



# University of Chester



**This work has been submitted to ChesterRep – the University of Chester's  
online research repository**

**<http://chesterrep.openrepository.com>**

Author(s): Tesso Djaleta

Title: A critical survey of the development of charismatic influences in the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus

Date: May 1994

Originally published as: University of Liverpool MEd dissertation

Example citation: Djaleta, T. (1994). *A critical survey of the development of charismatic influences in the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Liverpool, United Kingdom.

Version of item: Submitted version

Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10034/114279>

***A CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF CHARISMATIC  
INFLUENCES IN THE  
ETHIOPIAN EVANGELICAL CHURCH  
MEKANE YESUS***

***TESSO DJALETA***

**This Dissertation is submitted for the degree of  
Master of Education in the University of Liverpool  
in part fulfilment of the Modular Programme**

**May 1994**

## **ABSTRACT**

The objective of the study is to consider how the Charismatic Movement has influenced the doctrine and life of the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus. The whole critical survey is constructed through a study of academic theological texts, charismatic literature, numerous EECMY documentary reports and the writer's own personal experience.

Following a study of the Biblical understanding of the Holy Spirit and a discussion of the retrieval of its place in the life of the church, traditional pneumatological perspectives of the church are surveyed. The invisible personal work of the Holy Spirit is indicated, notably beyond the appointed liturgical means of grace.

A critical examination follows of the worldwide roots of the charismatic movement; its emergence in Ethiopia, particularly within the EECMY; the social and ecclesiastical reactions to that movement, and the tension between the traditional doctrine of the Spirit and its current experiential manifestations. This study shows that the charismatic challenge has led the church to restate its teaching about the Holy Spirit within its congregations.

The particular charismatic issue of the roots and sources of baptism in the Holy Spirit, with its charismatic interpretation and the needs and pattern of his empowerment, is then explored through its contemporary theological and pastoral aspects. Recognising varying views on the second baptism or experience, the conclusion then discusses the place of further fillings with the Spirit subsequent to its initial reception.

The substantive discussion indicates that the charismatic influences seem to provide the church with a reasonable challenge and also with opportunities to reappraise its traditional theology and liturgical practice in the light of a fresh understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit. This gives opportunities to involve many members in renewal, supporting such development so that the whole spiritual status of members and their church life are enriched. There remains the likelihood that the process of charismatic renewal has yet to unite all members in a common understanding: further educational processes, both theological and experiential, are necessary in order to avoid harmful confusion.

## ***DECLARATION***

The work is original and has not been submitted previously in support of any degree qualification or course.

Signed:.

✓ Tesso Djaleta

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

A special expression of grateful indebtedness must be made to the Western Synod, the EECMY and the LWF for their helpful recommendations for this scholarship and sponsorship in this study programme. It is the writer's pleasure to register his sincere acknowledgement to all the Religious and Theological Education Department tutors of Chester College of Higher Education for their useful lectures, tutorials and consultations. A deep gratitude is also due to the writer's personal tutor, the Reverend Robert Evans, for his deep concern in various matters; to the academic tutor, the Reverend Nigel J. Lemon, who carefully read the entire work and offered an acute and constructive criticism of it; to the typist Miss Caroline Roberts, for her careful work; to the College's Inset Modular Co-ordinator; to the Dean of Students; and to the Library staff for their invaluable help.

The writer would express his appreciation to the many individuals at home in Ethiopia who have been of assistance in sending materials, writing encouraging letters and being supportive in prayer; and others with similar concerns in Birmingham and Chester.

Above all comes his debt to family: father, mother, brothers and sisters, with their deep love and concern towards their eldest son and brother. Last but not least, the writer would like to record his acknowledgement to his wife and "true yoke fellow", Bekure Daba, and children Ebenezer and Yosiah who have experienced both joy and suffering from the production of this work: his wife's support was given at the time of her own studies towards an identical award. Not only have they been critically supportive in this present work, but also throughout the time spent on the whole course.

Nonetheless, the present writer's personal beliefs lead him primarily to thank God who offered him such a privilege to maintain a family of four through sponsorship aid in a foreign land which, throughout its time, has given both challenging and critical experiences.

# **CONTENTS**

	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
<b>Abstract</b>	i
<b>Declaration</b>	ii
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	iii
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	vi
<b>Introduction</b>	vii
<b>CHAPTER 1: THE HOLY SPIRIT IN SCRIPTURE AND IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE EECMY</b>	1
1.1    The Retrieval of the Holy Spirit	1
1.2    The Holy Spirit	4
1.2.1    The Person of the Holy Spirit	9
1.2.2    The Work of the Holy Spirit	11
1.3    The EECMY and the Work of the Holy Spirit	15
1.3.1    The Holy Spirit and Salvation	16
1.3.2    The Holy Spirit and the Word	18
1.3.3    The Holy Spirit and the Sacrament	21
1.3.3.1    Baptism	21
1.3.3.2    Holy Communion	24
1.3.4    The Holy Spirit and Worship	26
<b>CHAPTER 2: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHARISMATIC INFLUENCES</b>	35
2.1    Pentecostal Movement	35
2.2    Charismatic Movement	38
2.3    Charismatic Influences in the EECMY	42
<b>CHAPTER 3: THE CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT, BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE EECMY</b>	58
3.1    The Root of Baptism in the Holy Spirit	58
3.2    The Spirit-Baptism in the Perspective of the NT	61
3.3    The Infilling or Empowering by the Holy Spirit	74
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	90
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	95

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

AL	Amharic Literature
BL	Booklet
Ed	Edition
EECMY	Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus
EOC	Ethiopian Orthodox Church
FGBMFI	Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International
JC	Julian Calendar
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MYS	Mekane Yesus Seminary
N	Note
NEB	New English Bible
NT	New Testament
NP	No Page
OT	Old Testament
Rev.	Revised
RSV	Revised Standard Version
S.I.	No place of publication given
V	Verse
Vol.	Volume



## *INTRODUCTION*

In order to describe the scope and structure of this present work, the national and religious context of its subject matter need to be stated.

Ethiopia has been an independent nation in the highlands of eastern Africa for some three thousand years. Whilst its political existence as a nation-state is amongst the world's longest, its population, now estimated at over fifty million, is linguistically, culturally and racially of great diversity, perhaps correctly described as "a museum of peoples".<sup>1</sup> The main religions are Christianity (Orthodox, Catholic, Lutheran and other Protestant denominations) and Islam. Historically and culturally, Christianity has been and still is the dominant religion, constituting more than half of the population.

Ethiopia could claim to be the earliest Christian nation in the world, its tradition reaching back to the 4th century where the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (EOC) finds its origin.<sup>2</sup> From then until 1959, the EOC has had strong formal links with the Coptic church. Such an ecclesiastical position might be viewed as institutional, traditional and ritualistic, to the possible dissatisfaction of a present generation. Into this setting were attracted the 19th century evangelical churches and notably the recent spiritual revivals.

The Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus<sup>3</sup> (EECMY) was founded in the latter part of the 19th century by Western Evangelical missionaries and Ethiopian pioneers. Today this church claims to be the largest Protestant church in Ethiopia, was formally constituted in 1959 with a synodical form of structure and has a recent membership of about one million, four hundred thousand.<sup>4</sup>

As the EECMY results from the Lutheran tradition, it is founded on the bases of Lutheran teaching: the three universal creeds (Apostles, Nicene and

Athanasian), unrevised Augsburg Confession and the Short Catechism.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the Bible<sup>6</sup> and the two dominical sacraments (Baptism and Lord's Supper) are believed to be the supreme means of grace<sup>7</sup> through which alone the Holy Spirit works. In particular, Martin Luther maintained the authority of the Bible over ecclesiastical tradition, and justification of the individual by faith alone as the principal doctrine.<sup>8</sup> Likewise, for each EECMY congregation the Holy Spirit is regularly confessed in the words of the Apostles Creed: individually, the Spirit is understood according to its Biblical content and expression, yet subordinated to the means of grace.

Like earlier radical and pietist Protestantism, such kinds of allegiance to traditional orthodoxy have become the primary cause of the recent rise of the charismatic movement in the EECMY. Indeed, despite both political persecution, denominational distrust and ecclesiastical tensions, this principal Christian revolution of the current age appears to have challenged the church to reconsider its experience of the Holy Spirit. This thus forms the on-going history of a church whose contextualised theology and liturgy have yet to be finalised and whose present and future history may in part be being written alongside charismatic renewal.

Of specific importance in relation to the rise of the charismatic movement are the following questions: why and how has the subject of the Holy Spirit been overlooked? How has biblical understanding of his person and work developed? How has the EECMY traditionally understood and practised pneumatology?

Following these initial investigations, the second chapter then examines the range of charismatic influence. Of particular importance are the differences between the Pentecostal and charismatic movements; their arrival and growth in Ethiopia and the EECMY; doctrinal, liturgical and institutional conflicts; and the dynamic development and dramatic changes which follow.

The final chapter considers the controversial issue of baptism in the Holy Spirit, discussing against its New Testament background the respective claims of the Pentecostal and charismatic interpretations of this phrase. The EECMY's experience of Spirit-filling among its charismatics is then addressed.

This study is seen by its writer to have a particular importance regarding the life of the EECMY, his own church. In addition to its being an academic study of one area of Christian theology, its role may also be seen as contributing towards the development of the EECMY. It thus seeks to shed light on the varied theological perspectives of two differing groups, traditional and renewing, and so to offer a way forward through greater understanding of the purposes and foundation of charismatic renewal.

Its conclusions, therefore, suggest to the EECMY that, because of both the Lutheran theological background and the current range of personal experiences, even change, development and education may continue to draw on both the systematic and informal elements of Christian practice in order to effect the necessary bridge towards greater mutual understanding and purpose.

## **REFERENCES: INTRODUCTION**

1. The Writer's Dissertation (1991-92) pp.23-25.
2. Ibid. pp.27-30.
3. Although the EECMY has come from Lutheran tradition, it has a significant name. Especially, the phrase "Mekane Yesus" has derived from the old Ethiopian Orthodox Church liturgical language "Geez", and means "the dwelling place of Jesus". This may imply that this church is built on Christ's resurrection with the Risen Lord at its centre (Mt 18:19-20).
4. Its synodical structure stresses the importance of the local congregation, parish, district, synod and church at national level. According to the 1992 annual statistics it has 2702 congregations, 1069 preaching stations, many parishes and districts, 3 working areas and 8 synods. In local elders are elected by members for two years. The chairman of elders is called the president of the congregation. Furthermore, parishes may have both evangelists and a parish pastor. District superintendent and synod and church presidents are each elected for four years. Nowadays the young people are estimated to be more than 75% of the members, offering a positive future for the church (see the EECMY 1992 membership statistics).
5. EECMY Constitution and by-Laws, (Amharic Literature) 1983 Julian Calendar, Article 2, Section 2, p.1.; B. Wedajo (1984JC\*) p.23.
6. EECMY Constitution and by-Laws, op. cit. Article 2, Section 1, p.1; B. Wedajo op. cit. p.22.
7. B. Wedajo, op. cit. pp.14-22.
8. P. Althaus (1966) pp.35-42, "For God will not come to you in your private room and speak to you." p.37.

# **CHAPTER 1**

## ***The Holy Spirit in Scripture and the Theology of the EECMY.***

In common with other Churches, the EECMY has, within its inherited rather than devised ecclesiastical and traditional theology, long had its own understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit. Before examining this position, we need first to investigate two basic points: the late 20th Century quest for the retrieval of the Holy Spirit, an issue involving much contemporary Christian concern; and a biblical view of the Holy Spirit, tracing the salient and most universally agreed elements.

### **1.1 The Retrieval of the Holy Spirit**

A major question addressed within current Christianity is to understand why the subject of the Holy Spirit had been understressed by theologians and Church traditions. Questioning on this issue expresses a Spiritual anxiety now that the person of the Holy Spirit in particular, since the second half of the nineteenth century, has come once more to the attention of scholars. One such has thus argued:

It is a frequent and well-founded complaint that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been strangely neglected by theologians. Our theological text books, as a rule, pass over the subject with a few conventional pages.<sup>1</sup>

A more recent opinion records:

It has become almost a convention that those who undertake to write about the Holy Spirit should begin by deploring the neglect of this doctrine in the thought and life of the Church today.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps this neglect takes us to the company of Christians of the early centuries of Christianity. H.B. Swete began his study of the Holy Spirit with the statement "In the earliest age of the Church, comparatively little attention was paid to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit".<sup>3</sup>

The most frequent reason given for this inattention is that the mind of the Church was preoccupied with another more basic and important matter, the meaning of the person and work of Christ. Perhaps inevitably, Christology comes before Pneumatology: this explanation had been a comforting justification for an inattention to the subject matter of the Holy Spirit. More recently, however, some significant NT theologians would maintain a contrary argument. Dr V. Taylor writes:

The most immediate and striking impression regarding the origin and progress of the early Christianity which we gain from the NT is the strong consciousness of the first believers of being under the power and direction of the Spirit of God.<sup>4</sup>

David Watson, a late 20th century Church of England preacher, also says:

undoubtedly the Spirit of God was the key to everything in the NT Church. The fifth book of the NT should really be called the Acts of the Holy Spirit. If God had taken the Holy Spirit out of their midst in those days, about ninety-five percent of what they were doing in their Churches would have ceased immediately.<sup>5</sup>

No more obvious argument can be produced about the Christians of the first generation than this: they are seen to be Spirit filled, Spirit guided, Spirit controlled and governed. F. Grant states:

very naturally, the 'Spiritual' atmosphere of the early Church was strong and positive. Not only have modern psychologists studied the mind of Christ and tried to show that He was a mystic, a visionary with a 'spiritual' or 'pneumatic' personality, but the same tests have been applied to the Apostles.<sup>6</sup>

Likewise the Holy Spirit occupied the centre of the early Christian life. From the late fourth century<sup>7</sup> the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was never given that prominence in Christian apologetic accorded to the doctrine of the Son. If the function and work of the Holy Spirit were considered to be this vital as the fulfilment of a New Testament promise, it must then be asked why nearly two thousand years of Christian history passed without the

expression of popular and worshipping Christianity acknowledging and concentrating on this presumed heritage. This apparent absence was also found in the Creed-making process. As Professor Josiah states:

The Holy Spirit, neglected...even when the Creeds were still in the formative period of their existence, has remained until this day in the background of inquiry, both for the theologians and for the philosophers.<sup>8</sup>

In the classical creeds the Holy Spirit occupies, for example, one sentence following fuller statements about Christ and his Church: this may be understood as a lesser importance attaching to the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

Even today, many theologians whose concerns are about creation, incarnation, atonement, Christ, the Church<sup>9</sup> readily compress this subject into a smaller frame. This may reflect a view of the Holy Spirit as more of a hidden, personal and individual matter, so that every attempt to formulate a theology of the Holy Spirit could be seen as an implied disrespect.

↳ S. Hendry comments:

The real reason is that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is beset with difficulties and obscurities, which baffle the mind, and which no book has yet been able to dispel.<sup>10</sup>

Thus it is undoubtedly true, that pneumatology is a neglected field of systematic theology. It has been treated as the "step-child" of Christian theology too.

The mainstream Churches in particular seem to have been reluctant to give attention to the work of the Holy Spirit: their apparent emphasis on intellectual, traditional, ritual, institutional and organisational matters stands in contrast to the fast expanding Pentecostal<sup>11</sup> and Charismatic Churches: these claim the reality of the Holy Spirit's presence and the exercise of his acts and gifts in their worship and communities, an enthusiasm empowered by a supernatural inspiration. Understandably a much richer literature on the work of the Holy Spirit has been written within

this setting, albeit infrequently beyond a devotional or quasi-theological character; it is used only in the pulpit and in the expressed life of the Church, a quite different setting and purpose than that of Biblical Theology. This might have the dual effect of a spiritual under-nourishment of theology and of leading to a suspicion of formal theological thought. Thus two Church groups or viewpoints have lived by the shortcomings and mistakes of the other, providing the pretext to recognise neither their own limitations nor possible value within the other.<sup>12</sup> There remains a need to produce a balanced study of the Holy Spirit satisfying both academic methodology and ecclesiastical need and practice.

As for the Churches which do seem to have emphasised the work of the Spirit then, with Joseph Barry, it may be suggested that the building of 'altars of retrieval' or compensation of the Holy Spirit would make amends for this neglect.<sup>13</sup> And where for many today the invitation of Rev. 3:20 is seen as much as representing the person of the Spirit as it is of Jesus, then such understanding within the Church would claim a need to let in that Spirit to counter apparent worldly concerns.<sup>14</sup>

Thus a 'driving power' of the Holy Spirit comes primarily as experience, supplementarily as doctrine, to renew an organism's soul and banish defeat and despair: then it will retrieve the dead skeletons of ecclesiastical organisation and reform the dry rot of dogma.<sup>15</sup> For Churches to seek such renewal, there exists the obvious need to study the apparent nature, works and Charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit.

## **1.2 The Holy Spirit**

A modest and preliminary rather than exhaustive examination of the biblical treatment of the Holy Spirit notes, with H.P.V. Dursen among others, that the term 'Spirit' occurs no fewer than 378 times in the OT and 335 in the NT.<sup>16</sup> Some might without exaggeration thus designate the Bible as the book of Spirit.<sup>17</sup> In its opening passage the Spirit brings order and beauty to creation (Gen.1:2), its last pages describe the Spirit's missionary invitation (Rev. 22:17). The dynamic performance of the Spirit ranges from



the very birth of nature at creation to the regeneration of man's soul to eternal life.<sup>18</sup>

An initial investigation of the etymology of the Biblical words used for 'Spirit' may aid our understanding of particularly important emphases of theological usage.<sup>19</sup> In accordance with the OT view the Hebrew experience of God's Spirit undergoes a rich and complex development in the course of the centuries.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, the earliest usage endows the Spirit with life and power, both the Hebrew word *ruach* and the Greek word *pneuma*, as well as the Latin words *animus*, *anima*, *spiritus*, are translated and used variously as: "breath", "wind"<sup>21</sup>, "Spirit"<sup>22</sup>, life principle, human disposition, mood, thought, determination and the Spirit of God.<sup>23</sup>

In brief *ruach* serves in the OT for 'metaphysical' phenomena such as air-in-motion, either wind or breath; as 'physiological' references, the breath or principle of life, in the body of animals and men; as 'psychical' connotation: the emotional aspects of human experience which indicates anger, grief or fear. Above all, where used supernaturally to mark agencies operating upon man without and beyond nature, it is reserved to its divine source as the Spirit of God.<sup>24</sup> These different uses of *ruach* or *pneuma* denote both that aspect of the divine character of the elemental force which proceeds from God and partakes of his essence, creates, sustains and orders life and also indicates as the "cross-reference" and "God's creative purpose"<sup>25</sup> that both men and animals have *ruach* or *pneuma*.<sup>26</sup>

We must, however, distinguish both the difference and relationship between the human and divine *ruach* here. As the principle of life, God pre-eminently has *ruach*. "He is a breathing, living and acting God."<sup>27</sup> Yet God is unknown, imperceptible, invisible, incomprehensible, except in his self-disclosures and expression through the operation of his breathing. Naturally, man without God's *ruach* is merely dust, without a living quality. This is given to man through a mysterious miracle of creation (Gen. 2:7). Because of this gift, of all human things, man alone has the capacity for self-

contemplation, and the faculties of thought and reason, capable of participating in the life of God (Gen. 1:26-27 RSV).

In God's economy of creation, then, God's *ruach* is "the source of all that is alike, of all physical life"<sup>28</sup>, which is said to shape and direct both nature, humankind and history.<sup>29</sup>

In summary, the Spirit in the OT, which is originally thought of as "wind" or "breath"<sup>30</sup>, is later conceived as a divine entity, in particular a Spiritual reality independent of man<sup>31</sup>, by which God accomplishes his action in the world and operates his Charismatic power upon man.<sup>32</sup>

Similarly, the Holy Spirit is seen to come mightily upon man, stirring individuals or groups to ecstasy, often producing supernatural phenomena, active in such as Moses and the judges of Israel, in warriors, kings, prophets and prophetesses. Thus in the OT, creating, revealing and enabling are often displayed as the main activities of the Holy Spirit.

When we enter into the Greek NT, the situation basically seems the same.<sup>33</sup> In the NT, Spirit is *pneuma*, a term with similar association to the Hebrew of *ruach*<sup>34</sup> as commonly used in the *septuagint*.<sup>35</sup> The NT, with its many references to *pneuma*, is said to be the book of the Holy Spirit<sup>36</sup>, despite the possible exceptions of 2 and 3 John<sup>37</sup> and Philemon.<sup>38</sup> In contrast, many scholars have argued ~~that~~ the lesser *written* evidence *in* the synoptic Gospels on the Holy Spirit *is* the most striking phenomenon.<sup>39</sup> However, this dispute seems an exaggeration; though the actual references seem fewer, their meanings are of the utmost importance.

Furthermore, in the Synoptics, undue attention has *also been paid* to the contrary <sup>perspectives</sup> of the major indications to the Spirit in relation to the primary events in the life of Jesus and less to the records of His own verbal teaching about the Holy Spirit.<sup>40</sup> The latter seems to consist of only four or five spoken words of Jesus, of which only one is accepted almost unanimously as an authentic word of the Historical Jesus (Mt. 12:28; Lk.11:20). Dispute surrounds the other four on various grounds.<sup>41</sup> It thus remains debatable as to whether Jesus had a full consciousness about the

Holy Spirit during his earthly ministry or not. Nonetheless, the vital connection of the Holy Spirit with the major events of His life (conception, baptism, ministry, exorcism, Resurrection, Ascension, commissioning) together with other considerations do sufficiently express His consciousness of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, James D.G. Dunn who emphasises Jesus' consciousness in terms of his ministry states:

His consciousness of spiritual power so real, so effective, so new, so final, was the well-spring of both his proclamation of the presentness of the future kingdom and his authority in deed and word. This consciousness is summed up in the word "Spirit". His awareness of being uniquely possessed and used by divine Spirit was the main spring of His mission and the key to its effectiveness.<sup>42</sup>

Dunn's perceptive comment makes it explicit that the whole religious life of Jesus and his ministry was full of inspiration which confirms his consciousness of the Holy Spirit. However, as C.K. Barrett comments:

He could not in the time of his ministry speak of his own plenary inspiration, nor unmistakably reveal it, because that would have meant the betrayal of the messianic secret.<sup>43</sup>

In the context of the Synoptics, Barrett's comment seems valid in speculating on why Jesus did not teach <sup>about the Spirit:</sup> similarly, Peter at Caesarea Philippi confesses the Messiahship of Jesus rather prematurely (Mt 16:17). Unlike the Synoptics, however, the Fourth Gospel provides fuller references by Jesus to the Holy Spirit<sup>44</sup> during the earlier part of the ministry.<sup>45</sup> Some more modern criticism<sup>46</sup> suggests that this Gospel has probably undergone editorial development in order to emphasise the emerging Church's view of the place of the Spirit in the history of salvation.

Above all, in the whole NT, the book of Acts is where the OT prophetic promise of the Holy Spirit, reaching its high point in Joel's prophecy, is clearly fulfilled at Pentecost by his outpouring on humanity (Joel 2:26-28; Lk 24:49; Acts 1:5, 2:14). Some may dispute the outpouring of

the Spirit, referring to the account of John 20:22.<sup>47</sup> But this may present the Spirit as a power conferred upon the Apostles enabling them to remove sin by a forgiving act. However, "the Spirit does not come into operation until Christ is glorified, i.e. until he has completed the work of his earthly ministry and returned to the father".<sup>48</sup>

Thus at the early date of Pentecost it was specifically felt that Joel's prophecy had been fulfilled. Dunn claims:

The fact that Pentecost is the climax of Jesus' ministry for the disciples should not blind us into thinking that Pentecost is merely a continuation of what went before. Pentecost is a new beginning - the inauguration of the new age, the age of the Spirit that which had not been before.<sup>49</sup>

The new age of the Holy Spirit, which could not resume until Jesus was glorified, had now commenced. Undoubtedly the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost was seen as a crucial turning point in the history of God's dealings with the human race by now inspiring open witness to Jesus.

Having admitted this, the vital question to arise is, whether the NT notion of the Spirit is a completely new phenomenon or whether it may be claimed as a continuation and evolution of the OT concept.<sup>50</sup> The latter indisputably undergoes development and the doctrine and different titles of the Holy Spirit are produced from it.<sup>51</sup> To accord with this, the Holy Spirit is referred to as "Spirit", "Holy Spirit", "Spirit of God", "Spirit of Father", "Spirit of Lord", "Spirit of Christ"<sup>52</sup>, "Spirit of Truth"<sup>53</sup>, "Parakletos".<sup>54</sup> The interdependence of these various names, all together indicative of the central role of the Spirit in the NT, may not disguise the distinctive office or effect of each. Prime amongst these is "Holy Spirit", yet the comparative rarity of OT readings is notable: some scholars note seven occurrences<sup>55</sup>, others only two<sup>56</sup>. In these latter cases (Isa. 63:1; Ps 51:10) God's *ruach* possesses an ethical and moral holiness which contrasts with human unrighteousness. In the NT, "Holy Spirit" is the most used of the titles<sup>57</sup>: this may derive from its more developed nature as title<sup>58</sup>; from the results of

intertestamental views of God as the Holy One who, through Jesus' sinlessness and the Spirit's eschatological promise, seeks to produce holiness in his people<sup>59</sup>; and from the developing yet more restricting description of the third person of the Godhead.<sup>60</sup> The Holy Spirit's office of holiness, purity and sanctification, implicit in the name, are particularly evident. Additionally the biblical "Holy Spirit" also contrasts with perishable humanity and with unholy worldliness.<sup>61</sup>

There is the perennial problem of using human description and imagination to explain the supernatural character of God. But the continual tradition of the Bible as a book of metaphors makes it inevitable that many figurative representations are found to describe the person and work of the Holy Spirit: dove, wind, fire, water, seal, guarantee, oil. These impersonal metaphors both convey truth about the Holy Spirit, yet may also themselves be regarded as realities. This possible confusion may cause some to speak of the Spirit as "it" whilst traditional Christianity knows the Spirit as a divine "being".

### **1.2.1 The Person of the Holy Spirit**

In recent years, one of the lively debates within the EECMY Charismatics seems to be about the personality of the Holy Spirit. A.J. MacDonald, considering the example of incarnation in Jesus Christ, states "If God found it desirable to reveal himself to men in human form, we need not shrink from expressing the personality of the Spirit in human terms".<sup>62</sup> Although there is no exact term "person", there are numerous allusions to this concept in scripture, that the Spirit is experienced in terms of human personality.

Of the whole biblical tradition, in particular there is no clear personal concept of the Holy Spirit in the OT as there is in the NT. Amongst many scholars, J. McKenzie argues that if there is, it goes beyond the OT, but not explicitly beyond metaphor.<sup>63</sup> Indeed, as already seen, the OT offers no clear personal character (hypostation) of him rather than "as God's personal presence and intervention (Isa. 33:1)"<sup>64</sup>, as a substantial source of power and

creative activity.<sup>65</sup> Above all the Spirit is none other than God himself, present and at work, as are his hand and his arm<sup>66</sup>, without other distinctive personification. Chronologically, the Holy Spirit becomes personalised within salvific revelation only after one more step, the messianic age.

Yet there seems little doubt, whatever the attendant problems conceptually, that taken as a whole the NT does in fact express the Spirit in personalised terms. Nonetheless J. McKenzie writes:

The Spirit is not obviously and explicitly conceived as a distinctive divine personal being in Paul. The occasional personifications which he employs do not go beyond the personifications found in the OT and Judaism.<sup>67</sup>

Yet this statement does not explain the hesitation surrounding Paul's usage of personification of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps Spirit is merely "Spirit", "Spirit of God" as in the OT, in which case there remain potential areas for debate. Paul's expression of the Spirit, as the Spirit of God (Rom. 8:9; 1 Cor. 3:16, 2:11, 6:11, 12:3, 7:40; 2 Cor. 3:3 etc.)<sup>68</sup>, seems not to be "...the Spirit of God is God disclosing himself as Spirit"<sup>69</sup>, as in the OT; no longer is the Holy Spirit "ill-defined", "defused" or sub-personal presence<sup>70</sup> in the NT, particularly after the dramatic manifestation at Pentecost. Moreover, Paul's usage of the term, "Spirit of Christ" or "Lord" (Rom. 8:9; Phil 1:19) takes the concept beyond the OT understanding but at least finds here the raw material for the later Trinitarian formulae employed in the Church<sup>71</sup> with its distinctiveness for the Holy Spirit. There is altogether an enlarged understanding of its personality.

Moreover, today there are some who consider the link between Jesus and the Spirit as a problematic issue which may affect the personality of the Spirit. Amongst these, M. Green states the Spirit is "no longer sub-personal" as in the OT, but "sharply localised in Jesus" or "stamped within the personality of Jesus". He finally insists "...then, the Spirit is fully personal and the personality he wears is the personality of Jesus".<sup>72</sup> This argument

emphasises the role of the Spirit prior to Jesus' resurrection and glorification when Pentecost had yet to happen.

Yet whilst Green's case appears to depersonalise the Spirit, after the event of Pentecost the Spirit is explicitly experienced as a person, "distinct from the Father and the Son, with a ministry of his own".<sup>73</sup>

Perhaps that distinctive personal reality of the Holy Spirit is more explicitly asserted when he is called *parakelete* (Jn 15:26). Personal pronouns (Jn 15:26; 16:7-8, 13), the character of his mission, the attributes of intelligence, will, power, wisdom and emotions all unmistakably attest him a person.<sup>74</sup> Further, like the Father and Son, he acts anthropomorphically: he speaks, hears, teaches and guides. Again he attracts lies, is grieved by sin and is blasphemed against, other characteristics of personality.

Yet not only is he a person, he also carried divinity in him. The Biblical record strongly asserts the participation of the Holy Spirit in the Godhead so that he, like Father and Son and counter to the heretical beliefs of Arians and Sabellians<sup>75</sup>, has the divine attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence and eternity. The strong formal belief of Christian orthodoxy knows him as divine person. The issue of provenance, established in the NT by words of Jesus (Jn. 15:26) and expressing relationship within the Godhead<sup>76</sup>, has been the cause of major doctrinal division between the western Church (holding the Spirit to proceed from both Father and son) and the eastern Church (seeing the Father as the sole originator).<sup>77</sup> However, despite this controversy, Christians are united in their understanding of the Holy Spirit as a co-equal, co-eternal person of the Trinity: the terms "second" or "third" person imply neither superiority nor inferiority, though the Father is the source of all.

### **1.2.2 The Work of the Holy Spirit**

Following this discussion of the Spirit's nature in divinity and personality, we move now to consider his distinctive work. Whatever the common work of the Triune God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit have different distinctive functions to perform. For instance, neither Spirit

nor Father died on the Cross of Calvary: instead it was God the Son. This issue, however incomprehensible, has also been discussed by modern theologians. Jürgen Moltmann, after a long discussion, states "The son suffers and dies on the cross. The Father suffers with him, but not in the same way"<sup>78</sup>. Eventually, he concludes "Jesus' death cannot be understood as the death of God; but only as death in God".<sup>79</sup>

Indeed this logical way of theorizing expresses the mysterious salvific work of the Triune God in corporate yet in distinctive action. The emergence of an understanding of the threefold nature of God can be held to correspond with a specific biblical and post-biblical timescale. The work of God the Father is especially attested in the OT, the work of the Son in the Gospels. However, from the day of Pentecost onwards the emphasis is on the work of God the Holy Spirit, despite Scripture attesting that God the Holy Spirit works throughout history from the beginning of the world. In a similar manner some writers categorise the times in three eras: creation to Bethlehem, Bethlehem to Pentecost and Pentecost until now.<sup>80</sup> Without going into the historical survey, we need only single out a few key points.

In a more common sense, the Holy Spirit works in the individual, in the Church and in the world. But as to the Christian, the supreme instance of "God in action in the world"<sup>81</sup>, is the work of salvation and the mediation of that salvation to people. Thus Christian theology considers the operation of the Spirit distinctively in the high points of ecclesiastical life, and through the conclusive values in a believer's spiritual experience.

In the individual, the primary work of the Holy Spirit is regeneration, a term holding a variety of biblical and traditional meanings. In Lutheran tradition "justification", Reformed "regeneration", Methodist and Pietist "conversion" and "sanctification", Evangelical and Pentecostal groups "sanctification" and "filled with the Spirit" are likely key words.<sup>82</sup>

Human beings' will for good could be in bondage, and their spiritual faculties weak, thus it may be idle for them to delude themselves that they can turn to Christ. Nevertheless the life giver, the Holy Spirit, prompts them



to accept redemption by operating in their hearts and opening their minds for such a mysterious transformation through the process of spiritual birth or regeneration (Jn 3:3-8; 2 Cor. 5:7; 1 Peter 1:23). As quoted in B. Graham someone states:

There must be the mysterious work of the Holy Spirit of God in the new birth. Without that, all our arguments are quite useless....What the Holy Spirit does in the new birth is not to make a man a Christian regardless of the evidence, but on the contrary to clear away the mists from his eyes and enable him to attend to the evidence.<sup>83</sup>

This perceptive comment shows the specific work of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, regeneration like justification is, for many theologians and traditions at least, an immediate act. We shall, however, consider this point in the context of conversion-initiation in the following chapters.

No consideration of the Holy Spirit could be complete without some attention to the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church, although different beliefs about the Church are often rooted in different beliefs or unbeliefs about the Holy Spirit.<sup>84</sup>

This is a controversial issue, both in the NT era and also where similar problems exist now between institutional and Charismatics tendencies in Churches. We consider here only the general points.

The Holy Spirit is seen to express himself in creating unity in the Christian Church as a "Unitive Being"<sup>85</sup> (Eph. 4:3-4) in both vertical and horizontal aspects. Vertically, he unites believers to Christ in regenerative, life-giving co-resurrection, so that they may become partakers in his kingdom (Rom. 14:17) and members in the body of which he is head<sup>86</sup> (Rom. 6:3-11; Eph. 4:3-16; Tit. 3:4-7). In all this performance of the Holy Spirit, the relationship of the Church to Jesus is a very keen one. As C.K. Barrett says:

The Church's faith that it was the Spirit-inspired community, the new Israel by the Messias - was based upon the fact of Jesus, upon his life, death and resurrection regarded as decisive events in the eschatological programme.<sup>87</sup>

On this ground the Holy Spirit unites the Christian community to Christ and communion in a fellowship which could not be paralleled in any other group. Thus the Church becomes Koinonia (Act 2:42) of the Holy Spirit displaying a oneness which by his absolute power surpassed racial, economic, class and social divisions (Ph. 2:1-2).<sup>88</sup> This is the horizontal work of the Holy Spirit in the Church. Paradoxically, like so much in the believer's life, unity is a benefaction of God and yet the Church has to work in order to achieve it.

The Holy Spirit revives or renews the whole ministry of the Church by inspiring and empowering. He inspires the worship and prayer (Rom. 8:26-28), he preserves the Christian community from confusing Christian faith with dogmatic convention or hypocritical Christian tradition and secures Christian worship from degenerating into methodical ritualism.<sup>89</sup> Regarding the worship, the Holy Spirit bestows the gifts, namely witnessing, serving, teaching, revealing Jesus' reality and the truth about him in the believing community, to build up and edify the body. Beyond the Church, he also prompts the missionary vision to make Christ known to the outside world (Acts 1:1-8; 16:6-10). The energising persuasion of the Holy Spirit in the economy of Church growth is very significant. Thus he is the necessary supernatural power to point the way forward.

To sum up, the distinctive work of the Holy Spirit operates in the Church of every time and place and in the personal religious experience of every believer within the Church. Thus the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit sets forth the relationship between the historic work of God performed in Palestine in the first century and his practical saving operation in the world of any present day. Moreover, the biblical and traditional theology express further activity of the Holy Spirit in individual Christian life and in the Church. To avoid repetition here, these areas are reserved for subsequent chapters.

### 1.3 The EECMY and the Work of the Holy Spirit.

This present work has described briefly the EECMY's foundation and traditional background and then, in more detail, the biblical view of the person and work of the Spirit: we turn now to the traditional theology of the Spirit as understood by the EECMY.

More correctly, we may state that the EECMY has yet to produce any indigenous doctrinal theology despite a hundred year history, relying instead on traditional Lutheran dogmatics. But the matter of the Holy Spirit has attracted particular attention during two decades of growing influence of the Charismatic movement. As a result of the two EECMY theological consultations on leadership guidance for Charismatic renewal, the EECMY has restated its belief in the Holy Spirit as follows:

....that the Holy Spirit is one of the three persons of the Godhead, who from eternity is one God with the Father and the Son. This means the Holy Spirit equally is the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of God, and that we cannot know or receive the Holy Spirit apart from Jesus Christ our Lord and God our Father.<sup>90</sup>

This pneumatological, Trinitarian, established belief expresses no hierarchy, no theology, no fanaticism and seeks to invoke the Spirit only in dependence on the person and ministry of Jesus.

The whole notion of the Holy Spirit and his work has been understood through the corner stone of the Lutheran traditional terms of "sola fide", "sola scriptura", "sola Christus", above all through justification by faith. Following this line, the association of the Holy Spirit with "the means of grace" is the principal traditional understanding in the EECMY. In general, the Spirit and his work have attracted unfair comment and treatment in the dogmatics manuals and Catechisms of the Lutheran Church.<sup>91</sup> As Dr A. Norlander, a theology lecturer at MYS, comments:

Firstly, the doctrine of the ministry has taken over everything that has to deal with the Spiritual gifts according to 1 Cor. 12 and Rom. 12....Secondly, experiences of being filled by the Holy Spirit have

been looked down upon in traditional Lutheran context....Thirdly, there is a strange lack of a personal experience of the Holy Spirit in the dogmatics of the mainline Churches.<sup>92</sup>

When the theological crystallisation and the concept of tradition preoccupies peoples' thought, the Holy Spirit drops from the centre of attention because he has been lost from the heart of experience.<sup>93</sup> Although no specific doctrine of the Spirit emerged through two full Christian centuries we may nonetheless compare the EECMY's lesser treatment above with the personal experience of the Spirit recorded following its dramatic reception by believers at Pentecost (Acts 8:16; 19:2, Gal. 3:2; 5:4,6; Rom. 8:15-16; Eph. 1:3ff). Thus Norlander's comment is very explicit and appropriate and will receive continuing attention in later sections. Here, however, we note the place of the Holy Spirit in the work of salvation.

### **1.3.1 The Holy Spirit and Salvation**

In the mystery of salvation the relationship between Christ and the Spirit is of the greatest importance; at the same time it has been a keenly debated issue. In the process of human salvation, it is claimed that the Spirit is subordinate to the historic Christ and has, as his task, to apply to mankind the salvation achieved by Christ. On the one hand, this seems scriptural; thus among many biblical passages Jesus himself says that the Holy Spirit bears witness (Jn 15:26), glorifies and declares Christ rather than himself (Jn 16:13-14). In the Pauline corpus also, the work of Jesus is claimed as the content of the Spirit's work (1 Cor. 12:3). On the Day of Pentecost after the moving of the Holy Spirit, it seems that Peter emphasises not so much the Spirit but Christ (Acts 2 cf. Rev. 19:20).

According to this view, the work of the Holy Spirit is to draw attention to Christ in order to awaken faith as instrument and mediator: he is a second reality when seen alongside Christ. The Spirit is entirely subordinate to him, serving in the implication of his atonement in the apprehension of justification by faith.<sup>94</sup> As an American Lutheran scholar,

G.S. Hendry, puts it:

...the Spirit is presented in a purely Christocentric reference. There is no reference in the NT to any work of the Spirit apart from Christ. The Spirit is, in an exclusive sense, the Spirit of Christ.<sup>95</sup>

This is a distinctive Lutheran view in the relation of the Spirit to Christ in the work of salvation on which the EECMY's beliefs seem to have been founded. However, it may be argued that this pneumatological sentiment cannot be a full representation of NT teaching. Dr A. Norlander states:

It is quite clear from the NT teaching that the Holy Spirit does not only convey and mediate the resurrection life of Christ to us as a channel. He does this but he is also in himself a part of the gift of salvation.<sup>96</sup>

As seen earlier, he is a person and far more than instrumental. As H. Berkhof argues:

His coming to us is a great new event in (a) series of his own, a world of conversion, experience, sanctification....He is not only instrumental to Christ, but he is also a centre of a new actions.<sup>97</sup>

Thus, on the other hand, according to the NT (Acts 2:38, Gal. 4:4-7) the Lutheran view of the Holy Spirit's work only as a mediator and as messenger of forgiveness of sins rather than as a gift of salvation seems to be a depersonification of him and merely a restricting formula to his work. In fact it is clear that the cross of Christ is taken as the heart of man's salvation. In the same way, the gift of the Holy Spirit is also based on Christ's atoning death, as is the forgiveness of sins (Acts 2:33). Thus the gift of the Spirit should not be considered as a threat against the notion of "Christ alone".<sup>98</sup>

Such inattention to the Holy Spirit in terms of salvation was not only an early radical pietistic Protestant threat against Lutheranism; it is a strong challenge by the 20th century Pentecostal and Charismatic movements as well.<sup>99</sup>

Despite all critical issues, the EECMY's historical and traditional doctrine, through which the Holy Spirit performs human salvation, remains the word of God and the Sacraments.

### 1.3.2 The Holy Spirit and the Word

Lutheran theology teaches that "sola scriptura" is the source of all theology, as the "sole and most certain rule" for judging all teachers and teaching in the Church.<sup>100</sup> This theology seems to be produced against both the authority of the Roman Catholic Papacy and its importance of tradition and also the "Anabaptists" religious experience as the true distinctive biblical interpretation.<sup>101</sup>

As a Church of the Reformation, the EECMY also accepts the whole Scripture, i.e. Old and New Testaments, as the divine inspiration of God on the basis of a soteriological purpose.<sup>102</sup> As far as the relation between the word and the Spirit is regarded "...the Holy Spirit is associated pre-eminently with the means of grace, of which the first and foremost is the word".<sup>103</sup> In this practical character of the Lutheran view, the witness of the Spirit is further evidenced by the fact that it is related primarily to the living work of preaching rather than to the written word of the Scripture.<sup>104</sup> Here it seems that Luther emphasises the witness of the Spirit to Christ, to whom the scripture stands in an instrumental relationship. In this respect, it is significant that the Augsburg confession encloses no article on Scripture, but only on the ministry:

In order that we may obtain this faith (by which we are justified) there has been instituted the ministry of preaching the gospel and dispensing the sacraments. For it is through the word and the sacraments as means that the Holy Spirit is given, who works faith in those who hear the Gospel, when and where it seems good to God.<sup>105</sup>

In relation to this, it is in the reality of the preaching of the Gospel that the witness of the Spirit becomes effective to produce assurance of faith. As P. Althaus summarises Luther, "the Spirit does not speak [work] without the word. The Spirit speaks through and in the word....There is no new

revelation".<sup>106</sup> This authoritative Lutheran dictum emphasises the sanction of direct communication with God without the means of grace. As Althaus points out, if Luther was asked why God does not carry out his work in men without the word, Luther would say:

....although he could do it without the word, he does not wish to do so. It has pleased God not to give the Spirit without the word, but through the word, that he might have us as working together with him, we sounding forth without what he alone breathes within wheresoever he will.<sup>107</sup>

On this point Luther's argument hardly seems strong, but merely to resist the "Spiritualists", the Anabaptist enthusiasts of his time, who regard the operation of the Holy Spirit as a "new truth" beyond the normal channels of the means of grace.<sup>108</sup> In this context Luther appears to counteract the new revelation of God in the Spirit apart from the word. However, this may have both positive and negative impacts. On the one hand, there is the positive insight behind the assertion of sola scriptura as the critical questioning of all authorities. Also perceived is that the Spirit is present and active in the word to illuminate it for human beings, to make the word powerful in them. Luther says:

I believe that it is not on my own reason or by my own strength that I believe in Jesus Christ my Lord: it is the Holy Spirit that by the Gospel has called me, with his gifts has enlightened me, ...has sanctified and sustained me, just as he calls, gathers together, enlightens, sanctifies and sustains a Christendom by Jesus Christ in true proper faith.<sup>109</sup>

On the other hand, primarily as Peter C. Hodgson says:

the negative impact of sola scriptura was to turn Christianity into a book religion - a logical extension of the scripture principle not unlike the logical extension of institutional authority.<sup>110</sup>

This comment may contain two weaknesses of Lutheranism. Firstly, the Spirit has not found his rightful place within Lutheranism largely due to Protestant suspicion and rejection of the "Spiritualists". In fact as a logical

reverse of Catholicism the Holy Spirit has been subordinated to the Bible. This led Lutheranism to be claimed as "Bible-taught" rather than "Spirit-taught".

If a personal awareness of the appropriation of Christ's salvation continues not to occupy a significant place in popular preaching, then the EECMY will similarly not respond to the new phenomenon of the essential place of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church: nonetheless, recent years may have seen a reversal of this position.

Secondly, the limiting of the work of the Holy Spirit to the formal preaching of the word seems to be a form of implied indoctrination, scripture being seen as the sole medium for the passing on of teaching or instruction. Its authenticity is seen as total and conveys all truth, mediated through the Spirit in only this way. Yet the experiential reality on the other hand can hardly be gainsaid.

Since God is the God of all generations, he can speak and work in the present context through his Spirit beyond the normal channels of the means of grace.

Thus the Holy Spirit safeguards Christians' thought of God from too precise formulation and too definitive limitation. Above all, he keeps Christians' thought of God "open-ended" toward new discoveries springing from new experiences of God, in turn testimonies to new revelations of himself by God.<sup>111</sup>

H. Berkhof helpfully summarises these views thus: "The word is an instrument of the Spirit. But the Spirit is not the prisoner of the word, nor does the word work automatically".<sup>112</sup> Thus as the word of God is a gift of God and instrument of God through which he reveals himself to people, the Holy Spirit is also a divine gift of God and one of the ways through which God makes himself known to human beings so that the Holy Spirit can speak and work with and without the means of grace.



### 1.3.3 The Holy Spirit and the Sacrament

The Sacrament is a divine grace in the EECMY traditional theology. This term 'sacrament' is unscriptural, yet it has been commonly used by the Christian Church to denote a distinctive class of ceremonies or rites in Christian worship. Its original definition is attributed to Augustine (354-430) who defined it as "an outward and visible sign of an inward and Spiritual grace".<sup>113</sup> It is a symbol which is seen and done, as well as said. It involves a proper substance and action, as well as necessary spoken words.

Following Luther, the EECMY accepts only two sacraments as gospel commands of Jesus (Holy Baptism and Holy Communion, Mt 28:19-20; Lk 22:19-20). For Luther the sacrament is powerless without the word of God, which determines its character.

God confronts us in his word. We receive and accept his word in faith. God deals with men within the context of this correlation between the promise of the gospel and faith.<sup>114</sup>

In this light, the proclaimed gospel with the Biblical and dominical sacraments of baptism and Eucharist genuinely create and uphold the believers. More accurately, the Holy Spirit through only these means of grace has the capacity to call, save, comfort, build and sanctify his Church. We now turn to consider briefly these two sacraments.

**1.3.3.1 Baptism:** For the EECMY baptism is the first initiation for Christian life. If salvation is a complex term, so is baptism of which is a sacrament. It is the rite in which the transitional point of life is marked into being "Churched". According to the NT position, baptism by water and Spirit is the operative symbol of conversion to God. It is the mark of the beginning of the Christian life as the sacrament of the new birth or of regeneration.

The NT seems to declare from the beginning the means of baptism in many different images, expressing the riches of Christ and endowment of Christ's whole salvation. In consequence the EECMY accepts that baptism is for discipleship (Mt 28:19-20), for forgiveness of sins, washing away of sins (Acts 2:38; 1 Cor. 11:6), for membership, for new birth (Jn 3:5), for liberation

from devil, sin and death (1 Cor 10:1-2; Gal. 3:27-28), for participation in Christ's death and resurrection (Rom. 6:3-5; Col. 2). Ultimately baptism grants eternal life, both in body and soul to all believers.<sup>115</sup> Above all, baptism signifies "the sacramental sharing in the death, resurrection and life of Christ"<sup>116</sup>, that is full and complete justification. Baptism is believed to convey the entire grace of God, the entire Christ and the Holy Spirit with his gifts.

For the EECMY baptism is, indeed, an outward and visible sign of its entire doctrine of justification. If this is true how does an outward action actually do this? Luther answers:

It is not the water that produces these effects, but the word of God connected with the water, for without the word of God the water is merely water and no baptism. But when connected with the word of God it is a baptism, that is a gracious water of life and a washing of regeneration in the Holy Spirit, as St Paul wrote to Titus (3:5-8).<sup>117</sup>

As clearly stated it is by the power of God's promise that water can be the sign of the sacrament through which the baptised are cleansed from the unclean conscience, are forgiven their sins and become newly born by the Holy Spirit, the dynamic life giving power of God.

For although baptism is the beginning of the Christian life, the NT does not consider this as just some new formal ritual but as an actual receiving of the Holy Spirit. It has to be understood that there is some difference in the relation between baptism and the receiving of the Holy Spirit: this is to be expected in view of the flexibility not only of the sacraments but of all outward forms. Indeed, to be baptised seems normally to mean to receive the Holy Spirit (Acts. 2:38). As the character of the Church is the community of the Spirit, people may also claim to be received into the Spirit. Moreover, as Christian baptism may mean nothing less than that sanctification has begun and that within the community of the Spirit, the baptised person is already caught up in the movement of "unitive being".<sup>118</sup>

On the contrary, all this argument may not be the whole work of the Holy Spirit. Beside the above, the direct personal experience, the empowering and infilling with the Holy Spirit<sup>119</sup>, must be considered (Acts 2:4, 4:8, 31, 9:17, 13:9; Eph. 5:18). It is precisely here that the antecedent issues discussed as the reasons for our inattention to the Holy Spirit both in doctrine and experience are revealed in stark reality. We shall, however, return to this point.

Furthermore, as Luther had been challenged by Anabaptists of his time about infant baptism<sup>120</sup>, so has the EECMY by certain other denominations and by some of her less mature Charismatics. In fact, infant baptism is neither commanded nor even specifically mentioned in the NT scriptures. Nonetheless, God has at every period of the Christian era shown his approval of the practice by his undeniable bestowal of the Holy Spirit on the baptised infants.<sup>121</sup> Parallels to this may be found in, for example, the admission to the covenant by circumcision (Gen. 17:10ff), the blessing of children by Jesus (Mk 10), the call to all the nations (Mt 28:19-20) and the possibility of the household baptism (Acts 16:31).

Of course, from the point of view of these passages, and of those who accept that Scripture is to be supplemented by the tradition of the Church, the almost universal practice of infant baptism in the Church throughout its history is an entirely sufficient and satisfactory warrant and authority. However, this real defence seems to depend on the whole Lutheran theology of the Gospel with its universal aspects of salvation.

As to the question of faith, the many answers may not share an entire consistency. Like John the Baptist, infants may believe in their mothers womb.<sup>122</sup> It is Christ himself who arouses faith in children, although the "how" seems to be left with God.

Although Luther initially made the effect of baptism dependent upon faith, he later modified his position to emphasise the will and command of God as the justification for baptism.<sup>123</sup> So in this case, faith is not man's virtue but a gift of God through the Holy Spirit (Eph 2:8). If it were

otherwise, faith would itself become a human work which cannot deserve the grace of God.

Likewise, the EECMY believes that children are given a gift of faith by the Holy Spirit when they are baptised so that faith is not a visible maturity of the academic intellect, nor does its validity depend on any other person's faith, infant or adult: it is the result of God's divine grace which is growing within man until it is expressed outwardly.

In general:

the more baptism is seen as the expression of the candidate's faith, the less easy it is to hold to infant baptism. Whereas the more baptism is seen as the expression of divine grace, the easier it is to argue for infant baptism.<sup>124</sup>

In both cases the Church may need to acknowledge the great value of baptism in whatever form it is conducted given that baptising is in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: for "whatever the age of the baptised, baptism signifies grace and call for lifelong growth in Christ with a view to the resurrection at the last day".<sup>125</sup>

**1.3.3.2 Holy Communion:** For the EECMY, it seems that the central act of Christian worship in which the whole principle of the means of grace is more clearly manifested, is the sacrament of the gospel instituted by Jesus which is regarded as a real presence of Christ.

As Luther developed his Eucharistic thought in contrast to that of Rome, the late Anabaptists and all the Swiss movement, he emphasised "testament", "real presence" (the fullness of Christ), the word of God and the enabling power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>126</sup>

Similarly, the EECMY insists on the testament which is contained in the body and blood of Christ, conveys and gives the forgiveness of sins, which brings eternal life and salvation. Moreover, the Holy Spirit and all his gifts strengthens faith against death, devil and all misfortunes. The union with Christ and the community of believers as the "sacrament of love" is also vital.<sup>127</sup>

All these blessings seem vain without faith, yet faith (as in baptism) is insignificant to constitute the sacrament. On the other hand, faith is not marginal in the EECMY, but regarded as an arm or hand stretched out to receive the grace of God. It is believed that the real body and blood of Christ is given through the bread and wine which is received in faith.<sup>128</sup> Thus the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the communion maintains this function of the sacrament as the means of grace: by his body and blood Christ secured forgiveness of sins for all.

As far as the relation between the Holy Communion and the Holy Spirit is concerned, for Luther God's Spirit does not come to people in any other means than in the absolute concreteness, outwardness and boldness of history: as he clearly points out, "the Spirit cannot be with us except in material and physical things such as the word, water in Christ's body and in the these things on earth".<sup>129</sup> This argument seems to be based on the whole biblical history which bears witness to the material and outward elements, as the Spirit is not a transcendental sphere beyond all earthly history which is in the word of God. Here, Luther binds up the Spirit of God to the earthly element as its main means.

It may be sincerely held that the Spirit comes through Christ's body and blood and also mediates the Spirit's presence of Jesus in the sacrament of the Eucharist. However, no direct scriptural reference exists for the theory, unless it is implied from the doctrine of the general supervision assigned to him by Jesus over all activities of individual Christian life and all the operation of the Church. On the other hand, it seems that this concrete symbolism of the sacrament of the Holy Communion absorbs the attention of the Church, and becomes a channel of Spiritual grace co-extensive with the channel of Spiritual power offered in the Holy Spirit. Thus although faith in the grace offered in the Holy Communion scarcely needs re-emphasis today, yet faith in the grace offered by an empowering Holy Spirit in some distinctive way suggests itself as a means of revival.

### 1.3.4 The Holy Spirit and Worship

The EECMY as a living Church has its own formal liturgical worship which has been derived from different Lutheran Churches. Although some attempts at improvement were made in the years around 1974 and 1991, it has as yet hardly been adapted and expressed in the ideas of its Ethiopian context and culture. What follows covers not the whole liturgical activity of the Church but only items relating to the experience and expression of the Holy Spirit.

In order to speak genuinely about 'Christian worship' one must first decide just what this complex term means. Professor Paul W. Hoon writes "Christian worship is God's revelation of himself in Jesus Christ and man's response", a twofold action: that of "God to the human soul in Jesus Christ and in man's responsive action through Jesus Christ".<sup>130</sup> This denotes the dual action of Jesus as the indispensable origin of Christian worship which makes Christian worship distinctive from every other kind of religious worship.

M. Luther also says "to know God is to worship him".<sup>131</sup> This comprehends both the revelation of God and response to human beings which helps worshippers to know and realise God's character, beneficence and will through the help of the Holy Spirit. Above all the worship of God is a principal activity of the real Church, requiring no justification beyond itself.

Worship is both private and corporate. Most of its actions in meditation, in prayer, and in reading of the scripture can be informal and carried on without any formal Church minister. On the other hand, the more significant forms of Christian worship are corporate, being the work of the whole Church, in the sense that it calls for the 'active participation' of the whole assembly as to how it implies the etymological meaning of liturgy.<sup>132</sup> Nevertheless, it is a mistake to suppose that both forms of worship are in some way contrasted to one another: together they enhance the growth of the Church towards the attainment of the unity of faith and the knowledge

of Christ and his faithfulness (Eph 4:13). Thus worship in more general terms includes all the distinctive means of grace, because the preaching of the word and the sacraments are specific and conclusive actions in which the principle of worship comes to its most explicit expression.<sup>133</sup>

Similarly, the EECMY practises both forms of worship, with one supplementary to the other and Christ as the gracious self-giving act in it. It may be the faith of the EECMY that when the Church worships in whatever form and pattern the Holy Spirit is there, bestowing the sense of Christ in the midst. If this is true, how does the Church understand the reception of the Holy Spirit through worship?

We have already seen how the Holy Spirit has to be received through the means of grace. In addition to this, the Church understands the reception of the Holy Spirit through prayer, meditation, Scripture reading, preaching and so on. Moreover, the Lutheran emphasis on the word as central to worship led the EECMY to see preaching particularly as the royal sacrament employed by the Holy Spirit to crystallise the definitive conviction of personal faith. It is this Spirit, then, who calls the believers to an active participation in worship, enabling every member of the body to render service that furthers corporate growth into Christlike maturity (Eph 4:11-16) and designating and equipping particular individuals for specific ministries in the Church (Acts 13:1-2; Tim. 1:6-7). So it is perceived that all believers have received the Holy Spirit; without him nobody can confess Jesus is Lord (1 Cor 12:3). It seems also that in the Church's services the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been given a rightful place.

On the other hand, the order and principle of liturgical worship whatever the place and whenever the time ought to be kept on the ground of its traditional basic faith.<sup>134</sup> The service too, has been conducted by ministers and authorised lay persons, a permitted alternative to liturgical worship since the foundation of the EECMY. However, this kind of liturgical worship of the Church has been challenged by the new Charismatics since it lacks both contextualisation and freedom.

Indeed the EECMY has been traditionally conservative when it comes to modes of worship.<sup>135</sup> It seems that it has inherited these views from western Lutheran missionaries who adopted the conservative view. Whilst the worship pattern seems to depend on Luther's teaching, a current strict conservatism may be the result of recent interpretation of Lutheran dogmatics "as if Luther had never lived".<sup>136</sup> Nonetheless, Luther does not appear to require all modes of worship to be identical in every time and place. For instance the Augsburg Confession Article 7 says: "it is not necessary that human traditions or rites or ceremonies instituted by man should be alike everywhere".<sup>137</sup> According to this original Lutheran article, the ways of worship cannot be considered as dogma. The Churches everywhere can modify according to their own cultural, social, historical, contexts to suit the Spiritual needs of their own congregations. Similarly, the EECMY could have contextualised its liturgical worship to satisfy its new generation. But because it has relied on this deep-rooted conservative tradition, its effort in contextualising the liturgical *worship* has been far less.<sup>138</sup> Thus the retained formal modes of worship may be seen as suffocating any emphasis on the need to recognise the Holy Spirit and his manifestations. However, P.D. Manson states:

What is central to Christian worship is not 'forms' but the presence of the triune God, who through his word, the Bible, and by his Holy Spirit enlivens, enlightens and enables all who believe in order that they may worship, serve him in Spirit and in truth.<sup>139</sup>

In this light, the Church may need to be fully alive less to the human traditions than to the authority and the performances of the Holy Spirit to which all activities have to be subjected.

This conclusion might offer a clue how the EECMY has understood the person and work of the Holy Spirit. In fact the Church believes in the Holy Spirit as a third person of the Trinity, as proceeding from God the Father and God the Son, more expressly and effectually to operate in



human salvation. Nobody can argue that the power of the Holy Spirit has not been in action throughout the Church's ministry, to effect a remarkable development and expansion of the pastoral leadership of the Church.

On the contrary, the main critical argument is that his main inspiration and manifestation of the gifts have been limited to particular channels due to a traditional and ecclesiastical theology. But it is indispensable that God is the sovereign Lord and is not accountable to man for his actions (Ex. 33:19; Isa. 43:13). God's grace is not limited to the appointed means of grace. John Lawson, an Ecclesiastical Historian, perhaps correctly states:

In particular, when the Holy Spirit mediates Christian salvation to man through the preaching of the word and the sacraments and worship of the Church, it is not to be supposed that there is a kind of "spiritual electricity" flowing down an ecclesiastical wire. This is an example of the impoverished thought which may allow Christian rites to degenerate into formality or even into magic. God does not save man by infusing into his personality a mysterious heavenly substance which acts as a sort of spiritual preservative. It is by a powerful and transforming process of "personal influence" that he changes man in personal character, moral will and responsible ethical action....Thus when God in Christ visits the company of his people in the Church's ministry of word and sacraments and brings them their share of Christian salvation, there is always an invisible person there, never a mere invisible 'thing'. The divine agent is a person. All these important ideas are summed up in the doctrine of the personal existence of the Holy Spirit.<sup>140</sup>

The awareness and realization of the person and work of the Holy Spirit is, therefore, essential to vital, personal, converting and moral activity for both individual Christians and the Church as a whole.

In every generation God is held to arouse some counterpoise to the current inattention to the Holy Spirit in this Church. In this present age, that which is known as the Charismatic Movement is interpreted by many as a

transformation of traditional practices and beliefs ,being held to serve God's purpose and satisfy the spiritual needs of congregations: it would be tragic if the Church were not able to start to recognise this Charismatic renewal.

## *References: Chapter 1*

1. T.Rees (1915) p.ii.
2. G.S. Hendry (1957) p.ii.
3. H.B. Swete quoted in H.P.V. Dusen (1958) p.12, n.1
4. V. Taylor quoted in C.K. Barrett (1947) p.1.
5. D. Watson (1973) p.13; see C.K. Barrett, *op. cit.* p.1
6. F.C. Grant (1960) p.84.
7. D, Makonnen (1987) p.35.
8. J. Royce quoted in H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* pp.13-14.
9. H. Berkhof (1965) p.10.
10. G.S. Hendry, *op. cit.* p.11.
11. H. Berkhof, *op. cit.* p.11.
12. *Ibid.*
13. J. Barry, cited in F.C. Grant, *op. cit.* p.80.
14. A.J. MacDonald (1950) pp.ix-x.
15. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.28.
16. *Ibid.* p.33.
17. H.W. Robinson (1940) p.5.
18. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.33.
19. H. Berkhof, *op. cit.* p.13.
20. R.P. Imbelli in J.A. Komonchak (1976) p. 45.
21. *Ibid.*
22. H. Berkhof, *op. cit.* p.13.
23. M.E. Isaacs (1976) p.10.
24. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* pp.33-4.
25. R.P. Imbelli, *op. cit.* p.475.
26. H. Berkhof, *op. cit.* p.13.
27. *Ibid.* p.13.
28. G.E. Ladd (1975) p.287.
29. J.I. Packer in S.B. Ferguson (1989) p.316.
30. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.50.
31. C. Brown (1978) p.693.
32. J.L. McKenzie, (1976) p.841.
33. H. Berkhof, *op. cit.* p.113.
34. J.I. Packer, *op. cit.* p.316.
35. M. Isaacs, *op. cit.* p.10.
36. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.52.
37. *Ibid.*; G. Walters in J.D. Douglas (1962) p.532.
38. G. Smeaton (1958) p.39.
39. W. Barclay (1960) p.21; J.E. Fison (1950) p.81.
40. G. Walters, *op. cit.* p.532.
41. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.55; C. Brown, *op. cit.* p.696; C.K. Barrett, *op. cit.* p.131; J.D.G. Dunn in G.S. Wakefield (1983) p.357.
42. J.D.G. Dunn (1975) p.54.
43. C.K. Barrett (1947) p.160.
44. P.S.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.53.
45. G. Walters, *op. cit.* p.532.

46. A.J. MacDonald, *op. cit.* p.22.
47. J. Stacy (1987) p.164.
48. G.S. Hendry, *op. cit.* p.23.
49. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.44.
50. D. Guthrie (1981) p.513.
51. J. Stacy, *op. cit.* p.161.
52. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.37.
53. J. Stacy, *op. cit.* p.161.
54. G. Walters, *op. cit.* p.531.
55. J. Stacy, *op. cit.* p.309, n.1.
56. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.7; M. Green, (1985) pp.32-33.
57. M. Green, (1985) p.33.
58. J. Stacy, *op. cit.* p.161.
59. M. Green, (1985) p.33.
60. G.W.H. Lampe (1977) pp.61, 120.
61. H. Küng (1980) p.697.
62. A.J. MacDonald, *op. cit.* p.2.
63. J.L. McKenzie, *op. cit.* p.842.
64. M. Green, (1985) pp.33, 59.
65. J.L. McKenzie, *op. cit.* p.841.
66. J.I. Packer, *op. cit.* p.316.
67. J.L. McKenzie, *op. cit.* p.844.
68. J. Stacy, *op. cit.* p.161.
69. G.W.H. Lampe, *op. cit.*, p.61.
70. M. Green, (1985) p.59.
71. *Ibid.*
72. *Ibid.*
73. J.I. Packer, *op. cit.*, p.316.
74. G. Smeaton, *op. cit.* p.100.
75. *Ibid.* pp.96-114.
76. J. Macquarrie (1977) p.330.
77. *Ibid.*
78. J. Moltmann (1974) p.203.
79. *Ibid.* p.207.
80. M. Green, (1985) pp.15-18; see B. Graham, pp.24-34.
81. J. Lawson (1980) p.117.
82. B. Berkhof, *op. cit.* p.68.
83. B. Graham, *op. cit.* pp.52-3.
84. A.R. Vidler in H.P.V. Dusen *op. cit.* p.124.
85. J. Macquarrie, *op. cit.* p.330; see M. Green, (1985) p.120.
86. J.I. Packer, *op. cit.* p.317.
87. C.K. Barrett, *op. cit.* p.161.
88. J. Stacy, *op. cit.* p.166.
89. J. Lawson, *op. cit.* p.112.
90. EECMY Theol. Consul. on Charismatic Mov. August 1993, see I. Gobena, 1993, p.5.
91. A. Norlander (1993<sup>a</sup>) p.2.
92. *Ibid.*
93. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.27.

94. H. Berkhof, *op. cit.* pp.21-3.
95. G.S. Hendry, *op. cit.* p.26.
96. A. Norlander, *op. cit.* (a) p.2.
97. H. Berkhof, *op. cit.* pp.23-24.
98. A. Norlander, *op. cit.* (a) p.2; see F.D. Bruner: (1970) p.72. True, it is the Cross that saves and renders one a member of the saved community, nevertheless, it is the endowment, infilling of the Holy Spirit that equips with the gifts for better and powerful ministry, see J.D.G. Dunn (1970) "Calvary without Pentecost would not be an atonement to us. Jesus' death and resurrection go for nothing and are wholly ineffective without the gift of the Spirit." p.44.
99. *Ibid.* see J.D.G. Dunn, *op. cit.* p.225.
100. R.D. Preus in S.B. Ferguson (1989) p.405-6.
101. J.I. Packer, *op. cit.* p.316.
102. B. Wedajo, *op. cit.* p.22.
103. G.S. Hendry, *op. cit.* p.72.
104. *Ibid.*, p.74
105. Quoted in *Ibid.*, p.74.
106. P. Althaus, *op. cit.* pp.35-42.
107. *Ibid.* p.36, n.7.
108. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* pp.136-7.
109. M. Luther (1967) Article 3.
110. P.C. Hodgson (1989) p.46.
111. H.P.V. Dusen, *op. cit.* p.18.
112. H. Berkhof, *op. cit.* p.38.
113. S.B. Ferguson (1989) p.607.
114. P. Althaus, *op. cit.* p.346.
115. *Ibid.*, p.353.
116. C.F.D. Moule (1961) p.51.
117. M. Luther, *op. cit.* Article 4.
118. J. Macquarrie, *op. cit.* pp.460-1.
119. J.D.G. Dunn, *op. cit.* p.54.
120. P. Althaus, *op. cit.* pp.359-62.
121. *Ibid.* p.361.
122. *Ibid.* p.362.
123. *Ibid.* p.362.
124. J.D. Douglas (1962) p.123.
125. G.R. Beasley-Murray in S.B. Ferguson, *op. cit.* p.71.
126. P. Althaus, *op. cit.* p.20.
127. EECMY Baptsim (1976, JC) pp.1-7, see B. Wedajo, *op. cit.* p.20.
128. B. Wedajo, *op. cit.* p.20.
129. M. Luther quoted in P. Althaus, *op. cit.* p.397.
130. P.W. Hoons quoted in J.F. White (1990) p.26.
131. M. Luther quoted in P.D.M. in S.B. Ferguson, *op. cit.* p.730.
132. G. Wainwright in J.G. Davies (1986) p.505.
133. J. Lawson, *op. cit.* p.158.
134. B. Wedajo, *op. cit.* p.23.
135. K. McDonnell (1980) p.181.
136. A. Norlander, *op. cit.* (a) p.2.

137. K. McDonnell, (op. cit<sup>a</sup>.) p.181.
138. EECMY Theol. Cons. on Charismatic Mov. (August 1993) p.3.
139. P.D. Manson in S.B. Ferguson, op. cit. p.732.
140. J. Lawson, op. cit. p.155.

## ***CHAPTER 2: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHARISMATIC INFLUENCE IN THE EECMY***

For two decades or more, the Charismatic influence has become a significant movement in the EECMY. Before discussing its history and practice we must first note an introductory comment on the worldwide Pentecostal and Charismatic movements, recognising at least four categories.

Three specific groupings emerge, one being subdivided: the classical distinctive Pentecostal movement, which W.J. Hollenweger notes in its separate black and white manifestations<sup>1</sup>; the Charismatic renewal movement within the traditional Churches; and the indigenous Pentecostal movement, peculiarly in the third world.<sup>2</sup>

Unlike the others, the authenticity of this last named has been disputed by many Pentecostals and Charismatics because of its adoption of beliefs and practices, such as polygamy and ancestor worship, from non-Christian traditional religions. Thus, although it seems to hold some characteristics of Christian beliefs and practices, for example, that Christ is Saviour of humanity, its status as a specifically Christian group is questionable.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, it has yet to take root in Ethiopia and will, therefore, not be discussed in this present work.

### **2.1 Pentecostalism**

This form of Christian movement which accords supreme importance to personal religious experience and charismata with supernatural miracles, signs and wonders<sup>4</sup>, is conspicuous for signs of growth and commitment to the Christian mission in the world.<sup>5</sup>

In the early years of this century, many observers might have speculated on the rapid demise of Pentecostalism. On the contrary, it thrived and is now amongst the fastest growing religious movements in the Western Hemisphere. F.D. Brunner, an American theologian not necessarily sympathetic toward this movement, states "It is to be recognised that,

whether approved by us or not, the Pentecostal movement is in the world with increasing numbers and significance"<sup>6</sup>. Personal views of the theology of Pentecostal experience notwithstanding, it has been regarded as "the third force in Christendom"<sup>7</sup> alongside the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches.

This movement's title name is borrowed from the early Church's experience at the Jewish feast of Pentecost, recorded in Acts 2. This 'brand name', in Dunn's view, signifies a particular stance: it identifies a manner claiming a full Christian life and witness, it speaks of personal and treasured experiences of Christ and expresses a depth of devotion and praise.<sup>8</sup> A recent systematic theologian from within the movement, Ernest Williams, states:

To be Pentecostal is to identify oneself with the experience that came to Christ's followers on the Day of Pentecost; that is to be filled with the Holy Spirit in the same manner as those who were filled with the Holy Spirit on that occasion.<sup>9</sup>

Accordingly, it is an attempt to rediscover the experience of the early Church where Pentecostals may justly claim their belief and practice to have originated.

Among explanations offered for the rise of Pentecostalism are its reaction against rationalism, modernism, secularism, materialism and the formalism of the mainstream Churches.<sup>10</sup> In a perceptive theological explanation, Kurt Hutten, after comparing the rise of Pentecostalism with the above factors, concludes that the Pentecostals once again "made the heavenly powers, which a rational proclamation was threatening to eclipse, into living, present realities which were visible and experienceable".<sup>11</sup>

Whilst the ancestral historical line of Pentecostalism could be traced from the early Christian centuries to the present day, 20th century Pentecostalism has particular links with the Wesleyan revival of the 18th century. Thus 18th century Methodism is claimed as mother of the late 19th



century holiness movement, which in turn gave birth to 20th century Pentecostalism.<sup>12</sup>

Formal Pentecostalism alternatively seen as a reaction against the static condition of mainstream Churches is frequently regarded as originating in the Bethel Bible College in Topeka, Kansas, USA, on 1st January 1901<sup>13</sup> when some students, already influenced by the Holiness revival, were searching the scriptures for evidence of Spirit baptism and tongue speaking<sup>14</sup>: a female Sunday school teacher received the power of the Holy Spirit after being prayed over by Principal Charles Fox Parham (1873-1929) with the laying on of his hands, and spoke in tongues.<sup>15</sup>

Within a few years Pentecostalism had expanded widely in the USA, particularly from 1906 onwards through the influence of the Azusa Street, Apostolic Faith Mission in Los Angeles. It soon reached Europe and spread elsewhere in the world.<sup>16</sup> Despite the movement's growth, Pentecostals were rejected by their own Churches and formed distinct Assemblies. The Assemblies of God date from 1914, since which date other Churches and assemblies have been formed. Whether such division is caused by withdrawal, rejection or for an inner spiritual satisfaction, it invariably weakens the Church's witness to the world. In matters of doctrine, most Pentecostals can be described as Evangelicals with a theology akin to Fundamentalism. Nevertheless, they distinctively stress a post conversion religious experience, baptism with the Holy Spirit, accompanied by speaking in tongues.<sup>17</sup> In this case, Pentecostals argue that Spirit baptism would be a second experience subsequent to salvation, regeneration or new birth.<sup>18</sup> A New Testament background shows Christians who may be repeatedly filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts. 2:4; 4:8; 9:17) but the certainty of entering into Christian life more than once seems implicit; a thoroughly controversial opinion. Moreover, though they have traditionally apprehended tongue speaking as the principal sign of being baptised in the Spirit, most nowadays have developed or modified such views. Experience may predominate over theory in causing this since Pentecostalism is not

primarily a matter of doctrine, method or strategy, but a sense of the personal experience of the inner working of the Holy Spirit.

The characteristics of Pentecostal worship include a variegated pattern. It may comprise an unwritten liturgy, a narrative theology and personal testimonies: personal participation is at the level of reflection, extemporary praying, laying on of hands.<sup>19</sup> The subjective experience of worship includes emotional expression, freedom, Spirit baptism and exercise of the charismata as specific hallmarks.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless rather than its distinctive doctrine of Spirit baptism, such exuberance may be responsible for the phenomenal worldwide growth of Pentecostalism. Regarding moral issues most Pentecostal Churches are seen to be ascetic, prohibiting amongst other things smoking, alcohol, cosmetics, jewellery and secular dancing. Others, however, would claim that European Pentecostals are apparently more liberal in this respect.

Pentecostals are frequently lauded for their dynamic evangelistic missionary concern, and for re-emphasising the central place that ought to be accorded the person and work of the Holy Spirit as a mark of restoration within the Christian Church. On the other hand they could be criticised for remaining indifferent to the range of social problems that afflict contemporary society. Emphasising the vertical dimension alone and thus escaping the horizontal dimension of responsibility for and participation in the common life of people seems a denial of the incarnation of God's life for the world manifested in Christ. More recently, however, a greater acceptance of this part of the work and mission of the Church has been seen.<sup>21</sup>

## **2.2 The Charismatic Movement**

The Charismatic movement, initially known as neo-Pentecostalism, has emerged as an identifiable and significant movement within Christianity in the latter part of the 20th century in America, Europe and finally elsewhere in the world. Generally speaking, the term may refer to the supernatural gifts of the Spirit, specifically those listed in 1 Cor, 12:14, and to

the grace dimension of Christianity as distinguished from the institutional or hierarchical dimension of the Church.

Various circumstances aided the spread of the Charismatic movement. As Hollenweger comments, soon after the emergence of Pentecostalism a small Charismatic group appeared from English Anglican, French Reformed and German Lutheran Churches.<sup>22</sup> However, these seem to have been disregarded by historians. Later, an inter-denominational organisation designated as the Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International, which preached on the Holy Spirit's blessings and gifts in 1950s USA, may be regarded as a dominant origin.<sup>23</sup> From about 1960, some members of Protestant Churches, after receiving a direct personal experience, might insist on remaining in their respective denominations known as Charismatics. Later in the decade some Roman Catholics, and to a lesser extent Eastern Orthodox, began to embrace the movement, tending to prefer the term Charismatic renewal. Initially, to receive the 'baptism' of the Holy Spirit and practise the associated gifts seems to be restricted to a more private setting, organised for example as prayer meetings at a Bible camp, in homes, at work and in university circles.

Crucially, we may ask why Charismatic renewal should so emerge. As we have seen earlier, for centuries the person and work of the Holy Spirit were effectively subordinated to either the scripture, the Church or the means of grace by different Church traditions. In the broader sense, as John Stacey points out, the historic Churches "had become too formal, too institutionalised, too established, too cerebral, too cold, too tired, altogether too far removed from the dynamic community of the NT".<sup>24</sup> For a full half century the classical Pentecostal stream grew rapidly but made little or no impact on the mainstream Churches. Later, as Bruner comments, the Protestant Churches, and the Roman Catholic members especially since the second Vatican Council, have exercised vigorous criticism of a perceived irrelevance of the doctrines and practices of their own traditions.<sup>25</sup> Consequently the long-neglected doctrine and experience of the Holy Spirit

with its Charismatic manifestations have again been rediscovered. Over the years, it seems that these traditional Churches might have adopted a Gamaliel 'wait-and-see' policy. Eventually it is claimed they have recognised this phenomenon in terms of their traditional theology, in a way which does not threaten them.

This renewal holds the manifestation of the Charismatic gifts described in the NT, commonly followed by the Spiritual experience named in Pentecostal terminology the 'baptism in the Spirit'.<sup>26</sup> On the one hand, to some extent, this may mean that Charismatics are claimed to inherit their theological views from classical Pentecostalism. On the other, however, it may be seen that they have rejected nearly all of the fundamentalist heritage of the Pentecostal movement. Whatever the case, they appear mostly to concentrate on integrating the practice of Spirit baptism and the exercise of the charismata into the traditional doctrines and experiences of their respective Churches. Nevertheless, there remains controversy, for the central experience of the Spirit may be claimed in different ways and with varying effects.

As R.M. Anderson comments, some Protestant Charismatics like the classical Pentecostals seem to regard baptism in the Spirit as a second experience or being subsequent to conversion. On the contrary many Protestant and perhaps most Roman Catholic Charismatics are seen to consider it as a renewal or actualisation of the baptism in the Spirit which all members receive in water baptism or on conversion.<sup>27</sup> Whatever description may be given of the event, it may nonetheless be argued that both conversion and any prior or post empowering by or filling with the Holy Spirit do belong theologically to one work of that Spirit.

In contrast to traditional Pentecostals and some Protestant Charismatics, other Protestants and many Roman Catholic Charismatics would seem to see any of the Spirit's gifts or fruits, particularly love, rather than tongue speaking as an evidence of filling with the Holy Spirit.<sup>28</sup> Whether or not this perception has any New Testament precedent, the

experience of Christians seems to confirm it : similarly, other gifts receive an equal acclaim.

The content of much Charismatic worship seems to include the practice of speaking in tongues, visions, laying on of hands for the sick, healing and prophecy. The nature of such worship patterns is complex. As Hollenweger comments, at the present time worship in the Charismatic movement appears to polarise increasingly into "their original denominational worship, because they want to prove that they are not trouble-makers but loyal members of their respective Churches".<sup>29</sup> This is itself debatable, seeming to relate more specifically to Roman Catholic Charismatic meetings which are marked by more restraint than those in other Churches. In contrast, P.D. Manson points out that within an evangelical Protestant setting, Charismatics stress more the need for the Holy Spirit to enliven preacher and congregation.<sup>30</sup> Consequently, tension seems to continue between those who look for a common liturgy, uniting Churches wherever they meet, and those who depend on the unconstrained expression of faith. Most of them might find the need to be free to use both forms. In this case, the forms seem to lose their centrality as the Charismatics' view steps forward beyond their denominational pattern as an effective indication of the real renewal. In both doctrine and worship the Roman Catholic renewal seems more likely to compromise the basics of Charismatic practice because of traditional theology and institutional rites. In the long run this may lead the Roman Catholic Charismatics to *contain* the movement later.

Differing views account for the rise of both movements, background determining reaction to the view of this being simply a human scheme to bring about Christian renewal. From one perspective, liberals may contend that it simply happened - to the astonishment of those who found themselves caught up in it. Alternatively, Evangelicals would argue that it could be seen as an expression of man's longing for the 'otherness', the transcendent, so that it might be received as a gift from God to renew and

restore his Church. The 16th century Reformation is seen to have laid a greater emphasis on justification by faith in the work of Jesus, the Son of God: these more modern movements have brought many Christians and Churches to have a deeper appreciation of the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

### 2.3 The Charismatic Influence in the EECMY

The Charismatic movement first emerged on the Ethiopian scene in the early 1960s.<sup>31</sup> It seems to have been initiated by traditionally Pentecostal missionaries from Sweden and Finland.<sup>32</sup> This movement started in such urban centres as Addis Ababa, Bahar Dar, Harar and Debrezeyit, particularly as a few writers have indicated among students in university circles.<sup>33</sup>

Such zealous revivalism became especially identified amongst the youth who, dissatisfied with the state of their Churches, gathered in informal meetings apparently unrelated to any institutional Churches.<sup>34</sup> Often prayer partnerships would follow or small prayer group meetings in homes, at work, high schools and in the higher educational institutions. Soon the link with the foreign missionaries would cool and indigenous leadership evolve.<sup>35</sup> As T. Engelsviken points out:

The fact that there is no generation gap and the young people themselves have responsibility and leadership in the movement has....contributed towards the special appeal of the movement and its expansion.<sup>36</sup>

Moreover, as evangelisation, witnessing and prayer were from the start its principal manifestations, numerous groups formed in this way began to send untrained lay people for further evangelistic ministry.<sup>37</sup> Thus the general characteristics of the movement's expansion which include the involvement of a younger generation, an evangelistic zeal of individual Christians and free worship prayer meetings, have considerably challenged the Ethiopian Orthodox Church (EOC) and also other Protestant Churches.

As the consciousness of denominational identity arose, some adherents left these groups and established a formal distinctive Pentecostal Church called "Full Gospel" in 1965<sup>38</sup> seen to contain a majority of the groups originating in the EOC<sup>39</sup>, the EECMY<sup>40</sup> and other Protestant Churches also. In some few places where EECMY congregations accepted the movement, Charismatic members remained as effective participants within their own denomination. Whoever they are, however, both Pentecostals and Charismatics have experienced isolation, misunderstanding and rejection by their families, relatives, friends and society. Above all, they were socially and ecclesiastically affected and suppressed.

In particular the EOC expressed its opposition to the Full Gospel Church, David B. Barrett pointing out how the EOC publicly exerted its energies against a teaching and movement perceived as a challenge to the Church.<sup>41</sup> The assistance of governmental agencies was secured by the EOC with the result that many Full Gospel Church members were suppressed on charges of treason and imprisoned for long jail terms.<sup>42</sup> Subsequently, the Church has undergone severe persecution since 1972 and for a long time was compelled to operate underground.<sup>43</sup> This is hardly surprising, because it has been natural for most Protestant Churches to be counteracted by both the EOC and the government. Likewise, this movement experienced similar strong objection both before the end of the Old Monarchy (1930-1974) and also shortly after the beginning of the New Revolutionary Government (1974-1991) with its official Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Despite such persecution, the emergence of the movement some ten years before the Revolution might reasonably have been expected to extend its influence to all Protestant Churches including the EECMY.

We may not find a specific and documented date as to when the Charismatic movement began in the EECMY. Some may claim that the EECMY had the nature of being Charismatic from the beginning, so that this movement is not a new phenomenon to this Church.<sup>44</sup> This view may take

us back to the 19th century Western Evangelical revival missionaries, whose primary intention was to revitalise the old EOC and stimulate indigenous reformation through Bible teaching rather than specifically founding the Lutheran Church there, though because of opposition this proved unsuccessful.<sup>45</sup> The later EECMY indigenous pioneer Evangelists, notably Onesimos who worked side by side with missionaries translating the Bible into native languages, may be claimed as Charismatic.<sup>46</sup>

Additionally, about the second half of this present century, there were also dynamic ministers ('Kes' Shambo Kelebro, Gidada Solon and Ashana Negade) whose manner of biblical teaching might be considered as Charismatic.<sup>47</sup> Their ministries, indeed, seem to have contributed a lot to the growth of the Church. However, the nature of the Charismatic revival itself offers little support for the above position. The Charismatic characteristics may be seen mainly to involve the direct empowering experience of the Holy Spirit and the real practice of the charismata, although not frequently nor continuously stressed as essential parts of the Church's traditional theology, as we have seen already. Similarly, the EECMY adherents who were attracted by the traditional Pentecostal revival of the 1960s and remained members of their own Church<sup>48</sup>, might be regarded as part of the then recently developing world-wide trend of the whole Charismatic movement. Thereafter, the movement has evolved into its Charismatic nature which particularly embraces its youth groups. However, "more often the influence of the Charismatic youths resulted in opposition from the older members and the leadership of the congregation".<sup>49</sup> They were opposed by not only the traditional members at congregation but also by institutional leaders at parish, district, synod and Church levels. In this present work, two such levels (congregation and Church) will be stressed. In general terms, it may be observed and now enumerated how the EECMY has been in dilemma, having up <sup>now</sup> till both negative and positive reactions towards this movement.



Firstly, a negative reaction focuses on the Pentecostal oriented Charismatic pneumatological doctrine and worship practice which challenge the ecclesiological and liturgical traditions of the Church. As K. McDonnell states "the adoption of a classical Pentecostal theology made it difficult for many to live peaceable in a Lutheran context".<sup>50</sup> Similarly, there has been opposition to the Charismatics who seemed to adopt a Pentecostal theology, which claimed a particular personal experience of being filled with the Holy Spirit, going beyond the established sacramental tradition.

Engelsviken, in the paper he presented to the 8th EECMY General Assembly, comments:

one may reject the parts of the Theological bases for the Pentecostal movement, especially its understanding of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the baptism in water, but still recognise the authenticity of the Spiritual experiences and the spiritual gifts and fruits claimed by the movement.<sup>51</sup>

It might be evident that the distinctive aspect of Pentecostal theology, baptism in the Holy Spirit as a second initiation subsequent to conversion either before or in or after water baptism, cannot escape from heavy criticism from the Lutheran stand-point, which claims water baptism as the first initiation through which baptism in the Spirit and conversion then take place. Doubtless in common with many other mainstream Churches' Charismatics, the EECMY Charismatics also take note of their Churches' beliefs, yet beyond that they seem to be more anxious to be filled with or empowered by the Holy Spirit to be equipped for personal strength within their Christian life, service and witness. Thus as Dunn points out:

....the importance and value of the Pentecostal emphasis will not be lost sight of or ignored. In particular the Pentecostal contribution should cause Christians in the 'main-line' denominations to look afresh with critical eyes at the place they give to the Holy Spirit in doctrine and experience and in their various theologies of conversion, initiation and baptism.<sup>52</sup>

Thus, although the EECMY has argued for its traditional theology, a consideration of some values from a Pentecostal perspective would, if examined critically, add a future contribution in giving<sup>a</sup> more distinctive place to both doctrines and experiences of the Holy Spirit alongside other Protestant and Lutheran Churches.

The opposition focused on the worship practice as well. In addition to private prayer and a house fellowship worship, some conferences and all-night prayer meetings have been conducted where preaching, testimonies Spirit-filling and Spiritual gifts (tongues, prophecy, visions, healing) are practised, regarded by some as emotional, enthusiastic and disorderly.<sup>53</sup> These practices might also have gradually crept into more formal congregational worship. It is here that a contradiction between order and experience or freedom appeared. On the one hand, Paul indicated (1 Cor. 14:23, 29, 40) order is appropriate for healthy Church service, a means for a Church's leadership to exercise control over the Charismatic nature of worship. But it may not necessarily mean that human tradition should govern the exercise of enthusiastic worship and prevent the manifestation of the gifts. For instance 'Illilitation s', clapping of hands (PS. 47:1) 'responsive Amens' (Det. 27:15-16; Chron. 16:36; PS. 41:13; 106:48), 'Hallelujahs' and 'Praise the Lord' (PS. 111:1; 104:105)<sup>54</sup>, are clearly biblical expressions of joy and praise and perhaps some of them also indigenously Ethiopian expressions of a particular culture. To disregard these Biblical and indigenous assertions seems to be a rejection of contextualisation. Conversely, believers are given freedom from legalistic traditional religion (Gal. 4:5, 7) by the Holy Spirit. Yet "freedom is not licence"<sup>55</sup> for too much emotion and an undisciplined use of the gifts: order must attend the spiritual gifts (1 Cor. 14:40). An over-enthusiastic form of Charismatic worship may become both more sterile and less attractive aesthetically than the very liturgical services thus deprecated. But if both order and freedom, gifts and discipline go hand in hand the problem may be solved through exposing the new to the light of the old, in the belief that the Church's

traditions may always be enlivened by the Holy Spirit; one should not be matched against the other.

Another area of disagreement has been conflict between:

an established hierarchy and spontaneous enthusiastic leadership and between the theologically trained and those who accepted the Bible more or less at face value,<sup>56</sup>

above all between institutional office and charisma.

The leaders may have felt threatened by the young Charismatics who disregarded and disobeyed them. At the same time the leaders seemed fearful that Charismatics would assume responsibility for the congregations.<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, as Bakke writes, "the youth on their part accused the leaders of Spiritual dryness, lack of personal holiness, desire of power etc.,"<sup>58</sup> and furthermore, of conservatism regarding Spiritual activity in refusing to let them to sing, speak and pray in the Church.<sup>59</sup>

Although the Charismatic movement seems to pose a challenge to the conservation of institutional office, some facts may need to be justified. A general biblical perception of institutional office is to see it as an appointment by the Holy Spirit to look after the Congregation (Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 4:16). Traditionally, the EECMY believes that leaders are called directly by God and indirectly by the Church. Thus believers are expected to obey and submit to them (Heb. 13:7,17). Nevertheless, the leaders should not constrain others nor be domineering (1 Pet. 5:2-5). In the context of discussing the concept of hierarchical office, M. Luther states "everyone who emerges from baptism is consecrated as Priest and Pope".<sup>60</sup> The logical result of such justifying faith is the doctrine of the "priesthood of all believers", perhaps calling every Christian to pray, speak, tell others of the gospel, because "all Christians are priests and the baptism is their ordination".<sup>61</sup>

As M. Green also comments: "...the congregation no longer an audience but participants. The priesthood of all believers, so long assented to as a doctrine, has become a reality".<sup>62</sup>

Thus, whilst perceived as fanatics and enthusiasts by contemporaries, Charismatics are called and have an evangelistic zeal yet to be given its rightful place in the Church. However, no suggestion is made of their supposed monopoly of the Spirit which will be no less present through other gifts and other members of the one body. Nevertheless, the true Church of Christ may incorporate both office and charisma with the Charismatic renewal movement still a continuing challenge to those who exalt institution over life or charisma.<sup>63</sup>

We have now discussed the EECMY congregations' resistance to the Charismatic movement, an attempt to secure their traditional beliefs, practice and institutional office. Some parishes, districts and synods may have pressed their resistance through formal and informal resolutions.

The position of the national Church (EECMY) will now be considered. Firstly, the subject matter of the Charismatic movement was brought to the 8th General Assembly 1972 when Engelsviken presented a paper entitled "New Pentecostal theology with reference to Lutheranism" and then offered ten recommendations to the EECMY to provide a mutual understanding and development. These include:

1. Those members of the EECMY who have been drawn to the 'sentiment' of the Pentecostals need to be instructed in the faith of the EECMY for that is contrary to the teaching of the EECMY.
2. Disciplinary measures should not be taken in a legal context but should be practised as pastoral measures and action.
3. Church congregations' leaders need to be taught the differences in doctrine of the two Churches so that they respond to questions of our members properly. This teaching must be given in Bible Schools and in all levels in the Church.
5. The spiritual hunger which is in our congregations should be enriched with strong Christian spiritual life so that we stop the spread of those ideas which are not biblically sound.

6. For receiving spiritual blessings and gifts we can and should conduct Spiritual conferences to meet the need of our people.
7. Our Church must always be strongly Evangelical and live a sacrificial life in demonstration of quality spiritual life.<sup>65</sup>

Finally, he indicates that despite differences between the Church and Pentecostals, co-operation on common issues as needs arise and mutual recognition as brothers in Christ were desirable and necessary "...but if it is God, you will not be able to overthrow them. You might even be found opposing God." (Acts 5:39, RSV).

As a whole, that recommendation appeared to be applauded emphatically, being seen as a means of solving problems between Charismatics and non-Charismatics and enabling them to live and serve together as the real Body of Christ. Moreover, it could enrich the existing Lutheran theological tradition through a transforming self-assessment. So the General Assembly might have provided constructive theological guidelines for further development but instead deferred any decision and resolved merely to receive the document.<sup>66</sup> In one way or the other such kind of official inaction could cause the movement to flounder. Subsequently the Charismatic experience spread rapidly and widely, becoming an everyday challenge to the Church.

Meanwhile, political resistance fired the revival which thus entered a new phase. The Marxist Regime had initially proclaimed the personal nature of people's religious beliefs, all being permitted equal acceptance but in reality and in practice this "did not improve the situation for the Charismatic youth in the country."<sup>67</sup> In particular, from the late 1970s into the late 1980s, severe persecution, imprisonment, torture, dehumanisation and deprivation were heaped upon the Charismatics. Many young people were deprived of both internal and overseas scholarships, others were refused jobs and various privileges because of their 'penteness', the derogatory term 'pente' emerging as a shortened form of 'Pentecostal', being given to Pentecostals and Charismatics and whoever practised zealous

evangelism while living dedicated Spiritual lives.<sup>68</sup> The present writer, besides receiving several warnings, suffered discrimination and rejection, had some of his property confiscated and was imprisoned three times between 1980 and 1983 for an approximate total of a year. Although the government first focused its persecution on the Charismatics it later took similar steps against all Protestant Churches. Consequently, Evangelical Christians were hindered from assembling with the subsequent closure of many Churches and the confiscation of Church properties. Elders, Evangelists, Pastors and key leaders were imprisoned, some of them for years.<sup>69</sup> But the EECMY seems to have taken steps to save itself from persecution and to avoid being labelled 'pente' simply because of the existence of Charismatics. There were times when the Charismatic youth who formerly attended these Churches at risk of government awareness suffered the fears of congregations unwilling to be identified as 'pente'. This seems to have caused Church leaders to become even more cautious.<sup>70</sup>

In May 1981, the 54th EECMY Executive Committee was compelled to pass strict guidelines which may have caused frustration<sup>71</sup>, to all congregations. These guidelines were to exclude or even excommunicate Charismatics who were believed to challenge the statement of faith, rules, regulations, and constitution of the Church<sup>72</sup> in one way or the other. Either intentionally or not, the Church has done this to protect its own traditional zeal and self-existence. But in general terms, history suggests that Marxism has no positive regard for any sort of real Christianity, other than when manipulating it for divisive ends. Thus a Church knowing the need to be as wise as serpents and as innocent as doves would have done well to recognise that a bad tree, the Marxist government, could not bear good fruit, the diminution of the Charismatic influences in the Churches. For whatever reason it could be claimed that the Church may have exalted organisation over organism. Yet Bakke argues "...it would be utterly wrong to believe that a united EECMY leadership opposed the Charismatic youth".<sup>73</sup> More

particularly, a small number deliberately supported the Charismatic preferences of the young.

In the general view, it appears that discrimination has in fact been brought to bear by the official Church against the Charismatics. To some extent, the very fact that the EECMY has been fostering some ideas of reconciliation in order to maintain renewal may not be dismissed. From the early stage of the movement there were members, elders, pastors and leaders who have welcomed the Charismatics into their houses and congregations at their own risk. Not only these, but a few official leaders also promoted this movement in one way or the other.

Furthermore in the history of renewal, 1976 could be noted as a significant year for the Charismatic movement in the EECMY. In February 1976 a seminar at Church level, comprising mainly younger delegates, was held in order to focus on the movement. One of its recommendations was:

That the pastors, evangelists and elders of the Church study the Bible regarding the work of the Holy Spirit. That those who have received the spiritual gifts avoid boasting of it and rather use it for the glory of God.<sup>74</sup>

Thus were urged scriptural studies by ministers to develop the awareness of the work of the Holy Spirit and a proper use of gifts by Charismatics which may advance the development of Charismatic renewal in the light of mutual understanding. The latter view has already been dealt with. As regards the former, the problem of ministers may not be the lack of a biblical view of the work of the Holy Spirit: to progress any distance beyond the traditional position of understanding the personal experience has, however, proved particularly difficult for them. Without this experience, to lead a Charismatic congregation would indeed be challenging. However, the statement could be construed as an appropriate starting point, despite not being an official recommendation. Although the 8th General Assembly chose to be silent about the Charismatic movement, the 9th in April 1976, reconsidered the issues when conflicts and splitting among the

congregations got worse. As an outcome "Church leaders were urged to cooperate with the youths and to give them a chance to practise responsible leadership".<sup>75</sup> This could be resolved due to the positive attitude of a few influential leaders, such as the Reverend Gudina Tumessa, the former EECMY General Secretary, who for example, liked to say "...only those who had a touch of the Charismatic renewal would be really useful in the ministry of the Church".<sup>76</sup> With more such leaders the Church would earlier have given official recognition to Charismatic renewal.

Once more, the Church leadership saw the need for consultation. Hence the first such theological consultation, comprising forty persons, both Ethiopians and expatriate missionaries, was held in August 1976 to offer a recommendation. The consultation founded its discussion and recommendation on the given biblical teaching about the Holy Spirit; the document then noted solutions to the Charismatic question found in different Churches, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, in USA and Scotland. In its lengthy report it recommended "the Church must welcome the Charismatic renewal".<sup>77</sup>

In addressing authority, doctrine and worship, Bakke summarises thus:

It advised the youth to adhere to the EECMY constitution, pastors and evangelists to put renewed emphasis on the teaching on the Word of God, and Church leaders to allow more freedom in the way and forms of worship.<sup>78</sup>

The recommendation seems to offer progress to the movement if it was indeed to be applied. In fact as intended, a few congregations may have used it as official guidelines in their synods. But most congregations never learned of its existence, whilst its effect has been even less. Thus to a large extent, tension persisted among the members of the Church both during and after the period of persecution.

In August 1993 the second Theological Consultation, consisting of people in key leadership positions of the Church and Synods, was



convened.<sup>79</sup> The consultation seemed to require greater emphasis and awareness within congregations of the experience of Charismatic renewal and further recognised, on the basis of scripture<sup>80</sup>, its blessing to the Church's ministry. Its aims are clear: but by and large its final recommendation seems to be a mere repetition of the first, with no definite conclusions yet being reached. In general, the whole view of the consultation seems to constitute a better consensus statement to be tested in practice at the grass roots levels where the members are. Yet without its implementation the vision of the Church could be criticised.

So far we have discussed the whole attitude of the Church towards the movement in the light of contradicting perspectives which have put the EECMY in the state of dilemma. In any case, the significance of the Charismatic movement contribution to and effect on the Church's future, whether in negative or positive terms, may not be easily denied.

In general, the movement could be frequently applauded for its dynamic evangelistic concern, for re-emphasising the forgotten person and work of the Holy Spirit and for helping nominal Christians and casual Churchgoers become active believers undertaking zealous witness following personal experience. It seems to have reduced formality, professional domination and a dreary predictability in worship by giving it life and total congregational involvement. In particular, it has been able to provide more opportunity for personal worship, prayer groups and Bible-Study fellowships.<sup>81</sup> Other estimates of the movement, as noted earlier, have been less positive, as it is more concerned with experience and freedom than doctrine and tradition. Yet it has often done much more good than harm.

To sum up, in contrast to its past perspective, the EECMY now seems to have developed its views and noted the difference between Charismatic and Pentecostal movements.<sup>82</sup> All negative attitudes have constructively shaped the movement in providing ways and means for its qualitative and quantitative growth.

As a result of this lengthy development, the EECMY has now understood that its own conservative nature risks rendering the Church static and lifeless instead of active and visionary. It has thus become anxious to embrace the movement within the Church given that the Charismatics retain their biblical base and a spiritual sensitivity among their leaders.

Yet, whilst many members and some leaders have with increasing seriousness and openness accepted a role for the Charismatic movement, it remains true that this movement has yet to be understood in its central concerns, its doctrine and experience of the Holy Spirit. This must be now be considered in the following chapter.

## *References: Chapter 2*

1. W.J. Hollenweger in J.G. Davies (1986) p.430.
2. R.M. Anderson in M. Eliade, Vol.11 (1987) pp.229-30.
3. *Ibid.*, pp.230, 233.
4. *Ibid.*, p.229.
5. F.D. Bruner (1970) p.19.
6. *Ibid.* p.19.
7. H.P.V. Dusen in F.D. Bruner, *op. cit.*, p.29.
8. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.38.
9. E. William quoted in J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.38.
10. F.D. Bruner, *op. cit.* p.50; see R.M. Anderson, *op. cit.* p.230.
11. *Ibid.* p.50.
12. F.D. Bruner, *op. cit.* pp.35-7; see J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.1.
13. E.D. O'Connor in S.B. Ferguson (1989) p.437; see F.D. Bruner, *op. cit.* p.48.
14. M.T. Kelsey, *op. cit.* pp.61, 70.
15. J.W. Ward in S.B. Ferguson, *op. cit.* p.503.
16. M.T. Kelsey, *op. cit.* pp.63-74.
17. J.W. Ward, *op. cit.* p.502.
18. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.38.
19. W.J. Hollenweger in J.G. Davies, *op. cit.* pp.430-1.
20. R.M. Anderson, *op. cit.* pp.230-1.
21. J.W. Ward, *op. cit.* p.505.
22. W.J. Hollenweger in J.G. Davies, *op. cit.* p.431.
23. F.D. Bruner, *op. cit.* p.53; R.M. Anderson, *op. cit.* p.232.
24. J. Stacy, *op. cit.* p.168.
25. F.D. Bruner, *op. cit.* p.54.
26. A.Q. Lister in G.S. Wakefield (1983) p.85.
27. R.M. Anderson *op. cit.* p.235.
28. *Ibid.*, p.235.
29. W.J. Hollenweger in J.G. Davies, *op. cit.* p.431.
30. P.D. Manson in S.B. Ferguson *op. cit.* p.732.
31. J. Bakke (1987) p.251.
32. K. McDonnell (1980) p.150; see D.B. Barrett (1982) p.284; B. Wedajo *op. cit.* p.28.
33. J. Bakke *op. cit.* p.251.
34. *Ibid.* p.251.
35. K. McDonnell *op. cit.* p.150.
36. T. Engelsviken quoted in K. McDonnell *op. cit.* p.150.
37. J. Bakke *op. cit.* p. 251; see K. McDonnell *op. cit.* p.151.
38. *Ibid.*, p.251.
39. D.B. Barrett *op. cit.* p.284; see J. Bakke *op. cit.* p.251.
40. J. Bakke *op. cit.* p.252.
41. D.B. Barrett *op. cit.* p.284.
42. J. Bakke *op. cit.* p.252.
43. D.B. Barrett *op. cit.* p.284.
44. EECMY Information 5/93 (1993) p.5.

45. G. Aren (1978) pp.383ff; K.T. Anderson (1979) pp.10-12.
46. K.T. Anderson op. cit. pp14-16; see G. Aren op. cit. pp.383ff.
47. I. Gobena (1993) p.2.
48. J. Bakke op. cit. p.252; see K. McDonnell op. cit. p.151.
49. J. Bakke op. cit. p.252.
50. K. McDonnell op. cit. p.151; J. Bakke op. cit. p.252.
51. T. Engelsviken quoted in K. McDonnell op. cit. p.151.
52. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) preface.
53. J. Bakke op. cit. p.252; see K. McDonnell op. cit. p.151.
54. A. Norlander op. cit. p.12.
55. M. Green (1982) p.94.
56. J. Bakke op. cit. pp.252, 254.
57. Ibid. As an effect it seems that "youth groups were forced to leave their own congregations as a result of the attitude of the elders and the pastors". Ibid. pp.253-4; see EECMY information 6.93 pp.5-6. For instance, "in 1974 this group (the EECMY Charismatics in one synod) seceded from EECMY but later rejoined". D.B. Barrett op. cit. p.285; see J. Bakke op. cit. p.253. n.79.
58. Ibid., p.252.
59. Ibid. p.253.
60. M. Luther quoted in J. Moltmann (1978) p.14.
61. H. Harms in EECMY Theolo. Consul. (1991), p.4, in his own paper. See also, "Much recent thinking about baptism has seen it as the ordination of the whole people of God. Since the Christians' ministry is centred on reconciling work of Christ, baptism is our commission to engage in that ministry." R.F.G. Burnish in S.B. Ferguson, op. cit. p.72.
62. M. Green (1985) p.265.
63. Ibid., p.296.
64. K. McDonnell op. cit. p.151; see J. Bakke op. cit. p.252, n.70; I. Gobena op. cit. p.3.
65. T. Engelsviken quoted in I. Gobena op. cit. pp.3-4.
66. I. Gobena op. cit. p.4.
67. J. Bakke op. cit. p.256.
68. Ibid., p.251. nn.77,79.
69. Ibid., p.256.
70. Ibid., p.253.
71. I. Gobena op. cit. p.4.
72. J. Bakke op. cit. p.254; see Ibid.
73. Ibid. p.253, n.79.
74. EECMY Youth Seminar Report (February 1976).
75. EECMY 9th General Assembly Minutes (April 1976).
76. G. Tumessa cited in J. Bakke op. cit. p.253, n.80.
77. K. McDonnell op. cit. p.153; see I. Gobena op. cit. pp.5-6.
78. J. Bakke, op. cit p.254; K. McDonnell op. cit. pp.153-82, EECMY Theolo. consult. on Charismatic Mov. August 1976.
79. EECMY Theolo. Cons. on Charismatic renewal, Recomm. (1993) pp.1-2; EECMY Information 5/93, p.5.
80. Ibid.

81. I. Gobena op. cit. p.2. "But led many believers to read their Bible seriously and study the Word of God with fresh interest, individually and corporately." "Groups of different kinds have been formed: worship groups, Bible study groups....." J. Bakke op. cit. p.256; in addition to this, numerous indigenous hymns have been composed.
82. EECMY Theol. Cons. on charis. Renewal (1993) p.2. "The distinction in doctrine between Pentecostal movement and Charismatic renewal has been noted".

## **CHAPTER 3: THE CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT, BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE EECMY**

This chapter seeks now to consider the doctrine and experience of the Holy Spirit, with the distinctive areas of the "baptism of the Holy Spirit" and the "gifts of the Holy Spirit" as particularly important. Nonetheless, any discussion of "the gifts of the Spirit" within this present work can only be introductory given the immense breadth of the subject.

Earlier discussion of the former doctrine suggests that this is no new phenomenon for the EECMY: the Church believes baptism to be a means of grace through which conversion or salvation and the Holy Spirit are being received in such a way that water and Spirit baptism are inseparable. On the other hand, although the Charismatics have indeed accepted the traditional doctrine of baptism, yet they have argued for the direct personal experience of the Holy Spirit, thus going beyond the traditional - sacramental theology of the Church. The necessary question which then follows is: what is the root of this theology?

### **3.1 The Root of 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit'**

Baptism in the Holy Spirit has been regarded as the most distinctive hallmark yet controversial doctrine of Pentecostalism. It has not only been a controversial issue between the mainstream and Pentecostal Churches but also and most recently between the latter and the Charismatics, despite its apparent importance amongst the Charismatic pioneers.

Pentecostalism distinctively emphasises Spirit-baptism as a further or second experience or initiation subsequent to conversion<sup>1</sup>, according to its own traditional and scriptural sources: it is itself a decisive experience in the life of Christians.<sup>2</sup> Historically, its theological roots may claim the apostolic experience of Acts 2 as a paradigmatic model and a personal necessity for all Christians: this view has appeared<sup>3</sup> within the various pneumatic or enthusiastic movements of both Reformation and post-Reformation

periods.<sup>4</sup> Notably within more radical pietistic Protestantism, there has thrived a tradition holding salvation, so far as it may be known in this life, to be experienced in two stages: firstly, the experience of becoming a Christian; *secondly, the experience of the Holy Spirit as a later and distinctive event.* For many puritans, this second experience was one of assurance.<sup>5</sup> The entire tradition knows the concept of Spirit-baptism to be related to the second stage. Thus Thomas Goodwin (1600-80) identified the experience of assurance with the "seal of the Spirit" (Ep. 1:13f), and regarded the baptism with the Holy Spirit as "a new conversion"<sup>6</sup>. John Wesley (1703-1791), the founder of Methodism, saw justification and partial sanctification as the first stage and the divine gift of entire sanctification or Christian perfection as the second stage<sup>7</sup>, a "second blessing". John Fletcher (1729-85), Wesley's designated successor, echoed some later Reformers who spoke of the repeatable baptism of the Spirit, describing it as the sudden reception of entire sanctification.<sup>8</sup> The worldwide Holiness movement including the Keswick Convention with its "Higher life" influential teachers, amongst them W.E. Boardman (1810-1886), Charles Finney (1792-1876), R.A. Torrey (1856-1928), D.L. Moody (1837-1899), claimed the baptism of the Spirit as a post-conversion endowment of primary power for witness and service, not a second experience.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, towards the end of the 19th century, particularly in America, the emphasis in the use of the phrase gradually altered from the idea of sanctification and Holiness to that of empowering for service (mainly on the basis of Luke 24:49; Acts 1:5-8).<sup>10</sup>

Generally speaking, it was from this context then, that the classic pentecostals forged their doctrine: baptism in the Spirit as a second (pentecostal) experience distinct from and subsequent to conversion gave power for witness (Acts 1:8), with speaking in tongues as in Acts 2:4 the principal evidence of the baptism and with the spiritual gifts listed in 1 Cor. 12:8-10 to be practised whenever pentecostals met for worship.<sup>11</sup> The nomenclature differed, but 'entire sanctification', 'the blessing', 'the second blessing' or 'the baptism with the Holy Spirit' separately had significance

only within a detailed description of the contents of the experience. In each case it seemed to address a new quality of Christian experience *distinct from* conversion and emphasised Spiritual life as the true distinguishing mark of the Christian according to the ongoing pentecostal tradition. Conversely, it might attract criticism for categorising Christians in two classes, a divisible phenomenon. Biblically, the pentecostal doctrine of the subsequent baptism in the Holy Spirit seems dependent chiefly on the Book of Acts.<sup>12</sup> In their own literature, pentecostals argue that both the OT and the Gospels do not treat the chronologically second baptising experience of the Holy Spirit, but rather only indicate prophecies and promises which leave the experience itself in the future.<sup>13</sup> Although the Epistles discuss the Spirit, they lack his subsequent baptising, "because" according to Glenn A. Reed, himself a pentecostal writer, "they are letters addressed to Churches which were already established and in which the majority of members had already received the experience"<sup>14</sup>. Thus the setting of Gospels and Epistles seems to be too early and too late respectively, with Acts uniquely at the right location, where it alone records the vital experience of the Holy Spirit in believers' lives subsequent to the initial or saving faith.<sup>15</sup> Acts may thus be used as 'a normative record'<sup>16</sup>, a compulsory pattern. However, it should be noted that in Paul's Epistles no separate study is made of a baptism in the Holy Spirit, an experience discrete from the one baptism. Although Paul's expression of Spirit baptism may simply be implied<sup>17</sup>, he could be claimed as the first and most important NT writer<sup>18</sup> to theologise and integrate the water and Spirit baptism.<sup>19</sup> Thus Michael Green summarises as follows:

It has often been observed that Paul is more interested in the interior work of the Spirit, assuring believers, transforming their lives, and so on; whereas Luke is more interested in the broader picture of the coming of the Spirit on the Church, his external manifestations in prophecy and tongues, and his direction of the Christian mission.<sup>20</sup>



In accordance with this comment, it might be methodologically worthwhile for pentecostals to take Acts along with the Pauline epistles in the attempt at self-explanation, thus establishing an acceptable doctrine of Spirit baptism. It is also necessary for the Charismatic renewal movement to acknowledge the historical continuity of the Church, recognising the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and his experience based on the Word of God: this necessarily precedes any authentic Church renewal, unity and a balanced Christian life according to the context of each Church.

Similarly, the EECMY's Charismatic movement needs to understand the doctrine and experience of the Holy Spirit or Spirit baptism in the context of a wider Biblical base than simple Acts or any other single source.

### **3.2 Spirit-Baptism in the Perspective of the NT**

This is one of the most complex theological themes in the NT, leading Churches to varied and at times conflicting practices in baptism. Nonetheless Christian conviction claims the presence of God still to be seen and experienced in the practice of baptism, whatever the form.

In this section whilst a thoroughgoing exegesis will not be attempted, some key biblical passages and theological issues will be explored.

The three basic questions at stake are: does pentecostal teaching on baptism in the Spirit conform to NT teaching? Should Christians seek baptism in the Holy Spirit subsequent to their Christian initiation, their lives of necessity then being split into two stages? How do the Charismatics accept the pentecostals' theology?

1. The NT student might be surprised at the number of references to baptism in the Spirit. For pentecostals, the term 'baptised' in the Spirit subsumes what the scripture says in different forms: "baptised", "filled", "received", "sealed", "anointed", "earnest"<sup>21</sup>.... "It must not be considered that these different terms refer to different experiences"<sup>22</sup>, wrote Riggs, a pentecostal author. Despite a possible relationship between the terms, however, each word could have its own discrete meaning in a given context. Not all thus potentially carry identical meanings.

Some seven NT references may be found to baptism in the Spirit: Mk. 1:8; Lk 3:16; Mt 3:11; Jn 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16; 1 Cor. 12:13.<sup>23</sup> Six are related to John the Baptist's prediction of a Spiritual baptism by the greater one who was to come after him. This understanding of baptism in the Holy Spirit necessarily starts with the words of John the Baptist, he contrasted his water baptism for repentance with baptism in the Spirit, that which brings people into the blessing of the new covenant. This would be administered by Jesus<sup>24</sup> "...but he will baptise you with the Holy Spirit (Mk 1:8; Jn 1:33) and with fire (Mt 3:11; Lk 3:16)"

Although Mark here gives no indication of a time scale, his shorter form and meaning is understood by evangelist and readers alike as a reference to the gift of the Spirit to the Church recorded later in Acts. However, the issue of the term "baptise" being used metaphorically or of the liturgical rite of Christian baptism through which the Spirit would be received is debatable and requires further study.<sup>25</sup>

The Matthean and Lukan addition of "and with fire" to the Marcan saying have puzzled many scholars: they would deny that the Baptist stated "the Holy Spirit", and some (e.g. C.A. Briggs; Wellhausen, R. Buttman) would approve 'with fire' alone.<sup>26</sup> Others (C.K. Barrett) accept both 'wind' (Πνευμα) and fire.<sup>27</sup> In both cases the metaphor of baptism seems to be equivalent to the metaphor of separating and destruction by fire which directly follows (Mt 3:12; Lk 3:17). On the contrary, Dunn disputes both views supported by these factors: in his discussion of the Synoptic account of John's whole ministry, he maintains, there is more room in John's preaching for a gracious Spirit than <sup>one</sup> would think at first glance".<sup>28</sup> Secondly, John might have had contact with and gained from the Qumran community who "talked freely of a, or God's, Holy Spirit (or Spirit of Holiness) as a cleansing, purifying power".<sup>29</sup> "Therefore repent, cried John, that the coming wrath might mean redemption and not utter destruction."<sup>30</sup> In short, the baptism in Spirit and fire would be something to be experienced by all Jews, Gentiles, penitent and unrepentant: they must be immersed, to

remove by fire all impurities. Dunn further states that for the unrepentant it would mean entire destruction, with the refining and purging away of both evil and sin; for the already repentant, it would lead to salvation and the enjoyment of the blessings of the messianic kingdom.<sup>31</sup> This might happen in the messianic realm where the penitent would be initiated into the new age. On such terms John appears to foretell above all else a baptism in the Holy Spirit and with fire.

In Acts 1:5 Luke appears to explain the instruction to wait for an assurance from Jesus, to be recalled later (11:16). In contrast to John's simple water-baptism, the disciples will soon be baptised with the Holy Spirit. However, Dunn questions whether the promise was declared by Jesus: as he points out, "Acts 1:5 quite likely is a Lukan interpretation giving Jesus' assurance more precise reference to Pentecost".<sup>32</sup> Among others however, Ernest Hoenchen suggests, "The words are definitely part of Jesus' speech".<sup>33</sup> In any event in the Acts narrative, the Baptist's promise that Jesus would baptise with the Holy Spirit is viewed as fulfilled on the day of Pentecost<sup>34</sup>, being confirmed by Peter, his first experience (11:16) setting a norm for the reception of the Spirit.<sup>35</sup>

A final NT reference for baptism in the Spirit may be the Pauline account of a universal pentecost in 1 Cor. 12:13. This passage evokes many differing views. In anticipation of a more developed comment later, this short note stressed that Paul, contrasting his readers' spiritual pride with a baptism that unites across racial and cultural differences, insists that it is one Spirit that baptises all into Christ following the confession 'Jesus is Lord' (1 Cor. 12:3)<sup>36</sup>

Thus all seven references to baptism in the Spirit in the NT may well point to the eschatological promise fulfilled at pentecost, whose more recent occurrences may be interpreted "as the mark of entering into the messianic community"<sup>37</sup> in the economy of human salvation.

2. Taking this as a basis, we now examine a selection of the so called "pentecostal passages". To justify their distinctive second-experience of

baptism in the Spirit many pentecostals claim some seven biblical references (Mk 1:9-11; Acts 2:4; 2:38; 8:4-25; 9:1-19; 10:11; 19:1-7). In order to question their interpretation as a two-stage perspective of Christian initiation, two examples will be examined. The experience at Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4) is for Pentecostalism the principal instance for the subsequent operation of the Spirit when the 120 waiting believers "were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance"; (Acts 2:4 RSV)<sup>38</sup>. Maintaining this instance, pentecostals argue that those who were baptised in the Spirit on the day of pentecost had already been 'saved' and 'regenerated'. Their reception of the Spirit on that day was neither their conversion, nor the beginning of their Christian life. In other words, pentecost was a second experience subsequent to and distinct from their earlier 'new birth'<sup>39</sup>. Moreover, they seem to regard this belief as an obligatory model and expected all Christians to be so baptised in the Spirit further to their conversion. The adherents seem to have biblical affirmation for their arguments. E. Williams writes:

There is plentiful evidence that the disciples who received the Spirit at pentecost were already in a saved state....They were spiritually clean (Jn 15:3) and were acknowledged by Jesus as united to Him as a branch is to the vine (Jn 15:4-5). Yet they had not received the Baptism with the Holy Spirit.<sup>40</sup>

William G. MacDonald, however, writes that:

On Christ's resurrection He breathed out from into them 'Holy Spirit' (Jn 20:22); this may properly be called their Christian regeneration....<sup>41</sup>

Their arguments may be similar to those of the old Holiness teachers' and of some Catholics, that pentecost was analogous to the apostles' confirmation.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, the pentecostals notion entirely depends on the view drawn from the Gospels, mainly John. Nevertheless, Johannine passages, in particular (20:22) raise difficulties in the context of the coming of the Spirit at pentecost. Amongst scholars, G.E. Ladd suggests three probable solutions as follows:

Either John did not know about pentecost and substitutes this story so that it becomes in effect the Johannine pentecost, or there were actually two gifts of the Spirit; or Jesus' breathing on the disciples was an acted probably promissory and anticipatory to the actual coming of the Spirit at Pentecost<sup>43</sup>

However, it may be hardly possible to assume that any Christian teaching in Ephesus in the first century did not have any knowledge about Pentecost. On the other hand, it could be impossible to accept the dual impartations of the Holy Spirit, one as incomplete the other as complete. In the account of divine economy the Spirit could not be given until Jesus returned to the Father through the cross, resurrection and ascension (John 7:39). If the pentecostals' argument is to be valid, that Jesus gave his disciples the Spirit, there must be two ascensions (20:17). Since evidence for the disciples' entering into their Christian commission until after Pentecost is hardly available, the Johannine incident may be interpreted as an acted parable, fulfilled at pentecost<sup>44</sup>

Next, Luke has his own distinctive historical settings within which he understands Pentecost. For Dunn, Pentecost is seen by Luke as the climax of all that has gone before: "incarnation, the atonement, the resurrection, the ascension"<sup>45</sup>, the climax of Jesus' ministry (Acts 2:33), with the beginning of the new covenant for the disciples (Lk 24:49; Acts 1:4; 2:33, 38, 39) and above all the inauguration of the new age for the Church.<sup>46</sup> For Luke, the theological significance of the event is Epochal, the commencing of the final stage of salvation history. As far as the pre-Christianity of the disciples is concerned Dunn comments::

In Luke's understanding of salvation-history the 120 before Pentecost were in a position analogous to that of Jesus before Jordan. Only at Pentecost did they enter into that relationship with the Father which was made possible through the death, resurrection and exaltation of the Son and which was effected through the ascension gift of the Spirit.<sup>47</sup>

After their previous experience of the Spirit through the Old Covenant, only Pentecost could provide the 'Abba-relationship' with the Father: Christians repeat Jesus' 'filial relationship' to God in receiving the Spirit of His Son. This relationship alone would make a Christian, only at Pentecost could the disciples become Christians. Their pre-Pentecost experience cannot be normative for new Christians, since Pentecost alone opens the gateway to that realm of faith and experience of the NT Christian. Dunn thus concludes, "For those who live in the pentecostal age there is no going back through that door. There is no genuine Christianity 'on the wrong side of pentecost'"<sup>48</sup>

Nevertheless, in the rest of the texts too, the pentecostals argument remains the same. For instance, the Samaritans' case (Acts 8:4-25) may provide them with a further stronghold of baptism in the Spirit. However, this most problematical passage centres on two issues: the Samaritans were evangelised by Philip, believed and were baptised in the name only of the Lord Jesus (v.16); they did not receive the Holy Spirit until later when Peter and John prayed for them. The apparently accepted sequence, after Peter's promise (Acts 2:38), was to believe, be baptised in the name of Jesus, to have received the Spirit and thus be called Christians (Rom 8:9). Professor I.H. Marshall says, "This is perhaps the most extraordinary statement in Acts".<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, Dunn also adds "...in the context of the rest of the NT these facts appear to be mutually exclusive and wholly irreconcilable".<sup>50</sup> Varied scholarly explanations are understandably suggested to overcome this tension.

Some try to merge the Samaritans' case into the whole NT context in which initiation into Christ may be considered as a single stage. According to v.16 the Spirit which usually came at initiation had not yet come upon any of them, thus they had experienced only water baptism (that and nothing more, NEB) into the name of the Lord Jesus.<sup>51</sup> The term 'only' may expect the two elements (water and Spirit baptisms) to be anticipated simultaneously: in the case of the Samaritans, incompleteness may have

been experienced with the two senior apostles sent to solve the condition<sup>52</sup>, this being a linguistic sacramental rather than literal interpretation of the statement.

J.H.E. Hull argues that the Samaritans indeed believed, having experienced the Spirit prior to the visit of the apostles, but that in Luke's eyes the Spirit had not come unless he manifested himself appropriately<sup>53</sup> in the Charismatic gifts (Acts 2:4; 10:45f; 11:15; 19:6; 1 Cor. 12). Similarly, amongst the historical Reformers, Calvin concludes "...since the Samaritans had the Spirit of adoption conferred on them already, the extraordinary graces of the Spirit are added as a culmination."<sup>54</sup> Some Lutheran and Reformed commentators seem to follow this notion. In general, however, such a way of confining John's and Peter's interest only to gifts may not be less than exalting charismata far above their NT position "to out-pentecostalize the pentecostals".<sup>55</sup> In contrast, the apostles might observe that the Samaritans lacked the Spirit rather than the Charismatic gifts. If there was the Spirit there would be no lack of the gift.<sup>56</sup> This final analysis leads to Dunn's subjective view. He argues that the Samaritans' first stage was an inauthentic conversion, the Spirit not yet being given through an inadequacy of faith.<sup>57</sup> If they had not yet received the Spirit, Dunn thus sees their response and commitment as defective. Full faith was a necessary prelude to assurance and membership of the Christian community. However, Luke's emphasis on faith does not exclude other pre-requisites, for example, repentance, prior to the gift of the Spirit. If this then exalts a human act and intellectual assent, it may contradict God's justifying role in human salvation. But there is no explicit evidence that people were only superficial in their belief.

Above all, however, the Samaritans Pentecost may be seen as exceptional since "The conversion of the Samaritans was the first movement of the Gospel beyond Jerusalem".<sup>58</sup> Yet there was a strong historical and social antagonism between Jews and Samaritans: the Jews could not deal with the Samaritans (Jn 4:9). This might account for the delay of the gift of

the Spirit. G.W.H. Lampe contemplates that God withheld the Spirit until the coming of Peter and John in order that the Samaritans might be considered to be fully incorporated into the community of Jerusalem Christians who had received the Spirit at Pentecost.<sup>59</sup> Following their recognition and acceptance by the leaders of the mother Church, they could now experience the signs which confirmed and attested their membership of the Spirit-possessed assembly.<sup>60</sup> The question of the imposition of hands is obscure - elsewhere in Acts nothing links the reception of the Spirit with the new converts (Acts 2, 8b, 10-11, 16), save in the unusual and quite similar case of the Ephesian disciples (19:1f). Thus, the reception of the Spirit may occur with or without the imposition of hands. In any case, it is neither primary nor rejected<sup>61</sup>, but this particular missionary enterprise is part of the extending Christian mission (Acts 1:8) and is compatible with the rest of the NT. Nonetheless, the Samaritans' case is too exceptional a passage to stand as model for a whole theological pattern of baptism.

Taken over all, as Ladd points out, "It is obvious that there is no single pattern in Acts"<sup>62</sup>, a comfort for both sacramentalists and pentecostals alike. This fact notwithstanding each group there had consciously experienced the supernatural power of God and given expression of God's mighty acts to those around them. There remains the questions of what should be the normative Christian pattern for baptism according to the whole context of the scripture, and how the NT relates baptism in the Spirit to water baptism.

3. In his conclusion Ladd suggests that,

the normal pattern is that the baptism of the Spirit occurs at the moment of saving faith, which in NT times was practically simultaneous with water baptism, incorporating believers into the Church.<sup>63</sup>

This typifies sacramental theology which, as already discussed in chapter one, the EECMY accepts alongside the traditional Churches: there is not call to cover the same ground here. This view contrary to the pentecostals' two-stage pattern takes baptism as a once-for-all initiatory experience in which Spirit baptism and water baptism work hand in hand. However, in NT



theology, the relationship between baptism and the reception of the Spirit is most complex, notably so in Acts.<sup>64</sup> Here Dunn categorises water and Spirit baptism as "...sometimes sharply contrasted (1:5, 11:16), sometimes quite unconnected (2:4; 8:16f; 8:25), sometimes in natural sequence (2:38; 19:5f) sometimes the other way about (9:17f; 10:4-48)".<sup>65</sup>

G.R. Beasley-Murray writes similarly:

The complex phenomena of the Spirit in relation to baptism in Acts compel a dual recognition: first that baptism is closely linked with the reception of the Spirit, howsoever it may be received; secondly that allowance must be made for the freedom of God in bestowing the Spirit, since God exercises that freedom.<sup>66</sup>

In both views, one point may be made explicit by the evidence of Acts without diminishing the teaching of Acts: life is more complex than mere formulations of doctrine. And if an authentic scriptural doctrine needs to be established, further interpretative help should come from elsewhere in the whole Bible. But G. Kittel comments, "The chief mistake appears to me to lie in the fact that there is not a sharp enough distinction drawn between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism."<sup>67</sup> In his sentiment the NT never asserts that water-baptism grants the baptism of the Spirit or evokes any Spiritual transformation: it solely confirms an inward change that has already taken place. This position has indeed been taken up by non-sacramentalists, despite the difficulty of being justified on evangelical grounds. Nonetheless, B-Murray argues: "in the Acts and Epistles baptism is the supreme moment of belief. 'If the Spirit is received in baptism, that is because his operations are received with baptism'".<sup>68</sup>

After Pentecost the first Christians did not discontinue water baptism in favour of something better. Although the sequence of activity varies from occasion to occasion, they continued baptising the converts in water.<sup>69</sup> In particular Acts 2:38 may be claimed as the only verse noting the three most important elements in Christian water baptism: repentance, faith and the gifts of the Spirit. Three other strands together bind a Christian to his Lord:

the initiate, Church and God.<sup>70</sup> Whatever the order, they belong together in normal Christian baptism with a distinctive role for each party: unless each plays its part, the baptism may not be completed. As proclaimed in Peter's first sermon, both forgiveness and gifts of the Spirit are primary blessings which God bestows on everyone who repents, believes and is baptised (Acts 2:38-39).

This may be the situation which Paul inherited from his predecessors, yet his thinking and experience linked water and Spirit baptisms more closely together.<sup>71</sup> Paul stressed baptism as one of the seven initially important constituent parts of Church unity (Ep. 4:4-5). In Pauline theology baptism signifies and effects a union with Christ's death and resurrection (Rom. 6:1-14; Gal. 3:27); an incorporation into the body of Christ, the community of faith (1 Cor. 12:12-13), thereby into the Spirit of Christ, as the Spirit and Christ are inseparable in Godhead (Rom. 8:9f; 2 Cor. 3:17); above all, into the eschatological eternal life in the Kingdom of God. The Pauline conception of the Spirit and hence of baptism, is always eschatological. The Spirit remains the Holy Spirit of promise, the token first instalment of the ultimate redemption of that which God has sealed as His own, Eph. 1:13.<sup>72</sup> In particular 1 Cor. 12:13 is assumed as the only entire NT passage in which water and Spirit baptisms are viewed as a one-stage initiation.

Among other similar views of, for example, K. Barth, R. Bultmann, G.R.B-Murray and Gordon D. Lee, Dunn entirely regards water baptism as a mere metaphor and the gift of the Spirit as a nerve-centre of Christian initiation; thus:

the most popular view of 1 Cor. 12:13 is that Paul is describing Christian water-baptism which conveys the Spirit and which incorporates the baptisand into the Body of Christ. But βαπτίζειν in itself does not specify water-baptism. Paul is thinking of baptism in the Spirit, he is not speaking about water at all.<sup>73</sup>

This view may imply that Paul refers to their common experience of the one Spirit (not of water baptism) of conversion, denoting the most crucial

ingredients immersion in the Spirit and drinking to the full of the Spirit. Such understanding of water baptism as having any symbolical significance and Spirit baptism as having actual real and experiential significance seems to reverse manichean categories. It is nothing less than denying the unity in baptism and the unity in God who offers it.<sup>74</sup> In contrast, Lampe disputes that:

Pauline thought affords no ground for the modern theories which seem to effect a separation in the one action and to distinguish a 'Spirit-baptism' and a 'water-baptism', not as the inward and outward parts of the one sacrament, but as independent entities.<sup>75</sup>

It would have been more clear if the modern theories distinguished the inward and outward parts of Pauline sacramental expression since for Paul it is not only the external rite which makes a convert a new creation but also the impartation of the Spirit in response to faith.<sup>76</sup> Thus C.K. Barrett may justifiably write:

There is no reason to think that 'we are baptised' refers to anything other than baptism in water (together with all that this outward rite signifies). The death and resurrection of Christ are certainly implied and stand behind the rite....<sup>77</sup>

In general, however, 1 Cor. 12:13 is not a simple reference to the Day of Pentecost, for neither Paul nor his readers shared in that event. Its association with regeneration is not certain and its ambiguity allows both positive and negative claims to be used as the governing pattern by which to interpret the receiving of the Spirit in Acts.<sup>78</sup>

As far as the relation between the act of believing, being baptised into Christ, the gift of the Spirit and the order of salvation is concerned, pentecostals argue that the Spirit works within a person prior to conversion, enables them to repent and believe, to receive Jesus into their heart and life. In accordance with Acts 2:38; 19:5 they believe their reason to be sound, for that baptism is a witness of conversion which has already taken place: the Spirit is already operative in someone's life, so that the Spirit received at or

after baptism is a work of grace distinct from and further to conversion.<sup>79</sup> Some biblical passages (John 16:8-11; 1 Cor. 14:21ff) may well support this convicting work of the Spirit prior to and leading up to conversion. Yet NT writers seem not to have postulated such things of a Christian apart from the presence and the operation of the Holy Spirit in the believer. Dunn argues, "The decisive gift of the Spirit which makes a man a Christian and without which is no Christian comes neither before nor after conversion but in conversion. The NT knows of no prior reception".<sup>80</sup> Accordingly, there is no clear ground for supposing that baptism makes this practical difference or that it is an 'optional extra' in Christian life. The work of the Spirit is one and indivisible:<sup>81</sup> at conversion is received the new life of Christ and the new life of the Spirit. The NT, in particular Pauline theology, uncompromisingly declares that, "If a man does not possess the Spirit of Christ he does not belong to him" (Rom 8:9). The indwelling Spirit and the risen Christ may well be one: the presence of either one implies that of the other.<sup>82</sup> Yet this might not view the Spirit as simply submissive to Christ, but indicates the origins of Godhead. The Spirit may thus accompany the gift of salvation to all who believe and are baptised, that is to those who receive Jesus Christ.

We have seen in the whole biblical context how water-baptism and Spirit-baptism are theologically related to yield the first initiatory Christian experience in the economy of salvation. A fundamental question is whether baptism is, as pentecostals assert, a necessarily repeatable and second experience. In Luke-Acts we have seen that the phrase 'baptism in the Spirit' seems mostly to be associated with the one unrepeatable event of entering into the messianic age or the body of Christ<sup>83</sup> rather than as part of a sequence of events. Paul also sees baptism as analogous "to one's own death and burial, and so closely linked with Christ's death and burial that any going back on it or repetition of it would have been unthinkable".<sup>84</sup>

The breadth of NT view does not appear to commend the pentecostals' second-initiation of Spirit baptism for that "one does not enter the new age or Christian life more than once".<sup>85</sup> The prophecy of Spirit-

baptism seems to find its fulfilment "like the cross" in a "once-for-all"<sup>86</sup> event occurring when one believes and enters into the body of Christ. Such exegetical and theological analysis may well be the stumbling block to the sacramental-traditionalists' acceptance of non-sacramental view points of theology.

A summary must note, on the one hand, the strength of pentecostalism highlighting the drama of an initiating Spirit-baptism: the Spirit not only renews but also equips for ministry and witness<sup>87</sup> outside the acknowledged system of the mainstream Churches. On the other hand, a weakness could be their required harmonisation of all Luke-Acts incidents regardless of exegetical integrity, and their interpretation of Paul in the light of Luke rather than Luke through Paul which is more likely within the hermeneutical procedure of systematic theology.<sup>88</sup> The strength of sacramental-traditionalism derives from locating the theology of baptism within a wider scriptural context and from its objective rather than subjective nature. Conversely, it is limited by the insistence that all experiential inspiration of the Holy Spirit comes once-for-all time through only the specific sacramental action. This undervalues the apostolic quality in the Churches, but this belief may have comforted the traditional Churches across the centuries. However, any neglect of the practice of faith and any lack of awareness of the life-changing power of the Spirit would require a reconsideration by Charismatics of this traditional position. At this point we must directly ask what is the perspective of the Charismatics, notably in the interpretation of the phrase 'baptism in the Holy Spirit'?

We have already seen that the first Charismatics for historical reasons adopted the phrase to express the experience of entering a new awareness of the presence and power of the Spirit in their lives. Currently, however, some Charismatics within the mainstream Churches have uncritically adopted the pentecostal description of this phrase. Amongst these, K. McDonnell, a Catholic Charismatic, prefers to understand "baptism in the Spirit" as a less controversial "release of the Spirit".<sup>89</sup> Green, an Anglican

Charismatic, also disputes the usage of the term and writes "...it is contrary to the usage of the NT, confusing in the extreme, and contributory to division among the one people of the Spirit"<sup>90</sup>, so Christians are not told either to wait or seek to be baptised in the Spirit.<sup>91</sup> God has already given his Spirit to every believer (Rom. 8:9). Dr Graham, probably the 20th century world's best known evangelical evangelist, also rejects emphatically the pentecostals 'pattern.'<sup>92</sup> Amongst the alternatives proposed by Charismatics, McDonnell's seems to have been adopted as a model for the Charismatic traditional Churches:

release of the Spirit, renewal of the sacraments of initiation, actualisation of gifts already received in potentiality, and a manifestation of baptism, whereby the hidden grace given in baptism breaks through into conscious experience. These are all ways of saying that the power of the Holy Spirit, given in Christian initiation but hitherto unexperienced, becomes a matter of personal conscious experience.<sup>93</sup>

The still young theology of this movement appears to interpret the phrase 'baptism in the Spirit' in terms of traditional theology which reduces the importance of the experience, avoids confusion, and seeks a sense of greater order in liturgical practice. In fact any personal experience of the Holy Spirit may well fit no specific category: it may nevertheless make much traditional theology operational and the body of Christians inspired.

### **3.3 The Infilling Or Empowering By the Holy Spirit**

Our discussion could suggest Baptism in the Spirit to be the initial reception at the beginning of Christian life, associated with Christian water baptism as a once-for-all and universal gift. In this respect baptism in the Spirit has become part of the general theological language of the Church and found its place in its sacramental context. However, despite its apparent acceptance by the EECMY Charismatics, it has still been threatened, because of the lack of personal experience of the work of the Holy Spirit within individuals and their Church life. The Charismatics argue that, without

Christian family upbringing, specific Christian nurture and a faith which is practised individually and corporately, no mere external rite of baptism can lead to a personal appropriation of receiving the blessings. Dr A. Norlander points out, "The truth is that a lot of those who are baptised do not personally appropriate the heavenly blessings objectively given to them in the baptism".<sup>94</sup> The only remedy open to the Church seems to be preaching of repentance and conversion for not only the non-baptised members but also the already-baptised members so that they appropriate personally what they have received sacramentally through baptism.<sup>95</sup> Here, Norlander indicates the shortcomings of personal experiences and for its solution suggests preaching for renewal. But in anticipation of this comment he notes a crucial point which exposes the whole weakness of this tradition

In our tradition we have not emphasised that salvation consists both of the forgiveness of sins and the Holy Spirit. We have omitted the Spirit and, therefore, we are running into problems with the experience of the Spirit.<sup>96</sup>

Likewise, although the EECMY has argued that the Holy Spirit was considered as the chief participant in the work of salvation, in contrast that same Spirit seems to have been hardly experienced apart from the means of grace: preaching and sacraments. Furthermore, until challenged by the Charismatics, the converting and transforming power of the Holy Spirit was dependent on "justification by faith alone". However, it could be argued that the earliest Christians differed from this in knowing a much more direct experience of the Spirit when they accepted Christ.<sup>97</sup> Thus, because of the rarity of experience of that apostolic quality, the Charismatics may correctly challenge the Church with revival accompanied by the theology of Spirit-filling or empowering. Although this new phenomenon has yet to play any significant part in recent academic theology, it has been a primary issue for the EECMY Charismatics alongside those similarly renewed within the mainstream Churches: we have already noted the strength of this debate between traditionalists and the Charismatics. Before we assess the recent

attitude of the EECMY towards this issue, it may be worthwhile investigating some related phrases: 'the fullness of the Spirit', 'being full of the Spirit' and 'being filled with the Spirit'.

The former perhaps seems to be the current preferred term within the Holiness and pentecostal movements. Only those baptised with the Spirit have reached the permanent level of the fullness of the Spirit. Nevertheless, the New Testament Greek 'pleroma' (fullness) seems to apply variously to both God (Ep. 3:19), Christ (Jn 1:16), and the Church (Ep. 1:23) rather than only to the Spirit. Meanwhile the other phrases are much used by Charismatics, notably with the last describing someone who shares his experience in "contra-distinction to run-of-the-mill Christians".<sup>98</sup> Theologically the presumed difference between 'full' and 'filled' may puzzle some Christians. In short, to be 'full of the Spirit' may signify a constant state of being controlled by the Spirit, whereas to be 'filled with the Spirit' might refer to a particular and occasional filling for special tasks.<sup>99</sup> As regards scripture, the verb 'to be filled with' and the adjective 'full' occur mainly in Luke-Acts, with other examples in Matthew and the Pauline literature.<sup>100</sup> These references are chronologically both before and after Pentecost: in this present work, however, only the latter will be considered. The whole notion of being full of the Spirit, faith and wisdom (Acts 6:3, 5); 7:55; 11:24) seems to describe the continual or permanent state of Christian life, with a necessary special filling for some particularly circumstances. Post-Pentecost references recently recognised by some theologians include Acts 2:4; 4:8, 13; 9:17; 13:9, 52; Ep. 5:18.<sup>101</sup> In Acts 2:4, as seen earlier, the term 'fill' is used to describe an initial endowment of the Spirit to fit people for God's ministry and also to make important utterances. For instance in 4:8 Peter is filled with the Spirit before his address which challenges the Sanhedrin. The young Church is also filled with the Spirit when despite of the onset of severe persecution it continues its witness (4:31): likewise with Paul before the magician when miracles happened (13:9). Moreover, the word is further used to express a continuous process (Acts 13:52 and Eph.



5:18), where a person already filled with the Spirit receives additionally for some specific task or a repeated filling.

However, the pentecostals, who normally believe that to be filled with the Spirit is a once-for-all experience, nonetheless argue that the Lukan incidents do in fact describe repeated fillings of one and the same person.<sup>102</sup> The primary misunderstanding of pentecostals in this and similar descriptions may be their lack of differentiation between the terms baptism and fillings. However, these terms do not appear to be strictly synonymous: although Acts describes recurrences of the filling with the Spirit, never is it said that believers were baptised with the Spirit more than once.<sup>103</sup> Thus, as some scholars (e.g. J.D.G. Dunn, F.F. Bruce, I.H. Marshall and an evangelist, B. Graham) have claimed there could be many new or fresh fillings, but not new baptisms.<sup>104</sup> Some confusion of theological outlooks might be avoided through a more careful consideration of biblical usage of these terms.

Taking this into account, the appropriate question to ask is for what purpose Christians may need to be filled with the Spirit. As we saw earlier, the OT pattern provides for the gift of the Spirit to be made to particular people for special tasks; neither universal nor permanent availability obtained. The NT practice, however, assumes doctrinally that the gift of the Spirit is made through baptism for all believers regardless of age yet the continual fillings of the Spirit represent another element of NT practice which, if true, suggests the primary purpose of empowering to be for direct personal Spiritual experience and powerful ministry. As regards the former, since a believer meanwhile still belongs to this world his experience as a believer is inevitably one of Spiritual tension between the life of the Spirit and his place in this age of warfare between Spirit and flesh (Gal. 5:13-26).<sup>105</sup> In order to overcome this tension Christians may need to be filled in the Spirit.

In the EECMY Charismatic circles when people are touched by an experience of the Spirit they claim that their whole life is dramatically changed and they appear to be given entirely new powers prefigured in the

NT.<sup>106</sup> Thus Charismatics may be helped and inspired in worship (Rom. 8:26-28), guided, taught, comforted (Jn 14:26) and sanctified (Rom 15:16) by this power. "The fatherhood of God and the Lordship of Jesus Christ might become a living reality in their lives (Rom. 8:14-16; Gal. 4:6; 1 Cor. 12:3; Acts 5:31-32)".<sup>107</sup> Moreover, a new and enhanced quality of life may become apparent.

Power for service and witness is the Christian's conscious experience of the filling of the Spirit.<sup>108</sup> In EECMY Charismatic circles, this Spirit-filling experience is not acknowledged soteriologically but "dynamologically", necessary not for salvation but for spiritual power. Theologically the promise of power is likely to be associated with particularly evangelistic ministry (Lk 24:49, Acts 1:8). As seen in chapter two, this fresh experience, despite ecclesiastical and social discrimination and persecution, has persuaded numerous youth to be zealous in evangelistic work. Some discontinued their studies in order to serve, others sponsored them financially.<sup>109</sup> This renewal phase of witness and ministry has been accompanied by reports of signs and wonders; healing and exorcism of NT type (Mk 16:17-18; Acts 13:9). In local congregations, choir groups have been organised and indigenous hymns composed: ironically, Charismatics have revived such practices forgotten by traditionalist. Bold witness, unity in worship, humble administration and joyful ministry in the face of persecution have been the marks of the whole Church, traditionalist and Charismatic alike. Spirit-filled Charismatics have recognised the necessary tasks and opportunities: had the traditionalists encountered a similar dramatic consciousness of new filling by the Spirit they also might have acted likewise and could still require such an experience of the Spirit.

We move to the issue of the manner of the Christians being filled with the Holy Spirit. Its theology is primarily distinguished by a precise emphasis on personal experience rather than on a doctrine, method or strategy, with a variety of semi-theological sentiments expressing the manner of filling.

Christian scripture appears to give no clear formula for this action. The early Church's understanding may have assumed it to be simply the normal Christian life, requiring no explanatory manual, thus requiring little NT development of the matter. Theologically, academic thinking has yet to investigate it seriously. Yet the stress on personal experience must not be taken as an anti-theological sentiment. Nevertheless, if both theoretical and practical elements are required, the contemporary Charismatic renewal should produce a critically based biblical theology to address this apparent difficulty.

In part assessment of the reality and effect of the Spirit-filling or the Charismatic issue, issues specific to the EECMY include: specifically differing views amongst older members and Charismatics of the results of Spirit-filling; the possible effects if the 'official Church' does or does not commend Spirit-filling; means or methods available to educate the whole Church, notably older or traditionalist members, of the theology and impact of Spirit-filling.

As noted earlier, Spirit-filling appears to have given Charismatics a distinctive experience of a dramatic Spiritual transformation, albeit not as yet necessarily seen: the past is frequently disregarded in favour of a present experience, a perception of received power, and a vision of the continued presence of the Spirit. Additionally, some have become fundamentalist in their understanding of the Bible.

Furthermore, Spiritual filling may be claimed as a gateway into a fuller Charismatic life where candidates are open to receive other gifts, notably that group of gifts in 1 Cor. 12 considered by some as dying with the apostles or the completion of the NT canon.<sup>110</sup> These might become real among the EECMY Charismatics: tongue speaking, prophecy, the gifts of healing.... To express oneself in other tongues is no uncommon initial gift among other pentecostal Churches in Ethiopia<sup>111</sup>, yet the reverse seems true in the EECMY: some Charismatics who have been deeply influenced by the pentecostals, however, would argue that God's normal operation is orderly

and comprehensible. But since there are some Charismatics who have experienced a conscious Spirit-filling without tongue speaking, their reception of some other gift may indicate each as just one sign amongst many, all equally valid. Tongue speaking is thus neither given priority nor ignored.

Within the Charismatic debate, the gift of healing is also frequently reported nowadays as dominant amongst the EECMY charismata.<sup>112</sup> Beyond the Spiritual or psychic, many healings seem to involve deliverance from various physical conditions. Quite naturally there could be few rigorous scientific investigations; however, the impressive numbers claiming cures after intervention of this charismata has convinced other thousands of the reality of the Spirit of God at work.

Whilst such charismata have drawn attention to renewal in the EECMY, it must be added that Charismatics believe the fruits of love and brotherhood to flow from the same Spirit-filling. In short, the usage of spiritual gifts and renewed joy in worship should not be regarded as ends in themselves, as perhaps intended by some Charismatics.

Conversely, whatever these differing views amongst Charismatics, some members have been slow to recognise this Charismatic issue. Undoubtedly, the primary reason involves the deep-rooted traditional and sacramental theology already discussed and thus not restated here: additionally there is the socio-cultural impact. Culturally, there is a distance between adults and youth, as in most societies: as the Charismatic issue has been willingly received by younger generations, then members who are mature in their faith and with some theological training may be reticent at recognising in younger people the gift of the Spirit of which they must now learn. The older generation finds difficulty in being taught the Charismatic issue from the younger.

If the Charismatic movement which is regarded as counter-theological, counter-ecclesiastical and counter-religious-cultural cannot break through this socio-cultural divide, there remains a need for education

to value the importance of both. The existence of prejudice is a further issue: Charismatics may claim a strong tendency to see only themselves as first class Christians, inhabiting a plateau beyond the reach of others save by their specific route. If this were true, the reality of the Spirit is an emotional, individualistic and ecstatic stumbling block to traditionalists unable and unwilling to be involved in such experience. That no particular group within the Church can claim a monopoly of the Spirit's presence as private property, and that the diversity of manner of the Spirit's work is integral to the breadth of Christianity, are areas of education and development necessary amongst the Charismatics themselves. Conversely, the traditionalists may similarly need to look beyond their human traditions and a perception of no other spirituality outside it, in order to overcome their prejudices. With love amongst the true marks of the Spirit, it would be appropriate for all groups to acknowledge in others a further understanding of the works of the Spirit through the interdependence of Church membership: love should control cultural attitudes and emotions whilst gifts would be used for the good of the whole Church rather than for self-gratification of individuals.

As the result of the lengthy challenge of Charismatic renewal, the response of the 'official Church' has been through leadership meetings, theological consultations, education and conferences on pastoral leadership and guidance at Church level and in some synods respectively.<sup>113</sup> Whilst the leadership meetings have understandably enhanced Charismatic development, some may well have inhibited its growth. Further effort and openness may yet be expected from the Church.

On the Second Theological Consultation it is noted that the Church seems to modify the experience of Spirit-filling a step further than its sacramental concept.

As Lutherans we recognise that we receive the Holy Spirit at Baptism, however, it is also evident that believers experience spiritual renewal which is the infilling of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:4; 9:17).<sup>114</sup>

Based on this introductory notification the Church may have recommended the practice of the spiritual gifts in accordance with the scripture, this requiring openness and respect in service to one another.<sup>115</sup> Its final word is to:

recommend that doctrine of the Holy Spirit be elaborated to all the EECMY members on the basis of Augsburg Conf. Article 3 in Congregational teachings.<sup>116</sup>

The statement seems to restate the most traditional viewpoint to be used as a controlling brake on Charismatic experience as noted above. Nevertheless, if all characteristics of Charismatic renewal are held to be valid, some further and clear contextualised recommendation is required, resulting in further development of such renewal, with more involvement and mutual understanding by the more conservative leaders, ministers and members.

In contrast, if the Church did not improve its pneumatological and liturgical context beyond the present position, the previously stated tensions may well remain in similar or worse condition. Past experience indicates that conflict between the Charismatics and contrary pastors and elders resulted in the loss of many members and some congregations, taken over by other denominations.<sup>117</sup> In the long run, however, the reverse might happen: its enthusiastic nature and youthful leadership, whilst suggesting transience and possible demise, has in fact resulted in swift development and according to statistical evidence, a membership enhanced significantly by those of a younger generation. Responsibility for congregations as a whole may well be adopted by Charismatics.

But to maintain the unity of the whole Church, the continuity and enrichment of Charismatic renewal may require the official Church to enhance Christian education amongst all members. As J. Bakke suggested, "some of the problems were related to poor Bible teaching, weak theological leadership, lack of counselling and faulty use of spiritual gifts in the congregations".<sup>118</sup> It may be said that owing to the basic biblical, theological

and pastoral education, in a context of traditional doctrine and Charismatic experience, both groups have gained from weaknesses of the other, providing the pretext to overlook their own shortcomings and mistakes.

Because of the extreme tensions felt recently among the members and leaders, youth and elders in some synods, the 86th Church Executive Committee established investigating groups. For response, the subsequent committee adopted one of the ensuing recommendations:

Therefore, we recommend that...the EECMY Gospel Ministry Department and the Synod Evangelism Department...assign persons who can understand the Charismatic renewal and give teachings on spiritual revival, Spirit gifts and his use, Church doctrine and worship.<sup>119</sup>

This seems appropriate, yet can hardly be claimed new as teachings have already existed at some levels. Basic and crucial questions, however, remain: who will give the required teaching, from which particular background and reflecting what experience? Will 'Charismatic renewal' be interpreted experientially, theoretically, traditionally or dogmatically? Do Charismatic theologians of sufficient sympathy to bridge the existing gaps exist within the Church, having the Church's permission to teach? For if the Church marginalises such sympathetic Charismatics, its theoretical understanding and teaching of pneumatology might be considered as gainsaid before it has even started.

According to some observers the official Church, therefore, has yet to meet the target which requires a strength of commitment in accepting and teaching the whole nature of renewal. This demands not only the theoretical supportive and instructive means of officials, ministers and theologians as good facilitators and teachers of the Charismatic experience: they themselves need some practical, dramatic transformation of the experience of Spirit-filling. The same is true of ministers leading and teaching at grass roots level. The intellectual, institutional and traditional means of teaching

without a personal involvement and commitment may no longer satisfy Charismatic congregations already experiencing revival.

Following the pattern of this present work, the instruction should thus focus on a total pneumatology: the doctrinal and experiential; Spirit baptism in the sacramental context; the distinctive infilling with the Spirit; and his manifestation in terms of the traditional theology, no one element either exalting over nor ignoring any other.

This broad pneumatological education would prove worthwhile for the whole Church: primarily for the conservatives, and secondly for Charismatics. The aim of the instruction seems explicit: the awareness of the reality of the person and work of the Holy Spirit as doctrine and experience in the individuals and Church life, finding a rightful place in liturgical services and using the charismata according to the scripture.

The main methods required would include witnesses, literature, formal and informal teachings. The first named has been the classical means of Charismatic expansion; personal and individual contact, whether or not of an official nature. Nevertheless, this would be seen as the duty of the whole community with members sharing experiences in openness to each other. Informal education could be given at the different levels of congregational teachings, seminars, conferences, evangelism ministriem, workshop and specific Church meetings. Seminars and workshops may of themselves produce literature to feed into the Church's Christian Education curriculum. The Church would necessarily allocate adequate funding in order to fulfil these aspirations.

The Church Bible schools and seminary (MYS) are suggested as vital resources for the formal teaching of pneumatology to overcome its past neglect, but the pattern of instruction would remain an apt question. The Reverend I. Gobena, the present EECMY Gospel Ministry Department Director, comments perceptively:

The curricula must reflect and contextualise the life and ministry of our congregations and (be)



Biblically strong, traditionally critical, theologically reflective and sound.<sup>120</sup>

This speculative comment may be regarded as appropriate, in that it seeks to produce a balanced critical study of pneumatology satisfying both biblical and experiential theology in ecclesiastical life. It may also enhance the development of Charismatic renewal in a new pattern of theological investigation where the students may discover the reality of the Holy Spirit before they go back to the pastoral leadership of their respective congregations. Moreover, undertaking research on the pattern and functions of the Charismatic movement together with training personnel for further academic biblical scholarship in order to integrate Charismatic insight and Lutheran theology may be offered as a sign of total renewal. Nevertheless, this idealistic vision could be a long term plan which would require a gradual process. Moreover, through these means of pneumatological education both the conservatives or traditionalists and the Charismatics may understand their strengths and weaknesses for a future development of their understanding concerning the progress and process of Charismatic renewal.

Thus the doctrine of Spirit baptism, its relation to water baptism, the Charismatics' interpretation and its practical effects in the EECMY have now been investigated.

On the whole, the biblical and theological understanding of the usage of the term baptism seems to indicate a sacramental initiation of Christians, as a starting point rather than as a final goal, both in the case of water baptism and Spirit baptism which may not be repeated as pentecostals claim as a possibility.

Nevertheless, the reality of the direct personal experience of the Holy Spirit still attracts a further challenge to such a sacramental conclusion. This experience, according to the EECMY Charismatic's understanding, is claimed to be a filling with the Spirit and his gifts for practical personal

Christian life in such a way that Christians may become instruments for the ongoing process of the Spirit in the Church and society.

However, although we have seen the contrast between a tendency of extreme traditional orthodoxy in the Church and a dependence by the Charismatics on experience, the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit has been expanded among many members. With mutual understanding and a good pastoral leadership and guidance, this contrast might have grown beyond its present position into an authentic relationship between traditionalists and Charismatics together in the future growth of the Church.

## REFERENCES

1. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) pp.38-54; F.D. Bruner op. cit. pp.56-62.
2. F.D. Bruner, op. cit. pp.61-2.
3. J.I. Packer, op. cit. p.73.
4. F.D. Bruner, op. cit. p.37.
5. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.1.
6. *Ibid.* p.1.
7. *Ibid.* p.1; W.J. Hollenweger (1972) p.21; F.D. Bruner, op. cit pp.37-8.
8. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.1.
9. F.D. Bruner, pp.40-62; J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.2; W.J. Hollenweger, (1972) pp.21, 321-2.
10. J.D.G. Dun (1970) p.2.
11. *Ibid.* p.2.
12. *Ibid.* p.5; F.D. Bruner op. cit. pp.61-9.
13. F.D. Bruner, op. cit. p.61.
14. G. A. Reed, cited in F.D. Bruner, p.69.
15. F.D. Bruner, op. cit. p.61.
16. W.J. Hollenweger, (1972) p.321.
17. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.5.
18. M. Green (1985) p.157.
19. F.F. Bruce (1980) p.280.
20. M. Green (1985) p.162.
21. F.D. Bruner op. cit. p.59.
22. *Ibid.* p.59.
23. M. Green (1985) pp.169-71; *Ibid* (1987) p.133, J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.130.
24. F.F. Bruce (1980) p.280.
25. C.K. Barrett, (1947) p.125
26. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.8; see C.A. Briggs (1894) p.67; J. Wellhausen (1904) p.6; R. Bultmann (1963) p.246.
27. C.K. Barrett, op. cit. p.126; see J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.8.
28. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.9.
29. *Ibid.* pp.9-10.
30. *Ibid.* p.13.
31. *Ibid.* pp.13-14.
32. J.D.G. Dunn in C. Brown (1977) p.699.
33. E. Hoenchen (1971) p.142 n.5.
34. F.F. Bruce (1980) p.210.
35. J.D.G. Dunn, in C. Brown, op. cit. p.699.
36. M. Green (1985) pp.170-1.
37. J.D.G. Dunn in C. Brown, op. cit. p.699.
38. F.D. Bruner, op. cit. p.63.
39. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.38.
40. E. Williams quoted in F.D. Bruner, op. cit. p.63.
41. W.G. MacDonald quoted in F.D. Bruner, op. cit. p.63, n.10.
42. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) op. cit. p.39.
43. G.E. Ladd, (1974) p.289.
44. *Ibid.* p.289.

45. B. Graham (1978) p.30.
46. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) pp.44-51.
47. Ibid. pp.52-3.
48. Ibid, p.53.
49. I.H. Marshall (1980) p.157.
50. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.55.
51. A. Norlander, op. cit. (a) p.5 see J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.58.
52. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.58.
53. J.H.E. Hull cited in J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.55, n.1.
54. J. Calvin cited in A. Norlander, op. cit. (a) pp.5-6.
55. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.56.
56. Ibid. pp.56 and 70.
57. Ibid. pp.55-68, G.E. Ladd op. cit. p.347, n.12.
58. G.E. Ladd, op. cit. p.346; M. Green (1985) p.168.
59. G.W.H. Lampe (1967) pp.70-2.
60. F.F. Bruce (1962) pp.182-3.
61. G.W.H. Lampe (1951) p.70, see F.F. Bruce (1962) p.182; C.F.D. Moule (1983) pp.43, 50, 54; M. Green (1985) p.165.
62. G.E. Ladd, op. cit. p.346.
63. Ibid. p.347.
64. C.F.D. Moule, op. cit. pp.42-3.
65. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.90.
66. G.R. B-Murray, op. cit. p.301.
67. G. Kittel cited in Ibid. p.275.
68. G.R. B-Murray, op. cit. p.275.
69. F.F. Bruce (1980) p.280, n.1.
70. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) pp.90-1; 224, 227.
71. F.F. Bruce (1980) p.280.
72. A. Norlander, op. cit. (a) p.9.
73. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) pp.129-30, 22, 101-102; G.R.B. Murray, op. cit. pp.168, 170, 273; R. Bultmann, (1963) pp.138, 33; G.D. Fee (1987) pp.603-6.
74. K. McDonnell (1980) pp.174-5. "Manicheism suggested two orders of reality: the material which is base and confining, and the spiritual which is above, apart from, and superior to that which belongs to earthly experience."
75. G.W.H. Lampe (1957) p.57; F.F. Bruce (1980) p.281.
76. F.F. Bruce (1980) p.281.
77. C.K. Barrett (1968) p.289.
78. J.W. Walters in S.B. Ferguson op. cit. p.54.
79. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) pp.93-4; F.D. Bruner, op. cit. p.60.
80. Ibid. pp.94-5; G.R. B-Murray op. cit. p.276.
81. H. Berkhof op. cit. p.73.
82. F.F. Bruce (1980) p.209; J.D.G. Dunn (1988) pp.429-30.
83. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.54.
84. C.F.D. Moule (1961) p.54.
85. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.54.
86. G.E. Ladd, op. cit. pp.347-8; G.R. B-Murray op. cit. p.300; F.F. Bruce (1962) p.56; B. Graham, (1978) pp.64, 67, 71-72.

87. J.G.D. Dunn (1970) p.54, H. Berkhof, op. cit. p.87.
88. H. Berkhof, op. cit. pp.85-93.
89. M. Green (1985) pp.176-7.
90. Ibid. p.176.
91. Ibid. pp.171-2.
92. B. Graham (1978) pp.62-73; see W.J. Hollenweger (1972) p.15.
93. K. McDonnell cited in M. Green (1985), p.177; see W.J. Hollenweger (1972) p.15.
94. A. Norlander, op. cit. (a) p.12.
95. Ibid. p.12.
96. Ibid. p.12.
97. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.225.
98. M. Green (1985) p.179.
99. Ibid. pp.179-83; B. Graham, op. cit. pp.96, 103
100. Ibid. p.179.
101. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) pp.54, 70; see G.E. Ladd, op. cit. pp.345, 347, 348; M. Green (1985) pp.181-5.
102. J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.70.
103. G.E. Ladd, op. cit. p.345.
104. Ibid. p.347; J.D.G. Dunn (1970) p.54; F.F. Bruce (1962) p.56; B. Grham, op. cit. pp.64, 71.
105. J.D.G. Dunn in G.S. Wakefield, op. cit. p.357.
106. From the present writer's life and ministry experience.
107. K. McDonnell, op. cit. p.162.
108. Ibid. p.162.
109. J. Bakke, op. cit. p.251; K. McDonnell, op. cit. p.151.
110. J.I. Packer in S.B. Ferguson, op. cit. pp.269-70.
111. EECMY Theological Consul. on Charismatic Move: Group 4 discussion report, NP.
112. A. Norlander, Lecture Note (b) August 1993, pp.5-14. Norlander's lecture noted one EECMY congregation reporting the physical healing of some 2244 patients between 1981 and 1985 (pp.13-4): EECMY Information 1/94 reported hundreds healed at a 3-day Synod Conference (pp.6-7).
113. I. Gobena, op. cit. p.9; EECMY Information 5/93, p.5; 6/93, pp.5-6; 1/94, pp.6-7.
114. EECMY Theological Consul. on Charismatic Move: Recommendation Document (draft) (1993) p.2.
115. Ibid. p.3.
116. Ibid. p.3.
117. J. Bakke, op. cit. p.254; EECMY Information 5/93, pp.5-6; 6/93 pp.5-6; 1/94, pp.6-7.
118. Ibid. p.254.
119. I. Gobena, op. cit. p.7.
120. Ibid. p.9.

## CONCLUSION

This critical study has primarily noted the development of Charismatic influences in the EECMY as a recent "religious revolution" reacting against an only intermittent concentration of Christian purpose concerning the doctrine and experience of the Holy Spirit.

First, we have briefly reviewed the Biblical understanding of the Holy Spirit. In the OT, that Spirit seems to disclose himself in God's personal entity, acting to display his power as a source of all physical life: moreover, he is given to particular Charismatic leaders for their specific offices. However, in the NT and following the glorification of Christ particularly after Pentecost, the person and work of the Holy Spirit is seen more explicitly; his gift under the new covenant is for all believers, and all his manifestations are needed within the life of those believers. Nonetheless, pneumatology has often been ignored both by Churches and theologians across many centuries.

Such inhibition of the serious study of pneumatology derives in particular from the Augustinian tendency to ascribe potency to internal grace rather than to the Holy Spirit: thus in mediaeval times the institutional Church and its sacraments 'replaced' the Spirit and the later Reformation principle of sola scriptura. Salvation and assurance became more regularised.

In a modern revived Evangelical Protestantism, Pentecostalism alone seems to have reacted against such marginalisation and emphasised experiential reality as a true focus of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. In turn this may have contributed to the more recent Charismatic movement, where a restated adaptation of the theology of experience of Spirit baptism has occurred in traditional mainstream Churches.

The rise of the Charismatic movement in America and the operation of spiritual revival in Ethiopia seem to be contemporaneous. Despite

lengthy ecclesiastical and social objections, the movement has been adapted into gradual renewal within the EECMY, growing largely among the young but bringing Charismatic manifestations into the lives of many individuals and of Churches.

Through its current theological and pastoral practice, the roots and sources of this Charismatic issue have been explored. In contrast to the pentecostals' second Spirit-baptism, the EECMY Charismatic renewal recognises, in common with the parallel experience of other mainstream Churches, the sacramental theology of the Church. However, there arises the contentious issue of a further experience of Spirit-filling, or Spirit-empowering, subsequent to its initial reception and beyond the pneumatological beliefs of the Church. This Charismatic issue and its manifestation seem to have two impacts. Experientially, it has influenced the practice within the Church: the perception of direct personal experience of the reality of an indwelling Spirit has for many revealed a risen and glorified Christ, with many believers feeling empowered to witness and worship with the abundant life expressed in Acts and the Epistles. Organisationally and personally, it seems to have created a massive tension between the traditional perception of the Spirit and his current manifestation between institutional office and Charismatic ministries: in this latter case, it may be seen as divisive, with members and leaders, youth and elders being variously distributed among Charismatic and non-Charismatic groups. Indeed, in strict contradiction to NT practice and teaching, the one Church has experienced alongside unity not creative diversity but unwelcome division.

Yet a creative rather than destructive tension should emerge, for the EECMY both claims and needs enabling order and openness to the Holy Spirit's Charismatic ministry whose manifestations would meet particular needs of congregations in specific times and places. Thus these Charismatic influences would provide the Church with an achievable challenge and also

with necessary opportunities to re-examine its traditional theology and liturgical practice in the light of a new perception of the work of the Spirit.

The remedy for these tensions or conflicts should not be continued suppression of aspirations which seek greater development of enhanced spiritual experience within many congregations and among many members: only to exalt traditional and institutional aspects would overlook the Biblical call which recognises both freedom in which the Spirit works, and a compatible good order which provides a fitting context. The balance between these two must then be kept for the whole body to function as one.

Despite misinterpretation among some recent Lutheran dogmatics, Luther's original notion of "the priesthood of all believers" can be a reasonable clue to the Church to share its liturgical ministry with others beyond this dogmatic perspective. Since the Christian's ministry is centred on the reconciling work of Christ there is no other reason to limit it to only a comparatively few individuals. In this respect, modes of worship need to be thoroughly contextualised in ways which satisfy the whole membership.

These particular pastoral developments might offer opportunities to include all members in renewal, supporting its further development so that the whole spiritual status of members and their Church life are enriched. The terms "Charismatics", "non-Charismatics" and "traditionalists" may well disappear. These remain to date in the recognition that the process of Charismatic renewal has yet to unite all members in a common understanding of further educational process which, being both theological and experiential, is vital in order to avoid harmful conflict and confusion. In this case therefore, the current process of Charismatic renewal is best perceived not as an end in itself but a bridge towards the as yet unrealised objective of its central concern, namely: that full doctrinal understanding and extensive experience of the Spirit which have yet to be universally acknowledged throughout the EECMY. Whatever the other developments, education within the Church must play a prime and vital role in its further and future growth.



For the EECMY to live out its doctrinal understanding of the Church as incarnational, it must be fully committed to promote congregational education for the development of all individual members and an understanding of its own teachings.

No conflict with Lutheran principles exists in the claim that any congregation first comes into existence through the power of the Spirit: it must be formed and developed Charismatically through the promotion of doctrinal training, experience and pastoral education, to be renewed in every age and circumstance by the introduction of a new and appropriately contextualised order of ministerial life. This seems both aim and fulfilment for the theoretical and practical visions or plans of all ministers for the Church, to be tested strictly by the maturity in Charismatic renewal of their respective congregations.

To ensure that biblical and Lutheran teaching on the Holy Spirit is universally known would aid congregations to guard against the twin dangers of either letting in false and heretical teachings from outside, or rejecting the true charismata along with the false. Again, it is New Testamental teaching that Charismatic manifestations are to be perceived as gifts from God for his Church and for individual members, all given specifically for the service of the whole Church and not for personal gratification.

As regards the Church's self-expression and teachings within the field of Charismatic renewal, the EECMY is being challenged to discern an appropriate role in the sphere of renewal, given an understanding of the work of the Spirit that is beyond traditional and sacramental ministries: theology and practice both support such an extension. Past precedent, current experience and creativity, and anticipated development into the future all encourage and support changing and emerging roles, again part of the expression of an incarnational Church.

Thus if the Church promotes a balanced theological, experiential and pastoral teaching for and with guidance and leadership, the benefits to the

EECMY would be: first, to avoid all extreme expression and conviction whether of traditional conservatism, current Charismatic ecstatic excesses or imported heterodox teaching; and secondly, to enhance the Church in its self-assessment, further transformation and a mutual understanding among all the members and in itself.

This may call the EECMY in subsequent official meetings to restate an explicit, thoroughly contextualised and achievable recommendation with regard to the recognition of Charismatic renewal and its manifestations. Above all, through this present study, it is the writer's conclusion, dependent on his thorough biblical and ecclesiastical study of the theology of the Holy Spirit in the life of his Church, that the purposeful future of the Charismatic movement in the EECMY cannot lie in itself nor in a partial and self-contained section of that Church but in the Church's faithfulness to a long tradition which claims the Charismatic life of the Spirit to overflow into the life and being of the whole Church.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Althaus, P. The Theology of Martin Luther, 2nd Ed., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Anderson, K.T. A Brief History of the Mekane Yesus Church. Denmark: Modersmalets Publication, 1980.
- Aren, G. Evangelical Pioneers in Ethiopia. The Origins of the EECMY Stockholm: Offestcentre, 1978.
- Bakke, J. Christian Ministry. Patterns and Functions Within the EECMY. Norway: Solum Forlag, 1987.
- Barclay, W. The Promise of the Spirit. London: Epworth Press, 1960.
- Barrett, C.K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition; London: SPCK, 1947.
- Barrett, C.K. Black's NT Commentaries. The First Epistle to the Corinthians; 2nd Ed., London: A&C Black, 1971.
- Barrett, D.B. World Christian Encyclopaedia. A Comparative Survey of Churches and Religions in the Modern World, AD1900-2000; Oxford: OUP, 1982.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. Baptism in the New Testament; Michigan: William B., Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- Berkhof, H. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, London: Epworth Press, 1965.
- Bickersteth, E.H. The Holy Spirit, His Person and Work, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1959.
- Bittinger, A. Gifts and Ministries, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1973.
- Brown, C. (ed.) The New International Dictionary of NT Theology, Vol.3, P-Z, English Translation, Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978.
- Bruce, F.F. Commentary on the Book of the Acts. The English Text With Introduction, Exposition and Note, 3rd Ed., London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1962.

- Bruce, F.F. Paul, Apostle of the Free Spirit, (Re. Ed.), London: Paternoster Press, 1980.
- Bruner, F.D. A Theology of the Holy Spirit. The pentecostal Experience and the NT Witness, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans, 1970.
- Bultmann, R. The History of the Synoptic Tradition, ET Blackwell and Harper, 1963.
- Cho, P.Y. The Holy Spirit, My Senior Partner, Understanding The Holy Spirit and His Gifts, UK: Word Publishers, 1989.
- Daniel, M. The Holy Spirit, U.S.A.: Kingdom Life Publishing, 1987.
- Davies, J.G. (ed.) A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Workshop, London: SCM, 1986.
- Douglas, J.D. (ed.) The New Bible Dictionary, London: IVP, 1962.
- Dunn, J.D.G. Baptism in the Holy Spirit. Re-examination of the NT Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to pentecostalism Today. Studies in Biblical Theology Second Series, London: SCM, 1970.
- Dunn, J.D.G. Jesus and the Spirit. A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the NT, London SCM, 1975.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 38A World Biblical Commentary Romans 1-8, Texas: Word Books, 1988.
- Dusen, H.P.V. Spirit, Son and Father. Christian Faith in the Light of the Holy Spirit, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960.
- Eliade, M. (ed.) The Encyclopaedia of Religion, Vol.11, New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Fee, D.F. The New International Commentary on the NT. The First Epistle to the Corinthians, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans Press, 1987.
- Ferguson, S.B. et al (eds.) New Dictionary of Theology, London: IVP, 1989.

- Fison, J.E.                    The Blessing of the Holy Spirit, London: Longmans Green & Co., 1950.
- Grant, F.C.                    Basic Christian Beliefs, London: Boyd, 1960.
- Graham, B.                    The Holy Spirit, Texas: Fount Harper Collings Publisher, 1978.
- Green, M.                    To Corinth With Love. The Vital Reference Today of Paul's Advice to the Corinthian Church, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1982.
- Green, M.                    I Believe in the Holy Spirit, Rev. Ed., London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1985.
- Green, M.                    Baptism. Its Purpose, Practical and Power, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1987.
- Guthrie, D.                    NT Introduction, 2nd Ed., London: Tyndale Press, 1964.
- Guthrie, D.                    NT Theology, Leicester: IVP, 1981.
- Haenchen, E.                    The Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- Hendrikson, W.                    NT Commentary Romans (1-8), Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1980.
- Hendry, G.S.                    The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology, London: SCM, 1957.
- Hodgson, C.P. & King, R.H. (ed.s)    Christian Theology. An Introduction to its Traditions and Tasks, London: SPCK, 1989.
- Hollenweger, W.J.                    The Pentecostals, London: SCM, 1972.
- Issacs, M.E.                    The Concept of Spirit. A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and its Bearing on the NT, London: Heythrop Monographs, 1976.
- Kelsey, M.T.                    Tongue Speaking. The History and Meaning of Charismatic Experience, New York: Crossroad, 1964.
- Komonchak, J.A. et al (eds.)    The New Dictionary of Theology, Dublin: Macmillan Press, 1987.

- Küng, H. Does God Exist? (God in the Spirit), London: Collins, 1980.
- Ladd, G.E. A Theology of the New Testament, London: Lutterworth Press, 1975.
- Lampe, G.W.H. The Seal of the Spirit, London: Longmans, 1957.
- Lampe, G.W.H. God as Spirit. The Bampton Lectures 1976, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Lawson, J. Introduction to Christian Doctrine, Michigan: Francis Asbury Press, 1980.
- Luther, M. Small Catechism, Amharic Literature, Addis Ababa: Central Publ. House, 1967 Julian Calendar.
- MacDonald, A.J. The Holy Spirit, London: SPCK, 1950.
- Macquarrie, J. Principles of Christian Theology, London: SCM, 1977.
- Macrobert, I. The Black Roots and White Racism of Early pentecostalism in the U.S.A., London: Macmillan Press, 1988.
- Marshall, I.H. The Acts of the Apostles. An Introduction and Commentary, London: IVP, 1980.
- McDonnell, K. (ed.) Presence, Power, Praise. Documents on the Charismatic Renewal, Vol.II - Continental, National and Regional Documents. Numbers 38-80, 1975-1979, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1980.
- McKenzie, J.L. Dictionary of the Bible, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1976.
- Moltmann, J. The Crucified God, London: SCM, 1974.
- Moltmann, J. The Church in the Power of the Spirit, London: SCM, 1977.
- Moltmann, J. The Open Church Initiation to Messianic Lifestyle, London: SCM, 1978.
- Moule, C.F.D. Worship in the NT, S.I.: Lutterworth, 1961.

- Murray, J. The International Commentary on the NT. The Epistle to the Romans, vol.i & ii, Michigan: WM.B. Eerdmans, 1968.
- Rees, T. The Holy Spirit and Experience, London: Duckworth & Co., 1975.
- Robinson, H.W. The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1928.
- Schweizer, E. The Holy Spirit, London: SCM, 1981.
- Richardson, A. & Bowden, J. (eds.) A New Dictionary of Christian Theology, London: SCM, 1983.
- Smeaton, G. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1958.
- Stacey, J. Groundwork of Theology, 3rd Ed., London: Epworth Press, 1987.
- Tugwell, S. Did You Receive the Spirit? London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1972.
- Wakefield, G.S. (ed.) A Dictionary of Christian Spirituality, London: SCM, 1983.
- Watson, D. One in the Spirit, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1973.
- White, J.F. Introduction to Christian Worship, (Re. Ed.), Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1980.

## UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Djaleta, T. What is meant by the phrase "Bible-based Christian Education"? Essay Two, Westhill College, Birmingham, February 1992.
- Djaleta, T. The Development of Christian Education in the EECMY, Adv. Dip. Dissertation, Westhill College, Birmingham, June 1992.
- Djaleta, T. A Critical Examination of the EECMY Worship Pattern: Especially in Baptism, Essay, Chester College, December 1992.

- EECMY Youth Seminar Report, Addis Ababa: February 1976.
- EECMY 9th General Assembly Minutes, Addis Ababa: April 1976.
- EECMY Theological Consultation on Charismatic Movement Recommendation Report, Addis Ababa: 1976.
- EECMY Baptism (BL) Course 1, Amharic Literature (AL), Addis Ababa: EECMY, 1973, JC.
- EECMY Holy Communion (Rev.), BL, AL Addis Ababa: EECMY, 1976, JC.
- EECMY We Believe in the Holy Spirit, (BL), AL, Addis Ababa: EECMY, 1979, JC.
- EECMY Theological Consultation on Women's Ordination, Ambo: 1991.
- EECMY Constitution and By-laws, AL, Addis Ababa: EECMY, 1983, JC.
- EECMY 1992 Annual Membership Statistics, Addis Ababa: EECMY Information Office, January 1993.
- EECMY Theological Consultation on Charismatic Renewal Recommendation Document (draft), Addis Ababa: August 23rd-28th, 1993.
- Gala, S. (ed.) EECMY Information 3/93, Addis Ababa: 1993.
- Gala, S. (ed.) EECMY Information 5/93, Addis Ababa: 1993.
- Gala, S. (ed.) EECMY Information 6/93, Addis Ababa: 1993.
- Gala, S. (ed.) EECMY Information 1/94, Addis Ababa: 1994.
- Gobena, I. Survey of Charismatic Renewal in the EECMY Lecture Note, Addis Ababa: August 1993.
- Norlander, A. How is Baptism within the Spirit related to water baptism and filling with the Spirit? Lecture note (A), Addis Ababa: August 1993.



- Norlander, A. Biblical Teaching on Healing and the Present Phenomenon of the Healing Ministry. Lecture Note (B), Addis Ababa: August 1993.
- Wedajo, B. Christian Faith and False Teachings, AL, Addis Ababa: EECMY, 1984, JC.