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PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATIC SPIRITUALITY AND FREEDOM

Most of us familiar with departments of theology and religious studies in Europe will know that this is a very difficult environment. We have to deal with a liberal and pluralistic theological agenda that often seems to diametrically oppose Pentecostal/Charismatic spirituality and exclusivity. A certain tension exists between academic integrity and spirituality, especially when education does not seem to further Christian spirituality. Klaus and Triplett speak of Pentecostalism’s tenuous relationship with theological training and a “dead intellectualism” that “stifles the Spirit-filled life”. Most people in Europe might not have thought of “theological education” in any terms other than that which they are accustomed to—a particularly western, conservative model that divides the subject into clearly defined disciplines and processes self-selected young people through an information-gathering seminary or university into “ministry”, so that the end product is a person who looks like everyone else subjected to the same process.

Chris Thomas suggested that Pentecostal theology in the twenty-first century needed to have five characteristics, one of which was to be “contextual”. By this he explained that “the diverse voices from all parts of the world that make up the Pentecostal family” must be “encouraged and expected to speak their own theological language” in order to strengthen and critique the global Pentecostal community. He also admitted that this was very difficult to achieve. Of particular importance is it that Pentecostal/Charismatic education in Europe seeks to be contextual and desist from aping a North American model. Evangelical scholars have spoken of “indigenization” for a long time, and even Pentecostal missionary scholars like Melvin Hodges have written profoundly about an “indigenous church”. “Indigenization” assumes that the gospel message and Christian theology is the same in all cultures and contexts, and tends to relate the Christian message to traditional cultures. Western Pentecostal missionaries have often supported the idea of a self-supporting, self-governing and self-propagating church. But “contextualization”, on the other hand, assumes that every theology is influenced by its particular context, and must be if it is to be relevant. It relates the Christian message to all contexts and cultures, especially including those undergoing rapid social change.

The ideas of “contextual theology” were first formulated in the World Council of Churches in 1972. The rise of particular “contextual theologies” like “liberation theology” in Latin America, “Black theology” among African Americans and South Africans, and “Minjung theology” in Korea increased evangelical concerns (especially in North America) that this new trend in theology would lead to “syncretism” and a placing of culture above God’s revelation in the Bible. Gradually, evangelical scholars like Charles Kraft and David Hesselgrave began to give prominence to the importance of culture in the seventies and eighties. Kraft spoke of “the constant message in alternative forms”, and of “dynamic-equivalence theologizing”, and that “all theologizing is culture-bound interpretation and communication of God’s revelation”. South African Reformed
missiologist David Bosch declares that all theologies were contextual theologies, but that we should not confuse the essential and universal aspects of the Christian message from the local, contextual ones.9 Similarly, Lesslie Newbigin says that “every communication of the gospel is already culturally conditioned”, but reminds us that the gospel “is not an empty form into which everyone is free to pour his or her own content,” but that the content of the gospel is “Jesus Christ in the fullness of his ministry, death, and resurrection.”10

The importance of contextualization is now more readily accepted by evangelicals, although they have their own interpretation of what this means. Dean Gilliland has recently defined the goal of “contextualization” as “to enable, insofar as it is humanly possible, an understanding of what it means that Jesus Christ, the Word, is authentically experienced in each and every human situation”.11 He says that the Christian message must be proclaimed in the framework of the worldview of the particular people to whom it is addressed, it must emphasize those parts of the message that answer the questions and needs of those people, and it must be expressed through the medium of the cultural gifts of those people. Nigerian theologian Justin Ukpong says that “in the process of evangelization each new culture with which Christianity comes into contact should be respected and given the chance to give its own expression to the Christian message.”12

My first experience of theological education was training for the ministry in the early 1970s in an all-white, all-male, classical Pentecostal Bible College in Vereeniging, South Africa, a small, strictly conservative denomination with roots in the British Apostolic movement.13 This college was held in a church building, presided over by a pastor with an undergraduate degree in law. Only one of five lecturers had a degree in theology. Outward signs of “holiness” were a priority. Here men had to have “short back and sides” haircuts (in those days when long hair was fashionable), women were not admitted to the college at all, and students’ wives had to wear head coverings in church and never be seen in “men’s clothes”. The King James Version of the Bible was the only “Holy” Bible, and in common with similar colleges in the English-speaking world at the time, the Scofield Reference Bible was the preferred choice.14 The two-year programme consisted of indoctrination in the main tenets of the church (to the exclusion of all others), with a limited smattering of basic biblical survey studies. In common with many Pentecostals in other parts of the world, we shared a belief that spirituality and higher education were basically incompatible, and were warned against “theological cemeteries”.15 We were processed into probationary pastors, evangelists and “missionaries”. Not surprisingly, after a few years the rate of fall-out from the ministry of my fellow-students was high. I suspect that some of the older classical Pentecostals will be familiar with this model of Bible college education. Jeffrey Hittenberger writes of the hostility of Pentecostals to rationalism, which anticipated the post-modern critique but resulted in anti-intellectualism and particularism in their Bible schools.16

Five years later, as a young “missionary” and part-time theology student at the University of South Africa, the denomination assigned me the task of setting up a curriculum for another segregated college, this time to train African pastors. The pattern was the same: a two-year program to make sure that pastors remained faithful to the particular doctrines of this church. By this time I was beginning to feel very perturbed, not only about the doctrines, but even more about the politics and ideologies of the White-controlled church. After five years I resigned and joined a large charismatic Baptist church,17 and here was introduced to ICI and its four-year degree program.18 These impressive materials, complete with glossy study guides and multiple-choice “monkey puzzles” were my introduction to North American theological education. Here, there were four distinct ingredients of a “Bible/Theology” degree influenced by the “liberal arts” model.19 Most
people in the rest of the world have probably no idea what “liberal arts” means, let alone the educational philosophy behind this agenda. Theological education in the West, including this ICI program, is based on the classical fourfold educational model of Bible, theology, history (education) and praxis. Nevertheless, the ICI Bachelor of Arts degree in Bible/Theology had become the preferred option for several Pentecostal and Charismatic colleges in South Africa, and there was really little else to choose from, as strict rules for admittance precluded most young Africans from doing university degrees. Among other benefits, the ICI degree brought access to postgraduate degrees at some South African universities at a time when higher education had become a priority for those disadvantaged by the system.

From 1988-1995 as principal of Tshwane Theological College, I had moved into a very different environment, where the interests of Black South Africans were paramount, and where I found those interests often colliding with those of my former colleagues. I had begun to identify with the “freedom struggle” and felt I had done as much as any white Pentecostal to work towards reconciliation in our deeply divided and traumatized society. Other white South Africans considered me a “liberal”—a dirty word in these quarters. I began to realize that theological colleges in South Africa (and, I suspected, in many other places in the world) were answering questions that no one was asking, and worse, not answering questions that most people were asking. I had begun to think about “contextual theology”, but up until that time I had done most of my research exploring African indigenous churches with Pentecostal connections, and the role of African religions and cultures in formulating a relevant Christian theology. I later devised two courses at our college called “African Spirituality” and “African Pentecostalism”, which tried to be more “contextual” and used the two books I had written at the time. There was a dearth of materials on these subjects for theology students in Africa. But I had neither thought much about the socio-political implications of theology, nor about God’s concerns for the poor and oppressed in this world, even though the Bible was full of these issues.

SHIFTING OUR PERSPECTIVES

The issues of the “religious right” that influence “conservative evangelicals” in North America are peripheral to the concerns of people in the rest of the world, including most of Europe. The characteristic battles against “Communism” and abortion, supporting the state of Israel, retaining the death penalty, and so on, were not major concerns for people who lived under oppressive governments that sometimes used “Christianity” to maintain that oppression. Issues of rampant poverty, unemployment, institutional corruption, housing shortages, the HIV/AIDS pandemic (now an estimated 1,500 people a day die of AIDS in South Africa), poor educational and medical facilities, the exploitation of women and ethnic minorities, and the redistribution of land, were some of the much more pressing needs. Furthermore, Pentecostals in the Third World had a Christian spirituality that was influenced by the popular religions of the regions in which they lived, which often led to sharp differences with the rather cerebral Christianity of western missionaries and their theological colleges. The context of theological education is not the Bible college, the seminary or the university, but the community in which God’s people are found. Only when the context is clear in our minds can we begin to adjust the content of our education; and this is as true for Europe as for anywhere else. Pentecostals and Charismatics are often viewed by the outside
Christian world as those who are “otherworldly” and unconcerned about the pressing needs of society.

It is now almost a missiological maxim to speak of “the southward swing of the Christian center of gravity”, which has made Christianity more African and Asian than European. The majority of Protestant missionaries are now from the non-western world. The leading missionary sending nations are no longer the United States, Britain or Germany, but India, South Korea, Brazil and Nigeria. In Africa, there are very large numbers of Christians for whom theology can only be studied within an African context. The same can be said for Asia, where the largest number of evangelical Christians in any continent of the world live, most of whom are of a Pentecostal and Charismatic type; and so too for Latin America, where the largest number of Pentecostals in any continent live. Barrett and Johnson’s statistics give dramatic evidence of how rapidly the Northern share of world Christianity has decreased in the century of Pentecostalism. In 1900, 77% of the world’s Christian population was in Europe and North America. In 2000, only 37% of the two billion Christians in the world were from the northern continents, while 63% are from Asia, Oceania, Africa, and Latin America, and. Their projections for 2025 are 29% and 71% respectively. Furthermore, 26% of the world’s Christians are now “Pentecostal/Charismatics” (as defined by them), expected to rise to 31% by 2025. The “southward swing” is more evident in Pentecostalism than in other forms of Christianity. Most of the dramatic church growth in the 20th Century in Asia, Africa and Latin America has taken place in Pentecostal and indigenous and independent Pentecostal-like churches, and I would guess that at least three-quarters of Pentecostalism today is found in the Third World. Classical Pentecostal churches with roots in North America like the Assemblies of God, have probably only some 8% of their world associate membership in North America, with at least 80% in the Third World.

But this drastic transformation in Christian demographics has made little impact on western, rationalistic theological education, which continues to be the leading model in seminaries across the globe. Africans and Asians do not become Pentecostals or Presbyterians for precisely the same reasons that North Americans do, and neither do Europeans. Academic appointments in “Third World Theology” in western institutions often serve as smokescreens to camouflage the reality or to further marginalize the “voices from the margin”, whereas actually little has changed in the way most educators think of and teach theology. We must applaud the more recent efforts of Pentecostal colleges in Europe to forge alliances with secular universities and seek validation for degrees including masters’ programmes in Pentecostal studies, while Pentecostal educators attain doctoral degrees in theology. But there are dangers here. Although European theology has adjusted of late to the particular challenges of post-modernism, feminism and religious pluralism, the presuppositions remain. The rise of post-modernism has profoundly challenged the autonomous rationalism and empirical skepticism of western theology, but it has not yet shaken the foundations of the theology taught in Pentecostal and Evangelical seminaries. According to Andrew Walls, this theology exported to the rest of the world is a “heavily indigenised, highly contextual theology… a way of making peace between Christianity and the European Enlightenment, of translating Christian affirmations into Enlightenment categories”. Characteristic of this is the literary-historical method of approach to Scripture that is almost universal in the West. Such theological methods were foreign to the western church for centuries, and were certainly not practiced by the apostle Paul! Walls shows how all theological disciplines are affected, actually representing “a series of choices related to the cultural and religious history of the Western world”. However, the “southward movement” of world Christianity has both “opened up untold fresh possibilities for
theology” and “vastly multiplied the resources available”, but the western hegemony remains in theological institutions and their curricula. If the “non-western” world is given any attention, it is usually placed in the context of western churches and missions.

North American Pentecostal missions contributed generously towards the establishment of “Bible schools” and in-service training structures throughout the world, resulting in the more rapid growth of indigenous Pentecostal churches. However, the fundamental flaws in these structures exist particularly because they are western models foisted onto the rest of the world. This is part of the legacy of the colonial past with its cultural imperialism and ethnocentrism. Pentecostal (and other) missionaries from Europe and North America followed this pattern. They thought they knew what sort of training people needed in Africa, Asia and Latin America, in order to become ministers after the model of the West. This is part of the legacy of the colonial past with its cultural imperialism and ethnocentrism. Pentecostal (and other) missionaries from Europe and North America followed this pattern. They thought they knew what sort of training people needed in Africa, Asia and Latin America, in order to become ministers after the model of the West. This is part of the legacy of the colonial past with its cultural imperialism and ethnocentrism.

Pentecostals became vulnerable to losing their distinctive experience-oriented spirituality as Evangelical and fundamentalist models of education were bought into wholesale and uncritically. Henry Lederle points out:

> It is an irony of recent ecclesiastical history that much of Pentecostal scholarship has sought to align itself so closely with the rationalistic heritage of American Fundamentalism… without fully recognizing how hostile these theological views are to Pentecostal and Charismatic convictions about present-day prophecy, healing miracles and other spiritual charisms.

Pentecostal Bible colleges became prime generators of this new Pentecostal fundamentalism, and western Pentecostal denominations gave priority to exporting this theological education to the Third World. The US Assemblies of God has been in the forefront of this trend, with ICI being particularly influential in Africa and Asia. A survey conducted in 1959 by the US Assemblies of God revealed that half of its missionaries and half the budget of the Missions Department were committed to theological institutions. The question is whether this new emphasis was at the expense of spirituality, as Lee Wanak observes:

> Theological education in the 20th Century has been dominated by the West—its theological categories shaped by Greek culture; its educational patterns shaped by the university model; its attitudes influenced by modernity, industrialism, colonialism, and individualism. In the past its spirituality was marked by pietism, in the present it bears a faith of affluence and superficial commitment, and as the 20th Century comes to a close, the zeal of the Western church is waning.

The rest of the world suffered from this great malaise in western theological education, as missionary educators from Europe and North America unconsciously shared their presuppositions, paradigms and theological prejudices in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Pacific. Hwa Yung points out that the many theological institutions that have sprung up all over Asia have been “conditioned by the methodologies, agenda, and content of western theology”. He says, “This approach must be changed if the Asian church is to come to terms more adequately with its own identity, context, and mission”. But this conditioning has not only disturbed the Third World;
western Pentecostalism itself has lost something as a result. Del Tarr speaks of “the erosion of the sense of the supernatural” and “the eclipse of the experiential dimension of the Christian faith”. The emphasis on rationalism in western theology led to an “indifferent attitude towards spiritual experience and power”.39 This all had a profound effect upon Christians in the Third World for whom this dimension was vital. The independence of India in 1949 began a domino-like fall of colonies culminating with South Africa in 1994. The end of colonialism gave rise to a new and strident nationalism, and more recently there has emerged a new continentalism that emphasizes human dignity.40 The recent emergence of an “Asian Pentecostal theology” is but one example of the changing scenario. The time has come for Pentecostal/Charismatic churches to develop their own theological paradigms that challenge and transform Pentecostal and Charismatic spirituality throughout the world.

It is all the more sobering for us to remember that many of the early Pentecostal leaders in Europe and North America and some of the most successful indigenous pastors in many parts of the world have been those with little theological education, or none at all. In the 1960s, Swiss sociologist Lalive d’Epinay contrasted the remarkably successful indigenous Pentecostal pastors in Chile who had little or no education and the “complete stagnation” of the Methodists and Presbyterians whose pastors had high educational levels. This made him “less confident of the benefits of theological education, and even of the method of training in the developed countries which we impose on Protestants in the developing nations”. He stated that the educational methods of Europe and the USA were simply “not suitable for the needs in Chile”.41 There, because North American missionaries had instituted theological education to avoid the “excesses” and “ignorant fanaticism” of Pentecostalism, indigenous Chilean Pentecostalism now has a “strong anti-theological, anti-academic prejudice”.42

The emphasis in Pentecostal and Charismatic leadership usually has been on the spirituality of the leader rather than on intellectual abilities or even ministerial skills. The first European training college was run by the Pentecostal Missionary Union in London. It provided rudimentary training for missionary candidates, but stated that their qualifications had simply to be “a fair knowledge of every Book in the Bible, and an accurate knowledge of the Doctrines of Salvation and Sanctification”, to which was added that candidates “must be from those who have received the Baptism of the Holy Ghost themselves”. There was no shortage of applications, and entrance requirements subsequently became more difficult, including a required two-year training period.43 Pentecostals probably did not exhibit the same enslavement to rationalistic theological correctness and cerebral Christianity that plagued many of their contemporary Protestant missionaries. They were not as thoroughly immersed in western theology and ideology as their counterparts. Most early Pentecostals in Europe, who suffered from a siege mentality because they were such a small minority, shunned universities. No wonder: the European university model that pervades education in western cultures created an educated elite that often lost touch with ordinary people. Robert Schreiter speaks of the “separation of the theologian from the experience of living communities”.44

The precious doctrine of the “priesthood of all believers” that spurred on early Pentecostals to great heights of mission and ministry has become an empty shell. The clergy/laity dichotomy has been recreated through an emphasis on the need for a paper qualification before recognizing a calling and gifting for ministry. Edgar Elliston speaks of the “inflationary professionalization of the ministry” that posed serious questions for the church, exerting “pressure for ever higher entrance and exit requirements for our training programs”. He said that the “requirements for accreditation
and certification (ordination) move ever higher in terms of academic achievement and away from effective ministry experience." 45

European models of theological education often do not take enough notice of the specific, local, religious, social, and cultural contexts that dominate Pentecostal/Charismatic people throughout the rest of the world. Pierson points out that because theology was perceived to be “a list of timeless doctrines, the theological training of missionaries did not prepare them to recognize the theological issues arising in their host countries”. Consequently, it was also assumed that leadership would be trained using western methodologies, and little thought was given “to understanding how the gospel might be communicated appropriately in the receptor cultures”. 46 The world is becoming increasingly globalized, multi-ethnic, pluralistic, and urbanized. In addition, a polemical and confrontational approach to Christian theology seeking to preserve a “Pentecostal spirituality” often unrelated to Third World contexts and overly reliant upon foreign personnel has been nurtured. This in turn creates a vicious circle where “religious right” ideology and premillennial eschatological pessimism become “orthodoxy” in Pentecostal institutions throughout the world. Pentecostal and Charismatic quietism in the face of oppressive regimes, racism and “ethnic cleansing” is a disturbing feature of its recent history. Sometimes, insensitive and imperialistic attitudes on the part of dominant foreign missions have tended to stifle protest and constructive change. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that in some Pentecostal and Charismatic churches in the Third World, a new, educated elite in the ministry are clones of western forms of theologizing, and new initiatives in providing relevant theological education for Third World contexts are very few and far between. 47

In spite of this, fundamental questions are now being asked about the nature of theological education in the Third World. In a Pentecostal/Charismatic context in Europe, similar questions should be asked. Asian theologian Hwa Yung says that “there is even less reason today for non-western Christians today to allow their theologies to be domesticated by Enlightenment thinking, something which western Christians themselves find increasingly dissatisfying”. 48 From Africa, Kwame Bediako speaks of the “hard-line and historically imported categories” from the West that are “now found to be not always helpful, as they do not describe adequately the actual experience of the majority of African Christians”. 49 And Latin American José Miguez Bonino thinks that Pentecostalism has been “too limited by some current theological formulations adopted from Anglo-Saxon Evangelical circles” and that “the spiritual experience and the evangelical praxis of the Pentecostal/Charismatic Renewal is much larger and richer than those formulations”. He draws particular attention to the Pentecostal emphasis on experience as the grid by which to interpret the Bible. 50

THE NEEDS OF OUR GLOBAL VILLAGE

The way forward might be first, to acknowledge that for our theological education to be truly contextual, its content must change. This means that European and North American theological institutions could focus more on the “Rest of the World” in their education, which will often require re-educating on the part of educators themselves. Culture, global ideologies, local theologies, religions and new religious movements (for example) should be given more priority. Attention could be paid to insights from local anthropology, sociology, history, strategic and political studies, communication theory and cultural studies—not as exotic studies of “the other”,

but as part of a comprehensive attempt to learn more about the context in which global Pentecostal and Charismatic spiritualities are found. Africa, Asia and Latin America have their own Christian heroes, who are not just the western missionaries there! More work should be done on the pioneers of Pentecostalism in Europe, so that their voices are heard in the study of church history and theology. So for example, African writers have often pointed out that in the western world, information on western missionaries to Africa “is many times disproportionate to their role and contribution”, mainly because of the scarcity of written information on African Christians. A serious and extensive revision of Pentecostal history needs to be done, in which the enormous contributions of the as yet unnamed indigenous pioneers is properly recognized, so that US American classical Pentecostals in particular shed their often-heard assumption that Pentecostalism is a “made in the USA” product that has been exported to the world. Walter Hollenweger says that the challenging issues of today are the emergence of Third World Pentecostal churches with their own theologies, Pentecostal missionaries who “are prisoners of their own western culture due to their monocultural education”, and the burgeoning numbers of Third World missionaries. He pleads for an “intercultural” theology and education that “does not transform vital and spontaneous Christians into detached intellectuals” and says we must “break out of the monocultural methodologies and topics of the past” and allow the theologies of the Third World to be heard. The Holy Spirit often works without western missionaries; and theologies, liturgies and ethics that are a result cause tensions with western Pentecostal missions. The “bewildering pluralism within Pentecostalism worldwide” and “the theological contributions of Third World Pentecostalism” must be fully acknowledged and given due recognition.

The “voices from the margin” of Pentecostal spirituality should be given attention, particularly as Pentecostalism encounters very different contexts outside the western world. Although the sources of these local voices are more difficult to come by, academic theses and publications on Pentecostalism in Africa, Asia and (especially) Latin America continue to multiply, and the information highway has opened up new vistas of knowledge for those who are genuinely concerned to change the status quo. This also means that educators from the Third World could participate fully in western institutions, and not serve as mere tokenism. As Wesley Ariarajah observes, Third World theologies are not just optional extras, but they “provide fundamental challenges to what has been going on within the dominant tradition in the name of ‘theology’”. Western theological educators should themselves be given thorough exposure to the contexts in which they work, in which the agenda is set by local people. They should first and foremost be learners, where they can listen to local concerns before presuming to teach. This probably means that before educators or “missionaries” from North America and Europe in other continents begin their work, they should first be apprenticed to local ministers and be thoroughly exposed to the local context. Through serving people in humility over an extended period of time, intercultural workers will learn many vital lessons that several years in theological seminaries back home did not teach, and thus will be much more effective.

Second, our theological education should be more holistic and functional. The curricula we develop are usually photocopies of our own curricula and reflect our own worldview. We can no longer assume that a “liberal arts” or a classical European education followed by specialized seminary training will make a person fit for ministry anywhere in the world. This does not mean that we should simply expand our curricula to add more knowledge. Theological education must become “training in diversity to build tolerance and understanding, without which evangelization will be fruitless”. Anglican bishop John V. Taylor lamented that the churches’ training curricula
are “largely a hangover from the past and are not, in the main, functionally related to the tasks” for which people are being trained. He suggests that the only way forward is “to abandon the ideal of a comprehensive theology” and to train people “for different functions of ministry in the same way that all other professions have adopted long ago”—what he calls “a functional approach to theology”. Lalive d’Epinay observed that Chilean Pentecostals were trained “by the street”, that any convert could become a minister after a long time of testing of calling and capabilities in leadership and preaching, to the extent that this person must have actually “gathered a flock” before appointment as a pastor. Sepúlveda speaks of “the inadequate nature of a model of theological education that takes for granted a professionalized ministry with independent means”, and says that the Chilean “practical apprenticeship” model is well suited to their own needs.

The dichotomy between training for the ministry and academic theology must be overcome. Elliston recommends a “non-formal” education that is “usually functionally oriented, democratic, and the entry requirements are set by the community being served”. This “task-oriented” education has clear goals to be achieved, and is labour-intensive rather than resource-intensive. Perhaps we have departed too far from the biblical model of in-service leadership training by apprenticeship. Jesus and the apostle Paul both took “education for spirituality” very seriously, but the methods they used were so different from ours. They were also very different from the rabbinic method of education that Jesus vigorously rejected, an academic and residential method that was not unlike the models we use in theological education today. The Holy Spirit did not come on “empty heads” on the Day of Pentecost. He empowered those who had been through a three-year intensive process of training on the job. This is not to suggest that we take a first century model (or even an early twentieth century one) and make it normative for the twenty-first century. But if more recognition or accreditation were given to the experiences of ministry and the developing spirituality that these experiences bring, we would be educating people in Pentecostal/Charismatic spirituality more effectively. We must find ways and means to quantify and realize this, and to integrate cognitive learning with concrete, active learning.

Third, and most importantly, our Pentecostal and Charismatic spirituality should lead to total dependency on the Spirit of God in our teaching and example. He is the one who makes and equips teachers; he is an active participant in our development, and the one who enables us to change in a changing world. The western Church in particular, affirms Cheryl Bridges Johns, “has lost sight of the pedagogical role of the Holy Spirit”. She says that Pentecostal experience is the “epistemological key” that “radically alters traditional forms of theological education”. This is what is distinctive about Pentecostal/Charismatic education. We must never forget that as teachers we have been given a gracious gift by the Spirit that enables us “in a very significant way” to be “wisely guided and energized by the same Spirit”. The result will be that all involved will be radically transformed—teachers and learners alike. It is certainly true that Pentecostals and Charismatics in all their diversity throughout the world, will overlook many faults in their leaders, but require above all that these women and men know the Father intimately, love the Lord Jesus deeply, and are filled with the Spirit completely.

ENDNOTES

1. This was a paper given at the European Pentecostal Theological Association’s conference in Brussels, 23-27 July 2002 and is an extensively modified version of the keynote paper given at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, Oklahoma, March 2001, published as “The ‘Fury and Wonder’
PentecoStudies, vol. 3, no. 1, 2004
Allan Anderson, Pentecostal-Charismatic Spirituality and Theological Education
ISSN 1871-7691

Pentecostal-Charismatic Spirituality in Theological Education”, Pneuma 23:2, Fall 2001, 287-302. It is offered from the perspective of 24 years in theological education, mainly in South Africa and for the last eight years, in an international postgraduate institute in Birmingham, UK.


13. The United Apostolic Faith Church, founded in 1926 by James Brooke, who left the first classical Pentecostal denomination in Britain, the Apostolic Faith Church. Both churches had an unorthodox premillenial eschatology and like Charles Parham’s Apostolic Faith in the USA, they espoused British Israelism, probably the main reason why they did not grow significantly. Malcolm R Hathaway, “The Role of William Oliver Hutchinson and the Apostolic Faith Church in the Formation of British Pentecostal Churches”, Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association XVI (1996), 40-57.

14. This was common practice in Bible Colleges in North America and Britain until the seventies, and it helped foster the emphasis on premillenial dispensationalism. See CM Robeck, Jr, “Seminaries and Graduate Schools”, Burgess, McGee & Alexander (eds) Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 773.


17. The Hatfield Baptist Church, now Hatfield Christian Church, where ICI courses were taught at their theological school.

18. Originally the International Correspondence Institute, based in Brussels and run by the US Assemblies of God, this offered different distance-learning qualifications up to degree level.

19. Bible, Theology, Church Ministries and General Education.


26. I use “Third World” rather than “two-thirds world” in this paper following the lead of the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians, who agreed that the term, although inadequate to describe the vast majority of people in the world that it refers to, emphasizes the marginalization of most of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the face of western hegemony. “Third World” theology has been defined as that which “primarily arises from the social, economic, political, religious and cultural focus which render our people expendable”. Final Statement of the 4th EATWOT General Assembly, “Search for a New Just World Order: Challenges to Theology”, Ministerial Formation 81. (April 1998), 36.


31. Walls, 3.
33. Harvey Cox, Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century (London: Cassell, 1996), 303, suggests that fundamentalism was “a desperate effort to fend off modernity by using modernity’s weapons”.


40. South African President Thabo Mbeki gave an example of this in his inaugural speech in 1999, when he spoke of an “African renaissance”.


43. Confidence, 2:6 (June 1909), 129.


47. Wanak, 12.
48. Hwa Yung, 2.


50. José Míguez Bonino, “Pentecostal missions is more than what it claims”. Pneuma 16:2 (Fall 1997), 288.


54. Wanak, 6.
57. Sepúlveda, 32, 34.
58. Elliston, 212.
63. Johns, 47.
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