is really among you” (1 Cor 14:25). These ends, then, are acts of love. The Holy Spirit comes with power to do nothing other than bring life in all its fullness: healing, restoration, transformation, empowerment for living and participation in the inbreaking of the kingdom for those who otherwise have no power in their social status.

Frank Macchia concludes his landmark work on Spirit Baptism, which includes one hundred pages on ecclesiology, with a depiction of the Spirit Baptized life as a life of love. The outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh, the indwelling divine presence upon the ingathered community, is a gift of love from God to His creation which He is lovingly restoring to Himself. Central to an ecclesiology of presence, then, is the recognition of the self-giving of the God of love. Macchia draws upon Barth to describe this divine love:

Love is God’s supreme gift, for it transcends all emotion, conceptuality, and action only to inspire all three. It gives life and that more abundantly. Love is not only God’s supreme gift, it is at the very essence of God’s nature as God. There is nothing greater than divine love (1 Cor. 13:13). Karl Barth’s words are to the point: “The Christian life begins with love. It also ends with love.” Indeed, “there is also nothing beyond love. There is no higher or better being or doing in which we can leave it behind us.” Love is absolute to the nature of God. It is the essence of God and the substance of our participation in God.

Macchia also draws upon Emil Brunner in describing how Spirit baptism is a vital gift of divine love: “Through Christ as the Spirit Baptizer, God imparts his divine self as all-embracing love and not just something about God. The benefit that God wills for the creature is not ‘something’
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714 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, Chapter Six, 257-282.
715 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 259. The quotes from Barth are from CD I/2.
but God’s presence, ‘for this love is self-surrender, self-giving to the other, to whom love is directed.’ This bestowal of the Spirit’s Presence by Christ is ultimately a momentous expression of the Father’s love for the world as demonstrated through the church, the People of God’s Presence. As the Spirit indwells the church in this immanent, personal manner, He acts as the loving agent of the transcendent God. The transcendent/immanent or “personal-infinite” (to use Francis Schaeffer’s term) God who pours out Himself in the person of the Spirit into human community to create a more abundant koinonia is therefore most definitively a God of love; the same love that sent the Son willingly to the Cross on our behalf to make all things new.

Thus, as Macchia claims, “Faithful to Christ, the Spirit forms Christ in us (Gal. 4:19), in the many caught up in divine koinonia, ‘to the measure of the full stature of Christ’ (Eph. 4:13 NRSV). Ultimately, all of creation is to be anointed by the Spirit as a temple of God’s Holy Spirit in the very image of Christ.” Through the biblical narrative, we have seen the progression of the significant role of the Temple in God’s salvation history, and proposed the significance of the church as Temple from a pentecostal perspective. Macchia here states that the role of the church as Temple is to house the indwelling presence of God’s love to finally bring the world to the place where it will function as Temple in that it is the new creation. Macchia concludes his chapter (and his book) by casting the following description of Spirit baptism:
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716 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 261. The quotes from Brunner are from Christian Doctrine of God, 185.
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718 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 265.
Spirit baptism fills us with the love of God so that we transcend ourselves and cross boundaries. We find the power to transcend limitations through divine infilling to pour ourselves out for others. In transcending ourselves we are fulfilled, for we have been made for the love of God. God as a self-giving fountain of love poured out abundantly begins to shape us into something similar. Jesus pours out the Spirit so that the Spirit may pour forth in our empowered love for others. We become “Spirit-baptized personalities”. Jesus thus says that believing in him will cause a spring of divine life to flow forth from us in abundance. From within those who drink from the Spirit “streams of living water will flow” (John 7:38). Spirit baptism as an experience of empowerment is not just renewed energy to do things for God. It is rather the power of self-transcending, self-giving love. It involves us entirely.719

What Macchia describes here so well concerning the experience of Spirit baptism also applies directly to the Spirit-filled Church. The empowering presence of the Spirit in the Temple is not merely the ability to carry out a divine mission, but to do so in a spirit of love, because the divine love has been shed abroad in our hearts, and we freely give to others what we have been given. In so doing, we accomplish the mission of bringing others into the presence of God.

Donald Gelpi, a Catholic scholar, provides this summation in his book, Pentecostalism: A Theological Viewpoint:

By the same token, if it is to remain orthodox, Pentecostal piety must avoid exclusive preoccupation with the more flamboyant gifts like tongues and prophecy. There is a gift of the Spirit corresponding to every legitimate form of human activity. The gifts we should seek first, as Paul tells us, are those which correspond to actions that are directly expressive of love. Hence, Pentecostal piety cannot suffer itself to become indifferent to any legitimate form of human activity. What Pentecostal piety must seek to cultivate is peaceful docility to the inspirations of the Spirit in every legitimate area of human endeavour.720

719 Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit, 281.
Thus, the powerful presence of the eschatological Spirit which constitutes the church from a pentecostal perspective operates charismatically for the purpose of bestowing divine love upon the human community so that they may know life to its fullest and share this life with the world God loves. As Gelpi states, Pentecostalism must be about the broader mission of spreading God’s peaceful love rather than perpetuating certain charismata for their own sake.

Pentecostal ecclesiology in the 21st century, therefore, must build upon R.G. Spurling’s original vision of the Church as a Community of Love. The People of God’s Presence must be a church that loves in the power of the Spirit, for “love is the law on which Christ built the church.”

The two ‘golden rails’ of the great commandment to love the Lord God with all heart, soul, strength, and mind, and then to love our neighbour as ourselves (cf. Luke 10:27) are what the church, like a train, rolls along on its pilgrim journey to the eschatological kingdom. In this respect, Spurling understood the purpose and mission of the Spirit-filled church perhaps better than any of his first-generation Pentecostal peers, and better than some Pentecostal ecclesiologists today. The movement would do well to recover his theology of the church in this regard. The People of God’s Presence must always aim foremost to be a church that powerfully loves God and its neighbours.

This beginning attempt at an ecclesiology of presence concludes by quoting Jürgen Moltmann, who has at many points influenced the pneumatology operational here. He writes:

The gift and the presence of the Holy Spirit is the greatest and most wonderful thing which we can experience – we ourselves, the human community, all living things and this earth. For

---

721 Spurling, The Lost Link, Chapter 1.
with the Holy Spirit it is not just one random spirit that is present, among all the many good and evil spirits that there are. It is God himself, the creative and life-giving, redeeming and saving God. Where the Holy Spirit is present, God is present in a special way, and we experience God through our lives, which become wholly living from within. We experience whole, full, healed and redeemed life, experience it with all our senses. We feel and taste, we touch and see our life in God and God in our life…The Spirit is more than just one of God’s gifts among others; the Holy Spirit is the unrestricted presence of God in which our life wakes up, becomes wholly and entirely living, and is endowed with the energies of life.  

The presence of the Holy Spirit is therefore God’s life-giving, constituting gift to the Church, and by extension to the world. Pentecostals as the People of God’s Presence must therefore cherish this gift, live always in it and nurture it, so that they may freely share it with the rest of the church and to the world God so loves. There is no more exciting vision in the Christian imagination than a community of Spirit-filled people who have experienced the outpouring of the Spirit of love to such a degree that they love one another in Spirit-driven koinonia so that the world takes notice and declares, “God is really among you!”
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