



Vol. 1, No. 1  
Fall 2014

# The Pentecostal Educator

A Journal of the *World Alliance for Pentecostal Theological Education*

## Aims and Scope

*The Pentecostal Educator* biannually e-publishes scholarly and practical articles related to theological education within the Pentecostal tradition to encourage the continuing maturation of Pentecostal theological education. It is intentionally practical, applied and international.

**Senior Editor** – Dr. Paul Alexander, Chair of WAPTE (drpaul.r.alexander@gmail.com)

**Executive Editor** – Rick Wadholm Jr., Trinity Bible College and Graduate School  
(wadholm@gmail.com)

**Book Review Editor** – Justin Evans, North Central University (jjevans@northcentral.edu)

**Technical Services** – Robert R. Wadholm, Trinity Bible College and Graduate School  
(rwadholm@indiana.edu)

**Editorial Advisor** – Roland Q. Dudley

## WAPTE Officers

Chairperson: Dr. Paul Alexander

Vice-Chairperson: Dr. Dan Hedges

Secretary: Dr. Alex Fuentes

Treasurer: Dr. Weldyn Houger

Executive Committee Member: Dr. Stephen Fogarty

Executive Director: Roland Q. Dudley

## WAPTE Board

Dr. John Easter (USA)	Dr. Marilyn Abplanalp (USA)	Dr. Enson Lwesya (Africa)
Dr. Dan Hedges (USA)	Dr. Weldyn Houger (USA)	Dr. John Carter (USA)
Dr. Steve Fogarty (Australia)	Dr. Alex Fuentes (Philippines)	Dr. Ulrik Josefsson (Sweden)
Dr. Irving Whitt (Canada)	Dr. Jon Dahlager (Costa Rica)	Dr. Mark Williams (USA)
Dr. Paul Alexander (USA)	Dr. William Chelliah (Sri Lanka)	Roland Dudley (USA)
Dr. Jacob Cherian (India)	Rev. Pasi Parkkila (Finland)	Dr. Pedro Gomez (Dominican Republic)

## Instructions for Authors

All submissions to *The Pentecostal Educator* should conform to the latest edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* including its use of footnotes for all citations. For abbreviations of biblical and other ancient material, as well as transliteration of all non-Roman scripts, see *The SBL Handbook of Style*. Manuscripts should be written in English with consistent spelling throughout and using 12 point Times New Roman, single spaced lines. Submissions should not exceed 5,000 words in length, including footnotes, abstract, and bibliography (though longer submissions may be considered). All submissions should be emailed as Word (.doc) attachments to [rwadholm@trinitybiblecollege.edu](mailto:rwadholm@trinitybiblecollege.edu). Please include a brief biographical sketch, a 100-300 word abstract, 3-4 keywords, and a bibliography.

Use two levels of headings. They should be flush left, and not numbered.

### **This is the First Level Heading**

*This is the Second Level Heading*

Please insert page numbers in the upper right-hand corner.

Manuscripts which are submitted without sufficiently meeting the above criteria will be returned to the author without publication. All submissions must not be currently submitted to, or previously published by, any other journal. If accepted, the author agrees to transfer copyright to *The Pentecostal Educator* and the manuscript will not be published elsewhere in any form, in English or any other language, without prior written consent of the publisher.

# Contents

Endorsement Letter .....	4
<i>Prince Guneratnam</i>	
Introduction to the Journal – Editorial.....	5
<i>Paul R. Alexander</i>	
Volume Editorial .....	6
<i>Rick Wadholm Jr.</i>	
Aims of Christian Education .....	8
<i>William K. Kay</i>	
“Epistemology, Ethos, and Environment”: In Search of a Theology of Pentecostal Theological Education .....	22
<i>Velli-Mati Kärkäinnen</i>	
What Meaneth This? Edinburgh, Stone Church, and Doctors of the Church! .....	37
<i>Byron Klaus</i>	
<b>Book Review</b>	
Hunter, H. D. and Ormerod, N., eds.: <i>The Many Faces of Global Pentecostalism</i> .....	42
<i>Todd M. Johnson</i>	

# Endorsement Letter



PENTECOSTAL WORLD FELLOWSHIP

6 May 2014

Dr Paul Alexander  
WAPTE Chairman /  
President  
Trinity Bible College  
50 Sixth Avenue South  
Ellendale  
North Dakota 58436  
USA

Dear Dr Alexander,

## The Pentecostal Educator

The World Alliance for Pentecostal Theological Education (WAPTE) plays an important role in global Pentecostalism. The Pentecostal World Fellowship is enriched by WAPTE serving as its theological commission.

I am delighted that WAPTE is contributing to the cause of Pentecostal Theological education through the e-journal, *The Pentecostal Educator*. I heartily endorse this publication and trust that it will be a good source of information, inspiration and discussion for our educators around the globe.

Blessings,

PRINCE GUNERATNAM  
PWF CHAIRMAN

cc. PWF Secretary, Dr Matthew Thomas

**Prince Guneratnam**  
Chairman  
Calvary Convention Centre  
Level 4, Institute Block  
No 1, Jalan Jalil Perkasa, Bukit Jalil  
57100 Kuala Lumpur, MALAYSIA  
Tel: (603) 8999 5532  
Fax: (603) 8999 5312  
Email: gprince@pentecostalworldfellowship.org

**Isak S. Burger**  
Vice Chairman  
P.O.Box 51545  
Wierda Park, Gauteng 0149  
SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel: 012-6681634  
Fax: 012-6440732  
Email: afmgs@mweb.co.za

**Matthew K. Thomas**  
Secretary  
P.O.Box 63  
Itarsi (MP) 461-111  
INDIA  
Tel: 91-94250-39534  
Fax: 91-7572-37301  
Email: drmmatthewkthomas@gmail.com

Dag Heward-Mills  
Ingolf Ellssel  
William Wilson  
David Wells  
Arto Hamalainen  
Donavan Ng  
Ernest P. Komanapalli  
George Wood  
David Mohan  
Makoto Hosoi  
Pelle Hornmark  
José Wellington da Costa  
Wayne Alcorn  
Ong Sek Leang  
Lee Younghoon  
Dominic Yeo  
Richard Ciaramitaro  
Mark L. Williams  
Glenn Burris Jr  
Arthur Beacham Jr  
Ruben Salomone  
John Partington  
Elisario Alves Dos Santos  
Djakouti Mitre

**Honorary Advisory Members**  
David Yonggi Cho  
Jack Hayford

# The Pentecostal Educator

## Introduction to the Journal – Editorial

*Paul R. Alexander, PhD, Senior Editor*

Welcome to this first edition of the e-journal *The Pentecostal Educator*. This journal is the official publication of the World Alliance for Pentecostal Theological Education (WAPTE).

WAPTE is led by an international Board of Directors representing Theological Associations around the world. At a recent meeting of the board it was noted that this organization represents about 120,000 students worldwide.

The Association is also the Theological Commission for the Pentecostal World Fellowship (PWF). A greeting from the Chair of PWF is included in this journal.

The journal has a number of priorities:

- It is committed to theological education. Many of the teachers and professors teaching in Pentecostal institutions around the world are qualified in their specific fields – theology, Bible, church history etc. However, very few have had the advantage of good teacher training. Assessment, pedagogy and even class presentation is often completely ignored in the process of training Pentecostal Theological educators. This journal is a small attempt to encourage best practice in teaching among theological educators.
- This journal provides an ideal platform for educators to publish in a peer reviewed learned journal. I would encourage educators from around the world to develop their publishing credentials and, in so doing, assist their peers.
- Finally, this journal is intended to be a meeting place where meaningful conversations can take place and where both theological and educational constructs and concepts can be developed in a meaningful way.

I am grateful to the excellent editorial team that has committed time and effort to making this new initiative a success. Rick Wadholm deserves special mention as he has taken initiative in so many areas. I look forward to lively debate, helpful advice and useful information filling the pages of this journal in coming years.

## Volume Editorial

*Rick Wadholm Jr., Executive Editor*

Within my own fellowship (Assemblies of God, USA), there have been a couple of recent closures/consolidations of institutions of higher learning that had historically produced a significant number of the ministers and missionaries for this fellowship. All the while, the explosive growth of training centers via geographical districts of churches has increased across the United States. Reflecting on the history of Pentecostalism in North Dakota (mine and my wife's home state), one discovers that the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) once operated a Bible school and had a growing number of churches, but chose to consolidate this outlying training center (of which my father-in-law and several other family members are alumni) in favor of a move toward a centralized university. That move meant that many of the congregations were incapable of finding locally trained pastors and eventually led to the closing of many of the churches in the state. A number of the ministers who received their training in this regional Church of God institution have since received credentials with the Assemblies of God, USA (which continues operating several colleges in the region). Our broader Pentecostal congregations are indeed being impacted by such shifts in Pentecostal educational approaches and continue to shift. In this inaugural issue of *The Pentecostal Educator* are several stimulating articles intended to offer cursory entrée's on the potential future of Pentecostal theological education.

William Kay's contribution offers a brief summary of theological education leading to a survey of developments within Pentecostal theological education proper. This historical piece frames the discussion of the future of our educational practices by locating the developments within history and practice. Kay notes the movement from the educational orientation of Pentecostals along a trajectory from bible schools primarily intended for missionary/ministry training, to liberal arts colleges, and finally to universities.

Velli-Mati Kärkäinen addresses the various "cities" which have been proposed for conceptualizing the aims of education and associating each aim with various modalities for achieving such aims. Kärkäinen locates his discussion within the contemporary milieu of postmodernity that admits the philosophical context rather than ignoring or reverting contexts (as if the modern and postmodern impact were nil). Ultimately, Kärkäinen proposes a critical movement within Pentecostal theological education toward "authentic Pentecostal spirituality and identity" rather than an uncritical co-opting of other forms of Christian tradition and practice.

Byron Klaus's brief article is adapted from his message to the 2014 doctoral graduates of the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary. He calls for doctors of the Church to fully engage in mission with knowledge anointed by the power of the Spirit. His use of pictures to illustrate this call to respond to the needs of the wider church and the world offers a prophetic testimonial (something Pentecostals have a penchant for) to the continuing need to work with all our might toward the coming of our Lord Jesus.

While each of these articles suggest a manner in which Pentecostal theological education might be conceived and accomplished in the university or seminary settings of our Pentecostal fellowships, there still needs to be further engagement with the more widely available approaches as church-based, Bible school/institution, distance education, and schools of ministry. How might our fellowships be impacted by the institutionalization and accreditation of our colleges, seminaries and universities? Is there an increasing loss of specifically Pentecostal identity? What impact is there in Pentecostal theological education that is focused specifically on ministry preparation and/or credentialing? It is our desire that we might continue a fruitful dialogue toward enriching Pentecostal theological education and the various ministries of our wider stream of the Church in these last days.

In this vein we welcome potential contributions for future issues with content pertaining to all facets of Pentecostal theological education.



# Aims of Christian Education

*William K. Kay*

**Abstract:** This paper considers the aims or purposes of education from Old Testament times through the New Testament, St Augustine, Luther and into the present era. It shows how Christian education functions within and beyond the church, and considers the transmission of the faith and engagement with secular knowledge and wider society. It considers Pentecostalism and the educational institutions it founded and its later diversification, especially in the United States. It briefly touches on the distinctives of Pentecostal doctrine, experience and mission.

**Key words:** education, Pentecostal, history, Christian

## Introduction

Christianity characteristically engages in education, and has done so ever since Christ first chose his disciples. Pentecostal Christianity, for reasons associated with its revivalistic roots, has come to value education more cautiously and slowly, as we shall see. The first part of this paper will review selected historical periods and then, after a consideration of early Pentecostalism, it will draw out implied or stated educational aims before arriving at general conclusions.

## Historical Survey

Biblical injunctions on the teaching of children go back as far as the Pentateuch and press upon Israel the requirement to hand on to the next generation both the words and the deeds of their God (e.g. Dt 11.19). In the absence of any formal educational system, children would have learned farming, trading or craft skills from their parents or family members and they would have done so by observation, by copying their parents, and by taking part in communal activities.

Much of what we know of early Jewish education is speculative but it is clear that levels of literacy were high, and this implies some form of instruction in the home or, after the Exile, in the synagogue. By the time we reach the New Testament period, Ferguson states that the synagogue carries schooling among its functions, and that education was subservient to the religious purposes of the nation.<sup>1</sup> A man learned to count not only so he could trade but also so he could work out the religious calendar. Similarly, literacy assisted religious observance because

---

1 Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 85, 457.

copies of the Scripture, or portions of Scripture, might be individually owned. For our purposes, we can underline the overarching religious aim of education and stress that education was not simply an end in itself but subsumed within the belief that service of God was the highest destiny of human beings.

This is implied in Paul's sermon on Mars Hill (Acts 17.16-34). It is an evangelistic sermon to the intellectually curious pagan Athenians and engages with the culture of their day by quoting from classical poets (Epimenides and Aratus) to substantiate its points. To the church, Paul leans on the precedents of the Old Testament and warns against 'vain philosophy' (probably Gnosticism but possibly Hellenism) while stressing the continuation of parental responsibility for the spiritual well-being of children (Col 2.8). The duty to ensure children are brought up in the 'discipline and nurture of the Lord' remains with parents and is more important than any other kind of learning.

Among adults the teaching of converts was systematized after the earliest period of church history. Catechisms were arranged by grouping Christian doctrines around selected themes. Such catechetical instruction concerned the faith rather than secular knowledge and was often unimaginative in its delivery: new converts were expected to memorize set answers to set questions. In this respect catechisms probably copied the rote-learning educational models of their day.

When we arrive at Augustine (354-430) we find a broader understanding of education that accepts the value of secular knowledge. It was, he says, like the treasure of the Egyptians which the Israelites carried away at the exodus (Ex 12.36; *De Doctrina Christiana*, 40.60)<sup>2</sup>. Or, again,

Usually, even a non-Christian knows something about the earth, the heavens, and the other elements of this world, about the motion and orbit of the stars and even their size and relative positions, about the predictable eclipses of the sun and moon, the cycles of the years and the seasons, ... Now, it is a disgraceful and dangerous thing for an infidel to hear a Christian, presumably giving the meaning of Holy Scripture, talking nonsense on these topics; and we should take all means to prevent such an embarrassing situation, in which people show up vast ignorance in a Christian and laugh it to scorn. (*The Literal Meaning of Genesis* [*De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*])<sup>3</sup>

More to the point, without his enormous secular learning, Augustine would have been unable to mount the defense of Christianity that he did in the great *City of God*. Christians had been accused of weakening Roman martial character and causing the collapse of the Empire. Augustine in his prolific writings demonstrates how Roman gods encouraged licentiousness and

---

2 [http://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/documents/Stealing\\_Egyptian\\_Gold.pdf](http://web.cn.edu/kwheeler/documents/Stealing_Egyptian_Gold.pdf) [Accessed 30 May, 2014]

3 <http://www.pibburns.com/augustin.htm> [accessed 30 May, 2014]

were responsible for the corruption of public morals. It was this that weakened Rome and led to its downfall, not Christianity.<sup>4</sup> Without his education in the highest cultural writing of his day, Augustine would have been unable to make his defense. Nevertheless, by his example, he demonstrates that Christians subordinate secular knowledge for the purpose of revealing God's plan of salvation in human history.

The range and completeness of Augustine's thinking is astonishing. As a relatively young man he developed an understanding of learning by analysis of simple examples.<sup>5</sup> In an investigation that was ahead of its time he came to believe that learning was catalyzed by divine illumination. He was neither an empiricist who saw all knowledge as resting on an apprehension of the external world nor was he a rationalist who saw knowledge as deriving from the inner workings of reason independent of the world but, rather, he brought these two realms together (even though later intellectual history would separate into the competing philosophical schools of empiricism and rationalism). There is an act of judgment that notes the accord between sense impression and external reality. Like Plato, Augustine understood divine illumination as being analogous to physical illumination of the natural world: we see objects at a distance because of physical light and, in the same way, 'the nature of the soul is so made that by the disposition of its Creator it is naturally united to intelligible things; hence it is that it sees them in a kind of incorporeal light of a special sort' (from *De Trinitate*, IX, 15, 24).<sup>6</sup>

This conviction explains the universality and necessity of our ideas. Although each person possesses a natural capacity for knowledge, the universal truths grasped by the mind are divine ideas – and this is an adaptation of Plato's forms in the timeless realm. Ideas that originally existed in the mind of God have been exemplified and expressed in the creation of the universe. So the physical world is permeated by, and informed by, divine ideas and is not merely a jumble of arbitrary objects.<sup>7</sup> Our expression of these ideas through words is possible because there is a relationship between the word spoken and the thing to which it refers – although Augustine is careful not to present a simplistic one-to-one connection between words and things. Rather words are signs. And it is the existence of words which assist in the dividing up of the realm of human knowledge into the seven liberal arts that were conventionally taught in the classical curriculum. The first of these arts is grammar dealing with the use of words and this is followed by dialectic which is the activity of reasoning. Rhetoric is the means of moving hearts and minds in the exposition of truth and the other arts stem from the signs which nature itself presents.

All this shows how the pursuit of knowledge, even if it is secular knowledge, and the

---

4 Augustine, Books 1-4 of the *De Civitate Dei* (Eng. *City of God*).

5 Augustine, *De Magistro* (Eng. *On the Teacher*).

6 Quoted in S. J. Curtis and M. E. A. Boulton, *A Short History of Educational Ideas* (London: University Tutorial Press, 1970), 82.

7 Curtis, *Ideas*, 85,

apprehension of truth ultimately derive from the hand of God so that intellectual activity is, when it is a love of wisdom, also a love of God since God is the source of wisdom. In this way, too, Christian education is more than a narrow study of the ordinances or commands mapping the way to our salvation. Later writers would see God as having written two books: the book of nature and the book of scripture, and they perceived concord between the two.

If we were able to ask Augustine what the aims of Christian education were, he would certainly have been able to give an answer. He saw and was aware of the standard schooling within the Roman Empire that promoted classical philosophical knowledge and rhetoric as well as poetry and history. At the same time, through his work as the Bishop of the city of Hippo, he regularly expounded Scripture to his congregation. Christian education was pastoral, formative, doctrinal and church-related. Yet, given his understanding of the purposes of God for the world, he would have viewed Christian education as involving the capacity to engage with and critique and transform secular knowledge in the way that his own writings so ably did.

The gradual changes to European society over the following centuries resulted in the concentration of educational resources within the hands of the church, either in monasteries or cathedral schools. By the time we reach the 12th century the universities of Paris and Oxford were being formed, the first by papal recognition of its teachers and the second in a more organic and spontaneous way. There is a record of a course of lectures on the Psalms of David and the wisdom of Solomon being given in Oxford as early as 1193.<sup>8</sup> The granting of university degrees provided a means for public certification of the right to teach, which is where the notion of a 'Masters' degree comes from.

To gain degrees young men sharpened their minds by debating theological and intellectual conundrums and arguing for or against particular propositions (they had to be able to argue in both directions) and the university teacher presided at the debates and adjudicated on them. This dialectical form of argumentation depended upon the deployment of legal and theological texts, sometimes with great ingenuity, in favor of one position or another. Where there were definite camps – as between free will and foreknowledge – these were carried forward by particular religious orders. So Franciscans and Dominicans disagreed strongly, especially since Dominicans championed the theology of St Thomas Aquinas in Paris while Franciscans were stronger in Oxford. In a sense, at this time, it was impossible to understand any other form of education than that which was Christian. The church's dominant position in society ensured that theological faculties were senior to law faculties.

During the Reformation the universities were fully involved in the theological struggles within Europe, especially because the knowledge of biblical languages was held by university teachers. John Wycliffe (1320-84), Master of Balliol College, Oxford, translated parts of the Bible into English and so helped to initiate proto-Protestantism that pressed for reform by challenging the landholdings and wealth of the church. Erasmus (1466-1536) was given a teaching position at

---

8 <http://www.theology.ox.ac.uk/about-the-faculty.html> [accessed 2 June 2014]

the University of Cambridge for a while and Luther, despite being a monk early in his career, was a university lecturer at Wittenberg.

It is to Luther we can turn for a further development of Christian education. Once the Reformation had begun to gather speed and strength, existing institutions loyal to the Pope were depleted of resources and dismantled with the result that Luther, conscious of the decay of German scholarship, wrote a circular letter to the councilman of German cities in 1524 urging them to spend public money founding ordinary schools.<sup>9</sup> His eloquent plea asked for the schools to teach the languages of Hebrew and Greek since he knew that, by a study of them, proper and accurate attention would be given to the biblical text. Indeed he saw a mastery of Hebrew and Greek as being vital to the success and sustenance of the Reformation because Jerome's old Latin translation of Scripture had long obscured the truth of justification by faith. Only by going back to the original language had it been possible to bring the message of the New Testament to light and to clean away the misleading accretions that had grown up round the gospel.

In addition Luther understood that by providing a first-class education for its citizens, Germany would be blessed by a spate of able rulers, magistrates, soldiers and statesman. He said

a city's best and highest welfare, safety and strength consist in its having many able, learned, wise, honorable and well-bred citizens; ...Thus it was done in ancient Rome. ...As a result, their cause prospered; they had capable and trained men for every position (p. 82, see footnote 8)

Beyond the ordinary school, Luther set out to reform the order of service in Protestant worship and to ensure new catechisms were written for the people of Germany. The catechisms taught basic beliefs in God, the Ten Commandments, daily worship, and so on while the new liturgy (complete with new hymns) reinforced the doctrines of the Reformation. Christian education moved forward both inside the church and in the public domain outside the church. Its composite aims were soteriological, pastoral and social and harmonized with Luther's conception of the church within the state as a separate domain that was, however, subsidiary to civil rulers along the lines spelled out in Romans 13.

We can summarize the historical material as follows:

---

9 To The Councilmen of All Cities in Germany That They Establish and Maintain Christian Schools [[http://media.sabda.org/alkitab-8/LIBRARY/LUT\\_WRK4.PDF](http://media.sabda.org/alkitab-8/LIBRARY/LUT_WRK4.PDF)] [Accessed 1 June 2014]

Religious Context	Primary Aim	Method	Result
Old Testament	Obedience to Mosaic Law	Reading of text	Subservience of all knowledge to God
New Testament	Teaching about the kingdom of God	Evangelistic preaching	Evangelising the world
	Teaching the faith to believers	Congregational preaching and discipleship	Preparing the people of God
Augustine	Knowledge of God	Teaching and philosophical reflection	Extension of the kingdom of God
	Refutation of Pagan culture	Engagement and critique	
Reformation	Living as justified by faith in Christ in a Christian society	Catechism Schools Reformed worship	Transforming the individual and society

## Pentecostalism Beginnings

Pentecostal beginnings are complex and not attributable to any single person. Pentecostalism begins in the USA out of the revivalistic holiness preaching of the founders of the Church of God in the 1890s, out of the Bible School of Charles Fox Parham in Kansas in 1901 where the connection between speaking in tongues and baptism in the Spirit was vigorously articulated, out of the Azusa Street revival presided over by W. J. Seymour from 1906-1913 where Spirit baptism with tongues was deemed a step beyond sanctification, out of Pandita Ramabai's centre at Mukti, India, 1906 where baptism in the Spirit was associated with intercession, visions and evangelism and out of the Presbyterian/Methodist revival in Korea between about 1903 and 1910.

Pentecostalism has been aptly analyzed as having a series of characteristics: belief in baptism in the Holy Spirit with charismatic gifts in evidence; an eschatology of both the near return of Christ and a great harvest of converts to be gathered across the earth; divine healing; radical, sudden and complete salvation by faith in Christ - justification by faith that could be traced back to the New Testament. Because of its holiness roots in the USA, Pentecostalism was a child of Methodist parentage while, because of its eschatological orientation, it had affinities with missionary societies all over the world. Equally because of its own revivalistic beginnings, it saw itself as a revival that might be transferred anywhere in the world. Then, because of its stress on the Holy Spirit and healing, it was a message that struck home wherever pre-modern medical practices held sway (e.g. in Africa) and also in segments of the Western world. From its beginnings Pentecostalism therefore saw itself as having a global reach and decisive importance to the time-line of church history. What educational resources did it mobilize to carry forward its God-given task?

*The Early Days: Missionary and Ministry Training*

In the first few decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century it was said ‘one can find almost any practice in the “free” Pentecostal assemblies’.<sup>10</sup> This was put down to non-credentialed itinerant ministers as well as unlicensed missionaries who solicited funds and then seemed to waste much of their time traveling back and forth between one country and another.<sup>11</sup> There were also idiosyncratic private Bible schools that appeared to rely upon spiritual gifts like prophecy and interpretation of tongues as a method of teaching students, practices that were bound to lead to doctrinal disaster.

The founding of the long-lasting Bible schools or training centers was associated with the founding of Pentecostal missionary societies and the establishment of denominations. The Pentecostal Missionary Union in Britain was founded in 1909 and established two training schools for missionaries, one for men and the other for women. Already you can see that there is variation. Ministers, so far as British Pentecostals were concerned, did not need training whereas missionaries did. Yet, in United States the earliest Pentecostal missionaries received no training whatever. However, when American Assemblies of God was set up in 1914, it did recognize one institution where ministers (‘Gospel workers’ as they were called) might be well taught.<sup>12</sup>

By July 1909 the Pentecostal Missionary Union training program was carefully worked out. Students rose each day at 6 a.m. and every morning studied the Bible, doctrine and church history with some reference to ‘secular studies’ which may have included bookkeeping, grammar, and other practical matters. The afternoons were devoted to prayer and visitation, presumably in connection with local assemblies. Every evening there was a meeting and on every Sunday afternoon an open-air service was held in Hyde Park in central London.<sup>13</sup> The women’s home appears to have had a similar pattern though it was noticeably stricter. In both schools there was a strong emphasis upon sexual morality so that, when missionaries went out onto the field, they were not expected to be involved in any romantic relationships and, if they did feel romantically inclined, they had to seek permission from the missions board before they could consider engagement to marry.

When the Pentecostal Missionary Union was absorbed within British Assemblies of God, a new Bible School came to being in 1921 and combined both missionary and ministerial training. The curriculum was largely biblical and the study of the Bible was carried out by seven methods: the comprehensive, analytical, doctrinal, typical, prophetic, geographical and historical.<sup>14</sup> The

---

10 Edith W. Blumhofer, *Assemblies of God: A Popular History* (Springfield, MO: Radiant Books, 1985), 34.

11 Gary B. McGee, *People of the Spirit* (Springfield, MO: GPH, 2004), 111.

12 William W. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve* (Springfield, MO: GPH, 1971), 354.

13 Donald Gee, *Wind and Flame* (London: Assemblies of God Publishing House, 1967), 61, 62.

14 John Carter, “How to study the Scriptures”, *Redemption Tidings*, 1, 2, (1924): 11. John Carter along with his brother Howard were the only two full-time faculty at the time.

comprehensive method looked at the Bible as a whole while the analytical method focused on the specific message of each biblical book. The doctrinal dealt with systematic theology concerning the attributes of God, creation, fall, redemption, and so on, and also included reference to Pentecostal distinctives like speaking in tongues and healing. The historical method looked especially at the life of Christ. If the teaching method sounds rigidly over simplified, this is probably because it also formed the basis of a correspondence course for home-based students, most of whom were bereft of any tools apart from the Bible and a concordance.<sup>15</sup>

Members of the college shared their lives, eating communally, praying together, forming friendships and also taking advantage of the chance to talk with the emerging line of Pentecostal preachers arriving to give lectures additional to those provided by the full-time faculty. Students paid for their accommodation but tuition was free, something that was echoed in the non-payment of faculty who were expected to live, like the students, by faith. It was thought that, unless the faculty lived by faith, students would never learn to do this and Howard Carter, then the Principal, who had been imprisoned for pacifism in World War I, taught them to see every difficulty as an opportunity and every trial as part of God's shaping of character.

It is obvious that the aims of this education were doctrinal and also formational, involving the establishment of a Pentecostal lifestyle. The doctrinal emphasis makes good sense at a time when Pentecostalism was new. It was important that distinctive Pentecostal doctrines should be held and propagated by students passing through Pentecostal training institutions. Had this not been the case, Pentecostalism would have died out in a single generation.

#### *Consolidation: Missionary and Ministry Training*

The middle period of Bible College development occurred roughly between the start of World War I when Pentecostal denominations were formed and the end of World War II. This was a period of global economic stagnation and of totalitarian communism. Primary education was established in the Western world and there was limited and often selective secondary education. Tertiary education, beyond the age of 18, was rarer and in Britain amounted to less than 6% of the population. Bible school teaching hovered in the bracket somewhere around the upper end of secondary education – it did not have the characteristics of tertiary education. In the United States, which had the most economically developed economy and the largest Pentecostal population, Bible schools followed the pattern established by the D. L. Moody and A. B. Simpson. This was a three-year programme centred on biblical content and with a strong mixture of prayer meetings, worship services, and field placements in churches. The emphasis was on the practical ministerial training rather than on academic excellence.<sup>16</sup>

In 1949 American Assemblies of God found by survey that 36% of all its ordained ministers and

---

15 *Redemption Tidings* (October, 1925): 11. By 1929, the course has over 1,700 students, *Redemption Tidings* (November, 1929): 14.

16 Menzies, *Anointed*, 354.



74% of all of its missionaries had been trained the Bible schools. These figures show that between about 1920 and 1945 missionary training was almost always carried out in Bible colleges but that the path into the ministry could avoid formal training. By 1966 another survey showed that 49% of Assemblies of God ministers were graduates of Bible schools but by then another 21% had also obtained college or seminary degrees.<sup>17</sup> Nearly all these early Bible schools in United States were not accredited by any external agency. They were recognized by their denominations and served a purpose in the credentialing of ministers but, so far as the wider educational world was concerned, these colleges lacked credibility. Only a few of their graduates had been accepted as military chaplains, and it was this that encouraged the push for accreditation in the post-war period.<sup>18</sup> A new association specifically for accrediting Bible colleges was set up in 1947 although some of the ministers objected to the idea that their own colleges should be inspected by the non-Pentecostals. This, of course, was the problem with public recognition: it was necessary to conform to public, often secular, standards.

The actual curriculum within these colleges has been well analyzed by Douglas Jacobsen.<sup>19</sup> Taking Meyer Pearlman and Ernest Williams as examples of the period he is able to show that they constructed systematic theologies of Pentecostalism that were ‘scholastic’ i.e. rooted in an analysis of the relation of parts to the whole.<sup>20</sup> In both cases these texts provided a comprehensive outline of the doctrines believed by Pentecostals together with an attempt to interrelate them to each other through the Bible. Pearlman in his 1937 publication states that ‘the material in this book is a combination of biblical and systematic theology’ and he used biblical texts and sometimes expounded biblical passages to support his views. It is a compendium of beliefs that avoids other contrary opinions and is intended as a ‘backbone’ to Christian faith. There is no reference to the Azusa Street revival or to miracles or to any other aspect of Pentecostalism. Nor is there an attempt to refute, demonize or attack other believers or social groups. The attitude behind the book is one that shows Pentecostalism belongs within the mainstream of the church historically conceived.

Ernest Williams, in a three volume work published in 1953, presents his account as ‘that form of doctrine which is surely believed among us’. There is ecumenical charity behind his attitude and, like Pearlman, he quotes eclectically from his wide reading using sources that belonged to the 19th century, often modern liberals and progressive evangelicals. There is a broad orthodoxy here that was intended to help Pentecostals in the second generation understand the completeness

---

17 Menzies, *Anointed*, 355.

18 Menzies, *Anointed*, 357.

19 D. Jacobsen, “Knowing the Doctrines of the Pentecostals: The Scholastic Theology of the Assemblies of God, 1930-55”, in *Pentecostal Currents in North American Pentecostalism*, ed. E. Blumhofer, R. P. Spittler, G. A. Wacker (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1999) 90-107.

20 Meyer Pearlman, *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible* (Springfield, MO: GPH, 1937); Ernest Swing Williams, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols, (Springfield, MO: GPH, 1953).

of Christian doctrine. This is theology that does not hammer home Pentecostal distinctives or attempt to use Pentecostal experiences of the Spirit as the basis for constructing a theological edifice.

At this point in the cycle it is obvious that the aims of Pentecostal education were being widened beyond those originally held. Pentecostal ministers were expected to take part in the mainstream of society and needed an education that would give them credibility in recognized social roles like those of military chaplaincy.

### *Pentecostal Liberal Arts Colleges*

The next institutional stage produced Christian Liberal Arts colleges. Many have a two faculty structure. They began as Bible colleges and expanded to include a second faculty. Sometimes this faculty might be concerned with social work, or journalism, or might be a language school or possibly a unit concerned with the training of schoolteachers. In many instances this expansion from a Bible college to a two faculty Liberal Arts college was a device for increasing student enrollment without being underpinned by conceptual or visionary motivation. Difficulties arose because the second faculty was always less well valued by the denomination or the churches than the theological faculty. In any case members of the second faculty might well have different theological commitments from the Bible teachers. It is difficult to find educators who are journalists, or social workers or linguists with exactly the same outlook or faith position as theologians.

Yet there were other subtler pressures on these institutions because the second faculty, whatever it might be, was driven by the autonomous professional bodies that validated the qualifications students were working for. If students wanted a qualification in social work or counseling or journalism, the college was forced to take account of the demands of secular professionals in the designing of courses and this inevitably created tension inside the institution. There could be a tug-of-war between the theological aims and ethos and the secularized professional aims and ethos of the two branches of the curriculum.

The emergence of these Liberal Arts colleges in the Pentecostal context could only take place when high student enrollment for general education was the norm. Such enrollment could only take place in countries with a high gross national product where middle class families could afford to delay the entrance of their children to the labor market beyond the age of 20. In poorer countries there was pressure for young people to begin earning wages well before they had secured professional qualifications. With an economic downturn the Christian Liberal Arts college was in danger of collapsing back into a Bible college. There *were* notable successes and it was perfectly possible for such colleges to become universities but, to make this jump, they needed strong financial backing and high academic reputations.

### *Pentecostal Universities*

In an ideal world, a Pentecostal university would be invented from scratch. It would be built on a fresh site and designed on a blank piece of paper. This rarely happens but it is certainly worth

asking what an ideal Pentecostal university would look like. There have been various answers to this question. For now let us look at three separate models that might help us think about a Pentecostal university.

First, we would expect a Pentecostal university to involve Pentecostal distinctives, that is say, an emphasis on the Holy Spirit. We might expect this emphasis to be given to the curriculum, especially the theology curriculum, but we might also expect this emphasis upon the Holy Spirit to be seen in the methods of teaching that staff used and in the moral and spiritual characteristics of the teachers. So we might expect an emphasis upon the Holy Spirit to be implicit within the curriculum and therefore within the epistemology, the theory of knowledge, that underpinned the entire curriculum of the university. We might expect a Pentecostal university to see all knowledge as coming ultimately from the hand of God and all knowledge as reflecting the glory of God and the vastness of creation. We might expect there to be an integration between the different fields of knowledge as a consequence of this emphasis upon the work of the Spirit within of the story of the human race. Equally we might see the work of the Holy Spirit as being fundamental to the lives of Pentecostal teachers. We might expect them to be those who manifest the fruits of the Spirit as well as the gifts of the Spirit; those who show the capacity to be inventive as the Spirit inspires their minds; those who believe in and manifest the grace of God and show this in their lives to their students.<sup>21</sup>

Second, we might see a Pentecostal university formed on a different model. Here we might imagine that of the many different faculties that make up the university each would be seen as having their own independent values, methods and concepts and that these individual disciplines or fields within the curriculum of the university would, in many respects, be similar to those disciplines outside a Pentecostal university. This might be called the ‘hotel model’ of a university whereby each faculty, each lecturer, lives in his or her department and observes rules about courtesy to other guests but, in the main, only interacts with those guests infrequently and casually in the restaurant.<sup>22</sup> Here what holds the university together is the basic legal framework and the pre-eminence given to theology -- it might have the finest suite of rooms -- but in other ways theology has no privileges. It must give respect to the other academic disciplines. When Oral Roberts first conceived of his university he used a further unifying concept. He modeled his enterprise upon what he perceived to be the tri-partite nature of human beings with body, soul and spirit. He brought the traditional intellectual disciplines together in harmony and put a prayer tower at the center of his campus to show the importance of the spiritual. In the fully formed concept of the City of Faith, Roberts built a hospital adjacent to the university. Each aspect of human beings was catered for by the totality of the institution: the mind through learning, the body through medicine and sport and the spirit through attention to the divine.

---

21 William K. Kay “Pentecostal Education”, *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 25, 2, (2004): 229-239.

22 The phrase is used by Ian S. Markham “The idea of a Christian university,” in *The Idea of a Christian University*, ed. J. Astley, L.J. Francis, J. Sullivan and A. Walker, (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 5.

Third, we might see a Pentecostal university founded around the notion of truth. This notion can accommodate both the arts and sciences and is fundamental to our belief in God: we believe in a God who is truth. When Newman wrote his famous book on *The Idea of a University* he made truth the central binding concept and his discussion of the nature of truth shaped the university he envisaged.<sup>23</sup> There were four central component to his insights about truth.<sup>24</sup> First, truth is complex. For Newman truth must be worked for, pondered, and eventually grasped in all its interrelated complexity. The converse of this was, as far as he was concerned, that there were no sudden moments of illumination or insight but that the truth had to be put together from reason and evidence and eventually grasped by the whole being of a person. Second, the pursuit of truth is always infused with a moral aspect because knowledge has consequences and can generate action. Third truth is the product of a vigorous community and not of an individual. Within the constant crisscrossing of argumentation within the community of the university, truth is collectively reached. In this way Newman, a Roman Catholic, set himself against individuals with sudden fresh revelations. We may later ask whether and to what extent truth is an individual matter or truth is a collective matter in the life of the church. Finally, truth is Christian truth, the inexhaustible divine reality that the Christian knows and yet never fully knows. There are aspects of Newman's model that would dissatisfy the Pentecostal scholar but, for now, let us leave it on the table to see if we can work with it.

These three conceptions of a university may be labeled the 'permeating Holy Spirit model', the 'hotel model' and the 'truth model'. The table below summarizes these developments:

	<b>Early Bible School</b>	<b>Later Bible School</b>	<b>Liberal Arts</b>	<b>University</b>
<b>Aims</b>	Training ministers and missionaries	Training ministers	Training ministers and training Christians for secular careers	Professional and theoretical knowledge in a unified framework
<b>Curriculum</b>	Bible and character formation	Bible and systematic theology	Theology and one (or more) subjects	All subjects
<b>Teachers/ Teaching</b>	Preachers	Preachers with college level education	Qualified theologians and other professionally trained staff	Wide variety of well qualified staff

---

23 Newman's book was first published in 1852. The book was the outcome of his being appointed as Rector of the Catholic University of Ireland.

24 I am dependent here on D. Robinson "Sedes Sapientiae: Newman, Truth and the Christian," in *The Idea of a Christian University*, ed. J. Astley, L.J. Francis, J. Sullivan and A. Walker (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 75-97.

## Conclusion

In relation to Christian education as a whole, we may say that its aims were, in the first instance, to develop and transmit Christian doctrine either in the church or in ordinary schools or by encouraging devotional life within the home (e.g. in Luther's Little Catechism).

In the second instance Christian education began to expand its borders into the realm of secular knowledge and beyond into society as a whole. Once secular knowledge was acceptable as the content of study for Christians, it might be turned around and used in defense of Christianity or, if it was seen as a manifestation of divine truth, as an aid to the acquisition of a knowledge of God (Augustine).

Conventional understandings of the aims of education – which have not been considered in this paper – include the notion of the transmission of culture from one generation to the next and of induction into culture.<sup>25</sup> Both of these two aims may be seen as exemplified in Pentecostal institutions although not explicitly articulated in this way.

There is a final aim of Pentecostal education which has not been mentioned so far because it seems too lowly, too simple, too obvious to discuss but it is the aim of producing children who grow into adults who can care for themselves and other people, who relate to friends and family and neighbours, who are neither self-destructive nor perverse, who love God with their hearts and minds. Christian education, and Pentecostal education which draws specifically upon the role and power of the Holy Spirit, should ensure that those who pass through its hands are balanced, happy and fulfilled individuals, neither blighted by self-condemnation nor frightened to take their place within the church and wider society.

## References

- Augustine *De Civitate Dei* (English translation. *City of God*).
- Augustine *De Magistro* (English translation. *On the Teacher*).
- Augustine *De Trinitate* (English translation. *On the Trinity*).
- Blumhofer, Edith W. *Assemblies of God: a popular history*. Springfield, MO: Radiant Books, 1985.
- Carter, John. "How to study the Scriptures." *Redemption Tidings*, 1, 2, (1924): 11.
- Curtis, S. J and M. E. A. Boulwood. *A Short History of Educational Ideas*. London: University Tutorial Press, 1970.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.

---

25 P. H. Hirst and R. S. Peters, *The Logic of Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970).

- Gee, Donald. *Wind and Flame*. London: Assemblies of God Publishing House, 1967.
- Hirst, Paul H and Richard S. Peters. *The Logic of Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.
- Jacobsen, Douglas. "Knowing the doctrines of the Pentecostals: the scholastic theology of the Assemblies of God, 1930-55." In *Pentecostal Currents in North American Pentecostalism*, edited by E. Blumhofer, R. P. Spittler, G. A. Wacker, 90-107. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Kay, William K. "Pentecostal Education." *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 25, 2, (2004): 229-239.
- Markham, Ian S. "The idea of a Christian university." In *The Idea of a Christian University*, edited by J. Astley, L.J. Francis, J. Sullivan and A. Walker, 5. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004.
- McGee, Gary B. *People of the Spirit*. Springfield, MO: GPH, 2004.
- Menzies, William W. *Anointed to Serve*. Springfield, MO: GPH, 1971.
- Pearlman, Meyer. *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*. Springfield, MO: GPH, 1937
- Robinson, D. "Sedes Sapientiae: Newman, truth and the Christian." In *The Idea of a Christian University*, edited by J. Astley, L.J. Francis, J. Sullivan and A. Walker, 75-97. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004.
- Williams, Ernest Swing. *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. Springfield, MO: GPH, 1953.

# “Epistemology, Ethos, and Environment”: In Search of a Theology of Pentecostal Theological Education<sup>1</sup>

*Veli-Matti Kärkäinnen*

## First Words: Is Bigger Always Better?

Educators like to imagine that education matters. We like to believe that the leadership of a congregation is improved when that person has a graduate degree and three years of study. We like to think that pouring resources into education is worthwhile. We argue that the more resources we devote to theological education, the better.<sup>2</sup>

Against this commonsense expectation, the Anglican seminar professor Ian S. Markman bluntly says that in reality, however, it is sometimes the case that denominations such as his own, which invests huge amounts of resources into theological education, are declining in membership and activity. Markman reports that the Presbyterian Church (USA) with some of the most highly acclaimed theological schools in the world (Princeton and Columbia, among others) has lost two hundred thousand members during 1999–2004 – the biggest loss during that time period among all mainline churches! On the contrary, Markham further observes, Pentecostals with “very limited and informal” training are growing rapidly all over the world, including some parts of the USA.<sup>3</sup>

This is of course not to establish any negative causality between the high level of education and low level of church activity – an intriguing PhD study topic in itself! – but rather shake any unfounded belief in the effects of higher education. Indeed, a classic study conducted in the 1960s by the Swiss sociologist Lalive d’Epinay showed that the traditional theological academic training received by mainline Methodist and Presbyterian pastors in Chile was far from making them more effective pastors and church planters when compared to the minimal amount of

---

1 This essay is a slightly revised version of my presentation at the World Alliance for Pentecostal Theological Education Consultation in Stockholm, Sweden, 25 August 2010.

2 Ian S. Markham, “Theological Education in the Twenty-First Century,” *Anglican Theological Review* 92, no. 1 (2010): 157.

3 Ibid.

education received by Pentecostal pastors and pioneers in the same location.<sup>4</sup> Again, it is wise not to draw conclusions too hastily concerning the cause and effects. Whereas it can be the case that theological education itself may have a counter-effect on efficacy in church work, it may also be the case that it is rather a *poor* theological education that has had such effects. We'd better be reminded of the chiding remark by a theological schools' accreditation official on the effects of seminary education: "There is no other professional organization in the world that is as functionally incompetent as ... seminaries. Most of our students emerge from seminaries less prepared than they entered, biblically uncertain, spiritually cold, theologically confused, relationally calloused and professionally unequipped."<sup>5</sup>

Before Pentecostals start saying "Amen and Hallelujah! I knew that!," maybe they should pause and do some reflection. It seems to me there are very few Pentecostal churches that suffer from over-education! On the contrary, we could probably compile a long list of Pentecostal churches, planted and started well, that have become stagnant because of lack of a trained leadership facilitating and nurturing congregational and denominational life. Indeed, there is a dearth of academically trained leadership among Pentecostals, not only in the Global South where most Pentecostal churches (with a few exceptions such as those in South Korea) suffer from severe lack of economic and other resources, but also in Europe and the USA.<sup>6</sup> Let me just take as an example the US Assemblies of God, one of the most established and resourceful Pentecostal bodies in the world. A recent study of educational levels among Assemblies of God clergy revealed that among senior pastors, 12% had no education beyond high school and 4.3% claimed no ministerial training at all. While 30.6% claimed some training in college or at a technical school, 27.4% had taken a certificate course or had completed some correspondence courses in ministerial training. Some 55.6% had attended Bible College, though only 41.3% completed a degree. While 12.4% held a master's degree, only 9.9% held a seminary degree [often in counseling] and 2.8% held an advanced degree in ministry.<sup>7</sup> This example alone tells us that Pentecostals are coming to the task of considering the nature and role of higher education in theology from a very different vantage point than the mainline traditions.

---

4 Christian Lalive d'Epinay, "The Training of Pastors and Theological Education: The Case of Chile," *International Review of Missions* 56 (April 1967): 185–92.

5 The remark comes from Timothy Dearborn, Director of the Seattle Association for Theological Education, reported in Jon M. Ruthven, "Are Pentecostal Seminaries a Good Idea?" n.p., <http://www.tffps.org/docs/Are%20Pentecostal%20Seminaries%20a%20Good%20Idea.pdf> (accessed 7/12/2010).

6 For a fine essay with ample documentation on the history and current state of Pentecostal theological education, see Paul Lewis, "Explorations in Pentecostal Theological Education," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 10, no. 2 (2007): 161–76

7 "Fact\* Survey Results: A 2000 Survey of Assemblies of God Churches" (Springfield, MO: Office of the General Secretary, 2000), 9. Copies of this survey are available from the Office of Statistics or from the Office of the General Secretary in Springfield, Missouri. I am indebted to my colleague at Fuller Cecil M. Robeck for providing me with this information.



As the title indicates, my focus will be on the *theology* – rather than, say, pedagogy or philosophy or finances – of Pentecostal theological education. Therefore, I have to leave many things unsaid. My main goal is to urge Pentecostal theologians and educators to collaborate in developing a solid and dynamic theology as the proper ground for theological education. Mainline churches are ahead of us in this work – understandably so since they have had more time to “practice.” There is much to learn from those explorations and experiments.

My argumentation moves in three main parts. First I will take a look at the epistemological options for Pentecostal theological education. Second, building on that discussion, I seek to discern some key dimensions in the ethos of Pentecostal education. Third, I will offer some reflections as to different environments for Pentecostal theological education.

### Epistemology: Four “Cities”

In a highly acclaimed and programmatic essay titled *Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Debate*, David H. Kelsey of Yale University outlines the underlying epistemology and theology of theological education using two cities as paradigms.<sup>8</sup> “Athens” refers to the goals and methods of theological education that are derived from classical Greek philosophical educational methodology, *paideia*. The early church adopted and adapted this model. The primary goal of this form of education is the transformation of the individual. It is about character formation and learning the ultimate goal of which is the knowledge of God rather than merely knowing about God. “It is not primarily about *theology*, that is, the formal study of the *knowledge* of God, but it is more about what Kelsey calls *theologia*, that is, gaining the *wisdom* of God. It is the transformation of character to be God-like. The emphasis therefore falls upon personal development and spiritual formation.”<sup>9</sup> The second pole of Kelsey’s typology, “Berlin,” is based on the Enlightenment epistemology and ideals. (This turn in theological education was first taken at the University of Berlin.) Whereas the classical model of “Athens” accepted the sacred texts as revelation containing the wisdom of God, not only knowledge about God, in the “Berlin” model, rational reasoning and critical enquiry reign. The ultimate goal of theological training is no longer personal formation based on the study of authoritative texts. Rather, it aims at training people in intellectual affairs.

It doesn’t take much reflection to realize that, as helpful as this scheme is, it only says so much. There is more to the picture of the underlying epistemology and theology of theological education. Two other models could be added to the equation before an assessment from a Pentecostal perspective is in order.<sup>10</sup> My former colleague at Fuller Seminary Robert Banks has

---

8 David H. Kelsey, *Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Debate* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993).

9 Brian Edgar, “The Theology of Theological Education,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 29, no. 3 (2005): 209.

10 I am indebted to the essay by Edgar, “Theology of Theological Education,” for helping find connections between the four models.

suggested a third model, which appropriately can be attached to the city of “Jerusalem,” as it denotes the missionary impulse of the Christian church to spread the gospel from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth. In an important work titled *Revisioning Theological Education*,<sup>11</sup> Banks argues that if Martin Kähler’s classic dictum “Mission is the Mother of Theology” is true, it means theology should be missional in orientation. The ultimate goal and context of theological education should thus be missional, which at the end of the day fosters and energizes the church’s mission. It is, however, more than what is usually taken as “missiological” education as in the training of foreign missionaries. It is about theological education building the “foundation,” which is the mission of the church in all aspects of the church’s life and work. This missional orientation is of course in keeping with the current ecclesiological conviction according to which mission is not just one task given to the church among other tasks such as teaching or children’s work, but that the church is missional by its very nature, and thus, everything the church does derives from the missional nature.

Yet one further model can be added to the scheme. Named “Geneva” after the great center of the Reformation, this approach to theological education cherishes a confessional approach to theological education. It seeks to help the students to know God through the study of the creeds and the confessions, as well as the means of grace. Formation is focused on the living traditions of the community. “Formation occurs through *in-form*ation about the tradition and *en-culturation* within it.”<sup>12</sup>

What would a Pentecostal assessment on this typology be? Pentecostals certainly prefer “Athens” over “Berlin” and “Jerusalem” over “Geneva.” So the question is settled. Or is it? I don’t think so. We all agree that it would be too cheap to pick a couple of appealing choices and move from there. The issue is more complicated – and it has to do, I repeat, both with epistemology and theology.

The choice between the classic model of “Athens” and critical model of “Berlin” reflects the dramatic intellectual change brought about by the Enlightenment. From a Pentecostal point of view, two overly simple responses to the Enlightenment can be mentioned: First, it is bad! Second, it is inevitable! What I want to say here is that even though it would be safe and soothing to be able to go back to the pre-Enlightenment mentality in which the biblical authority, the uniqueness of Jesus, and other key faith convictions could be taken at their face value – and are being taken as such among the common folks not only among Pentecostals but in most all traditions as well – for an academically trained person living in our times it is not a feasible option. To pretend that the Enlightenment never happened is the worst kind of self-delusion.

What about postmodernity? Wouldn’t postmodernity’s critique and rejection of modernity’s legacy come as a God-sent aid to those who are bothered with the rule of reason? Indeed, many

---

11 Robert Banks, *Revisioning Theological Education* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999).

12 Edgar, “Theology of Theological Education,” 211.

Pentecostals have been turned on by the promises of postmodernity; I myself am much more reserved. Indeed, what is happening in the beginning of the third millennium is that there is a continuing debate, at times even conflict, between three poles when it comes epistemology. Following Ernest Gellner's suggestive book title, *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion*,<sup>13</sup> they can be named as religion, modernity, and postmodernity. Whereas "religion" (cf. "Athens" and "Geneva") builds on authoritative revelation, "modernity" (cf. "Berlin") seeks to replace all faith-commitments for critical inquiry, and postmodernity de-constructs all big narratives in turning to everyone's own stories and explanations. "Religion" is between the rock and hard place. Neither modernity nor postmodernity looks like a great ally.

The lesson to Pentecostal theological education may be simply this: Even though Pentecostals with all other "Bible-believers" seek to build on the authoritative revelation of God in Christ ("Athens"), that cannot be done in isolation from the challenges brought about by both modernity and postmodernity. Pentecostal theological education should seek to find a way of education in which the challenges of both of these prevailing epistemologies are being engaged in an honest and intellectually integral way. Two other lessons that guide us in reflection on the ethos of Pentecostal theological education in the next main part of the essay, follow from this discussion. It is clear and uncontested that Pentecostals should incorporate the missional impulse ("Jerusalem") into the core of their education. Furthermore, I urge Pentecostals to also consider the importance of a confessional ("Geneva") approach, not exclusively, but rather as a complementary way.

### **Ethos: Four Polarities**

Building on these tentative conclusions based on the epistemological discussion, let me continue my reflections on the theology of Pentecostal theological education by discerning and highlighting four dynamic continuums or polarities. Polarities are not just opposite ends, they are also processes and orientations in dynamic tension with each other. I think it is important to hold on to the healthy and constructive dynamisms when speaking of the theological education of this movement that was birthed by a dynamic movement of the Spirit. This is what makes the ethos of Pentecostal theological education. I name these four polarities in the following way:

"Academic" *versus* "Spiritual"

"Indoctrinal" *versus* "Critical"

"Practical" *versus* "Theoretical"

"Tradition-Driven" *versus* "Change-Driven"

---

13 Ernest Gellner, *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion* (London: Routledge, 1992).

*“Academic” versus “Spiritual”*

Everyone who has worked in the context of Pentecostal or any other revivalistic theological training knows that there is a built-in tension between investing time on spiritual exercises or academic pursuit. In contrast, the “Berlin” model pretty much leaves that tension behind because only academic excellence is pursued. Everyone who has worked in “secular” theological faculties knows what I mean by this.

The “Athens” models suggest that knowledge and wisdom are not alternatives, nor can they be subsumed under each other. Knowledge is the way to wisdom, the true “knowing” of God. The noted American theologian Ellen Cherry describes this in a most useful way as she reflects on the lost heritage of the Augustinian and patristic way of doing and teaching theology: “Theology is to enable people to advance in the spiritual life. Spiritual advancement is the driving force behind all of Augustine’s works. Theories about God and the things of God (i.e., doctrines) are important and wanted, but they are to a further end: to enable people to know, love, and enjoy God better and thereby to flourish.”<sup>14</sup> Augustine is a wonderful example to lift up here because alongside deep spirituality, he is also well known for his highly intellectual and analytic mind. Let me just take up one example. As you read his classic autobiographical *Confessions*, you will soon notice that in the true spirit of Pentecostal-type testimonials he shares about his life before turning to Christ and the dramatic change he underwent. At the same time, this book also contains one of the most sophisticated inquiries into divinity and theology, including the famous chapter 11 on the theology and philosophy of time! Spirituality and academics seem to go well together with the bishop of Hippo.

Whereas for Augustine and those likeminded theology was spiritual by its nature – an aid to help Christians know, love, and enjoy God –post-Enlightenment academic education, as conducted in the university-setting, has strayed so far from this ethos that recently courses in “spirituality” had to be added to the curriculum!<sup>15</sup> As if studying God – *logos* about *theos* – were not a spiritually nourishing exercise in itself.

*“Indoctrinal” versus “Critical”*

Pentecostal preaching and testimonies are about persuasion – and often amplified with a loud voice! Not only that, but the Pentecostal way of discerning God’s will is geared towards nonmediated, direct encounters with God. In that environment, critical thinking, analysis, and argumentation often sit uncomfortably. Coupled with this is the Bible-school mentality of much of Pentecostal training which, in opposition to critical academic faculties in the universities, was set up to combat reigning liberalism. In other words, the “Berlin” model doesn’t seem to be a viable option in that kind of environment. Mark Hutchinson describes aptly the dynamic field in

---

14 Ellen T. Cherry, “Educating for Wisdom: Theological Studies as a Spiritual Exercise,” *Theology Today* 66, no. 3 (2009): 298.

15 See further, Cherry, “Educating for Wisdom,” 296–97.

which Pentecostal theological education often finds itself in the midst of conflicting expectations:

It would be true to say that most leaders in our movement have little understanding of educational processes, and little expectation about the intelligence of their members. The model of the charismatic leader is to hear from God and then tell the people what he has heard. The concept that they may be in fact serving a *community* which can hear from God and which is capable of dealing with what they've heard is not a common one. And yet, the community model is precisely what a *uni*-versity is – it is a *community* of scholarship. With the prevailing church model, education tends to default towards indoctrination, with more emphasis on character outcomes and opinions than on intellectual formation and knowledge.<sup>16</sup>

There is a clash of cultures between the church and the academic institution; only the Bible school environment in most cases avoids this dynamic by going smoothly with the church culture. A Pentecostal academic institution of theological knowledge “exists as a place where definite, charismatic, revelational knowledge and certainty exist alongside and in interaction with the indefinite but progressive search for truth,” whereas a typical church setting calls for a definite, authoritative settling of the issues under discussion. In order to keep this dynamic tension in a healthy measure, “[l]eaders and pastors will have to acknowledge that their revelational knowledge and ecclesial authority is not absolute, while teachers will have to admit that their academic freedom and scholarly knowledge are not absolute goods.”<sup>17</sup>

A Pentecostal academic mindset should be able to make a distinction between two kinds of understandings of the term *critical*. The first meaning that usually comes to the popular mind is something like “tearing apart” or “breaking down” beliefs dearly held – as in radical forms of biblical criticism. That kind of use of critical faculties often replicates the naïve and unfounded understanding of rationality *à la* the Enlightenment in which one assumes the location in “no-man’s land” and is able to know something neutrally, without prejudice or bias. That modernist illusion is of course thoroughly prejudiced and biased. If postmodernity has taught us anything, it is that all of our knowledge is “perspectival”; there is “no view from nowhere.” This takes me to the other, more constructive, meaning of *critical*, which means something like “sorting out” or “weighing” between various opinions, options, viewpoints. On the way to a confident opinion or belief, the intellectual capacities are put in use to make sure one’s opinion is justified in light of current knowledge, experience, and wisdom.

---

16 Mark Hutchinson, “‘The Battle Hymn of the Republic of Learning’: Thoughts on Academic Freedom in a Pentecostal College,” *Australasian Pentecostal Studies* 9 (July 2005/6): 10.

17 Ibid.

The Pentecostal movement at large would be greatly helped by soberly trained leaders who have been taught how to exercise healthy criticism, including self-criticism. Pentecostals would, for example, learn that “bigger is not always better.” Even though it is not an easy task, by taking the “Athens” model as the basis and the “Berlin” model as a necessary aid, Pentecostal theological education would benefit greatly. In practical terms this means teaching the basics of biblical and doctrinal criticism as part of the curriculum, doing historiography rather than hagiography when studying the past of the movement, subjecting prevailing leadership or church growth patterns and ideals to scrutiny, and so forth.

*“Practical” versus “Theoretical”*

A recent essay by the newly elected president of Union Theological Seminary (NY), Serene Jones, discloses the depth of the problem that has haunted theological education, particularly ministerial training, from the beginning, namely, how to balance “practical” and “theoretical” aspects. She makes painfully clear just how far academic theology too often has strayed from its practical task. Her title “Practical Theology in Two Modes” is an admission that systematic theology, her own discipline, needs practical theology by its side as a separate field of study, although at the same time she acknowledges that “everything we do in the divinity school is practical; it’s about faith and people’s lives.”<sup>18</sup>

The divide between theoretical and practical is another child of modernity. Although the distinction of course serves heuristic purposes and everyday needs – think for example of how useful it is to study first about traffic signs in class (“theory”) before venturing into actual traffic (“practice”). Common sense dictates that in some manner, the distinction should be maintained.

In the case of theological education as long as it has ministerial training as its goal, the *separation* cannot be accepted. Theological education that does not lead into the adoption of “practices” and virtues relevant and conducive to Christian life and ministry is simply a failed exercise.<sup>19</sup>

Theology is a peculiar form of cognitive reflection, for its goal is not simply the expansion of knowledge. Theology has a quite practical goal – what I would call the formation of religious identity. Theology must once again become an activity forming religious identity and character. For it to play that role, theologians must be engaged in reflection upon religious practices. Some of those practices will be located within religious communities, while others may be broadly distributed within society. Theologians need to attend both to the practices of congregations –

---

18 Serene Jones, “Practical Theology in Two Modes,” in *For Life Abundant: Practical Theology, Theological Education, and Christian Ministry*, ed. Dorothy C. Bass and Craig Dykstra (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 195.

19 For an important discussion of “practices,” see *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life*, ed. Miroslav Volf and Dorothy Bass (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002)

worship, preaching and counseling, for example – and to societal practices that have religious and moral dimensions....<sup>20</sup>

When beginning a new course in systematic theology for seminary students, I usually tell the students that my discipline may be the most “practical” and “relevant” of all fields in the theological curriculum. Students often respond by asking, isn’t systematic theology rather about thinking, argumentation, doctrines? My counter-response affirms that but also adds that in the final analysis what else could be more “practical” to pastors, counselors, and missionaries than thinking deeply about what we believe, why we believe, and how we best try to formulate it. That is what shapes sermons, testimonies, worship, counseling, evangelism, finances, marriage, and so forth. Although such an exercise may not seem to be as “practical” in a shorter view as, say, basics of homiletics or church administration, its long-term effects may be far more relevant than one would assume.

I repeat myself: the study of theology that fails to positively shape a person’s identity, faith, character, and passion for God has simply failed its calling. An alternative is not to drop altogether the pursuit of theological education, but rather, to work hard for the revising and rectifying of training.

The focus of the “Jerusalem” model, missional orientation, comes to focus here. If it is true that mission is far more than one of the many tasks that the church does – namely, that the church *is* mission, mission is something that has to do with everything the church is doing, its *raison d’être* – then it means the ultimate horizon of theological education is the mission of the church.<sup>21</sup> Pentecostalism with its eschatologically loaded missionary enthusiasm and yearning for the power of the Spirit has all the potential of redeeming that promise. Yet a word of warning is in order here. While Pentecostals have rightly lifted up the needs of the mission as the key factor in shaping education, they have often done so in a way that has shortsightedly promoted merely “practical” tools of effectiveness. The urgency of mission does not mean, therefore, that it need not be theologically grounded nor reflected upon. On the contrary, if mission is the mode of existence for the church, it means we should continue careful theological reflection along with praxis of mission, both affirming our praxis and offering needed self-criticism.

### “Tradition-Driven” versus “Change-Driven”

“Tradition” is a bad word in Pentecostal vocabulary. Indeed, a main impulse that helped birth Pentecostalism was an opposition to the traditions, creeds, and rites of traditional churches.

---

20 Ronald F. Thiemann, “Making Theology Central in Theological Education,” *Christian Century*, February 4–11, 1987, 106–8, available at <http://www.religion-online.org/showarticle.asp?title=360> (accessed July 11, 2006), n.p.

21 For an important call by a noted ecumenist from India to renew missional commitment in all theological education, see Christopher Duraisingh, “Ministerial Formation for Mission: Implications for Theological Education,” *International Review of Mission* 81, no. 1 (January 1992): 33–45.

Pentecostalism breathes renewal and revitalization. Turning its attention to the future rather than the past, there emerged also a curious view of church history: basically it was a leap from the Book of Acts straight to the beginning of the movement in the twentieth century.

As a result, Pentecostalism is known for innovation, creativity, boldness, “frontier spirit,” which have helped cultivate spontaneity, loose structures, and the use of unheard-of techniques. Ever-new discoveries in church growth, evangelism, leadership, and the like catch the imagination of Pentecostals.

Tradition represents everything stagnant, archaic, irrelevant, dead. Or does it? For Paul, in what may be the oldest section of the New Testament in the beginning of 1 Corinthians 15, it was of utmost importance to pass on tradition about Jesus and his salvific work. The term *tradition*, of course, comes from the Greek word to “pass on.” The Johannine Jesus promised that after his exit, the Holy Spirit would continue working in their midst to help them embrace and gain a deeper insight into Jesus’ teaching, “tradition.” In the Christian view, tradition is but the work of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit helps each new generation to delve more deeply and in a more relevant way into the knowledge, power, and mind of Christ.

Although a Pentecostal approach to theological education cannot be based solely or even primarily on the “Geneva” model, neither should it ignore or downplay its importance. There are two facets to Pentecostalism’s relation to tradition. First of all, the Pentecostal movement stands firmly on the tradition of the Christ’s church. Hence, a sufficient study of the whole of the church’s theological, creedal, and historical tradition should belong to the core of the curriculum. Second, Pentecostalism in itself represents a growing tradition. As much as new revivalistic movements seek to live in the denial of the inevitable, there is no denying the accumulating effects of tradition and traditions.

Any effective theological education needs to be a good training in the tradition. Given the social reality of knowing, we must work within a framework of texts and community. Each one of us is born into a family and learns a particular language. From day one, each person looks at the world in a certain way. Knowledge is the result of the hard work of communities that struggle with the complexity of the world and start arriving at a more plausible account.<sup>22</sup>

As this word of wisdom from Markham illustrates, a proper attention to tradition also helps bring in the importance of community. Communal orientation is needed in order to redeem Pentecostalism, including its leadership, from hopeless individualism. This is nothing but the ecclesiological model of Acts 2.

---

22 Markham, “Theological Education,” 159.



The important task for Pentecostal theologians is to discern and bring to light the key elements of what makes Pentecostal tradition. What, for example, is the role of the baptism in the Holy Spirit in Pentecostal living tradition?<sup>23</sup> Change and tradition, new and old, should be kept in some kind of dynamic balance; that is a continuing challenge.<sup>24</sup>

### Environment: Four Locations

The term *environment* in this essay refers to two interrelated aspects of Pentecostal theological education. The first has to do with the setting in which the training is done, whether in a church-based Bible school, theological college, theological seminary, or in collaboration with “secular” university faculties such as in the Free University of Amsterdam. The second meaning of the environment relates to whether Pentecostal theological education is “Pentecostal” or, as it most often is alternatively, “Evangelical” with some Pentecostal tinsel. Let me begin with this latter meaning.

Anyone knowledgeable of typical Pentecostal theological schools knows that much of what is taught has little or no direct relation to Pentecostalism; it is rather borrowed materials from the Evangelical storehouses. Pentecostal dynamics and philosophy of education is due to the “reliance upon pedagogical and philosophical models that are more Evangelical (or fundamentalist) than Pentecostal ... [and] written resources on educational philosophy and pedagogy authored by Pentecostals for Pentecostal educators are lacking, especially for higher education.”<sup>25</sup> In other words: although Pentecostal students study in a Pentecostal environment, their education is not often distinctively Pentecostal. It is rather the extracurricular activities that are more Pentecostal in nature. As a result, Pentecostals become vulnerable to losing their distinctive nature and identity.

Behind this malaise is not only the lack of developed Pentecostal theology or textbooks but also a general orientation in much of Pentecostal theological scholarship that often tends to major in repeating uncritically the voices of Evangelicalism, at times even Fundamentalism – even though it is the Fundamentalists who have been most vocal opponents of anything charismatic! I am thinking here of Fundamentalistic views such as the doctrine of Scripture and inspiration (inerrancy), dispensationalist eschatology, and so on, which have been adopted without a

---

23 See Lewis, “Explorations,” 162.

24 See further, Markham, “Theological Education,” 164.

25 Jeffrey Hittenberger, “Toward a Pentecostal Philosophy of Education,” *Pneuma* 23, no. 2 (2001): 226, 230; I am indebted to Lewis, “Explorations” (p. 172) for this citation.

concerted theological assessment of how well – or how badly – these views fit Pentecostalism.<sup>26</sup> Henry Lederle of South Africa, himself a Charismatic Reformed, rightly remarks: “It is an irony of recent ecclesiastical history that much of Pentecostal scholarship has sought to align itself so closely with the rationalistic heritage of American Fundamentalism ... without fully recognizing how hostile these theological views are to Pentecostal and Charismatic convictions about present-day prophecy, healing miracles and other spiritual charisms.”<sup>27</sup> Now in principle there is of course no problem with borrowing from others. It would be only foolish to decline to drink from the common Christian wells and take advantage of other churches’ millennia-long traditions of theological reflection. However, the way Pentecostals have done that – and seemingly continue doing it – is what raises concerns. In most cases, I fear, Pentecostal theologians do not acknowledge the fact that what they claim to be presenting as a “Pentecostal” theological view is often nothing more than a “Spirit-baptized” Evangelical, often even Fundamentalistic, view taken from others with little or no integral connection to the core of Pentecostal identity.

Pentecostals have much to learn from older traditions. Let me take just one current example. In the above-mentioned essay, the Anglican Ian S. Markham carefully considers what are the key elements in his own tradition and, on the basis of that investigation, lays out three broad theological principles with regard to Anglican theological education: first, it should be creedal because of the centrality of the ancient creeds and later Anglican dogmatic formulae; second, it should be liturgical because of the center of the church life in worship and liturgy; and third, it should be engaged because of Anglicanism’s deep desire to engage the society at large, including politics, culture, arts, science, etc.<sup>28</sup> Now, these are not theological underpinnings for Pentecostal higher education. But I admire the clarity, consistency, and boldness of being true to one’s own tradition, without being hostile to others.

Building on one’s own identity and tradition is in no way an excuse or rationale for excluding others or fostering anti-ecumenical attitudes (those are prevalent enough without much training, unfortunately!). On the contrary, from the “foundation” of a clearly formulated identity and belonging to one’s community grows an irenic spirit towards others. In keeping with this goal is the set of guidelines from the global working group of theological educators who prepared a useful document for the Edinburgh 2010 World Missionary Conference in relation to theological educators:

- a. they should strengthen the denominational identity of future pastors and church workers, so that graduates will have a very clear understanding of the church to which

---

26 For an enlightening analysis of the uneasy relationship between Pentecostalism and Fundamentalism, see Gerald T. Sheppard, “Pentecostalism and the Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism: The Anatomy of an Uneasy Relationship,” *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 6, no. 2 (1984): 5–34.

27 Henry I. Lederle, “Pentecostals and Ecumenical Theological Education,” *Ministerial Formation* 80 (January 1998): 46.

28 Markham, “Theological Education,” 160–62.

- they belong (*theological education as denominational initiation*);
- b. they should introduce students to the wider horizons of the worldwide church so that they will understand that they also belong to the ecumenical fellowship of churches (*theological education as discovery of catholicity*);
- c. they should prepare candidates to engage models of church unity, to reflect theologically on ‘unity in diversity’ and to ask how the relation between local or denominational identity and the ecumenical worldwide fellowship can be lived out (*theological education as enabling for ecumenical learning*).<sup>29</sup>

As mentioned above, Pentecostal theological training by and large takes place in four different environments.<sup>30</sup> Both church-based Bible schools and biblical/theological colleges have rendered an invaluable service to the global Pentecostal movement. Indeed, one can safely say that without this network of grassroots-level training that owes its beginning to the end of the nineteenth century Holiness and other Evangelical movements’ example, the establishment of Pentecostal churches all around the world might not have been possible. Even today these schools play a critical role in ministerial training, as is the case, for example, in most Latin American Pentecostal movements. The mode of rationality in those settings is markedly different from that of higher education proper. Their frame of reference is practical, short-term training of workers rather than academic education based on research and new knowledge.

In this essay, my focus has been on the academic section of Pentecostal theological education as conducted in theological seminaries and theological colleges with graduate departments; as mentioned, there is also emerging a new breed of Pentecostal theological training, that located in “secular” university faculties.

Seeking a proper balance between the epistemologies of “Athens” and “Berlin” and consequently between the ethos of passing on tradition and critical scrutiny thereof, the important question regarding the relation of the church and academia emerges (“church” here stands for all levels of ecclesiastical life from local churches to global networks of national movements). Unlike university-based theology faculties – unless directly related to the given church as still in many Roman Catholic settings – that, in the name of the academic freedom, resist any kind of supervision from the church, Pentecostal theological institutions better nurture a constructive, mutual relation to the church. As discussed above, this kind of relationship is not without its challenges that have to do with two different rationalities and intellectual climates. The above-mentioned Edinburgh 2010 document summarizes in a most helpful way some of the key principles in this regard under the title “Theological education and the church – a relationship of

---

29 “Challenges and Opportunities in Theological Education in the 21st Century: Pointers for a New International Debate on Theological Education,” Short version, Edinburgh 2010 – International study group on theological education, World Study Report 2009, p. 8, <http://www.oikoumene.org/gr/resources/documents.html> (accessed 7/13/2010).

30 In addition, there are locations that are difficult to classify such as the *Folkhögskola* (“Folk High School”) institutions in Nordic countries. which play an important role, for example, in Sweden and in Finland.

service, ownership, and critical distance.” The document takes as its starting point the overarching principle of closeness and distance, which helps the church to be the church, and academia be academia, yet in a way that makes the relationship mutually conditioning:

- a. There is no fundamental contradiction between the principles of academic learning or intellectual discipline on one hand and a church-related faith commitment on the other, although at times there may be tension between the two. It is the task of theological education to strengthen the commitment to Christian faith and to develop a proper understanding and practice of it, which may include liberating faith from narrow-minded or uninformed concepts and/or practices.
- b. Theological education has a critical and liberating function in relation to the existing church; with reference to both Biblical and Christian tradition, theological education can remind Christian communities of their proper tasks and key mandates.
- c. The church has a critical and alerting function over against theological education and the forms of cultural captivity and blindedness theological education can find itself in due to its particular environment and internal value systems. Serious complaints are being heard that the theological academy in the West has lost its world-wide, ecumenical perspective and its missionary impact, and that it is not sufficiently cognizant of emerging shifts in World Christianity today.
- d. Theological education therefore needs regular contact with the existing realities of church life, involvement and close touch with the challenges of mission, ministry and life witness of churches today, but it also needs critical distance and a certain degree of autonomy from the daily pressures of church work and from the direct governing processes and power interests of church institutions.<sup>31</sup>

### Last Words: “An Unfinished Agenda”

Following the title of the late missionary-bishop Lesslie Newbigin’s autobiography, *An Unfinished Agenda*, suffice it to say that the continuing work towards a more coherent and comprehensive theology of Pentecostal theological education is a task for the worldwide Pentecostal movement.

That said, I would like to come back to the question I raised in the beginning of the essay, namely, is bigger always better? Jon Ruthven formulates this question in a helpful way: “Could it be that the extreme reluctance of Pentecostal leadership to bow to pressures for the establishment of theological seminaries has merit? Instead of dismissing them as anti-intellectual, perhaps we might pause to consider if these leaders were onto something.”<sup>32</sup> Professor Ruthven himself teaches in a seminary/divinity school setting; this surprising question is thus not meant to dismiss or even downplay the importance of highest-level theological training for Pentecostals. The way

---

31 “Challenges and Opportunities in Theological Education,” 6.

32 Ruthven, “Pentecostal Seminaries,” n.p.

I take it is that in the midst of many and variegated efforts to update the level of theological education among Pentecostals, it would only be counterproductive to be so carried over by this effort as to lose the bigger perspective. As a bumper put it succinctly: “The main thing is to keep the main thing the main thing.” The key is to work towards a form and content of theological education that bears the marks of an authentic Pentecostal spirituality and identity.

Ultimately, “theological education is part of the holistic mission of the Christian church,” says the World Council of Churches’ Oslo (1996) statement to which Pentecostals can only say, “Amen and Amen.”

There is consensus among us on the holistic character of theological education and ministerial formation, which is grounded in worship, and combines and inter-relates spirituality, academic excellence, mission and evangelism, justice and peace, pastoral sensitivity and competence, and the formation of character. For it brings together education of:

the ear to hear God’s word and the cry of God’s people;

the heart to heed and respond to the suffering;

the tongue to speak to both the weary and the arrogant;

the hands to work with the lowly;

the mind to reflect on the good news of the gospel;

the will to respond to God’s call;

the spirit to wait on God in prayer, to struggle and wrestle with God, to be silent  
in

penitence and humility and to intercede for the church and the world;

the body to be the temple of the Holy Spirit.<sup>33</sup>

---

33 Cited in “Challenges and Opportunities in Theological Education,” 5.

## What Meaneth This? Edinburgh, Stone Church, and Doctors of the Church!\*

*Byron Klaus*

Today we celebrate the largest group of doctoral candidates in the history of AGTS. The location we are celebrating in is the William Seymour Chapel. Even with the sensitivity to the Spirit that Brother Seymour demonstrated throughout his life and in his leadership at Azusa Street, I'd venture a scene like this was not on his radar screen. This largest of doctoral classes also occurs during our Assemblies of God Centennial celebration. Centennials are once in a lifetime experiences for most of us. They are events that celebrate the past with great exuberance, while simultaneously snapping our heads around and asking us abruptly, "So what now? What about the next century? How will you be stewards of this next gift of time?"

I would like to take some cues from a recent Centennial that recognized the historic World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh, Scotland that occurred in the summer of 1910. Scholars of twentieth century Protestant missions have almost uniformly suggested that the delegates to this great gathering of mission leaders misread the signs of the future of Christianity. Respected voices, like that of mission historian Andrew Walls, observe that during the subsequent 100 years, between 1910 and 2010, one by one all of their assumptions about how evangelization of the world would be impacted and, in effect, "crumble away." Christianity was indeed transformed during the twentieth century, but not in the ways nor through the mechanisms anyone might have imagined. Another respected historian, Brian Stanley, suggests that this transformation of Christianity during the twentieth century was most clearly brought about by those **not** present in the hallowed halls in Edinburgh. Rather, Stanley argues, it was a "miscellany of indigenous pastors, prophets, catechists and evangelists, men and women who professed instead to rely on the simple transforming power of the Spirit and Word.

During the time of the Edinburgh Centennial celebration (several years ago), Tufts University professor, Heather Curtis, published some stunning research about a little known Pentecostal conference that occurred just previous to Edinburgh in May 1910 at Stone Church in Chicago. She juxtaposed the triumphalist celebration at Edinburgh with the meeting in Chicago that advertised itself as a "Glorious Celebration" where the only sure thing was the definite date we

---

\* The following represents the reflection I offered to the largest group of doctoral candidates (30) in the history of the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary (AGTS). This doctoral celebration occurred during the activities related to the 41st commencement held May 1-3, 2014. This event was a testimony to the reliance on the Holy Spirit that need not shun sturdy research, in the service of the continuing redemptive mission of the Jesus Christ.

have fixed upon as the opening day. The uniform voice at Edinburgh was one of boundless optimism and unsullied confidence in the ideological and financial power of western Christendom. The voices at Chicago suggested a sharply contrasting perspective. William Piper, the pastor of Stone Church, contended that the Baptism of the Spirit was not only drawing together believers of many nations, but uniting Christians across doctrinal and class lines. He said that the Pentecostal sweep of the earth was God reaching down into every denomination and baptizing His disciples! “What else,” queried Piper, “could break down 'bigots' than the fact that God is bigger than our denominational differences? There is little or no room for one set of people to exalt themselves over another.” That message, so powerfully declared by William Piper, was actually voiced at Edinburgh conference several months later by British missionary Alice Luce, who would, shortly, have such a profound influence on early Assemblies of God evangelism and church planting strategy in the U.S. Luce actually testified to the Edinburgh conference of her experiences in the Pentecostal revival in India at the Mukti Mission. She told of how she had seen the poor and illiterate transformed through the love of Jesus and the power of Spirit. In response to Edinburgh’s meticulous analysis of mission efforts to date and strategies for the future, Luce declared the one all-important need was a mighty outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the Christian Church in every land.<sup>1</sup>

One can easily set up straw men and women for rhetorical purposes during Centennial celebration events. The juxtaposing of Edinburgh and Stone Church provides plenty of preaching material to launch a whole sermon series geared to the “Pentecostal rooting section.” However, I do not want this moment to be the opportunity for pompous positioning of the fact we’ve come a long way in 100 years from the unplanned, but spiritual meetings at Stone Church or Hot Springs to this moment: where we are now Pentecostals in medieval finery that somehow demonstrates our arrival at the throne of acceptance, like so many of the older traditions in the Christian family. I think we need to take another pathway.



I want you to consider an image: Look at it closely.

This is the *LIFE Magazine* cover dated April 21, 1941. This issue featured a symbol of U.S. military might: the U.S. cavalry. So what is wrong with this picture? How is it that a magazine would feature the U.S. cavalry as the paragon of U.S. military prowess? This issue of *LIFE Magazine* was

- 1 Heather Curtis’ research has appeared in at least three forms: (1) An address to the Institute for the Study of Evangelicals entitled, “Baptism in the Holy Ghost Should Make Us World-wide: Pentecostal Missions and the Changing Character of Global Christianity,” *International Journal of Pentecostal Missiology* 2 (2014); (2) “Pentecostal Missions and the Changing Character of Global Christianity,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 36, no. 3 (July 2012); (3) “Pentecostal Missions and the Changing Character of Global Christianity,” *Heritage Magazine* (2013).

published eight months before Pearl Harbor and the war had already raged in Europe for nearly two years. The Pacific Rim had also seen the prowess of the Japanese army in the brutal conquest of parts of China. “Irony” would be one word to describe the photo, maybe “naïve” or maybe even “clueless.”

This photo certainly reminds us that we all have blind spots. At milestones in our lives, such as the achievement of a doctoral degree, as part of the largest doctoral class in the history of AGTS in this Centennial year, we must celebrate the achievement of the moment while asking the consummate Pentecostal question:

### “What Meaneth This?”

Should the Lord delay His return: Will the folks evaluating this event fifty or 100 years from now look at us and compare us to Edinburgh or Stone Church, Chicago? Or, is that too shallow a comparison? Does such a comparison actually miss a proverbial Hegelian moment where two streams of thoughts flow together and the resulting convergence yields a synthesis stronger than either?



*Knowledge on Fire* is an image that reflects part of the AGTS identity. It is the belief that passionate hearts and strong minds belong together. While history teaches us that passionate hearts can be shallow and strong minds can certainly be obtuse, I want to suggest a way in which the second century of Pentecostalism can forge a powerful and substantive future.



Thirteen years ago, in this chapel, we held the first doctoral symposium as a way of recognizing the first ever doctoral degrees granted by a Pentecostal seminary here in the U.S. I suggested that such an occasion signaled a new possibility in our tradition that championed *educational thoroughness*. Such a dawning reality was made possible because we were champions of *Knowledge on Fire*. The first doctoral degrees (at that time) were a visible demonstration of what *Knowledge on Fire* meant. Strong minds meeting passionate hearts yielded thoroughness in building the foundations that could propel us into the second century equipped to meet its daunting challenges. I also observed that Brother Seymour had pioneered such a legacy of thoroughness in some observations he made that offered wisdom from his attempts 100 years ago to handle the spiritual thrill seekers of his day who were in no way committed to thoroughness in anything. Seymour observed: “We are



measuring everything by the Word; every experience must measure up with the Bible. Some say we are going too far, but if we have lived too close to the Word, we will settle that with the Lord when we meet him in the air.”



I would add another image today to the image of thoroughness—the picture of a Doctor of the Church. This is not a new idea; it was something I have reshaped for my own purposes from the writings of my own doctoral advisor, the late Ray S. Anderson at Fuller Seminary, who shaped his thoughts from a concept that has been around for a long time.

A Doctor of the Church: That lofty designation carries an imagery of preeminent learning and the proclamation of the Gospel clearly and openly in the public marketplace. For example, two of the first four people ever called “Doctor of the Church” were Ambrose of Milan, the great

preacher apologist/evangelist whose most famous convert was the rogue scholar and Doctor of the Church, Augustine. All those historically named as doctors of the Church exemplified knowledge and inspiration, certainly the root of our commitment to *Knowledge on Fire*. Ray Anderson further developed this concept by painting the picture of leaders in the Church who saw themselves as more than motivators of people, a pastor to the broken, or even the CEO of a corporation, but a public voice calling God’s people to consider that God’s Kingdom rule was pervasive in every nook and cranny of created order.



This imagery, that I propose you consider today, is the picture of a public figure who challenges people to consider the world in reference to God. In the current cacophony of attempts to narrate the world, a “Doctor of the Church” offers a picture of the world where these public figures actually point people to clear and not so clear ways that Jesus is truly Lord of all created order. Doctors of the Church speak for God in public places with Spirit-empowered words and discerning images that frame a world that actually

acknowledges there is more to this life than the eye can see.

We want to honor you as a Doctor of the Church. We also want to do so in the context of this Centennial year. This event may occur annually, but it will never quite be like 2014.

You stand on the dawn of a second century of the Assemblies of God. Your name is going to be

called and you will step to a place where Rev. David Flower, whose family is notable in the first Pentecostal century, will give you a medallion. As you receive that medallion from the hands of Brother Flower, you will be literally touching the first century of the Pentecostal tradition. You will be receiving a symbolic and real expression of the first century of Pentecost. As he places the medallion around your neck, you will be reminded that you will always carry a piece of this past, not to idolize nor to replicate, but as a reminder that you are rooted in the transforming power of Pentecost with its guarantee that, by the power of the Spirit, Jesus is still doing today exactly what He was doing 2000 years ago. Later you will receive a miniature of the bronze “Divine Servant” sculpture that sits in the Great Hall. Allow this to be a reminder to you that you are a steward of the second century of Pentecost and your witness will be to the legacy of thoroughness as a Pentecostal doctor of the church with “Knowledge on Fire” as an image and commitment seared into your very being!

### Doctoral Covenant (A Public Commitment by the Doctoral Candidates)



Over the last century, the Lord of the Harvest has demonstrated grace to ordinary people who were committed to extraordinary vision empowered by the Spirit. In this time of centennial reflection and commencement activities, as servant-leaders and Doctors of the Church, will you take the medallion in your left hand, and raise your right hand, and pledge this covenant?

- Will you re-commit yourself today to the Kingdom call God has placed on your life?
- Will you use your scholarship in service to the Church to better equip God’s people for ministry?
- Will you yield yourself to a new infusion of the Holy Spirit?
- Will you pledge this prayer?

Let me meet the cynic with wisdom to speak with clarity and persuasion

Let me lift the marginalized with compassion, to act with justice and mercy

Let me welcome the broken with healing that points them to wholeness

Let me seek the lost with the Gospel of salvation so they may experience the power of the Cross.

Following a century-long tradition of **global impact**, I pledge my life to “the greatest evangelism effort the world has ever know.”

I pledge to respond to real-world challenges with **biblical answers**.

I pledge to yield my leadership to **Spirit-empowered ministry**.

Father, in anticipation of your soon return, I pledge to be a servant-leader, who models *knowledge on fire*, as a Spirit-empowered Doctor of the Church.

## BOOK REVIEW

Harold D. Hunter and Neil Ormerod, eds., *The Many Faces of Global Pentecostalism*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2013. x + 291 pp. \$16.95. Paperback. ISBN: 9781935931393.

*Todd M. Johnson*

*Many Faces* is the product of the Consultation on Global Pentecostalism held in June 2012 at the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies in Oxford, England. The gathering was convened at the request of the relatively new global Pentecostal network Empowered 21, which provided funding and considered the conference part of the lead-up to its own international conference planned for May 2015 in Jerusalem. The older Pentecostal World Fellowship (1947) is also mentioned in the introduction. Both have struggled with the increasing diversity of Pentecostalism documented in these pages.

In the preface and the introduction, the editors characterize Pentecostalism as neither Protestant nor Western. While both of these ideas can be contested, the papers support this premise. Section I, entitled “Global Voices from Oxford”, presents the addresses of three invited scholars who were resident in Oxford. The first chapter is a fine essay by Orthodox Metropolitan Kallistos Ware setting out key differences between Catholics and Orthodox. In this sense, Pentecostals are the younger brother looking on as the two oldest try to work out a truce. In the second chapter, Baptist theologian Paul S. Fiddes takes a more direct approach, outlining how unity can be achieved by all parties, including Pentecostals, if they accept a bottom-up approach that recognizes the *koinonia* and communion of all the churches. In this case, Pentecostals represent part of the legitimate diversity of the global Church. In Chapter 3, Pentecostal theologian Wonsuk Ma locates Pentecostals in the context of Christian history and global Christianity. He concludes that Pentecostals will play a central role in the evangelization of the world.

Section II, “The Global South”, includes eight essays from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Historian Connie Au, from Hong Kong, describes the suffering of Pentecostals in China (especially in house churches) in the context of recent Chinese history. Palestinian Yohanna Katanacho offers a sweeping history of the Church of the Arabs. Chilean theologian Elizabeth Salazar-Sanzana outlines the challenges Pentecostals face in Latin America, particularly the rise of “mercantilist” neo-Pentecostal movements. Puerto Rican professor Agustina Luvis-Núñez tells

how Caribbean Pentecostals are contextualizing their theology and experience in their post-colonial reality. Ghanaian theologian J. Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu traces the origins of African Pentecostalism in primal religions with an emphasis on experience of the supernatural and its transformative influence on the natural order. Philippe Ouédraogo, a pastor from Burkina Faso, recounts the history of Pentecostalism in French-speaking West Africa. Church of God scholar Clifton R. Clarke surveys the impact of migration on Pentecostalism, particularly African churches in Britain. Finally, Russian theologian Olga Zaprometova recounts the history of Pentecostalism in Russia, contrasting Eastern and Western views of reality.

Section III, “The Global North”, contains four essays presenting a variety of perspectives on Pentecostalism in Europe, North America, and Australia. Latino historian Daniel Ramirez documents how Latino Pentecostals in the Global North challenge its disembodied theological stance with a deeply embedded incarnational presence among the poor. Australian historian Mark Hutchinson tells how Pentecostals have reinvented themselves in post-Christian Australia. British theologian David Hilborn suggests that there are theological grounds for enhanced ecumenical dialogue between Anglicans and Pentecostals. Canadian professor and pastor Pamela Holmes highlights the ambiguous role of women in Canadian Pentecostalism.

One of the central questions scholars are asking is “What is Global Pentecostalism?” The editors state in the preface/introduction “a definition of Pentecostalism is not possible.” Their book both contradicts and affirms this premise. It contradicts it by offering clear characteristics and commonalities shared by Pentecostals around the world. It affirms it by the sheer variety of forms of Pentecostalism presented in the essays. As such, *Many Faces* joins an emerging literature documenting Pentecostalism around the world. The book is global in coverage and includes many different varieties of Pentecostalism. One in four Christians can be said to be part of this wider movement, including three major types: Classical Pentecostals (Assemblies of God, Church of God, etc.), Charismatics (Catholic, Lutheran, etc.), and Independent Charismatics (African Independents, Chinese house churches, the Vineyard, etc.). In trying to cover “Global Pentecostalism”, the main weakness of the volume is the relative absence of the second type, especially Catholic Charismatics, who make up nearly a third of all “Pentecostals” globally. On the other hand, *Many Faces* does better with the third type, Independent Charismatics (who make up 44% of all Pentecostals), who appear in the articles on China and Africa. The volume shows that the Pentecostal World Fellowship and the newer Empowered 21 continue to mature in the breadth of who is considered “Pentecostal”. For example, Oneness Pentecostals at one time were not welcome, but significant bridges have been built there—as the inclusion of the excellent article by David Ramirez shows.

Yet several essays are not about Pentecostalism at all. In this way, the book moves into the wider world of global Christianity, examining the role of the Holy Spirit in the split between Catholics and Orthodox (Kallistos Ware’s essay) and the (mainly Orthodox) Church of the Arabs (Yohanna Katanacho’s essay). One missing element in both of these essays, however, is what the Orthodox think about the role of the Holy Spirit in Pentecostal theology.

*Many Faces* offers an engaging and wide-ranging set of essays that contribute significantly to the ongoing global conversation on the role of Pentecostalism in global Christianity. This book will be useful to theological educators, especially as an introduction to global Pentecostalism. While no single book has yet achieved comprehensive coverage of this multi-faceted phenomenon, *Many Faces* joins other multi-authored works like *Spirit and Power*, edited by Donald Miller, Kimon Sargeant, and Richard Flory (Oxford University Press, 2014), as well as single-author works such as Allan Anderson's *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* (Cambridge University Press, 2004) to help the reader navigate the rough waters of this dynamic global movement.

