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Chapter I Introduction

A. The issue and its problems

The surge of Pentecostalism and Charismatic movements\(^1\) proposes that their spirituality may be the greatest feasible form of Christianity for a postmodern, post-Western and post-colonial world (Yong 2011: 2-10). The Charismatic movement has developed and became the fastest growing religious movement that affected across the barrier of Christian denominations\(^2\) (Synan 2011: 7). Christianity was reshaped across the globe by more than five hundred million advocates of this movement (Kärkkäinen 2010: 223). According to Steven (2009: 22-25) Charismatic communities express an abundantly varied perception of the presence of the Spirit, grounded both in the practice of devotion and in the academic experiment. The Charismatic movement is not a political surge, nor an ideological pursuit.

\(^1\) Cartledge (2010: 27) says academic Pentecostal-Charismatic theology is a comparatively adolescent division of theology. It appeared in the 1970s, with the beginning of the Society of Pentecostal Studies and the publication of its Journal of Pentecostal Theology.

\(^2\) Balmer (2004: 87-89) notes that the Episcopalian Dennis Bennett is occasionally mentioned as one of the charismatic movement’s leading figures in America. This movement influenced hundreds of thousands of Anglicans globally and similarly initiated a renewal movement within the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches. In Britain, Colin Urquhart, David Watson and others were in the precursors of comparable expansions. There are Charismatic Renewal theologians such as Wayne Grudem in evangelical the Reformed tradition, Kevin Ranaghan in Roman Catholic churches, J. Rodman Williams in Presbyterian denomination, and Paul Fiddes in Baptist denominations. Rev, Ray Muller and Bill Subritzky took a leading role in developing Charismatic movement leaders in the Massey conference, New Zealand. Larry Christenson, a Lutheran theologian of San Pedro, California interpreted the charismatic Renewals for Lutherans. Charismatic Lutheran worshipers became particularly dominant in the assembly called “Hosanna” in Lakeville, Minnesota. Fr. David Buss and Fr. Boris Zabrodsky of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in North America, founder of the Service Committee for Orthodox Spiritual Renewal were noticeable frontrunners of the charismatic renewal in Orthodox churches. The Calvinists or Reformed traditions were conventionally acknowledged in Presbyterian churches in which there are divergent opinions concerning the continuance or termination of the charismata of the Spirit. Reformed charismatics distance themselves from renewal activities with trends which might be apparent as emotional, such as the Toronto Blessing and Lakeland Revival. Conspicuous Reformed charismatic groups are the Sovereign Grace Ministries in America, the New Frontiers churches and the Charismatic movements led by Terry Virgo in the United Kingdom. Barrett (2009: 25-32) says that the Charismatic Renewal movements spread predominantly among Roman Catholic churches in the Hispanic Filipino and Korean communities of the United States. In the Philippines and in Latin America roaming clerics and laity allied with the movement, frequently visit parishes and chant in the charismatic masses. It is alleged to be the principal distinctive movement, approximately 120 million members, within global Charismatic Catholicism, along with Conventional Catholicism. Patrick (1999[2008]: 18) says a current alternative to the Seventh-day Adventists is charismatic. They are related with those advocate sustaining “progressive” Adventist dogmata.
Cox named it ‘the experience of God’ (Raschke 2004: 210). The dynamic influence of the Charismatic movement is in line with the contemporary post-modern vibrant worldview (Kärkkäinen 2009:167). The work of the Spirit is an essential and vital theological topic in the Christian faith and its existence (Steven 2009: 59). The Charismatic movements have principally become a worldwide movement with a tremendous impact, whether it is complementary or critically (Badcock 2009: 147). More important, however, is that it occurred a crucial historical juncture, one with dire implications not only for them but for Christianity as well, insofar as they represent Christianity to the world.

Smith (2010: 25) views the philosophical implication of the Charismatic worldview in the areas of ontology, epistemology, aesthetics, language, science, and philosophy of religion. Smith (2010: 124) points out how the implicit perception of Charismatic spirituality contributes to current dialogues in Christian beliefs. The charismatic spirituality is significant not only for ‘religious’ instruction, but for an accurate academic quest because applications within the charismatic experiences are relevant to the world (Smith 2010: 27).

The charismatic phenomena are principally transported by ‘mysterious experiences’ of the anointing with the Spirit. These experiences can be characterized by ‘transcendence and intentionality’, while they are internal but constantly connect to two essentials: the human being and the world(s) (Veldsman 2010: 179). The question is how to discern, define, and relate these charismatic experiences to the communities and the world. Harvey Cox (1996: 77-99) describes the global phenomenon of Charismatic Movements as a configuration of three dimensions of religiousness: ecstatic speech, (glossolalia), mystical piety (trance, visions, dreams, prophecy, dancing, healing, and other kinds of religious experiences), and millennial fervour (eschatological preparedness). According to these movements, the anointing with Christ and with the Spirit was the beginning of the mission of God’s chosen people (Lk 4: 18-19). That same anointing had been poured upon his followers for the mission for which Jesus the Anointed One commissioned them. The present days can be characterized as the era of the Spirit, signified by the explosive manifestations of the Spirit,

3 Yong (2011: 288) says that the charismatic thoughts regarding the dynamic presence and actions of the Spirit of God and the pluralistic cosmology of the spirits are broadly discussed in science as well as in religion.
yet, in spite of the fact that the outpouring of the Spirit was the promise of God the Father, it has many unsolved issues.

This research will investigate and clarify some unsettled issues in the Charismatic movements. The question is whether Joel’s promise that God will pour his spirit upon all flesh in the last days, means that it was fulfilled by the anointing with the Spirit, whether the anointing with the Spirit is the same as the baptism by the Spirit (Baumert 2004: 147-179); whether the anointing with the Spirit is transferable, experiential and acceptable, distributable and indispensable at all times for all believers, as the Charismatics say, or is every believer in Christ anointed with the Spirit for life, without laying on of hands, transmission, experience or distribution, or is it not for all the believers, but only for the chosen and called, and for specific purposes and missions. Is there any difference between the indwelling of the Spirit in believers and the anointing of believers by the Spirit? What is the purpose of the anointing with the Spirit? Was it just a symbol of inauguration of the three offices of the messianic mission in the Scriptures, or is it the fulfilment of the kingdom of God to inhabit the believers through the anointing with the Spirit? Can the anointing with the Spirit bring the manifestations of the Spirit of 1 Cor 12: 8-11, or can the charismata of the Spirit be manifested without the anointing with the Spirit? What is the relationship between the anointing with the Spirit and the word of God? Is the doctrine of the Spirit to be expounded in the Trinitarian concept? Does the anointing with the Spirit work to bless, heal and recover, not only the believers in Christ, but also through people who do not believe in Christ?

The theological enquiries numerated above are thoroughly allied with the identical beliefs, activities, and objectives of our contemporary days, whether they are exposed to be deliberately erroneous or negligently inaccurated, whether they are mechanically orchestrated and pursued in the form of counterfeits and with egotistical intentions. These questions will be analysed for their communal dependability as well as for their subjective credibility.

---

4 A recent charismatic scholar, Baumert (2004: 149ff) labours to describe differences between the ideas about charisma, which derived from the anointing with the Spirit, or from the baptism with the Spirit, particularly as they are used at present.
The objective of the charismatic thoughts is to believe more firmly in divine action and miracles on the historical and theological landscape (Yong 2011:112). Most prominently, miracles are performed through faith, and it provides momentous motivations for individual lives. (Yong 2011: 117). However, one of the main aspects of the ministry of the Spirit, his holistic redemptive ministry, does not receive due attention in the Charismatic movements with their emphasis on subjective, experiential, phenomenal, human-centred, and materialistic experiences. Although the ministry of the Spirit should be actualized in a sanctified life, they show a lack of responsibility for the contemporary society.

Charismatic believes that the anointing with the Spirit indicates the presence of God. If it is the presence of God, the esteemed lives of the believers should be manifested through sturdy witnesses and irresistible sanctification in their societies? One’s conviction of God’s justification through Jesus the Anointed One affects one’s personal life and that of the society.

B. Scope of the research

The Charismatic renewal movements are more evocative than rational or analytical. The Charismatic Renewals were peculiar to their social and historical settings, and distinct from their contemporary intellectual rationality. The Charismatic Renewal is undoubtedly a phenomenon with origins in the Charismatic traditions, as well as a phenomenon with divergent indigenous and worldwide manifestations. From their autochthonous perspective, Charismatics have intermittently repelled labeling the Renewal as a movement. They have frequently adopted the conception that theirs is a movement “of the Spirit” or what is demonstrating is “the Spirit himself”. To them the Renewal is not at all in the category of a sociological occurrence, but throughout a transcendent one.

However, from the viewpoint of the anthropological principle, the typical prototype for acknowledging sociological and religious movements, poses three categories of problems: (i) they are rather isolated bodies than demonstrations that are diagnostic of the societies in which they are germinated; (ii) a comprehensive interpretation of the causes and sociological forces behind these movements; and (iii) the hypothesis to define their cohorts as insecure in
their course of revitalization (Csordas 1997: 3-4).

This thesis sees the Charismatic Renewal as a “movement,” that is noticeable and spreading. But it is difficult to classify the phenomenon, and to distinguish between the believers in these the movements and believers concerned with these movements. It has been perceived as a social and cultural phenomenon, a “movement,” to describe the identity of the movement. But this research has not confined the identity of the ethos of the Charismatic Renewal as a “movement”. It analyzes the characteristics of the movements to clarify it. The emergence of this movement is the consequence of its beliefs, dogmas, and theologies, which identify the movements. Hence it is focused, not to classify the form of the Charismatic Renewal as a “movement”, but to investigate the genuineness of its impetus.

The wide-reaching analysis of the Charismatic Renewal in this research is an indication of the range and multiplicity of the movement. Indeed the phenomenon compromises an infrequent prospect for ethnological examination. This research tries to classify the various socio-religious enquiries related to the development of the movement in diverse national settings and from international perspectives. These scopes describe the systematic extent between fundamental and judicious views of these communities, from the perspective of the covenantal community with God, to discern their misappropriation of the charismata and the unrelenting stimulus for charismatic restoration.

The Charismatic communities show the gap between Charismatics and movements advocating communal involvement, between congregation and clerics, between institutionalized hierarchy and lay movements. Its internal conflicts, dynamic mechanism, and significances will be depicted and analyzed in the contemporary state of their ethos. Empirical and theoretical researches will be implemented to illustrate the manifestations of the Charismatic Renewal in its local and global and socio-cultural settings.

Reformed theology’s assessment of the Charismatic movements is not restricted to Calvin’s assessment that is occasionally seen to be the prototype of Reformed thought. Reformed theology is compared to torrent into which numerous causes stream and from which many
brooks create. There has been a diversity of Reformed scholars figures have been commencing out of from all over the world. Nevertheless, this research provides selected assessment of the anointing with the Spirit of the Charismatic movements by theologians from its early periods, through its developed and formative phases the measurement to determine the anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movements, though, has to be a generalisation of the common belief of the Reformed theologies.

The Reformed theologies hold to the notion of God’s sovereignty and dominion over all creation. They acknowledge the sovereignty of God as described in the Scripture as the word of God, and its implication for strive for God’s creation and in all substantial matters. They have continuously inculcated in believers to steadfastly respond with sincere thought, dialogue and deed to God’s endowments for all substantial issues. Reformed communities have constantly participated in affecting and improving civic societies and cultures in which they are situated. The Reformed recognize that sanctified beings and societies should be the product of the response to God’s calling and the demonstration of the anointing with the Spirit.

Reformed thought stands for “Ecclesia Reformata, semper reformanda,” “(the Reformed church is continuously reforming to be reformed)”. The Reformers of the sixteenth century did not see this idiom to signify that the church is constantly transforming into some innovative tendency of time along with its covenantal theology (Sproul 2007: 141). This maxim is secure with the Reformers’ notion that they were not inventing, but returning to the principles and mandates created by Jesus the Anointed One, practiced by the principal disciples and original churches.

---

5 There are “Four-point Calvinism”, “Hyper-Calvinism”, “Neo-Calvinism”, Evangelical Reformed tradition, “New Calvinism”, “Conservative evangelicalism”, “Post-conservative evangelicalism”, etc.

6 Prominent theologians of the initial Reformed stage were John Calvin, Ulrich Zwingli Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr Vermigli, Heinrich Bullinger, Theodor Beza, and John Knox. Abraham Kuyper, Herman Bavinck, Charles Hodge Benjamin. B. Warfield, Karl Barth, G.C. Berkouwer and Cornelius Van Til, Geerhardus Vos, and Herman Ridderbos were significant in the twentieth century, whereas contemporary Reformed theologians comprise Daniel H. Williams, David F. Wells, Robert Weber, Millard Erickson, R. C. Sproul, and Michael Horton, Thomas Oden, Roger Nicole, and Kevin Vanhoozer, etc.
The Reformers reject the idea that tradition can provide an adequate resolution for the substantial beliefs. However, Reformed theology does not discard the primordial knowledge of the church, but to transmit it with comprehension and loyalty to the word of God, the Scripture. The Reformers maintain that “Scripture” is the norm of faith, and that all supplementary knowledge, including a church’s conventional practices, had to have to abide by this essential truth. Most Reformed theologians would profess that the Scripture is primary and crucial, and their theologies must remain faithful to it, although while there are on-going debates even among the Reformed scholars on “Cessationist versus Continuationist” arguments, both sides agree to Scripture as the absolute standard of all the verifications for the charismata of the Spirit.

This research holds to the Reformed theology as its hermeneutical principle to analyse and evaluate the anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movements. It acknowledges that the canonized revelations are sufficient to discern the aim, purpose as an instruments, and genuineness of the characteristics and theology of the Charismatic movements in relation to the manifestations of charismata by anointing with the Spirit.

C. Purpose and methods

The aim of this research is to identify whether the charismata of the Spirit, demonstrated by the anointing with the Spirit, has been terminated or are working throughout the histories of the Christian church. The Charismatic movements advocate the persistence of the charismata of the Spirit. In the Reformed tradition although many are inclined to the cessationational view, recent among reformed scholars Wayne Grudem and R. B. Gaffin focussed on the prophetic charisma, and many historical, Scriptural, empirical and systematic researches

---

7 Olson (2007:186-191) says conservative reformed thinkers frequently sustain to the theological scheme of Old Princeton School scholar, Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, A.A. Hodge, and Benjamin B. Warfield, and to the collective thoughts between more contemporary conservative evangelical scholars such as F.F. Henry, E. J. Carnell, Wayne Grudem, and Millard Erickson. Post-conservative evangelicalism is to reform and renewal that comprehends “evangelical reformed theology” as progressively enchanted by tradition and inflexible orthodoxy. Their resolution to liberal modification and doctrinal stray among evangelicals is to instruction, indoctrinating esteem for and gratitude of tradition within a superior indebtedness for the exclusive ultimate authority of Scripture (Olson 2007:187).
explored the hermeneutic perspectives of the Charismatic and the Reformed.

Reformed theology revolved to the Scripture as the completed revelation against the continuation of revelation. The assimilation of Charismatic movements to Reformed theology has been unravelled. A prominent reformed theologian, B.B. Warfield says that there is indeed a basic, deep-rooted incompatibility between the Reformed tradition and the Charismatic movements (Elbert 2002: 278). This research will examine whether the charismatic believer’s doctrine of justification through the anointing with the Spirit is in line with that of the Reformed tradition. The former believe that they stand before the God as righteous ones, being transformed in nature (Clifton 2007: 5-8), by the imparted righteousness of Christ, while the Reformed tradition recognizes that the believer stand before God as justified, not by being transformed in nature, but by being sanctified by grace, through faith in the Anointed One (Allen 2010: 127-9).

Both traditions emphasize the role of the Spirit. The Charismatic movements emphasise and magnify the personality and power of the Spirit (Cartledge 2010: 25-7). Likewise, the Reformed tradition has placed great emphasis on the person and work of the Spirit. The Reformed tradition may be short on the experience of the reality, joy, and fullness of the Spirit. The Charismatics may be lacking in an adequate Scriptural understanding of the missio Spiritus.

A question arises as to whether the Reformed churches have been aware of and faithful to this notable theology of the Spirit developed by the Reformers. Unfortunately, the answer has to be largely negative. In the seventeenth century the scholastic orthodoxy on the one hand, and the one-sided pietism on the other dealt crippling blows to the Reformer’s balanced presentation of the work of the Spirit (Dunbar 2009: 171-9). It is also a question whether the Reformed tradition’s extreme criticism of the Charismatic movement’s insistence on experiential and phenomenal manifestations, is a significant problem (Grenz 2005: 67-8).

These problems are closely related to the anointing with the Spirit. The anointing with the Spirit can be identified as the ministry of the Anointed One poured out upon the believers
with manifestations, to redeem God’s chosen ones, and to make them conversant with the work of the Anointed One in the believers. It has a close relationship with the presence of God, and with the expansion and establishment of God’s Kingdom across the earth. To analyse and evaluate the anointing with the Spirit, biblical, historical, theological and hermeneutical methods will be implemented in this research. Its methodologies comprise documentary sources, information examination and verification of the experiential evidences. Its hermeneutical research tries to elucidate the role of the Spirit. It is, however, largely confined to the tasks of exegesis and what may be termed descriptive Scriptural theology.

The anointing with the Spirit functions in two ways, one is instrumental (I Cor 12:1-31) to bring salvation to those who believe, and the other has a soteriological purpose teaching them to recognize the truth, which is residing in the believers (1 Jn 2:20; 27). These two functional ways should be distinguished and practiced according to their own purposes, either as instrumental or purposeful in the substantial settings of the believers. Simultaneously, they should have one shared aim for the soteriological fulfilment in the believers and their communities. Consequently this research will endeavour to clarify whether both the instrumental and the purposeful are employed in the Charismatics movements dedicated to the soteriological achievement of their manifestations of the anointing with the Spirit.

While the doctrine of justification was a crucial doctrine in the Reformer’s era, in the contemporary days it is decisive to understand, analyse and evaluate on the anointing with the Spirit of the Charismatic movement. The theology of every movement determines it ways of life. To relationship between the Charismatic movement’s doctrine of justification and their doctrine of deification will be vital to evaluate that movement, since the anointing with the Spirit originates from the divine work in the human being.

Reformed theology recognizes that these criteria are interrelated and inseparable. Justified believers and societies should live out their eschatological perspectives, identify their imputed righteousness by the Anointed One, and fulfil their assignment in sanctified communities. Hence, to investigate and estimate the anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movements it is necessary to examine their doctrines of justification,
sanctification, deification and eschatology.

This research will investigate how the exegetical work and Scriptural theology about the anointing with the Spirit relate to the broader disciplines of systematic theology and ethics via insights from their historical backgrounds. This will lead from the realm of hermeneutics to that of theological method.

The second chapter will indicate how the key idea of this research, “the anointing with the Spirit”, has been described in Ancient Near Eastern Literature and in Scripture. The biblical foundation of the Reformed tradition about the idea of this research will be investigated. The history of Christian theological reflection on the anointing with the Spirit will be summarized, and how the church’s beliefs around the anointing with the Spirit developed throughout the history of the church. Whether the anointing with the Spirit in the present Charismatic movements is biblical or post-modernistic will be examined, as well as whether the anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movement was implicated in the Reformed tradition.

Whether the Reformed tradition rejected all supernatural phenomena will also be investigated, as well as their concept of the anointing with the Spirit. Sound reformed theology is established on two pillars: truth and spirituality.

The third chapter will highlight tensions between charismatic and reformed perspectives on the theological characteristics of the anointing with the Spirit. Their theological relatedness will be indicated. Crucial to the argument is the nature and character of the Pentecostal-charismatic movement, the importance of their experiences of the Spirit to their spirituality, and their reaction to the world. A detailed empirical investigation will be conducted to test the adequacy of the charismatic categories. Unique characteristics and experiences of prominent contemporary leaders of the charismatic movement will be researched to be compared to Reformed views, whether these two distinctive views can be harmonized with or are incompatible with the Scriptural perspectives.

The fourth chapter will systematically recapitulate and evaluate the researched issues that
remain to be resolved. Four systematic areas will be studied with different hermeneutical methods: an assessment of the biblical and theological pneumatology; soteriology, in which the anointing with the Spirit is to be applied; eschatology that provides the characteristics of the *missio Spiritus* and the extent of the establishment of God’s kingdom in relation to the anointing with the Spirit, and finally ecclesiology that defines responsibilities and commitments of those who are endowed with the *charismata* of the Spirit in the sphere of all contemporary areas.

The first area will assess some hermeneutical issues; the questions of the anointing by the Spirit, discernment of manifestations, and principles to identify the extent of the genuineness and restrictions of the *charismata* in the Charismatic movements which was examined through pneumatological studies on the basis of previous biblical and historical researches.

The second area to be examined is the soteriological extent and boundaries of the anointing with the Spirit. What is the effect of the anointing with the Spirit on the doctrine of justification and on the sanctification of the believers’ lives? How does the emphasis on receiving the anointing with the Spirit in the charismatic movement effect the sanctification of the society and the community? An investigation of the immanent presence and economy of the Trinity will provide a clue to understand the anointing with the Spirit in recent charismatic movements.

The orthodox Reformed theologies also reflect on eschatology as anticipatory and on-going to the consummation (Olson 2007: 195). The eschatological study will identify to what extent God’s kingdom is fulfilled through the anointing with the Spirit in its relation to the doctrine of justification and to the sanctification of the believers according to the Reformed assessments.

The ecclesiological application in the last section of the fourth chapter will define obligations and commitments of those who are gifted with the *charismata* of the Spirit and will propose some comprehensive applications in all contemporary realms of the church movements.
The final chapter will indicate some critiques on the Charismatics movements and their contributions, suggestions, and future perspectives in our communities.

The next chapter is a first step in the research of the traditional aspects of pneumatology to understand the anointing with the Spirit, which is the main subject of this thesis.
Chapter II Traditional aspects of the pneumatology

This chapter examines the key idea of the research, namely “the anointing with the Spirit”, how it has been described. The relevant biblical research will provide the criterion for this research to analyse and evaluate the reformed and charismatic views on the anointing with the Spirit, and how the church’s belief about the anointing with the Spirit developed throughout history. The aim of this chapter is to indicate whether the anointing with the Spirit in the present charismatic movements is biblical or post-modernistic, and whether the anointing with the Spirit in the charismatic movement is implicated in the reformed tradition.

There are sufficient records of the use of oil as remedy in connection with prayers through most of the first millennium of Christianity (Larson-Miller 2005: 7). The second millennium of Christianity, however, transferred the usage of anointing to the final rite before demise, and doubtless in many incidences, after decease. A part of sixteenth-century Western Christianity discarded that ceremony because it recognized the deficiency of its foundation in Scripture and the realities of misuse related to the practice. The remaining part of Western Christianity silently diminished the rituals during the late twentieth century and in many Eastern churches, while sustaining anointing for the sick through the centuries. Initiates encountered a ritual so intricate as to be infrequently practiced (Larson-Miller 2005: 9-20).

The origin and meaning of the anointing with oil as symbols of the anointing with the Spirit and metaphor of the missio Spiritus will be traced in several Ancient Near Eastern texts.

A. The anointing in Ancient Near Eastern literature

1. Introduction

There are two types of ritual anointing that were distinguished in the Ancient Near East: one that functions as purification, in which there is an aspect of release, and one that is concerned

---

8 The gift of oil as a mediator of healing was most wonderfully articulated by the Syriac writings of Aphrahat and Ephrem. Both of them mention the Anointed One as the olive or source of oil.
with intensification and strengthening. Anointment consecrates and liberates maidservants and menservants to denote a change in their legal status as freed from the ruling of their master. Such anointing does markedly not engage any sacral phase (Loberbaum 2011: 21).

The literature of Palestinian Judaism reflects that people anointed with the Spirit are commissioned in order to restore the people of God (Went 2004: 66). The coronation by anointing illustrates a system of divine appointment for an extraordinary mission (Fried 2004: 178). Ancient Near Eastern evidence does not uphold a late progression from the pre-exilic anointing of kings to the postexilic application of the ritual to priests. Such an improvement assumes an improbable seclusion of the practice in a solitary office. Pentateuchal scholarship’s preoccupation with the innovations of the exilic crisis has permitted the comparative neglect of other explanations for the variety of religious practice recorded in the Priestly instruction commonly identified as P and H. ¹⁰

Noth’s (1967: 234)¹¹ work is already several decades old, but his treatment of the anointing of priests has neither been advanced nor challenged directly during the interval. Spiegelberg (1906: 184-5) maintains that officials in ancient Egypt were anointed in connection with a ceremony which took place at their installation in office where the anointing rendered the

---

¹⁰ Fried (2004: 78-9) says that the biblical idea of a professional public cult has long been separated into “Priestly law” (P) and the Holiness Code, with the latter defined as the older collection. Whether this order is correct, or the reverse, both sets of material appear to derive from the same “priestly” institutions that are eventually associated with Jerusalem. In some cases, an argument for postexilic innovation has been bolstered by the apparent absence of independent evidence for a practice in the earlier Near East. Even when new comparisons are discovered, the Bible remains an artefact adrift from its context, but the weight of probability may shift. With a written artefact like the Bible, known only from copies long after composition, historical certainty remains ever elusive, but the conservatism of ancient Near Eastern temple institutions by itself suggests that change is built on a substantial foundation of continuity. Even when the Bible preserves no evidence for many cultic requirements outside the Priestly instruction, these should not be identified as idealistic fictions or novel Second Temple procedure until a First Temple setting is disproved. Of course, the historical origins of many individual religious practices will have to remain hypothetical or unknown unless excavation or datable epigraphic finds provide further data.

¹¹ Noth (1967: 235) considers anointing to be one part of the expanding prominence of priests in postexilic Judean society, in contrast to their relatively minor role in pre-exilic Israel and Judah.
The crucial phrase in Stele Florence 1774 is an epithet applied to the owner of the Stele, Montu-Usir, who is called the *wrh i3wwt m pr hk3*, “the anointer of officials in the house of the ruler.” A similar phrase, using a different verb, occurs in stele Munich 3 and reads *iw nd.tw n.i i3wt*, “an office was conferred on me.” Based on this parallel, Spiegelberg suggested that those passages in which a person was instated in a ceremony for which the verb *nd* was used should be interpreted as meaning “anointed into office.” Although Spiegelberg’s explanation of *nd* as meaning “to anoint into office” was rejected decades ago, his contention that Egyptian officials were inducted into office by means of anointing is still accepted. Even though Chavalas (2007: 27-31) denied the main thrust of Spiegelberg’s argument, he agreed that the text of the Florence stele was evidence that “anointing ... accompanied the conferring of rank upon officials.”

De Vaux (1961:103-5), in a study of the significance of the anointing of the Hebrew kings, noted that the Israelites probably derived this practice from the Canaanites, who had previously been introduced to it by the Egyptians. He maintained that the Egyptian rulers installed their vassals in Syria-Palestine in the same manner in which they invested their officials in Egypt, i.e., through an anointing. In another case of an ancient Egypt, the act of anointing the head of a girl was the original pledge of troth, analogous to the modern ceremony of wearing an engagement ring (Chavalas 2007: 190). This ceremony signifies mutual loyalty, purification, and love between bride and bridegroom.

An indication of how firmly ingrained the notion has become that Egyptian officials were “anointed into office” can be found in Dion (1988: 334) with an analysis of appointment ceremonies in Egypt and the ancient Near East. The number of scholars who have expressed this viewpoint outnumbers the items of evidence on which this opinion is based. There are three pieces of evidence frequently cited in support of the contention that officials were

---

12 It is based on a passage in the Middle Kingdom Stele Florence 1774.
13 Several other scholars have also stated that officials were anointed at their installation into office. Bonnet (2006: 131) stated that this anointing took place in one of two possible ways: either the functionary was anointed by the king or his representative; or the official had to content himself with receiving a jar of ointment as a ‘badge of office’. The significance of this action was explained in that “the oil, coming from the horus-king, conveyed to the anointed the power to act in his name and as his representative.”
14 Chavalas (2007: 191) notes this derivation: “the Hebrew ritual of anointing kings may possibly be traced back to a ... Egyptian source”.
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anointed as part of a ceremony inducting them into office. These are the Florence Stele 1774, a scene from TT 90, and a passage from the Demotic Papyrus Rylands 9. Each of these sources will be analysed below.

2. Literature evidences

2.1. Nebamun’s article

A scene from TT 90 (Davies 1923:34-35), belonging to Nebamun, an official who served under Kings Thutmosis IV and Amenhotep III, was cited by Bonnet, Cothenet, Pardey, and Helck as evidence for the contention that a container of oil could be given to an official at his induction as a “badge of office” (Tompson 1994:17). However, as pointed out by Kutsch (1964: 35), this scene does not show Nebamun receiving a container of oil. He is shown as receiving the staff of office and a tube which Davies believed contained the “warrant of office.” This container is represented in the shape of a palm column, which Davies noted was a common form for eye make-up (kohl) containers.\footnote{Although the object in question may resemble a shape commonly found in kohl containers, it should not be identified as such. Such containers, common in New Kingdom graves were generally quite small.} There is nothing in the accompanying text which would suggest that the tube was a container for oil (Lichtheim 2006: 8). The only indication that oil is present in this scene is found in the Davies description. He remarks: “A second episode shows Nebamun in the act of receiving the sign and warrant of his change of office. Divested of his ornaments, but still in civilian dress, as the long skirt and the stains of ointment on the vest suggest . . .” (Davies 1923: 34). There is no indication how or in what context these stains were received (Lichtheim 2006: 11). There is nothing to indicate that the stains should be interpreted as resulting from an anointing as part of the investiture ceremony (Tompson 1994:17). In fact, since Nebamun is depicted as receiving the “gazelle-standard of the police of western Thebes” and possibly the “warrant of his office,” it would appear that these were the significant signs of his induction (Gaballa 1976: 63).

2.2. Florence tablet

The issue surrounding the Florence Stele 1774 is what is meant by the title \textit{wrh i3wwt m pr}
hk3, “the anointer of officials in the house of the ruler.” The text gives no indication of the circumstances in which these anointings were performed. There is nothing that requires the interpretation that such anointings occurred at induction ceremonies (Thompson 1994: 15).

2.3. Ptolemaic documents

Two words in the preceding passage deserve further comment. In his translation, and throughout P. Rylands IX 8/15-1826, Griffith (1967: 83) chose “anoint” as the translation equivalent of thb. This word first occurs in the medical texts, where it is used to describe treating an object, in the grammatical role of patient, with a liquid, introduced by the preposition m (Deines & Westendorf1961: 960). There are also several instances, in which thb is used to describe the condition of a person. During the Ptolemaic period, thb could be used in parallel with other terms for anointing. In Edfu, Mammisi40 159/2-4, we are told that Iht-wrt was “anointed (wrh) with myrrh (and) soaked (thb) with sgn-ointment.” By the time of the Ptolemaic period, thb could be used in parallel constructions with one of the main Egyptian words for “anoint,” wrh.

The use of thb to refer to priestly washings also occurred in the Ramesside period (Tompson 1994: 20) and in the Canopus decree, thb is rendered in the Greek portion of the text as hagneion, “purifications” (Thissen1977: 70). There is no apparent justification for translating thb in this instance as “anoint,” since there is no indication that oil was involved in this process. From the above, it would seem likely that the passage describes the application of oil scented by lily petals to Petiese. The question, however, is whether this process should be described as “anointing.” As noted above, the verb thb could refer to the complete covering of an object with a liquid or the sprinkling of liquid. Since English “anoint” is marked in that it is used only in connection with oils, while thb could be used with any liquid, “anoint” is a poor translation. The anointing therefore cannot be considered as part of an induction ceremony. There is no mention of an induction ceremony, and the anointing and priestly appointments should be understood as part of a reward ceremony. The anointing and rewarding with offices are both elements of a reward ceremony (Tompson 1994:18-21). As will be seen below, these actions are frequently mentioned in New Kingdom accounts of reward ceremonies.
2.4. Dead Sea Scrolls

The “holy anointing oil” was lately found by way of the data specified in the Copper Scroll, a fragment of the Dead Sea Scrolls in one of the caves of the Qumran scheme. It dated just before the demolition of Jerusalem in 70 A. D (Vandergouw 2011: 180-1). Testing of the substances discovered an oil that was depicted as the particular oil performed to anoint the kings of Israel. One drop of the oil modified the water milky white, precisely as ancient texts indicated it should. Carbon-14 dating determined the oil to have been retained in the flask during the first century. According to Vandergouw (2011: 180), it is particular oil that is designated “afars’mon” and originates from a now vanished balsam tree which used to cultivate near Ein Gedi, Israel, on the coasts of the Dead Sea. This oil had been used during the Old Covenant era of the first and second Temple as well to anoint the kings of Israel including Saul, David and Solomon. It is alleged that when the Anointed One returns, He will be crowned and anointed with this particular oil by the ministers of the third Temple when it is reconstructed (Vandergouw 2012: 181).

2.5. Purpose of anointing

Williams (1977: 275) noted that “the ceremony of the anointing of officials is also recorded on tomb walls”. He does not, however, cite any examples of such scenes. It is possible that he was referring to those scenes which depict officials being rewarded with gifts in the presence of the king. This would indicate that an individual might be appointed to an office within the context of the reward ceremony, or as the means of reward (i.e., gold collars and anointing) were integral to the appointment of a person to an office (Fried 2004: 56). It is significant that of the thirty-two scenes of ceremonial reward collected (Redford 1987: 224) only two appear to involve the appointment of the rewarded individual to an office. It therefore becomes obvious that the occurrence of an appointment during a scene of reward is the exception, rather than the rule. The occurrence of anointing in the context of reward scenes cannot be

---

16 In 1989, Joseph Patrich of the Hebrew University’s institute of Archaeology led some archaeologists and eventually found a mud bottle in three-feet deep hole by tracing instructions specified in the Copper Scroll.
taken as evidence for the events which must take place at an induction ceremony.

Anointing observes a variety of transitions in status through the ancient Near East (Kutsch 1963: 308). Anointing was an essential part of everyday life in the ancient Near East. Based on the variety of ritual and symbolic legal use outside Israel, it should not be surprising if in Israel both kings and priests were anointed for their new status, as the rite likewise may have been applied to prophets (1 Ki 19:15-16; Is 61:1; Ps. 105:15), brides, or others taking on obligations or released from them. Noth (1967: 232) begins his treatment of “Office and Vocation” by stating that “the more ancient Old Testament tradition never once recognizes a special act in the conferring of the priestly office. If we are to conclude from this that priests, themselves were not anointed, such a failure would be quite incredible in an ancient Near Eastern setting. The priests’ own biblical contributions refer to one anointing, and Emar (1986: 369) provides the first attestation of such a practice in early Syria-Palestine. The hypothetical development from anointing Israelite kings to unction for all Second Temple priests forces evidence for a widespread ancient custom into Israelite cult through the narrowest of passages, an unlikely scenario (Fried 2004: 89). From a purely theoretical perspective, the particular association of royal anointing with designation by God, however early, may itself be rooted in the old practice of consecrating “priests” for divine service, set apart as sacred to the god (Schmidt 1970: 186).

17 Kutsch (1963: 309) says if Moran correctly considers the enthronement a completed event, the anointing gift has been disconnected from its attested occasion, at the accession itself. Also, the rite is mentioned as one familiar to the Egyptian ruler. According to Kutsch, Amarna letter EA 34 speaks of oil sent by the king of Alasiya (Cyprus) to the Egyptian king is perhaps reflecting Cypriote rather than Egyptian custom.
18 Enkidu demonstrates the essential ingredients in civilized human life by his transformation, and the anointing of the body is given particular prominence in Mesopotamian life by this location in the Gilgamesh Epic (Kutsch 1963: 307).
19 Noth argues that “filling the hand” (e.g., Jdg 17:5, 12; Ex 32:29; 1 Ki 13:33; and priestly law) refers generally to appointment and indicates no ritual act.
20 The Emar evidence (1986: 368) for anointing a priestess need not serve any hypothesis of foreign origin. Whether or not the Israelite rite derives ultimately from some distance, its direct antecedents should more likely be sought in the long-held custom of Syria and Palestine.
21 Schmidt (1970: 185) suggests that the postexilic anointing of priests developed from a new understanding of royal anointing as consecration for divine service. If the idea of consecration indeed were first attached to kings and not to priests, Schmidt’s proposal might as easily suit a monarchic rather than a postexilic transmission of the custom.
The preceding discussion of the Ancient Near East suggests that the anointing of Israelite priests before the Babylonian exile is intrinsically plausible. Leviticus and the related professional idea in Exodus and Numbers displays this procedure imbedded in priestly custom at least by the time of the restoration under the Persians (Fried 2004: 67-8). If the rite is preceded with this period, its heritage in Israel must be conceived along new lines. The biblical material that will be pursued is the instructions for and execution of the priests’ installation in Exodus 29 and Lv 8. It offers the only detailed elaboration of anointing procedure, and indicates two quite distinct ritual traditions that do not appear to be directly related.

3. Conclusion

There is no evidence that such a ceremony ever originated in ancient Egypt. Attempts to trace the origin of the Hebrew practice of anointing kings to an Egyptian source are misdirected (Redford 1987: 361). Redford (1987: 368) notes that the phenomenon of anointing kings at their coronation in Israel may be an indigenous development rather than a borrowing from Egypt. The practice of anointing priests is best not to be explained as a postexilic pilfering of royal prerogative and stature. Anointing was performed for many occasions in the ancient world, including the consecration of priests. The Scripture’s own texts for the installation of priests distinguish radically different procedures for anointing the high priest as such and for anointing the larger class of priests who are legitimized by their lineage from Aaron.

The next section is crucial to understand the anointing with the Spirit which is closely related to pneumatology in its redemptive indispensable ministries. Thus, the pneumatology can definitely be traced in the light of development of the anointing with the Spirit on the Scriptural perspectives.
B. Biblical perspectives on pneumatology

1. Pneumatology in the Old Testament

1.1. Usage of the term of rûah & pneuma in the Law, the Prophets

1.1.1. Rûah as divine being

In the Old Testament the Spirit of God is primarily designated with the term rûah. The Hebrew OT has three hundred and eighty occurrences of this term (Cottrell 2007: 12). Of these references, approximately one hundred and seven refer to the movement of God in the natural world and in the life of humankind. In these passages, rûah is translated “Spirit” and indicates the work and activity of the Spirit of God.

The West Semitic usage of the root rh is comparable to the OT paraphrase of ‘wind’ and ‘breath,’ but there is no confirmation that the root has the connotation ‘spirit’ or ‘Spirit’ in the OT sense outside of the Hebrew canon. Cottrell (2007: 13) states the term “rûah” does not indicate that gods have spirits or that the rûah is as expansion of a god. Nor does the idiom refer to facets of the human spirit. Therefore, whereas Israel has numerous correspondences with the socio-cultural background of the Ancient Near East (Dunbar 2009: 16-7), the idiom rûah has an exclusive development with its own connotation in the OT (Benjamin 2006: 8-11). The OT is the only ancient literature that develops this idiom to depict a people’s experience with their God.22

In the Septuagint the term pneuma is classified mainly in two ways. For the most part, pneuma is ‘wind’ which ranges from a tender breeze to an aggressive explosion. Second, pneuma not only refers to wind and life-breath in the LXX, but to superhuman force, spiritual capacity, to determine the will, the formation of the soul, an eschatological endowment and the principle of life in humans.

---

22 Benjamin (2006: 10) says that while not directly interrelated to the surroundings of the OT progression of meaning for rûah, the translation of rûah in the LXX and in Greek literature is informative. The verb pneo, from which pneuma is derived, means ‘to blow’ or ‘to breathe’ (wind or air). The LXX translates rûah by anemos as a substitute of pneuma when the meaning ‘wind’ is obviously proposed (52times). The typical version of rûah is pneuma (277times). Pneuma not only refers to wind and life-breath in the LXX, but to superhuman force, spiritual capacity, to determine the will, the formation of the soul, an eschatological endowment and the principle of life in humans.
pneuma is breathed out in the sense of respiration, which points to the breath of life. The externally identifiable characteristic of life for ancients is respiration. Therefore, the term rûah has constantly “preserved the meaning ‘wind’ conveying the activity of air both outside man in nature, and inside him, his own breath” (Eichrodt 1967:46). With these observations, it can be concluded that the word rûah, translated pneuma, has to do with breath and respiration, which indicates the presence of life, and gives rise to the hypothesis of the unseen living spirit. External features that may affect the spirit would in turn cause changes in the ‘spirit’ of humankind that influence dispositions and sensations. Therefore Spirit turned out to be the ideal word to indicate God’s omnipotence in affecting both nature and humanity (Matthews 2006: 127). In nature, the undetectable winds sent by God can cause catastrophes and atmospheric disruptions. The term ‘creation’ implies the recognition and acknowledgement of the Spirit of God, and as a result the epistemological effects are only completed in the community of believers (Schaeffer& Schaeffer 2006: 213-4).

In relation to humankind, God’s activities that begin with the provision of the breath of life may cause a transformation in disposition, in respiration, and in action. This term becomes the most excellent one for Israel to commune God’s invisible presence, through which God effectively brought the world into existence. The invisible rûah is therefore active in all of God’s fabrications and actions, and begets dramatic transformations in the substantial world.

1.1.2. Rûah in humanity

When rûah is utilized in relation to humankind, it is mostly used as an anthropological and psychological expression with an enormous diversity of denotations (Stephenson 2011: 67-9). These denotations may be classified from plain physical breath to a scope of psychological and emotional dispositions. Possibly the most significant connotation of rûah in relation to humanity is its indication of the animating law of life (Yates 2008: 39). With this meaning, it is often found in synonymous parallelism with the term nefesh, which is frequently translated ‘soul, life, life breath’ (cf. Is 26: 9). The rûah is the endowment of God, who shapes human

---

23 When signifying the spirit of the living, breathing being, dwelling in the flesh (basar) of humans and of animals, the terms nefesh and rûah are used equivalent approximately 25 times.
beings and breathes life into them. It commonly designates the inner person. Correspondingly, when God breathes into the nostrils of man, *nefesh* constitutes a living, breathing human being (Gn 2: 7).

In the Prophets, Yahweh is acknowledged as the one who structures the human *rûah* within a person (Zch 12: 1). As the principle of life, *rûah* repeatedly parallels *nefesh* where God provides living breath to humankind (Is 42: 5). Consequent to Hezekiah’s prayer, his *rûah* was reinstated to life (Is 38:16). In Ezekiel’s vision, the bones are animated by the *rûah* of God (Ezk 37:5-10). The term may as well refer to breath in the sense of uncomplicated respiration (Jr 10: 14; 51: 17). The emblematic use of *rûah* is noticeable in the perspective of judgment where the *rûah* goes forth to punish the wicked (Is 11: 4). As the animating principle of life, one may portray *rûah* ‘breath’ or ‘spirit’ in the Writings. Thus, the duration of life depends on the *rûah* residual in a person (Jb 27: 3). In Yahweh’s hand lies the life and breath of every creature (Jb 12:10; cf. Lm 4:20).

1.1.3. *Rûah* as an eschatological intensity-empowering force

The outpouring of the *rûah* in the last days is intensely associated with the end era of tragedies and calamities, blood, fire and smokes. (Jl 2: 28-32). It is strongly related to both the opening of New God’s Kingdom and ‘the dreadful day of the Lord’ which implies the ultimate judgment of the world. Montague(2001: 35-60) illustrated the biblical descriptions of the Spirit: life-breath, wind, fire, water, cloud, dove and *Paraclete* and contemplates God as the source of the Spirit in the Old Testament, and the Messiah, the Anointed One as the source in the New. God is depicted as acting through the Spirit of God (Higton 2008: 141). Montague (2001: 47) indicates that the Spirit is an eschatological gift that is relational, sanctifying and transforming, ministerial and charismatic. Gabriel (2007: 210) recognizes that the liberating and transforming power of the Spirit of the Anointed One is operating ubiquitously where people are delivered from the despotism of the natural world, state, colour, class, rank, sex, deficiency, illness and ignorance'.

For the individual believer in Old Testament times the Spirit was responsible for much more
than just equipping one for secular life. The Spiritual life in Israelites, which was intertwined with his everyday life, was also directed and influenced by the Spirit. The poet of Psalm 139 declares that he could do nothing to escape the Spirit of God (v. 7). God knew him already before his birth and leads him every way he may go. In Psalm 51:12-13, the activity of the Spirit induces revival in the Spirit of David after his confession of guilt earlier on in the Psalm. However, the Spirit is also involved in the spiritual condition of his people as a corporate body In his mercy he promised that, notwithstanding their apostasy, he will once again put his Spirit in them so that they may live (Ezk 37:4).

1.2. The mission of the Spirit of Yahweh

Warfield describes that the three realms of the Spirit’s activity emerged successively in the Old Testament. First, the cosmic Spirit; in this correlation, the Spirit is characterized as the source of all order, life and light in the universe. He is the divine principle of all movement, of all life and of all thought in the world (Gn1: 2). Exclusive of God, there was not anything made that has been made, so without the Spirit nothing has occurred that has occurred (Warfield 1968: 138). In a word, the Spirit appears at the precise opening of the Scripture as God of immanent presence not as God of transcendent being (Warfield 1968: 132). It would not be unproblematic to overrate the significance of the early emergence of this dogma of the immanent Spirit of God, with the high doctrine of the transcendence of God which pervades in the Old Testaments. Second, the theocratic Spirit; predominantly, he is acquainted with as the source of all the supernatural powers and activities which are directed to the foundation and conservation and advancement of the kingdom of God in the midst of the wicked world (Gabriel 2007: 210). In other words, the theocratic Spirit seems to be embodied as the executive of the Godhead within the consecrate nation, the divine power working in the nation for its defence, governing, instruction and leading of the people to its destined purpose. The theocratic Spirit characterizes the presence of God with His people. Thirdly, the individual Spirit is his relation to the individual soul, functioning inwardly in the spirits of men as the Spirit of grace. As He is the source of all cosmic life, and of all theocratic life, so is He also the source of all spiritual life. The Spirit of God in the Old Covenant is not purely the immanent; and not purely the inspiring Spirit, but the source of His church’s potency and
protection, and of its development in accordance with its extraordinary mission. He is as well the indwelling Spirit who sanctifies the hearts of God’s children.

Israel acclaimed the Spirit of Yahweh in creating the universe and sustaining all life on earth, in prevailing leadership to carry out God’s deliverance from the adversary of Israel, in the words of prophets who audaciously stood for truth and justice and in the anointing with their kings and in the anticipation of a truly anointed one to come. They longed for a new epoch of the unobstructed, unchallenged supremacy of Yahweh, the Lord of Israel. A vastly significant part of that expectation was that when God entirely established his reign over his people and over the earth, (Wright 2006: 121-156) there would be a fresh and unprecedented outpouring of God’s Spirit. The creating, empowering, prophetic, anointing Spirit whom they previously knew was moreover the upcoming Spirit for whom they longed. It is this future longing for the coming of God’s Spirit that guides unswervingly on to its fulfilment at Pentecost and the extended instruction in the New Testament about the Spirit in relation to the anointed one, Jesus Christ.

Isaiah prophesy’s with a valiant declaration that one day there will be a truly righteous king reigning over people in contrast to the perverted dynasty that subjugated the throne of David at the time; “See a king will reign in righteousness and rulers will rule with justice” (Is 32:1). This is an indispensable part of Israel’s hope and faith that an ideal king would do what their historical kings were anointed for, but lamentably failed to do. The age of righteous rule is further described as an outpouring of God’s Spirit in such a way that everything is transformed by it. The Spirit of God in the Old Testament thought is related with creation, with justice and with implementation of power for the benefit of society. All three realms are affected as they are flooded and washed by the outpouring Spirit.

Till the Spirit is poured upon us from on high, and the desert becomes a fertile field, and the fertile field seems like a forest. Justice will dwell in the desert and righteousness live in the fertile field. The fruit of righteousness will be peace; the effect of righteousness

24 Wright (2006: 131) explicated that the missions that the Spirit accomplish in these area are: re-creation and righteousness (Is 32), renewal and resurrection (Ezk 36-37) and repentance and restoration (Jl 2).
will be quietness and confidence forever. My people will live in peaceful dwelling places, in secure homes, and in undisturbed places of rest (Is 32:15-18).

The Spirit who is already constantly at work to sustain and renew creation (Ps 104), will then do so in full profusion and all nature will be transformed by his power and presence (Gabriel 2007: 212). The moral order (Is 32: 16) will be set right once again. The outpouring of the Spirit, who is the Spirit of justice, will inevitably denote that the very character of God will encompass the universe. Righteousness and justice are two of the biggest realities in all the ethical teachings of the Old Testament. They are the foundation of God’s throne. So when the Spirit is poured out, God’s own moral character will prevail, and will once again flood the whole of creation. The social scheme of shalom will be established. Isaiah 32: 17 speaks of human society that will enjoy the fruit of justice, which means the end of all violence, fear and disarticulation. It will be replaced by rest, security, confidence and well-being as the result of the outpouring of the Spirit.

Anointing with the Spirit has a special purpose in fulfilling the missio Spiritus through the chosen officials of the Old Testament. The next section will describe the anointing with the Spirit expressed in an extraordinary way in the vessels chosen for commissions.

1.3. Extraordinary empowerment for official tasks

Although God acted through his Spirit- right through Old Testament history (cf. for instance Hg 2:4, 5 and Nh 9: 20, 30), it was not an automatic prerogative of every Israelite that the spirit of God would be ‘in him’ (Nm 27:18). The expression, ‘‘in him’ as well as related ones like ‘the Spirit of God came upon…’ (2 Chr15:1) or ‘the Spirit rested upon...’ (Nm 11: 26) occurs frequently in the Old Testament, but it is used in respect of specific individuals. These were primarily commanders, rulers or spiritual leaders of the people. It was because God acted in the history of his people through human beings in the roles of judges, prophets and kings, that he equipped them with his Spirit for their task. Such a person experienced God’s grace in a special way. Among others, God shared his will with them. Joshua was a good example of it (Nm 27: 18, 21).
1.3.1. Judges and Kings

According to the Pentateuch, Moses, with the help of the Spirit in his life, ruled the people. Numbers 11: 17 indicate that when he had secured seventy elders to assist him in this task, God gave the Spirit to them as well. Later on, the Spirit also came upon the judge, Othniel, with a view to leading the nation to victory in a war against the king of Aram (Jdg 3: 10). The same applies to Jephthah when he commanded the Israelites against the Ammonites (Jdg 11: 29-33). Samson, another judge, as well as Saul and David, the kings, were already endowed with power by the Spirit at their calling (Jdg 13: 25; 1Sm. 10: 10; 1 Sm 16:13). In the case of Samson and Saul it becomes apparent that the Spirit is sensitive to sin. He does not share his place and guidance with a deliberately sinful person. It may be pointed out that there is, interestingly enough, one example in the Old Testament where it is stated that the Spirit worked through someone who was not an Israelite. In the case of the ‘heathen’, Balaam, the Spirit came upon him so that he could proclaim the word of God on a number of occasions, blessing the Lord’s people (Nm 23; 24).

1.3.2. Prophets

The prophetic office is also presented in the Old Testament in such a way that it is clear that these people acted under the guidance of the Spirit. More than once Ezekiel said that the Spirit entered him when the Lord spoke to him (2:2; 3:24) or that the Spirit lifted him up in order that he might see a vision (11: 1, 24; 43: 5). Micah declared, when referring to his task of proclamation, that he was filled with power by the Spirit (3: 8). Nehemiah (9: 30) and Zechariah (7: 12), both say that the Lord, by his Spirit, spoke to his people through the prophets. Joshua, a leader of God’s people for many years, was filled with the Spirit of wisdom (Dt 34: 9). The Spirit also give man the ability to administer justice (Nm 11:17). This indeed illustrates the variety of charismata which can be related to the Spirit of God (Philip 2005: 38).

According to 2 Kings 2:9 Elisha, the prophet who succeeded Elijah, desired to receive a
double portion of his master’s spirit. The prophets who followed them at a distance later acknowledged that this indeed happened (v.15). This ‘transfer’ of the Spirit from one person to another is already mentioned when Moses appointed the seventy men to share the responsibility to lead the people (Nm 11: 17). It appears that such a transfer of the Spirit implied that the abilities manifesting in one person also became evident in other people.  

Two places where a direct relationship is drawn between Elijah and the activity of the Spirit, is an indication that the Spirit could transfer him physically from one place to another (1 Ki 18: 12; 2 Ki 2: 16). We can add the names of Isaiah and Hosea to the group of prophets as evidence of further examples that God was working in and through the prophets by his Spirit. It is pertinently affirmed that ‘the Spirit came into’ Isaiah while the Lord spoke to him (2:2). In the prophecy of Hosea, the prophet is described as ‘an inspired man’ (9:7). Zedekiah, the leader of cultic prophets, eventually admitted during his confrontation with the prophet, Micaiah, that the Spirit of the Lord left him (1 Ki 22:24).

The observation that the Spirit does not rest permanently on a person that once he has been used by God is also noticeable in the case of an entire community. The prophet Isaiah reported that the people and their leader refused to be led by the Spirit. In this way they grieve the Spirit (Is 63:10). Some of the writing prophets from the eighth and seventh centuries BC clearly hesitated before ascribing their actions especially to the working of the Spirit. They put much more emphasis on the word of the Lord that came to them and which prompted them to address the people (e.g. Mi 1:1). As far as ecstatic experiences are concerned, it appears that they were referred to in a derogatory way during the time of Hosea (cf. 9: 7). Jeremiah related the inspiration of the Spirit to ‘the word of the Lord’ and proclaimed bluntly that the cultic prophets could claim no more authority whatsoever, due to

---

25 Philip (2005: 36) notes that what is significant in the case of Moses and the seventy helpers is that ‘the presence of Yahweh with Moses was so powerful that it could be shared among the 70 without diminishing it effectiveness in Moses’ responsibilities or authority.

26 Although we do not have Scriptural evidence saying explicitly that it was the Spirit who acted through Elijah and Elisha, it is nevertheless stated several times that they were servants of the Lord (2 Ki 10:10) and ‘men of God’ (I Ki 17:24; 2 Ki 4:7).
the fact that ‘the word’ was not in them (Jr 5:13). The prophet Ezekiel, however, once again inaugurated a new era by assigning his ministry to the activities of the Spirit, while he himself encountered ecstatic experiences (Ezk 2:2; 8:3). Whether these ‘translocations’ comprised physical or spiritual movement, is not clear.27

In Deutero-Isaiah (59: 21) it appears that this ‘tension’ between inspiration either due to the Spirit or the word is eased and there are simultaneous references to the word or the Spirit as source of inspiration. It is noticeable that throughout the Old Testament, the working of the Spirit was still incidental and to a certain extent partial, as described in Numbers 11:25: ‘When the Spirit rested on them, they prophesied, but they did not do so again’. The continuous action and experience of the Spirit in his fullness only existed as an expectation of an era to come.

1.4. *Missio Spiritus* for messianic redemption

The Spirit of God revealed himself in the Old Testament only in a preliminary manner. As will become evident from the following verses, the prophets presented an anticipation of the activities of the Spirit in the future. More than one of them predicted that there would come a time when there would be an encompassing revelation of the work of the Spirit (Yates 2008: 46). This fuller revelation is presented along two lines: The Messiah and A New Israel. The Old Testament entertains a prospect of a specific figure or messianic deliverer upon whom the Spirit will abide in his fullness. In Isaiah (11:1-2; 42:1), the abundant presence and working of the Spirit thus appear to be the very proof of the messianic era in which salvation will dawn (Philip 2005: 44). The advent of Jesus, the Anointed One, did eventually take place and these prophecies were completely fulfilled in him. Luke recorded in 3: 22 how the Spirit descended on Jesus after his baptism and how he returned from the river Jordan full of the Spirit (4:1). John 3: 34 states ‘to him God gives the Spirit without limit’. The other instance of a prospect of a fuller revelation of the Spirit concerns the people of God who would be revived in the era of salvation (Yates 2008: 78). Jeremiah (31: 31) looked forward to a day

27 For a discussion of different possibilities; see Vriezen (1966: 232) and Montague (1976: 25).
when the Lord would make a new covenant with his people. He would put his law within them and write it on their hearts (v. 33). Ezekiel prophesied along the same lines, saying that if the people gave up all the evil they had been doing (18: 31), the Lord would replace their ‘heart of stone with a ‘heart of flesh’ and this would result in them becoming obedient (11:19-20). He would cleanse them of their idols (36: 25) and put his Spirit in them (v. 27).

Isaiah enlarged the sphere of this blessing and predicted that the Lord would also pour out his Spirit on the descendants of Jacob (44: 1, 3). One of the consequences the prophet foresaw for the new Israel, when the Spirit would be poured out from on high, was discussed above. The idea that there will come a time when the Spirit, with accompanying blessings, will not only be poured out on chosen individuals, is also sketched by the prophet Joel in no uncertain terms. In the well-known prophecy of 2: 28 and 29 the Lord said through him that the Spirit would be poured out on all people, irrespective of sex, age or status. With the establishment of the New Testament Church the apostle Peter directly connected the events of the day of Pentecost with the prophecy of Joel (Acts. 2: 16ff.). The longing that Moses expressed many centuries earlier, was answered: ‘I wish that the entire people of the Lord were prophets and that the Lord would put his Spirit on them!’ (Nm 11:29).

In conclusion, the Spirit of God in the Old Testament participates in the daily lives of every believer. The relatedness between the Spirit of God in the Old Testament and the Spirit in the New Testament can be described by the notions of ‘continuity’ and ‘discontinuity’. **Discontinuity** refers to the idea that the Spirit does not function so prominently in the Old as in the New Testament. The Spirit in the Old Testament refers to God in relation to mankind, communicating with and revealing himself to his creatures. It is only after reflection on the New Testament about the Spirit that the church formulated the Trinitarian doctrine in the fourth century. **Continuity** refers to the idea that the Spirit in the New Testament cannot be understood without its Old Testament context (Philip 2005: 85). It will be useful to trace another origin of anointing in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in the following section before the continuities and discontinuities between the OT and NT are investigated.
1.5. Anointing with the Spirit in the Old Testament

Anointing was conventionally related with three primary offices - king, priest, and prophet; all three figures featured in Israel’s eschatological anticipations (Dunn 2003: 618, 706).\(^{28}\) First, the anointing of the historical kings of Israel and its meaning will be investigated. Second, the anointing of the one whom the Old Testament anticipated as the coming servant-king will be studied. Third, the entire mission of God through Israel which the servant-king anointed with the Spirit will be looked at.

The Hebrew word, ‘mashach’ means: to smear, anoint, pour, and spread a liquid, to anoint as consecration and appointment (Harrington 2009: 10). The anointing is empowerment to function in a particular office. Jones (2005: 35) entitles anointing is a “God endows flesh to do those things that flesh cannot do”. The anointing of the Spirit, as an endowment for commission (Harrington 2009: 10), is sometimes sacramentally connected with symbols of meeting: in the case of Joshua with the laying on hands (Dt 34: 9), in the cases of Saul and David with anointing (1 Sm 10: 1, 16: 13). The representations with reference to the official theocratic Spirit culminate in Isaiah’s prophetic descriptions of the Spirit-endowed Messiah (Is 11: 1-5; 42: 1-9; 61:1-3). The gift of prophecy by the anointing with the Spirit was given to particular persons chosen with the objective of the revelation of God’s will (Warfield 1968: 140). The relationship between the Spirit in the Old Testament and the Spirit described in the New Testament is that He performs all the functions which are ascribed to the Holy Spirit of the New Testament, and has the same characteristics. He is perceived as the same Spirit in nature and in operations (Warfield 1968: 151).

The work of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament is to empower leaders to promulgate the law and to enable people to stand up for justice. Kings in Israel were supposed to exemplify all three of the following (Wright 2006: 83). Kings were required to be strong leaders in order to protect their people (like the judge), in battle if necessary. Kings were expected to know

\(^{28}\) Caudill (2006: 54) says in the eschatological perspective, the event of the end times, depicted in the OT became closely connected to the belief that the Messiah would ultimately appear on the world scene and radically transform the world order (Is 2; 2-4; 9: 5, and 40: 2-10).
and serve the law and to give wise decisions when cases were brought before them. According to the law, the Prophets, the narratives, the psalms and the wisdom literature, kings were superlatively expected to provide justice for the weak and poor, particularly those who lacked the natural protection of strong families to look after them, such as widows and orphans. The mandate and expectations of Israelite kings is extensive and well known.  

Hear the word of the Lord, O king of Judah, you who sit on David’s throne…. Do what is just and right. Rescue from the hand of his oppressor the one who has been robbed. Do no wrong or violence to the alien, the fatherless or the widow, and do not shed innocent blood in this place (Jr 22:2-3).

Such high expectations could not be met with human strength alone. For all these responsibilities kings needed the Spirit of the Lord. That is what their ‘anointing’ symbolized. Kings in Israel were anointed with oil for Yahweh’s commission laid on them as indication of the empowerment by the Spirit of Yahweh for their different tasks.

1.5.1. Anointing as a mark of office with commission

Anointing was a mark of office as well as the consecration for the office of kings, priests and prophets. Extraordinary empowerment were intended for the leaders of the state of Israel as the Spirit came upon kings and equipped them to govern the people of God (Estep & Allison 2008: 152). The charismatic leadership were endowed with charisma they influenced their followers, and presented a resolution to certain political, social, economic, or religious crises (Czövek 2006: 30). Lv 8:10 says, “and Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed the tabernacle and all that was there in, and sanctified them.” The anointed should be free of sin, leading a self-controlled life, worthy of the calling of an anointed: “If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people; then let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young bullock without blemish unto the Lord for a sin offering” (Lv 4:3, 5.

29 See Dt 17:18-20; Jr 22:2-3; Ps 72:1,4,12-13; Prv 31:4-5,8-9; 1 Ki 3:28; 10:9.

30 Consecration by anointing also applied to the temple and its instruments. Nm 7:1.2 says “and it came to pass on the day that Moses had fully set up the tabernacle, and had anointed it, and sanctified it, and all the instruments thereof, both the altar and all the vessels thereof, and had anointed them, and sanctified them”.
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Anointing is a sign of ‘office’ with a commission, not in the sense of status and privilege, but rather in the sense of commissions and responsibilities. An ‘anointed one’ plainly meant somebody chosen and commissioned by God to do a task that God wanted to be done, and enabled by the power of God’s Spirit to accomplish it (Cottrell 2007: 97-111). It could even apply to a non-Israelite king. According to Isaiah God referred to Cyrus, the king of Persia, in this way:

> God says of Cyrus, “He is my shepherd and will accomplish all that please me; he will say of Jerusalem, ‘Let it be rebuilt,’ and of the temple, ‘Let its foundations be laid.’ This is what the Lord says to his anointed to Cyrus, whose right hand I take hold of” (Is 44: 28; 45:1).

Cyrus could be called ‘the Lord’s anointed one’ because, as the text says, he was going to carry out what God wanted to be done, and God would strengthen and enable him to do it. Saul was the first anointed king of Israel (I Sm 9-10). The relevant verses that refer to his anointment and the role of the Spirit are as follows:

> Then Samuel took a flask of oil and poured it on Saul’s head and kissed him, saying, “Has not the Lord anointed you leader over his inheritance?”… “The Spirit of the Lord will come upon you in power, and you will prophesy with them; and you will be changed into a different person.”… When they arrived at Gilbeah, a procession of prophets met him; the Spirit of God came upon him in power and he joined in their prophesying (1 Sm 10:1, 6, 10).

Anointing was, on the one hand, a modestly physical act. A flask of olive oil was actually poured over Saul’s head as a symbol and a very visible indication. But it was followed, on the other hand, by a spiritual anointing, an experience of the mysterious power of the Spirit of Yahweh that evidently affected Saul very deeply and visibly. This combination of symbolic action and internal effect had two implications in this instance. On the one hand, it authenticated the word of Samuel as a prophet for what he had told Saul, to anticipate what he would experience. On the other hand, it primarily authorized him for the leadership
position into which he was about to be thrust. His early actions were clear demonstrations of the power of the Spirit of Yahweh at work in his leadership.\footnote{However, in Saul’s case, as with some of those who had been judges before him, this anointing did not guarantee his achievement as a leader or his faithfulness or his long-term efficiency. On account of his foolishness and disobedience, his vocation went from early hope to mid-term squandering, to final self-destruction. Nevertheless, it is interesting that his status as ‘the Lord’s anointed’ was respected, even by David who had also been anointed to be next king (1 Sm 16:13). Clearly, the act of anointing and the power of Yahweh’s Spirit that went along with it was not something to be lightly disregarded, even, when the one who bore it was becoming increasingly unworthy of it.}

In the wake of Saul’s failure, while Samuel was still grieving it, he was commissioned to anoint David as a replacement. After some formalities and an unpredicted suspension, David is finally designated and the ritual is completed.

Then the Lord said, “Rise and anoint him; he is the one.” So Samuel took the horn of oil and anointed him in the presence of his brothers, and from that day on the Spirit of the Lord came upon David in power (1 Sm 16:12-13).

In David’s case, dissimilar to Saul’s, the anointing is met with a more wholehearted submission to God, though not by any means with ethical excellence. David was still capable of grievous sin. God speaks of David as ‘a man after my own heart’ (1 Sm 13:14). ‘The heart’ in Hebrew idiom, is where you do your thinking, weighing up, deciding and planning (Cottrell 2007:123). So ‘a man after God’s own heart’ means one who will think and do as God choose, one who will carry out the plans that God has in his mind. When the phrase is first used in 1 Sm 13:14, it was in contrast to Saul who had failed to carry out God’s commands. David is neither morally perfect nor God’s special favourite. He is simply the one who will obey and accomplish where Saul had disobeyed and failed Saul and David were both anointed as kings. But their stories demonstrate visibly that anointing by itself is not warrant of truthfulness or even of long-term legitimacy in the service of God. Anointing must be met with full submission to God, with reliance on God, by serving God and doing his will. Even for the foreign king Cyrus it was the point. Whether he
was aware of it or not, he was selected by God to accomplish God’s plan for Israel, which he fulfilled. In contrast, the majority of the kings of Israel, though physically anointed and fully aware of what it meant, actually failed to do what their anointing symbolized. They were anointed on their head with oil, but they were not submissive during their reigns. They failed to fulfil the significance of their anointing. It was this continuing collapse of the historical kings of Israel that led to increasing hopes of a coming anointed one, a coming king in the line of David, a man truly ‘after God’s heart,’ who would be fully obedient, who would fully carry out the saving work of God in the power of God’s Spirit. That figure of prophetic hope and vision will be subsequently deliberated (Wright 2006: 92-3).

1.5.2. The anointment as the coming king

Some of the key texts about the anticipated anointed king are noted.

A shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse; from his roots a Branch will bear fruit. The Spirit of the Lord will rest on him, the Spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the Spirit of counsel and of power, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD, and he will delight in the fear of the Lord. He will not judge by what he sees with his eyes, or decide by what he hears with his ears; but with righteousness he will judge the needy, with justice he will give decisions for the poor of the earth. He will strike the earth with the rod of his mouth; with the breath of his lips he will slay the wicked. Righteousness will be his belt and faithfulness the sash around his waist (Is.11: 1-5).

‘Here is my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen one in whom I delight; I will put my Spirit on him and he will bring justice to the nations. He will not shout or cry out, or raise his voice in the streets. A bruised reed he will not break, and a smouldering wick he will not snuff out. In faithfulness he will bring forth justice; he will not falter or be discouraged till he establishes justice on earth. In his law the islands will put their hope. This is what God the Lord says; he who created the heavens and stretched them out, who spread out the earth and all that comes out of it, who gives breath to its people, and life to those who walk on it: I, the Lord, have called you in righteousness; I will take hold of
your hand. I will keep you and will make you to be a covenant for the people and a light for the Gentiles, to open eyes that are blind, to free captives from prison and to release from the dungeon those who sit in darkness (Is 42: 1-7).

The Spirit of the Sovereign Lord is on me, because the Lord has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim freedom for the captives and release from darkness for the prisoners, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all who mourn, and provide for those who grieve in Zion, to bestow on them a crown of beauty instead of ashes, the oil of gladness instead of mourning, and a garment of praise instead of a spirit of despair (Is. 61: 1-3).

These distinguished passages from Isaiah have in common at least three ideas. They all address a coming one, occasionally in the linage of kingship, to be crowned to rule, sometimes in terms of a servant; secondly, the role of the Spirit of Yahweh in relation to that person and the commissions he will carry out. He will manifestly be filled with the power of God’s Spirit; thirdly, they all speak of God, fulfilling his own mission or purpose through this servant-king who will be anointed by God’s Spirit. He is clearly an ‘anointed one’ par excellence. Like the historical kings, he too will be anointed, but there is a mystery. His kingship will be unlike most kings. He will be characterized by the humility and gentleness of a servant. Like the kings, his anointing will symbolize the power and presence of God’s Spirit, but in his case there is detailed depiction of what that will consist of. His anointment is fundamentally his commission to carry out God’s definitive assignment and intention for the world, not just for Israel but to the utmost parts of the earth (Wright 2006: 96).

In this predicted coming one the assignment of the Anointed One and the commission of the body of the Anointed One can be understood. The Spirit of God is the link between them all. The servant-king would be anointed to carry out his commission in the power of God’s Spirit. It is Jesus, the Anointed One who fulfilled the mission of the servant-king, who commissioned his followers to continue the scriptural instruction. To them is granted the Spirit of God (Wright 2006: 97-105).
1.5.3. Inhabiting vs. the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit

The Spirit of God does not reside in his people in the OT, but he does inhabit among them. Three contexts in which rûah Yahweh works in the OT will be indicated in this section: first, that the OT describes God inhabiting in specific sites (Mount Sinai, the tabernacle); second, that in the OT the presence of the Spirit upon particular people equips them for extraordinary tasks (Cottrell 2007: 391-3); and third, that the guarantee of an upcoming outburst of the Spirit implies that the truthful remnant was not yet inhabited by the Spirit when the prophecies were proclaimed.

The OT does not describe the Spirit of God as inhabiting his chosen people, but it does illustrate him inhabiting with them, in their midst (Hamilton 2006: 15-9). Throughout the OT Yahweh confirms to his people, “I will be (or, am/have been) with you”. This promise is guaranteed to outstanding individuals and to the nation as well. Not only does Yahweh affirm that He is with his people, but at numerous situations the people either transmit a yearning for this, as in the statement, “may Yahweh be with you”, or they construct a total declaration that, “Yahweh is with you”. In some cases the writer adds to his remarks the statement that Yahweh was with someone (Cottrell 2007: 391-3). Throughout the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings 108 affirmations have been found of this nature. Once the chosen people have become a nation, after the exodus from Egypt, God’s presence with the people is realized as He dwells in the tabernacle. He commands the tabernacle to be built “so that He may dwell among the people” (Ex25:8). Later in Israel’s history the temple was built, and subsequent OT texts assume that Yahweh is to be found at the temple in Jerusalem.

32 Hamilton (2006: 32) says there is more than 380 usages of rûah in the OT.
33 See Gn 26:1-5, 24-25; 31:42; 46:2-7; Ex 3:6-14; 4:12-17; Jos 3:1-13; Jdg 6:11-18; 2 Sm 7:1-17; 1 Chr 17:2-15; Is 41:8-13; Jr 1:4-10.
35 See Gn 26:26-33; Nm 14:4-10; Dt 30:15-31:6; Jos 14:6-15; Jdg 6:6-18; 2 Sm 14:1-20; 1 Kgs 8:54-61; 2 Chr 20:14-23; Ps 108:7-13; Am 5:4-17; Zch 10:1-7.
37 For debates on the statement “I am with you”, corresponds with numerous other expressions about the presence of God with his people in the OT.
This reality gave Israel’s belief a localized quality. Certainly, they are to worship in Jerusalem and in Jerusalem alone (Dt 12:5). After Solomon, Israel’s kings are evaluated by how they regard the temple in Jerusalem.\(^\text{38}\) The declaration in 2 Kings 16:18 that Ahaz removed the house of Yahweh serves to condemn him. By contrast, Josiah’s piety is demonstrated by his commitment to the preservation of the temple (2 Kgs 22: 3–6).\(^\text{39}\) Solomon was aware that God was not restricted to the temple (1 Kgs 8: 27); nevertheless, he certainly assumes Yahweh to be present in the temple (8: 13). He expects the righteous to pray ‘toward the temple’ because that is where Yahweh is (e.g., 8:44). Thus, when Hezekiah is in anguish he goes to the temple to stretch out the intimidations of the Rabshakeh before Yahweh (2 Kgs 19: 14). Correspondingly, it is righteous of Daniel in exile to have windows ‘opened toward Jerusalem’ when he prays (Dn. 6: 10; cf. 1 Kgs 8: 48–49). Solomon even assumes that God’s presence with the people as he dwells in the temple will have a sanctifying affect upon Israel. He prays at the dedication of the temple: “May Yahweh our God be with us as he was with our fathers! May he neither forsake us nor abandon us, that he may incline our hearts to himself, to walk in all his ways, to keep his commandments and statutes and judgments just as he commanded our fathers” (1 Kgs 8: 57–58).\(^\text{40}\) The OT does not signify that God inhabit in his people by his Spirit, but it does designate that God stayed with his people by inhabiting in the sanctuary. His residence in the sanctuary enables the hearts of God’s people to be with him (1 Kgs 8: 22-61).\(^\text{41}\)

When the OT illustrates a personal experience of the Spirit, it is essentially the presence of

\(^{38}\) Von Rad (1965: 336) notes that the kings of the Israelites declared the Jerusalem Temple as the only legitimate place of worship and sacrifices.

\(^{39}\) Eichrodt (1967: 107) remarks that devotion to the sanctuary was thus to be compared to allegiance to the enunciation of the command of God.

\(^{40}\) Wood (1976: 86), mistakenly states that the Spirit ministered to Old Testament believers by not merely being next to them, but in them. However, Hg 2:5, where the prophet proclaimed Yahweh’s promise it should not be understood as the indwelling of the Spirit in God’s people.

\(^{41}\) The issue of Psalm 84 is not the structure, but the one who inhabits in the structure. Thus the temple is attractive because it is the resident site of Yahweh. The psalmist’s reliance is on Yahweh not on the temple itself, but as a link of the old covenant, he ought nevertheless to draw near Yahweh through the temple and its rite.
the Spirit which characterizes that person as extraordinary. The Spirit principally comes upon his chosen prophets and national selected leaders in the OT. Joseph is portrayed as having a ‘divine spirit’, and this indicates his unique capacity to interpret Pharaoh’s dreams (Gn 41: 38). The craftsman, Bezalel, who was summoned to labour on the tabernacle was filled with the Spirit of God (Ex 31: 3; 35: 31; 1 Ki 7: 14). This distinguishing filling of the Spirit enables Bezalel to work what no one else in Israel is capable of. Moses is also matchless as Israel’s leader because the Spirit is upon him. When Moses wished that Yahweh would put his Spirit upon all the people of Yahweh just as he has done for the seventy (Nm 11: 29), it appears obvious that the rest of the people were not inspired by the Spirit. Each case where the Spirit came on a person in the OT indicates that those who have the Spirit in the OT have eminency above the people of the nation through their empowerment by the Spirit. Those on whom the Spirit came upon served God’s people either as leaders of the people or as prophets.\textsuperscript{42} Consequently there is no evidence in the OT, that the believing remnant in the nation of Israel was individually and continually inhabited by the Spirit (Cottrell 2007: 334).

The prophetic declarations of an eschatological outpouring of the Spirit designates that the people do not possess the Spirit at the time of the decree. These prophecies would hardly motivate anticipation if they simply guaranteed what was previously being experienced. God inhabits in the sanctuary. There He was with them. The Old covenant followers continued to be truthful through the rejuvenating mission of the Spirit, which in the OT is depicted as ‘circumcision of the heart’ (Jr 9: 25) compared to ‘regeneration from above’ (Jn 3: 3). They remained true, not through the Spirit inhabiting in them, but by the Spirit inhabiting in the Holy of holies (Ps 73: 17), where they are eager to be (Ps 116: 18-19). The Spirit was dynamic through Israel’s prophets (1 Pt 1: 11). As the prophets announced God’s word, the Spirit reproached and instructed God’s people (Neh 9:20, 30). Under the Old covenant, the Spirit gave life and inhabited in the sanctuary. Under the new covenant, the Spirit gives life and inhabits in God’s people as his temple.

\textsuperscript{42} Cf. Nm 27:12-23; 1 Sm 16:6-13; Is 59:15-21; Ezk 11:5-13; Dn 5:10-16.
1.5.4. Conclusion

This term, *rûah Yahweh*, the Spirit of God, is used in the OT to communicate God’s invisible presence through which He effectively brought the world into existence. The invisible *rûah* is, therefore, behind all of God’s designs and actions which bring about dramatic changes in the physical world. The Spirit of God is the source of all cosmic life, and of all theocratic life. He is also the source of all spiritual life. The Spirit of God, in the OT, is not imminent nor simply an inspiring Spirit, but the source of God’s people’s strength and safety and of its development in accordance with its exclusive commission.

Noticeably indicated by the OT, the anointing with the Spirit did not permanently dwell in the community of Israelites or in the believing remnant of Israel. The anointing of the Spirit was poured out upon marked distinctive persons, such as kings, prophets and priests. It was also a sign and symbol of offices sanctified and consecrated by the anointing with oil to carry out the ultimate mission of God to fulfil his supremacy over the earth, not as a guarantee of their occupational position.

1.6. Spirit-baptism of the Anointed One in messianic setting

God, the Son, the Anointed One, has vigorously ministered through the anointing of the Spirit that was on Him during His earthly life (Schroeder 2007: 29). He has his ontological consciousness of the sacred Spirit within Him (Churcher 2009: 19). Although John and the Synoptic writers coined a new phrase for the concept of the Anointed One’s role through the Spirit, the concept of revelation and cleansing by the Spirit is present in Judaism. That God gave revelation through his Spirit was prevalent in Judaism.\(^{43}\) Judaism also knew the concept of cleansing by or in relation to God’s Spirit.\(^{44}\) But, although Judaism clearly depicts God as giving revelation and eschatological purification through his Spirit, it is questionable whether Judaism

\(^{43}\) See, 2 Sm 23: 2; Neh 9: 30; Is 48; 16-17; 59:21; Ezk 8; 3; 11: 5.24-25; Zch 7: 12; 4.

\(^{44}\) See, Ps 51, 10-12; Is 4,4; 32,15-18; 44,3-5; Ezk 36,25-27; 1QS 3,6-9; 4,20-22.
could conceive of a messianic figure who would baptize the believers with the Spirit in such a role.

The Jewish background is particularly instructive. There are no pre-Christian references to a messianic bestowal of the Spirit that purifies and transforms the individual. However, there are wealth of passages that describe the Messiah as charismatically endowed with the Spirit of God so that he may rule and judge (e.g. 1 En. 49:3; 62:2). Isaiah 4:4 refers to the Spirit of God as the means by which the nation of Israel (not individuals!) shall be shifted to separate the righteous from the wicked and the nation will thus be cleansed. Several texts tie these two concepts together. Perhaps most striking is the Psalms of Solomon 17:26-37, a passage which describes how the Messiah, “powerful in the Holy Spirit” (Psalms of Solomon, 17:37), shall purify Israel by ejecting all aliens and sinners from the nation. Isaiah 11:2-4 declares that the Spirit empowered the root of Jesse who will slay the wicked “[ruach] of his lips”. Against this background it is not difficult to envision the Spirit of God as employing the Messiah to sift and cleanse the nation. Indeed, these texts suggest in metaphorical language the messianic deluge of the Spirit, and the Spirit-inspired oracles of judgment uttered by the Messiah (cf. Is 11: 4), the blasts of the Spirit that will separate the wheat from the chaff.

The objective of this section, therefore, is to elucidate the extent to which Judaism already envisaged or anticipated a messiah who would perform activities of cleansing and revelation through the Spirit. Due to the plurality of messianic expectations in Judaism, we shall use “messianic” rather loosely, namely as referring to an anointed eschatological figure who will act as God’s agent in the last days to redeem Israel and to rule over her in justice and peace (Oegema 1998: 21-27). From the examination of Jewish literature the only results were found in the Palestinian literature and in the Qumran literature.  

---

45 This passage is echoed in 1 Enoch 62:2 and 1QSb 5:24-25.

46 Since the Diaspora literature (literature written in Greek and/or outside of Palestine) seems little interested in messianic ideas, and rabbinic writings are notoriously difficult to date and rarely attribute specific functions to a messiah.
1.6.1. Palestinian literature

Messianism emerged largely in apocalyptic Jewish beliefs. These are Palestinian literatures: ‘the Psalms of Solomon’, the ‘Similitudes of Enoch’, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and probably the ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’ (Bennema 2003: 42).\(^47\)

For the messianic thought, ‘Psalms of Solomon’ envisions a Davidic messiah who is gifted with the Spirit, wisdom, understanding and might (17: 21, 37: 18.7), which reflects Isaiah 11: 2. This messiah will demolish the wicked, judge the nations, restore and rule over Israel as God’s appointed king (Is 11: 1-12). It is essential to detect how the Messiah will complete his commission. He will execute judgment by the word of his mouth (17: 24. 35), which echoes the LXX version of Isaiah 11:4. If we identify the correlation of terms engaged by “utterance”, “power” and “Spirit” in 17: 36-37, in connection with Isaiah 11: 2,4, the Messiah’s unction contains such a mighty consequence because his words are Spirit-empowered words. He will also purify Israel and consecrate her people (17: 22. 30). He will assemble a sanctified people whom he will guide in righteousness and disclose to them God’s righteousness (17: 39-44). The messianic notion in ‘Psalms of Solomon’ is sturdily entrenched in Isaiah 11, and the crucial means by which the Messiah will fulfil his mission of judgment and cleansing is his Spirit-empowered revelatory word (Bennema 2003: 48).

The ‘Similitudes of Enoch’ which can be placed between 48 BCE and 68 CE, also portrays a messianic figure, called the “Elected One” (cf. Is 42:1), the “Righteous One” and the “Messiah” (Charlesworth 1992: 169-191), who is empowered with the Spirit of wisdom, knowledge, might and righteousness (49: 2-5; Is 11: 2), and who will execute judgment and provide “redemption” to the righteous (48: 6-8; 61:4-6; 68:21-30).\(^48\) Hence, the *Similitudes* also elaborates on Isaiah

---

\(^47\) This type of literature is distinguished by revelation, mysterious insight and its eschatological judgment and refurbishment. These manuscripts were approved by most scholars and contain messianic notions in their texts.

\(^48\) It would propose that messiah reveals wisdom because he is empowered with the Spirit of wisdom. Besides, he can judge in righteousness.
42’s image of a messianic person who will establish salvation to the righteous by means of his Spirit-empowered word.

‘4 Ezra’, depicts an outlook of judgment in which the lion is plainly recognized as the Messiah (12: 31-32). Even if the “man from the sea” in 13:1-13 is not clearly acknowledged as the Messiah, yet the parallel in mission, the reference to Isaiah 11, and the equivalence between 13:25-26 and 12:32 clearly advocate that this figure is the Messiah. This messianic figure will judge the wicked and set free the righteous (13: 9-12). The Messiah will destroy the wicked by means of a blazing sceptre from his lips (13:11-12), which is analogous to the strongly destroying of the wicked by the rod of his mouth in Isaiah 11: 4.

Even though ‘2 Baruch’, collected approximately the same time as ‘4 Ezra’, has many indications of a messiah, it does not disclose his commissions, excluding the general portrait of a messiah who will execute judgment and redemption (39: 60). Concerning the ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’, the ‘Testament of Levi’18: 1-10 portrays a messiah, described in Isaiah 11, upon whom the Spirit of perception, consecration and purification rests (Oegema 1998: 79-80).

### 1.6.2. Qumran literature

Qumran literature uncommonly illustrates three eschatological messiahs, a ‘prophet like Moses’, the ‘messiah of Aaron’ and the ‘messiah of Israel’.49 First, the messianic ideas are elucidated in a few manuscripts. Isaiah 11 is reflected in 1Q28b22-25 which provides a messiah empowered with the Spirit of knowledge and power who will execute judgment and redemption with the might of his lips.50 4Q175 5-12portrayed both the eschatological prophet who will carry God’s revelation with harmful punishments for those who refuse it and a faithful messiah who will execute judgment (Knibb1987: 264-266). 4Q17515-19 illustrates a messiah giving a revelation similar to a messiah who would teach the law (cf. Dt 33: 10). 4Q541 5 shows a messiah with his

49 1QS 9 is the locus classicus for this anticipation, but cf. 1Q28a 2,11-22; 4Q174 f1-3; 4Q175 18.
50 4Q161 10 encloses the whole texts of Isaiah 11: 2-4. This implies that the mighty rod of the Messiah’s mouth is derived from his empowerment by the Spirit. 4Q534 1:8-10 most likely refers to Isaiah 42 when it describes God’s elected one, equipped with knowledge and wisdom, which will bring destruction by the rod of his mouth.
word to judge and sift the wicked. 4Q541 2 elucidates a messiah who will carry out missions of purification, and reveal wisdom in his teaching. The Damascus texts give reference to an eschatological redemption which will purify the iniquities of the people, (CD 19).\(^51\)

Qumran texts extensively describe OT ideas with a range of messianic distinctions. They entail some collective peculiarities.\(^52\) The warning of a coming dreadful judgment is a vigorous consignment of the prophet and the faithful messiah, and it will occur when the prophecies are discarded (4Q541). In these numerous documents, the anointing with the Spirit is instrumental in the messiah’s eschatological commissions of judgment and redemption (Bennema 2003: 47).

1.7. The Spirit of prophecy in Judaism

1.7.1. Introduction

This section assesses the empathy of the idea of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism in relation to the pneumatology in Pauline epistles. Since the purposes of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism are debated, the academic argument demonstrates some congruencies and dissimilarities. It is commonly acknowledged that Judaism alleged the Spirit to be ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ (Turner 2001: 284). In the existing academic dispute, this consensus is noticeable in connection with the Lukan pneumatology (Dunn2010: 7-18).

1.7.2. The Spirit of prophecy in ancient evidences

The Spirit of God is acknowledged as ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ in Judaism. The obvious proof of it is in the Aramaic Targum. Joseph is expressed to ensure the Spirit of prophecy when he interpreted Pharaoh’s dream in Targum Onkelos (\textit{Tg.Onk. Gn}41:38).\(^53\) Equally Joshua is...

---

\(^{51}\) Other document, 11Q13 elaborates on Isaiah 61, in which a messiah is described as the one who provides redemption, the idea of purification, and who will declare the good news of freedom.

\(^{52}\) Additional manuscripts that comprise messianic prospects are, e.g., 1Q28a, 4Q246, 4Q252, 4Q285.

\(^{53}\) It is not uncommon to discover the locution “the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord” in the Targums, as in \textit{Tg. Onk. Gn} 41:38. Klein (1979: 502-507), has exposed that the term ‘before’ is a phrase of deference in the occasion of a reputable being or organization. It is an Aramaic saying and is, consequently, not a try to distance the Spirit of...
bestowed with the Spirit of prophecy (Tg. Onk. Nm 27:18). The Spirit of prophecy poured upon the seventy leaders of Israel, and they prophesied (Tg.Onk. Nm 11:25-29), the equivalent occasion takes place to Balaam, the false prophet (Tg. Onk. Nm 24:2).

Israel’s kings, judges, priests, and prophets are related with the Spirit of prophecy in the Targums on the Pentateuch.\textsuperscript{54} The significance of the Aramaic Targums for New Testament research have been recognized, since the finding of Targumic pieces in the Qumran caves (4QtgJob [4Q157], and 11QtgJob [11Q10]), signifying that transcribed Targums existed from pre-Christian epochs (Bowker 1969: 14-16). Essentially the term ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ is not frequently described departing from the rabbinic tradition.\textsuperscript{55}

1.7.3. The purposes and consequences of the Spirit of prophecy

Contention among biblical scholars arises precisely in relation to the purposes and consequences of this Spirit of prophecy. Schweizer (1968: 409) writes that Luke ‘shares with Judaism the view that the Spirit is essentially the Spirit of prophecy’ (Schweizer 1968:404). Luke regarded the church as ‘the community of the prophets’. The Spirit is largely acknowledged as inhabiting person constantly in the individual or the community (Schweizer 1968:408). In the same way, Menzies (1991:104) indicates that Judaism noticed the Spirit of prophecy as the ‘exclusive’ cause of prophetic inspiration, which embraces revelatory insight, mysterious wisdom, prophetic

\begin{itemize}
\item It includes Othniel (Tg. Neb. Jdg 3:10), Saul (Tg. Neb. 1 Sm 10:6, 10; 19:23), David (Tg. Neb. 2 Sm 23:2; 1 Chr 28:12), Solomon (Tg. Ket. Ct. 1:1; 7:2; 9:7; 10:7), Zedekiah (Tg. Neb. 1 Ki. 22:24; 2 Chr 18:23), Micaiah (Tg. Neb. 2 Chr 18:27), Zechariah (Tg. Neb. 2 Chr 24:20), Isaiah (Tg. Neb. Is 61:1), Ezekiel (Tg. Neb. Ezek 1:3; 3:22; 37:1; 40:1), and Micah (Tg. Neb. Mi 3:7-8).
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item Dunn (2010: 13-4) elaborates two features. First, prophetic persons are recognized since the presence of the divine Spirit is manifested. Accordingly, the prophets are specifically those who possess the divine Spirit (Nm 11:29; Nh 9:20; Zph 1:6; 7:12) in the LXX. Publics speculated whether Saul was a prophet since the Spirit bestowed upon him as upon the other prophets (1 Sm 10:10-12; 19:23-24). An authentic prophet hold the power of the divine Spirit (1 Sm 10: 10). Equally, a prophet is inhabited by the divine Spirit, so Moses, the prophets, was carried with the divine Spirit. Second, the divine Spirit is frequently linked with prophecy or prophesying. Hence, prophecy is the unswerving consequence of the Spirit upon the seventy leaders (Nm 11:25-27), Saul (1 Ki 10:6, 10; 19:23-24), Saul’s men (1 Ki 19:20-21), Zechariah (2 Chr 24:20), and upcoming Israel (Jl 2:28).
\end{itemize}
utterances to supervision, and motivated preaching. The charismata of the Spirit were not observed as a soteriological requirement: one is not to keep the charisma to sustain veracious relationship to God and achieve eternal life.

The exemptions, according to Menzies, are observed in 1QH and the Wisdom of Solomon, where:

The gift of the Spirit, previously \[i.e., in other parts of Judaism\] viewed as the source of esoteric wisdom and inspired speech, is presented as the source of sapiential achievement at every level \[and not a donum superadditum granted to some individuals for special tasks\]. Thus the developments within the sapiential tradition culminate in the attribution of soteriological significance to the gift of the Spirit (Menzies 1991: 112).\(^{56}\)

According to Keener (1997: 8-10), Judaism alleged the Spirit both as the Spirit of prophecy and as the Spirit of sanctification. While the former is unquestionably the more repeated, the latter is not exclusively inattentive. Keener (1997: 11) interprets the virtuous Spirit that sanctifies the believers from iniquities, and endows them with charismata to accomplish God’s mission and to perform uprightly. Keener (1997: 9) believes that while the Spirit of prophecy alone are found in Luke-Acts, both the Spirit of prophecy and the Spirit of sanctification are noticeable in Matthew and John.

Turner (1998: 334) says that the Spirit in Judaism is not merely the cause of prophetic stimulus.\(^{57}\)

---


\(^{57}\) Turner (1998: 134) categorizes five roles of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism: First, the Spirit endows charismatic revelation and direction to the believers through supernatural experiences, dreams, listening of utterances; Second, the Spirit allows charismatic wisdom to interpret dreams or to rule prudently either evidently or unobtrusively; Third, the Spirit inspires them to deliver instantaneous prophetic utterances, where the Spirit entirely substitutes the orator’s usual capacities; Fourth, the Spirit motivates them to charismatic praise and worship characteristically to God; and lastly the Spirit permits people supernatural power to overcome opponents or to
There is a significant dissimilarity between Turner and others (such as Schweizer and Menzies) who exclude miraculous power as a role of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism. Turner argues that the revelatory Spirit is simultaneously the ethical and soteriological Spirit:

It would appear various sectors of Judaism expected the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ to give such important and/or transforming revelation, and such ethical renewing wisdom, that these activities would almost inevitably be regarded as virtually essential for fully authentic human existence before God, and so also for that future state of it which writers mean by ‘salvation’ (Turner 1998: 133-37).

It entails that the Spirit cannot purely be a donum superadditum but must be an indispensable and salvific charisma to Israel, enabling her to sustain upright relationship with God. So Turner concludes:

Neither the Old Testament nor Judaism knows of any ethically transforming or recreating gift of the Spirit that is necessarily other than the gift of the Spirit of prophecy which reveals God’s presence, wisdom and will to the human heart in such a way as thereby to motivate (and so enable) the life of filial righteousness (Turner 1994: 133-7).

Both the LXX and the Targums trail the MT in relating the Spirit with mystical power (Hui 1999: 101). Certainly, the Targum on the Prophets goes beyond both the MT and the LXX in that it plainly calls the Spirit of the Lord or the hand of the Lord ‘the Spirit of power’. Together the LXX and the Targums track the MT in correlating the Spirit with moral or pious action whether in relation to indiscretion, idolatry, righteousness, justice, or the fear of the Lord, as in the circumstances of Israel in the desert (LXX Nh 9:20; Is. 63:10-14) (Turner 1994: 123). Equally perform miraculous performances..
the LXX and the Targums trail the MT in connecting the Spirit with liberation from adversaries, as in the occasions of Israel’s judges and kings.\textsuperscript{59}

Schweizer and Menzies argue that the Spirit is not given to all Israelites but only to some individuals within Israel for divine commissions. However the \textit{charisma} of the Spirit by the anointing of the Spirit is not observed as a soteriological requisite (Menzies 1994: 112). It is noteworthy that these appointed commissions have soteriological aspects for Israel. The judges and kings are commissioned by God to redeem Israel from their adversaries.

It may be concluded that in Judaism, the divine Spirit is simultaneously the Spirit of prophecy, of wisdom, of power, of ethical life, and the Spirit of redemption. The missions through the anointing with the Spirit are inclined to be acknowledged as revelational knowledge and sanctificational righteousness, and delivering redemption.

\textbf{1.7.4. Conclusion}

In conclusion, even if there is not one manuscript that unambiguously features all the above tasks to a particular messiah, some common qualities can be discovered in the various depictions of messiahs in Judaism. These numerous messianic transcripts elaborate on Isaiah 11 and thus envisioned a messiah empowered with the Spirit to fulfil his assignment. It may be concluded, that at least some messianic texts in Judaism recognized a messiah who would execute judgment, deliverance, purification and revelation by means of the anointing with the Spirit. Judaism also anticipated that God would bring Israel’s eschatological redemption by means of his Spirit (Is 44; Ezk: 26) specifically through God’s Spirit-empowered messiah.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{59} Cf. LXX Jdg 11:28-30; 1 Ki 16:13; Ps 50:11; \textit{Tg. Neb.} Jdg 11:28-30; 1 Sm 16:11-14; Ps 51:12-14. Furthermore, there are other Jewish transcripts which connect the Spirit with deliverance (1QH 7:5; 25; \textit{Sol.} 18:6-8; Wis. 9:15).
\end{footnotesize}

To a large extent the argument circles around the understanding of Scriptural manuscripts: the contrast between the theological perspectives of Paul and Luke; the use of Scriptural accounts for the development of dogma, and the function of collective experiences of the Spirit in the assignment of Scriptural hermeneutics (Clifton 2007: 5).

The evidence from the New Testament indicates that the missio Spiritus as well as the anointing with the Spirit provide a barometer to discern the realities of both the Reformed and the Charismatic movements. It would be plausible to look into Lukan literature, since it is likely to depict about most of the controversial issues in connection with the baptism and anointing with the Spirit.


This section deals with the Charismatic perspective in Luke and Acts, particularly in connection with the understanding of Spirit baptism and its importance for Charismatic traditions. Luke utilizes the outpouring of the Spirit in Acts, which replicates three distinctive demonstrations of the Spirit (Baumert 2004: 159): the Spirit as the eschatological charisma; the believers’ life as distinguished by the Spirit; and extraordinary filling with the Spirit for motivated declarations (Hamilton 2006: 15-33). The distinction in Luke’s account, in comparison with the other three gospels, can be regarded by observing the pouring of oil, as a metaphor of a sacrificial submission of the Anointed One to provide the remission of sins rather as an anointing (Van Til 2006: 73-82, cf Corley 2003: 61-72).

Menzies (1991: 54-61) said that a comprehensive research of Luke-Acts and the Pauline literature reveals that there was a development of the understanding of missio Spiritus in the

---

60 The Charismatics believe that these studies are contributions to the Charismatic movement. They demand the church universal to reconsider Luke and Acts and its own understanding and need of the Spirit’s power.
early church. Menzies (1994: 31-4) argued that Paul recognized the soteriological functions of the Spirit and that his distinctive insights did not impact on the non-Pauline sectors of the early church until after the writing of Luke-Acts. The main position of Menzies’ reading is the confirmation that the theology of the Spirit in Luke is dissimilar to that of Paul. While Paul refers to the soteriological aspects of the *missio Spiritus*, Luke steadily describes the Spirit as a charismatic, accurately, a prophetic gift as the foundation of power for achieving a commission.

2.1.1. Perspective on charismatic baptism with the Spirit

The soteriological aspects of the *missio Spiritus* are not referred to by Luke. Luke’s narrative presumes a pneumatology that does not comprise this aspect. A comprehensive assessment of the two-volume work of Luke is requisite to this allegation, which Menzies (1994[1991]: 38) has argued. Three important passages are significant to correlate with the term, “baptism in the Spirit”: the prophecy of John the Baptist (Lk 3:16-17); the Anointed One’s discourse at Nazareth (Lk 4:17-19); and references to the guarantee of the Spirit (Lk 24: 49; Acts 1: 4; 2: 33; 2: 39).

Luke deliberately depicts the *charismata* of the Spirit as prophetic enabling factors in his two books. Whether it is John in his mother’s womb, the Anointed One at the Jordan, or the disciples at Pentecost, the Spirit is bestowed upon them all as the foundation of prophetic inspiration, permitting extraordinary insight and inspiring prophecy (Marshall 2004: 67-89), since the text of inter-testamental Judaism signifies the Spirit with prophetic inspiration.

The key literatures of Lukan are formed by his pneumatological perspective that refers to baptism in the Spirit as follow.

---

61 Many scholars from Gunkel (1979) to Haya-Prats (1975) have reached similar conclusions.


63 This is the prevailing viewpoint. The only exceptions are shown in sapiential literatures and are exceptionally uncommon.
2.1.2. Prophetic Spirit-baptism

The prophecy of John the Baptist, concerning the Anointed One who will baptize with the Spirit and fire is remarkably significant for this study recorded in Luke:

He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing fork is in his hand to clear his threshing floor and to gather the wheat into his barn, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire” (Lk 3:17).

The elucidation of this prophecy is essential, exclusively of the functions it attributes to the Spirit, since the baptism with the Spirit of the anointed One’s disciples testifies that this prophecy was at least partly fulfilled at Pentecost (Acts 1: 4-5). Dunn (1970: 13) states that the prophecy describes the Spirit as “refining and purifying for those who had repented, destructive...for those who are unrepentant.” Menzies (2007: 114-5) argues this analysis must be discarded in the perspective of its Jewish setting, the immediate circumstance with its winnowing allegory, and in the larger framework of Luke and Acts.

Luke’s text depicts the fuller portrait and is relevant to the prophecy by the Spirit-inspired eyewitness of the primitive church on the day of Pentecost (Acts 1:4-5). The wheat is separated from the chaff through their witness (Lk 3: 17). This understanding is emphasized by the winnowing metaphor, which describes the wind as the foundation of sifting. Since the term translated “wind” in Greek (πνεύμα) and Hebrew (רעה) is also used to refer to “the Spirit,” the symbolism is remarkable. This Spirit-inspired witness and its impact are predicted by Simeon’s prophecy in Luke 2:34. Simeon, with reference to the Anointed Jesus, prophesies: “This child is destined to cause the falling and rising of many in Israel”. Luke describes the fulfilment of this prophecy in the mission of the church through its Spirit baptism. John the Baptist portrayed the Spirit’s work, not as purification of repentant individuals, but as a flare of the “breath” of God that would shake the nation. The fundamental point is that Luke presents the Spirit, not as the basis of refining for the individual, but rather as the enforcing might enabling the witness of the early church.
2.1.3. Prophetic anointing with the Spirit


‘The scroll of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. Unrolling it, he found the place where it is written. The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to release the oppressed, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour’ (Lk 4: 17-9).

In contrast with Mark’s Gospel, Luke underlined the importance of this passage. Luke usually pursues Mark’s chronology of the ministry of the Anointed One. But this time, Luke writes about an event, Jesus’ ministry in Nazareth, which occurs in the middle of Mark’s Gospel (Mk 6: 1-6) and locates it at the forefront of his account of the ministry of the Anointed One. Luke’s description of the Nazareth occasion contains important particulars and is more extensive than Mark’s, indicating Luke’s intentions (Mittelstadt 2004: 126-9). The significance of the Anointed One’s reception of the Spirit is intended to help the reader to be aware of it. It is pertinent, not only through its references to the Spirit in Luke’s account which relate the narratives of Jesus’ anointment (Lk 3: 21-22), but also by the substance of the quotation from Isaiah 61:1-2 in Luke 4: 17-19, together with his report of the whole Nazareth event (Lk 4: 16-30). In Luke 4:1, he reminds the reader that the Anointed One was “full of the Holy Spirit” as he was led into the wilderness to be tempted. He also confirms that the Anointed One left the desert in the power of the Spirit (Lk 4: 14). With this “redactional link,” Luke emphasizes the correlation between the pneumatic anointing of Christ and his sermon at Nazareth. Consequently the speech in Nazareth is crucial since it explicates the significance of the Anointed One’s reception of the Spirit (Menzies 2007: 111).
Luke draws an analogy between Jesus’ reception of the anointment with the Spirit (Lk 3-4) and that of the disciples on the day of Pentecost (Acts 1-2). In this way Luke propounded Jesus’ anointing as a model for the believers in Acts and upcoming generations of disciples (see Lk 11: 13; Acts 2: 17). It is obvious that this passage is essential for the perception of the significance of Jesus’ reception of the Spirit and that of the disciples in Acts (Thomas 2005: 198-9). It also gives a vital description of how Luke saw Spirit baptism. The crucial texts (Lk 4: 17-9) underscore Jesus’ declaration, inspired his sermon, as the primary result of Jesus’ anointing. In summary, Luke describes Jesus’ experience of the Spirit as a prophetic anointing, by which he was equipped to fulfil his appointed commission (Menzies 2007: 113).

2.1.4. The promised charisma of the anointing with the Spirit

To Luke “the promise” in connection with the charisma of the Spirit of prophecy that was promised in Joel 2:28-32, and is quoted in Acts 2: 17-21. It is highlighted in his prologue to the quotation (Thomas 2005: 179). His explicit definitions of “the promise” of the Spirit are four times referred to in his two-volume work. “The promise” is acknowledged as the charismatic gift of the Spirit (Acts 2: 33) firstly fulfilled at Pentecost (Acts 2: 4), by the unambiguously distinctive reception of “the promise” that “clothed the disciples with power from on high” and equipped them to be efficient “witnesses” to the world (Lk 24: 48-49; Acts 1: 8).

Acts 2:39 does contain a supplementary factor, even if the Lukan “promise” of the Spirit ought

---

64 Menzies (2007: 110-3) writes that both events are situated at the beginning of Luke’s gospel and of Acts, relating the reception of the Spirit with supplication, physical and experiential manifestations and offering explanations of the event in the form of a preaching that implicates the fulfilment of the prophecy.

65 The quotation from Isaiah, which plays such a prominent function in the narrative, is the key: his anointing was the means with which he was equipped to carry out his messianic assignment.

66 This prologue contains the expression “God says” (Acts 2:17) and in this way acknowledges Joel’s prophecy as “the promise of the Father”. The complete depiction of “the promise” is specified in three of the four Lukan references (Lk 24: 49; Acts 1: 4; 2: 33). In Joel’s prophecy the Spirit is introduced as the cause of predictive insight, a point that Luke underlines with the expression “and they will prophesy” (Acts 2:18). Luke also altered Joel’s “slaves” into “servants of God”, and underscores what is implied in the Joel literature: the charisma of the Spirit is bestowed on believers of the saved community.

to be translated in perspective of Joel’s promise regarding the fulfilment of the Spirit of prophecy. It reads:

Peter replied, “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven. And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. The promise is for you and your children and for all who are far off, for all whom the Lord our God will call (Acts 2:38-39).

In Acts 2:39, “the promise” of the Spirit indicates more than the experience of conversion. Consistent with the other references to “the promise”, the promised charisma of the Spirit in Acts 2:39 refers to the promise of Joel 2:28, and of prophetic enabling bestowed on the repentant. In Acts 2:39, the range of the promise prophesized is broadened to comprise the promise of salvation presented in Joel 2:32 (together with the guarantee of the Spirit of prophecy in Jl 2:28). The promise of Acts 2:39, like the promise of the Anointed One in Acts 1:8, also implies the re-establishment of Israel: deliverance is promised (Jl 2:32), but the guarantee embraces the restoration of Israel’s prophetic commission to draw the nations into the light (Jl 2:28; cf. Is 49:6 and Acts 1:8).

Dunn (2010: 90-102) disapproved this view, arguing that one should understand Luke’s earlier references to the promise of the Spirit in line with the promise of salvation guaranteed in Acts 2:39. Yet, the Charismatics think that Acts 2:39 does not imply that the bestowal of the Spirit is the cause of the new covenant reality. It is only a reminder that the prophecy of Joel 2:28-32 contains two essentials: the charisma of the Spirit of prophecy (v. 28) and the promise of redemption to those who call upon the name of the Lord (v. 32). Acts 2:39 describes both, but does not propose that the two are indistinguishable. It prevails in Luke’s unambiguous declarations in Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:4-8, his use and redaction of the Joel quotation in Acts 2:17-18, and the broader framework of his two books (Mittelstadt 2004: 131).

The expression of Joel 2:32; Acts 2:21 is reflected in Acts 2:39: “Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved”. In Acts 2:39 Luke broadens the “the promise” to comprise the salvific aspect since the audience of the preaching contains non-believers.
Luke’s narrative of the baptized followers (Acts 8: 16; Acts 19: 2), who are all still without the Spirit, causes insuperable troubles for this view (Turner 2001: 267). It is a point of dispute whether Luke’s perception of the guarantee of the Spirit stated in Joel 2:28-32, was also stated in other OT prophecies concerning the eschatological task of the Spirit, particularly in Isaiah 44: 3-5 and Ezekiel 36: 26-27. The eschatological outpouring of the Spirit was normally interpreted in the perspective of Joel 2: 28-29 as a reinstatement of the Spirit of prophecy.\(^6\)\(^9\) Ezekiel 36: 26-27 was generally interpreted as a prophecy relating to the end-time elimination of evil and without indication of the action of the Spirit. The abolition of iniquities was a prerequisite for the end-time outpouring of the Spirit of prophecy.\(^7\)\(^0\) But this interpretation of the guarantee of the Spirit is in conflict with the facts from early Jewish literatures and Luke’s independent works (Thomas 2005: 125). Unlike Paul and John, Luke does not quote the other Old Testament texts. There is no reason to deny that Joel 2:28-32 speaks of all embracing soteriological transference of the Spirit.

From the succession of conversion, water baptism, and acceptance of the Spirit in Acts 2:38 the Charismatics deducted the distinction between water baptism and the acceptance of the Spirit, but it hardly gives a clue about the substance of the _charisma_ of the Spirit. Although the range might specify that for Luke the ritual of water baptism usually accompanied the transmission of the Spirit, Luke’s tradition elsewhere may indicate that the Charismatics’ analysis may be a statement of the issue (Marshall 2004: 134-7). That the text would imply that the Spirit described the foundation of the original covenantal existence is indefensible. Since Luke does not elsewhere clarify an intensive linkage between water baptism and the acceptance of the Spirit, and commonly distinguishes the ceremony from the _charisma_ of the Spirit (Lk 3:21-22; Acts 9:17-18; 18:24-25), the verse “and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit” in Acts 2: 38

---

\(^6\) Menzies (2005: 34-5), a charismatic theologian contends that the transformation of the heart related to in Ezekiel 36: 26-27 was translated as a precondition for the eschatological transfer of the Spirit and that the rabbis interpreted Isaiah 44:3 as a indication of the outpouring of the prophetic Spirit upon Israel.

\(^7\) Menzies (1991: 55-110) gives notable information for additional debates on these portions and the relating Jewish literatures.
ought to be translated as a guarantee that the Spirit shall be infused to those who are already converted and baptized”. The significant point that can be analysed from the transcript is that remorse and the baptismal ceremony are the customary prerequisites for acceptance of the Spirit, which is guaranteed to all followers.

2.1.5. Conclusion

The pneumatic charisma as a prophetic empowering for the commissionable vocation is indicated in the interpretation of Acts 2: 38-39 by the perspective of Luke’s unambiguous statement relating to the guarantee of the Spirit mentioned in Luke 24: 49; Acts 1:4; and 2: 17-18. Mensies (2005: 31) argues that Luke translates the sifting and separate estranging action of the Spirit of which John the Baptist prophesied (Lk 3: 16-17) to be fulfilled in the Spirit-enabled assignment of the church. Accordingly John the Baptist’s prophecy is primarily accomplished in the charismatic transference of the Spirit. The believers were baptized with the Spirit and, by that means, empowered on the day of Pentecost to bear witness to the Anointed One, Jesus (Acts 1: 8). It is contended that for the perspective of Luke-Acts baptism in the Spirit is an eschatological, communal and break-through occurrence, in which (not unlike what is found in Qumran writings) present and future phases are held in tension. Luke’s description of the missio Spiritus resists a stiff classification and, from a scriptural viewpoint, supports the balance of a special tension in Pauline instruction on the missio Spiritus (Zwiep 2007: 127-149).

The charismatic description within the perspective of Luke’s unique pneumatology can be contended that the Spirit bestowed upon the followers at Pentecost, was not the foundation of a new covenantal subsistence (Hamilton 2006: 17), but rather as the empowerment to be efficient eyewitnesses (Menzies 2007: 112). Since this Pentecostal charisma, to be anointed by the baptism with the Spirit, is charismatic rather than soteriological in nature, it is to be distinguished from the charisma of the Spirit, and even from the baptism in the Spirit in 1 Corinthians 12: 13 where Paul evidently links it with conversion and rebirth.71 Charismatics should recognize

---

71 Paul elaborates on the charismata received through the anointing with the Spirit in a redemptive Trinitarian
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Paul’s soteriological contribution by emphasizing the *missio Spiritus* in conversion, rebirth, and sanctification. Yet the charismatic awareness of baptism in the Spirit from the Lukan texts distinguishes it from regeneration. They derive this distinction and the unique vocational function of the Spirit from Luke’s peculiar pneumatology.

2.2. Baptism of the Spirit in the Johannine literature

2.2.1. Introduction

The notion of “baptism of the Spirit” has been a disputed subject for a considerable period, both in scholarship and in the Christian church. Is “the baptism of the Spirit” a “second blessing”, an empowerment for particular missions separate from and subsequent to regeneration? (Menzies 1994: 12), or does it relate to the commencement of faith, to regeneration? (Dunn 2010: 183-194). NT scholarship researched this topic in the Synoptic texts and Acts. However, the baptism with the Spirit is also present in the Johannine Literature (Jn 1:33), but has received little attention from Johannine scholarship. Consequently, the significance of the notion of Jesus’ Spirit-baptism in this Gospel appears to have been neglected. The intention of the present section is to explicate the perception of baptism of the Spirit and Jesus as the Spirit-Baptizer in John’s Gospel. Even though the expression “the baptism with the Spirit” is a *hapax phrasis* in the Johannine text, the idea is disseminated in the Johannine texts.

John confirms that Jesus, the Anointed One, is God. He is the Word of God (1: 1). He does not reveal God by means of the Spirit because He and the Father is one (14: 7-11). While He is with his disciples He is the *Paraclete* who will dispatch them another *Paraclete* after He has ascended. He is the Anointed One, who was publicly announced by John the Baptist at his baptism as the One on whom the Spirit came to stay who baptises with the Spirit (1: 33), not as a means, but

---

72 For debates on the subject “baptism in the Spirit” in the NT, see Keener, (1996), Ervin, (1987), Lanham (1983). Nevertheless, these writings do not contain in detail the merits of the Johannine Literature.

73 The single noteworthy exemption is Porshe (1974).
Himself as the One with the Spirit.

This section will indicate that the statement in John 1: 33 concerning Jesus’ baptizing with the Spirit is a metaphor for Jesus’ ministry of revelation and sanctification by means of the Spirit. This section will pursue to establish that “the baptism with the Spirit” is a metaphoric account of Jesus’ soteriological ministry to people by means of the Spirit. This notion is entrenched in Jewish messianic beliefs, which expected a messiah who would govern, purify and rebuild them by means of his Spirit-inspired utterances. At first the idea of the phrase will be studied. Subsequently whether this notion was identified in Judaism will be examined. Then John’s Gospel will be investigated to elucidate how Jesus’ Spirit-baptism is connected to particular ministries. Finally, a more defined conception of “Spirit-baptism” in the Johannine Literature will be established.

2.2.2. Recipient of baptism with the Spirit

John 1: 33 illustrate how Jesus will bestow the Spirit on the believer. But it is a question whether John the Baptist himself would have implied it, or how the Jews of those days would have recognized it? Turner (2010: 37) argues that perhaps Judaism did not think a messiah will pour the eschatological Spirit on Israel, and consequently it is unlikely that John the Baptist himself or the Jews for that matter would have contemplated it.74 Judaism obviously comprehended the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit to be performed by God himself (Is 32: 2-9; Ezk 39: 27-29; Jl 2: 28-32; Zch 12: 8-14). It was expected that the coming of the Messiah, tremendously empowered with the Spirit, would affect Israel (Turner 2010: 38-41). It is necessary to recognize what the expression “the baptism with the Spirit” describes. Different to John the Baptist’s baptism with water, the baptism with which Jesus will baptize ought to be interpreted figuratively. A literal understanding of being immersed in the Spirit in the form of a fluid is

74 Cf. Turner (1996: 179-180); cf. Lindars (1972: 111); Isaacs (1976). Dunn (1972: 91) assumes that some Qumran texts refer to the messiah’s pouring out the Spirit. But even if Dunn acknowledges that the verification for this idea is so trivial that it would be imprudent to construct on it, he however feels that John the Baptist reaches at this notion.
incongruous, and demands a symbolic analysis. If it is a symbolic phrase what is it indicating? How are the two baptisms similar and dissimilar? A linguistic study may be helpful to clarify these questions.

The noticeable key to examine these two baptisms is to understand the word “βαπτίζω”. The usage of “βαπτίζω” in John’s baptism (1: 33) is factual, implying ‘to immerse’, while in Jesus’ baptism “βαπτίζω” is used figuratively. The interpretation of the term “βαπτίζω” will be explicated symbolically. The difference between the baptism of John and Jesus’ baptism is not the manner of “βαπτίζω”, but the intention with which the ritual is carried out. To the early church, the Baptist’s water-baptism would have suggested the concept of purification from iniquities, not hygienic cleansing, but ritual cleansing: the usage of water for ritual purification was prevalent in Judaism.

2.2.3. Purpose of the Spirit-baptism of the Anointed One

Having sketched the characteristics of the Anointed One’s ministry and the missio Spiritus in it, the relationship becomes apparent between the notion of the baptism with the Spirit and the Spirit-empowered messiah that reveals God and purifies the believers.

First, the symbolic rebirth by water and Spirit indicates the purification and transformation of the believers by means of the Spirit, which is grounded on a Spirit-bestowed perception of the importance of the Anointed One’s revelation. Second, the living water that the Anointed One provides symbolizes the purification and life-creating natures of his Spirit-inspired revelation.

---

75 Metaphors may have more than two implications however a presenter might have one proposed implication for a speech, or else an expression would be unfeasibly vague.

76 Even though the understandings of Dunn and Turner are grounded on the Q-materials (Q?) for “the baptism with the Spirit”, (Mt 3: 11; Lk 3: 16), it will merely be examined how they have comprehended “βαπτίζω”.

77 I am indebted to Turner (2010: 42) for this idea.

78 Ex 30: 19-20; Lv 14: 6-8; Nm 19: 8; Ezk 36: 25; 1QS 3: 5-8), and the LXX rarely describes “βαπτίζω” with this meaning (2 Ki 5: 1-16).
Third, the Anointed One’s revelatory instruction is life-creating if its significance is comprehended, since the Spirit is dynamically converting people through the messages of God commissioned and illuminating to them by the revelation of the Anointed One, particularly the occasion on the cross (Jn 3: 6).

From the research the subsequent depiction appears. The Anointed One’s major assignment in the Fourth Gospel is to offer a Spirit-empowered revelatory message that purifies the believers, transforms them and brings deliverance to them. The Anointed One reveals God by means of his Spirit-empowered words and life, if acknowledged, it purifies people and creates eternal life, or, if discarded, judgment and condemnation is implemented. This idea could be a key understanding of the baptism with the Spirit by the Anointed One.

According to the Johannine literature, the Anointed One preaches to the people with his Spirit-empowered life-creating instruction. It is a fundamental materialization of the baptism with the Spirit by the Anointed One. The Spirit-baptism symbolizes the notion of purification in the text. All people who accept the instruction of the Anointed One experience the baptism with the Spirit for sanctification and salvation, while those who deny it ultimately encounter final judgment (Dunn 1989: 185).

John’s Gospel describes the explicit continuity between the assignment of the Anointed One and that of the Παράκλητον and the disciples. First, after his departure the Παράκλητον will perform the same mission as the Anointed (Jn 14: 16). Second, as an instructor, the Παράκλητον will remind the disciples of the instruction of the Anointed One and teach them to understand its meaning and significance (Jn 16: 12-15), which will equip and prepare them to witness to the world (Jn 15: 25). Third, relating John 16:7-12to John 16: 12-24, the Paraclete will convict the iniquities of the world, righteousness and judgment specifically by the messages of the Anointed One through his disciples (Bennema 2003: 53). The missio Παράκλητον brings about the same results as the Anointed One did in either deliverance or judgment, depending on whether one believes or discards the related witness of the Paraclete and the disciples (Jn 16: 4;16: 9-10). Fourth, the task of the Anointed One is the model for the task of the disciples (Jn 20: 21). This
interrelated continuity between the earthly ministry of the Anointed One and the ministry of the *Paraclete* through the disciples brings up the issue of how this later ministry may be correlated to the Spirit-baptism of the Anointed One and the inquiry of how the task of the *Παράκλητον* and the disciples will then be one of purification and redemption. If the disciples were purified by the words of the Anointed One (Jn 17: 17) offered by the *Παράκλητον*, then the Spirit of truth (Jn 16: 13) will be anticipated for their sanctification and redemption. Consequently, both the bestowing of the Spirit in John 20:22 and the expected coming of the Spirit can be integrated in the conception “to baptize with Holy Spirit”.

At the beginning of this section, it was suggested that “the baptism with the Spirit” mainly relates to the expected consequence for Israel by the coming of the Spirit-empowered Messiah rather than that the Messiah will bestow the Spirit on Israel. Rather than understanding “πνεῦμα” as a *charisma*, it appears more plausible to understand “πνεῦμα” as the means by which the Messiah will take action towards Israel (Van Iersel 1988: 135-6). In this case, “ἐν” should be interpreted instrumentally, implying “with” or “by means of” (Baumert 1997: 88). Therefore the Spirit is predicted to be the *means* by which the Anointed One will reveal God and purify people. Consequently the referents of the metaphor “the baptism of Spirit” are purification and revelation. For this reason the baptism of the Spirit by the Anointed One has soteriological foundations.

The issue that still requires to be explained, however, is precisely how the two aspects of revelation and purification relate within the symbol “the baptism of Spirit” and how the Spirit is related to it. The exegetical evidence from John’s Gospel will be presented, first to be observed whether Judaism previously “knew” this notion of Spirit-baptism. It indicates the essential implication of the Johannine symbol “to baptize with Holy Spirit” in terms of the actions of purification and revelation of the Anointed One by means of the Spirit.

2.2.4. Characteristic of the Spirit-baptism

Having presented the Johannine idea of Spirit-baptism that refers to the actions of purification and revelation by the Anointed One through the Spirit, which is embedded in Jewish messianic
expectation, the scope the researches holds to this perception of the symbol will be investigated. The idiom “to baptize with Spirit” is a hapax phrasis in John’s Gospel and the writer of John explains and expands which has most likely proposes and outspreads this idea of the Anointed One’s baptizing with the Spirit by means of other metaphors and images to advocate the symbol.

The notion of the Spirit-baptism described in the Johannine Literature will be researched as follows. First, the Anointed One’s major ministry and his activities will be studied. Second, the function of the Spirit in the Anointed One’s assignment will be elucidated. The Anointed One’s baptizing with water (Jn 3: 22; 4: 1) will not be used as an evidence for interpreting his Spirit-baptism, since the rectification of the narrator in 4:2 explicates that it was in fact not the Anointed One himself who baptized, consequently it would be implausible that the water-baptism by the disciples of the Anointed One can be used to understand the Spirit-baptism by Him (Dunn 2010: 23-36).

2.2.4.1. Missio Spiritus in the Anointed One

Teaching ministry is the major activity of the Anointed One in the Johannine Literature and he is repeatedly designated as “Teacher”. The Anointed One’s teaching is presented in the public narrations in John 2-11 and in his personal dialogues with the disciples in John 14-17. His instruction is a revelation that comes from God, the God whom no one has seen. Actually, Jesus, the Anointed One’s revelation and instruction are identical. The Anointed One instructs through his revelation and he reveals through his instruction. The purpose of his revelatory instruction is to reveal the identity and ministry of the Father and Son and the character of their relationship (Bennema 2003: 117-20). The Anointed One confronts people with the option of welcoming or refusing Him and his revelation that requires reaction. The knowledge He reveals

leads people to redemption if acknowledged but to judgment and death if discarded.\(^83\)

The teaching of the Anointed One also has a refining dimension. To his disciples He announces that they are already purified (Jn 15: 2-4) by his authoritative and truthful word. The Anointed One provides the word of God to his disciples (Jn 17: 7-15), to purify them. The word of Anointed One can purify people since it holds truth, which will consecrate people to God and recreate them to be free from their transgressions (Jn 8: 30-35; 17: 17). The image that appears of Jesus’ word is that it holds life-creating, liberating, healing, and sanctifying truth.

The revelatory lesson of the Anointed One’s is fundamentally the statement of what he has seen and heard from the Father.\(^84\) He conveys this revelation from and about God specifically because he is endowed with the Spirit. It refers to Isaiah 11:2, where the Anointed One’s empowerment with the Spirit of wisdom, knowledge and might are indicated. The implication is that the Spirit endows the Anointed One with revelatory knowledge and understanding, which would obviously shape the foundation for his revelatory teaching. It fits John 3: 34 which indicates that the Anointed One can articulate the words of God, i.e., carry God’s revelation, since God provides him with the Spirit without measure (Burge 1989: 83-4). The Spirit endowed upon the Anointed One does not only empower him for his assignment but also has a consequence for people. The “approval” of Jesus’ revelatory instruction so as to inherit everlasting life is grounded on an total truthful reaction that identifies and acknowledge the factual distinctiveness and work of God, the Father and God, the Son, and of their relationship.

According to John’s Gospel, the Spirit is instrumental in the progression of making people to believe in Jesus for their redemption. First, those people who accept Jesus as God’s Anointed One, are born from God (Jn 1: 11-14). Subsequently the origin of this birth from God is explained as from the Spirit. It signifies the eschatological purification and renewal of Israel that God will accomplish by means of his Spirit (Turner 2010: 176-180).\(^85\) Second, the Spirit is

---

85 See Ezk 36: 22-28; 37: 1-16. Regeneration (born anew from above Jn 3: 3) is accomplished by the Spirit who
The Anointed One is dynamically creating His people through the anointed teaching of the Son. The Anointed One is portrayed as the source of “living water” (Jn 4: 10-14), which is a metaphor for his Spirit-anointed revelatory instruction that purifies and sanctifies and which guides to eternal redemption if it is received (Jn 4: 40-44). Jesus, the Anointed One, declares that his words are life and spirit (Jn 6: 63), since the Spirit creates life in and through his life-creating utterances. This fits with the notion of the Spirit of truth (Jn 14-17). Subsequent to ascension of the Anointed One, the Spirit will manifest the life-creating reality to people by means of the instruction of the glorified Christ (Jn 16: 13-15).

The Spirit functions in this life-creating process as the facilitator of true perception while the Anointed One executes missions of revelation and purification through his anointed instruction.

2.2.4.2. The significance of Spirit-baptism

The denotation of the metaphor “the baptism of Spirit” in the Johannine literature is to be defined more correctly according to John’s own understanding (Dunn 2010: 173-182). Semantically, it is presented that the two essential aspects of “the baptism of Spirit” are revelation and purification by means of the Spirit. The concept of revelation and purification by means of the Spirit is rooted in the Jewish messianic expectation. The characteristics of the ministry of the Anointed One and the missio Spiritus were examined with the assumption that the denotation of “the baptism of Spirit” would be unfolded in the rest of the Johannine literature.

This investigation illustrated that both revelation and purification are prevailing characteristics of the Anointed One’s ministry and were repeatedly related to the Spirit. These activities of the Anointed One by means of the Spirit are an actualization of his baptizing of the believer with the Spirit. John appears to recognize “the baptism of Spirit” as a symbol of the Messiah’s continuing creates faith in Christ in us (Jn 3: 15-16) to join us to Christ (Jn 15: 4, 9), to Christ’s death for our sins (Jn 3: 14) that is God’s forgiveness, his cleansing, the water of Jn 3: 5, and to his resurrection (Jn 11: 25) the renewal of the Spirit (Jn 3: 5). However, Nicodemus cannot understand the revelation by the Anointed One to respond in faith (Jn 3: 8-13).
revelation of God to Israel, and of the purification of Israel by means of the Spirit, completing both redemption and judgment, depending on one’s decision towards the Spirit-Baptizer. Therefore, “the baptism of the Spirit” is a soteriological necessity. The majority of scholars acknowledge that “the baptism with the Spirit” refers to one distinct event.\(^86\)

However “the baptism with the Spirit” cannot be limited to a single occasion. The Fourth Gospel portrays the Anointed One’s activity of baptizing with the Spirit as a progression of activities, which was initiated during his earthly ministry, which continues unrelenting after his glorification, and which reaches its achievement in the future. This future epoch might be the Parousia.\(^87\) Classical Pentecostalism construes “the baptism in the Spirit” as the gift of the Spirit for mission empowerment (Ervin and Menzies). However, to understand “the baptism in the Spirit” in terms of the Messiah giving God’s Spirit as empowerment remains challenging and is also too restricted since the Spirit-baptism of the Anointed One is not simply a *donum superadditum* without soteriological consequences. Furthermore, “βαπτίζω” in Judaism does not have the meaning of “to empower”.

Dunn (1993: 24) views Spirit-baptism as an initiatory conversion metaphor just as Jesus’ own baptism at the Jordan River was an initiatory occurrence, a baptism in the Spirit, so the Anointed One will baptize others in the Spirit and initiate them into the new Kingdom. Accordingly, the baptism in the Spirit of the Anointed One is a model for all later baptisms of the Spirit; everyone have accesses to the new covenant, and its prototype is the Anointed One’ admission into the new Kingdom (Dunn 2010: 32). Dunn argues that the ministry of the Anointed One as Baptizer in the Spirit is postponed until he has been glorified (Dunn1993: 21). But Dunn’s observation is not without obscurities (Dunn 2010: 9-22).\(^88\) First, there is no verification that “βαπτίζω” is used

---


87 A few researchers, such as Yong (2005b: 67-8) and Zwiep (2007: 130-7), understand “to baptize with the Spirit” in John’s Gospel as some type of continuing activity rather than a single occurrence.

88 Even though Dunn later altered his position, he still understood baptism in the Spirit as a solitary and initial event.
as a symbol of “to initiate” (Turner 1996: 183). Second, according to John 1: 32-34, its reference to Isaiah 11:2, the anointing of Jesus at the Jordan River was not a commencement of the new covenant, but an empowerment of the Spirit to accomplish his messianic mission as Spirit-Baptizer. Third, from the Johannine viewpoint, the Anointed One is not in need of purification or sanctification to baptize with the Spirit. Therefore the experience of the Anointed One at the Jordan River cannot be equated with a baptism in the Spirit. As a result, his anointing with the Spirit is not a model for those who believe in Him.

2.2.5. Conclusion

Jesus, the Anointed One is portrayed in the Johannine literature as being empowered by the Spirit to endow the believers with his life-creating revelation that will sanctify them. The eschatological purification of Israel by the Spirit is described by John with the metaphor “to baptize with the Spirit,” which refers to the revelatory instructive ministry of the Anointed One. “To baptize with the Spirit” epitomizes the ministry of the Anointed One; it is the salvific agenda of revelation and purification by means of the Spirit. John 1: 33 is a programmatic salvific program for the believer and the world by the Anointed One. The Jewish picture of a messianic figure endowed with the Spirit which would cleanse Israel with his revelatory Spirit-anointed word ingrained in Isaiah 11, implicates the preeminent image of the Johannine Anointed One, Jesus.

Turner (1996: 183) disputes whether the baptism of the Anointed One in the Spirit at the Jordan River presents a theological prototype for all subsequent baptisms in the Spirit. He sees it as empowerment for a commission. However, “to baptize with the Spirit” signifies more than only empowerment of believers for mission.
Baptizer and his ministry, “to baptize with the Spirit” is a soteriological inevitability and not merely a *donum superadditum* contra classical Pentecostalism and Charismatic movements. Johannine scholarship has mistreated the significance of the notion of the Anointed One as the Spirit-Baptizer. The “baptism of the Spirit” is a metaphor for the summation of the soteriological activities of the Anointed One, particularly of his revelation to and purification of the believers by means of the Spirit (Bennema 2003: 60). If “to baptize with the Spirit” implies the soteriological activities of the glorified Anointed One in this world until the *Parousia*, it has an unrelenting significance for every generation of believers. “To baptize with the Spirit” introduces the rebirth or “acceptance” of the Spirit, as well as the development of perseverance in redemption, in which that salvation is worked out and lived in, to be sanctified by God in the truth of Christ’s word (Jn 17:17-19).

2.3. An assessment of Spirit-baptism in John and the Synoptic Gospels

According to the Synoptic narrative the ministry of the Anointed One is characterised by his power and authority from the Spirit (Charette 2005: 356-7).\(^90\) While Jn 1:33 and Mk 1:8 writes of “the baptism with the Spirit”, Mt 3:11 and Lk 3:16 refer to “the baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire”.\(^91\) From the viewpoint of ‘source-critical’ research it appears that Matthew and Luke followed the Q tradition, which is most likely the original text (Turner 1996: 172-3). Turner (2001: 41, 184) argues that Luke’s interpretation of the metaphor of the Spirit-baptism of the Anointed One is the purification through the Spirit of repentant Israel, that John the Baptist embraced the traditional anticipation of the Messiah endowed with the Spirit, based on Is 11:1-4, and that he saw the advent of the Messiah as the fulfilment of both redemption and judgment expressed by the metaphor “to baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire” (Turner 1996: 183).\(^92\)

---

\(^{90}\) Cf. Mk 1: 22; Mt 7: 29; Lk 4: 32.

\(^{91}\) Painter (1993: 89-7) observes that John has many close verbal parallels with Mark, and in general John 1-12 follows the order of Mark.

\(^{92}\) Judaism did not only use “fire” to denote both destruction and purification (Is 31: 9; 66: 15-16; Am 7: 4; Zch 13:9; Mal 3: 2-3), but also “Spirit” (Ps 51: 10-11; Isa 4: 4; Ezk 36: 25-26.)
The Synoptic elucidation is interrelated with John’s interpretation of “to baptize with the Holy Spirit”. Brown (1960: 295) explained that John misplaced the “and fire” from the original Q-saying since according to John’s Gospel the Anointed One did not declare a judgment by fire as John the Baptist expected (Brown 1960: 295). Judgment in John’s Gospel is not illustrated in apocalyptic end-time language, nor does John represent the Anointed One as implementing judgment in a vigorous manner. The Anointed One is portrayed as the messenger of God’s redemptive revelation. The ministry of the anointed One has the following negative consequence: judgment is the inevitable and immediate consequence of those who refuse him and the revelation he delivers in his instruction.

John’s Gospel and the Synoptic have an analogous perception of “baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire”. The intention of purification and causing redemption or judgment is implicated in that Spirit-baptism (Barclay 2011: 145). A plausible account for this similarity may be that John acknowledged a part of Q or of the Synoptic tradition, and formed it through his own theological understanding (Bennema 2003: 59). Yet those who dispute John’s reliance on the Synoptic still explicate the acquaintances between John and the Synoptic in terms of connections between the resources of the Synoptic writers and those available to John, rather than between the Gospels themselves (Bennema 2003: 43-47).  

2.4. Pneumatology in the Pauline literature

2.4.1. Characteristics of the Spirit

There are two questions in relation to the pneumatology in Pauline epistles. First, in what way is

93 Cf. Jn 3: 16-18; 8: 14-16.
95 See particularly Dunderberg’s (1994: 183-4) research, which also testifies to the influence of the Synoptic material on John 1, 31-35. Other scholars, for instance, Barrett, Carson, and Bauckham who contemplate that John’s accountable source is Synoptic like.
96 This prospect has also been adopted by many recent commentators on John, including, Brown, Lindars, Morris and Schnackenburg.
Paul connected to Judaism? Second, in what manner is Paul distinguished from Judaism? With these in mind, the Spirit and prophecy will be investigated, defining ‘prophecy’ generally as to embrace revelational knowledge, inspired wisdom and utterances, charismatic praise, the Spirit and power, the Spirit and ethical living or righteousness, and the Spirit and salvation or life.

2.4.1.1. The Spirit as the redeemer

Paul’s epistle to the Romans is a primary manuscript of access into the Scripture (Ehrensperger & Holder 2008: 35). Paul observes the Spirit as the Spirit of redemption and life (Menzies 1991: 303-15). The Spirit is the author and mediator of sanctification and justification and the benefactor of eschatological life, whether present and future.97 Qumran literature (1QS 3: 7; 4: 21) shows ‘the Spirit of revelation’ is not only the author of ethical life, but also the completer of sanctification (Charlesworth 1994: 59; cf Barclay 2011: 191). The Spirit cleanses and sanctifies the community through the ‘knowledge’ and ‘truth’ of God as revealed by the Spirit to the community (1QH 9: 30-32; 12: 11-13; 1QS 4: 18-23). Hence, the revelatory Spirit is simultaneously the soteriological Spirit (Warrington 2007: 266-267); the very basis of the transformed “life” and sustained righteousness of the restored community (Turner 1996: 139).

A similar concept is found in the Pauline epistles. The answer appears through the charismatic preaching.101 It is the Spirit-inspired and faith-arousing preaching of Paul that led the believers to ‘faith’ in the ‘gospel’ or ‘word’ of ‘truth’ and so affected salvation or sanctification (Hui 1999: 253-67). It is significant since there are two mediators of redemption or sanctification: Jesus

---

97 See Rm 7: 6, 8: 2-13, 15: 16, 1 Cor 6: 11, 15: 44-46, 2 Cor 3: 6-9, Gl 4: 29, 5: 25, 6: 8, 2 Th 2: 13.
98 Cf. Rm 15: 16; 1 Cor 6: 11; 2 Cor 3: 8-9; 2 Th 2: 13; Tit. 3: 5.
99 Cf. Rm 7: 6; 8: 2-10; 2 Cor 3: 6; Gl 4: 29; 5: 25; Tt 3: 5.
100 Cf. Rm 8: 13; 1 Cor 15: 44-46; Gl 6: 8.
101 Cf. 1 Cor 2: 1-5; 2 Cor 3: 1-18; 1 Th 1: 5-6.
the Anointed One as the objective mediator affecting salvation through his sacrifice on the cross and the Spirit of God as the subjective mediator completing sanctification in the life of the individual believer in (1 Cor 6:11; cf Fee 1994: 845-55).

2.4.1.2. The revelational and relational Spirit

The revelational and relational character of the Spirit is highlighted by Paul. It is the Spirit that enables the Christian to cry out, “Abba! Father!” (Gl 4:6) and since this is the Spirit of “his son,” obviously the Christian’s prayer to the Father is a participation in the Anointed Son’s own encounter of the Father. The Spirit bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, and if children, then heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ (Rm 8: 15-17). Believers have access in one Spirit to the Father (Eph 2: 18). The gift of the Holy Spirit is the definitive response to the disciples’ request to be taught how to pray as the Anointed one prays. He first gives them the words, and then tells them to ask for the Holy Spirit which is upon Jesus as he prays. It is the Spirit who will make the Abba prayer a living experience.

The Spirit also enables the Christian to declare, “Jesus is the Lord” (1 Cor 12: 3) and to witness to Jesus (Acts 1: 8). The prophetic spirit confirms its authenticity by bearing witness to the Anointed One (Rv 19: 10). In this relation we might describe that the Spirit not only as relational but revelational. The Spirit reveals the profundity of God (1 Cor 2: 9-16) and the mysteries of Jesus (Jn 16: 12-15; Eph 1: 17).

“I have said these things to you while I am still with you. But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything, and will remind you of all that I have said to you” (Jn 14: 25-26).

To the contemporary methods of analysis such as historical-critical analysis, reader-response criticism, feminist biblical interpretation, or the Bible and theoretical hermeneutics, Brown (2003: 103)

Cf. Mt 3: 13-7; Mk 1: 7-11; Lk 3: 21-2; Jn 2: 29-34.
271) responds that the Spirit of God is the far more effective revelation-giver than any other modern thought and methods. “There is a comprehensible strand running through the NT that an perception of Christian truth does not come merely through the operation of human reason, but is rather given by the Holy Spirit” (Brown 2003: 9, 13, 89, 98, 167). Since the NT more than once refers to “things hidden” from the “wise and learned” (Mt 11: 25), or to the “opening of the minds” of the faithful (Lk 24: 45) or “the eyes” of the Gentiles (Acts 26: 17-18), Brown’s first point could not be more important. Without the illumination of the Holy Spirit, humankind would be left to fumble in obscurity for its quest for truth.

The reference of “power” in Acts 1:8 is explicitly premeditated for scriptural elucidation. Peter’s first preaching and his words before the Sanhedrin, the witness of Stephen or the ministry of Philip are all testimonies of the power of the Spirit to enable the truthful to translate the Bible for their audiences (Brown 2003: 271). As far as Acts is concerned, however, Scripture indicates that “power” was apparent both in biblical interpretation and in miraculous signs that escorted the ministry of the Apostles and others. For instance, Acts 8 states that the crowds both heard the sermons of Philip and witnessed the signs (demonic deliverance and physical healing) that accompanied his preaching (8: 6-7). The ministry of the Holy Spirit is more than just a “reminder” of Christ’s earthly life; rather, he also directs the believer to the truth (Jn 16: 13) and Acts and the Epistles witness to this happening as the emerging church expanded into new cultures.

2.4.1.3. The Spirit as charismatic force

The charismata of the Spirit are inclined to sustain vigorously charismatic characteristics. Prophecy is one of the charismata or manifestations of the Spirit (1 Cor 12: 10; 13: 2, 8; 14: 1-40; cf. Rm 12: 6), and to despise prophecies is to quench the Spirit (1 Th 5:19-20).104 1 Corinthians

---

104 Three other Pauline passages are also worth mentioning. In 1 Corinthians 14: 37, a prophet is more or less equated with a Spirit inspired person (cf. Ho. 9: 7). In 2 Thessalonians 2: 2, ‘by Spirit’ is generally taken to mean prophetic utterance, and NIV even translates it as ‘by some prophecy’. In 1 Tim 4: 1-3, while there is some doubt as to whether a specific oracle is in view, there is no doubt about the revelatory function of the Spirit who speaks. Not surprisingly, the Spirit-inspired prophet is a key figure in the Pauline churches (1 Cor 12: 28, 29; 14: 37, Eph 2: 20; 3: 5; 4: 11).
14: 1-40 make a clear distinction between ‘prophecy’ and ‘tongues’ and proposes that it compares two formulae of impulsive utterances: prophecy as extemporaneous comprehensible utterance, and tongues as unstructured incomprehensible utterance. The Spirit is the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in Pauline epistles.\(^ {105}\) The Spirit discloses divine wisdom\(^ {106}\) concealed mysterie,\(^ {107}\) unambiguous revelations,\(^ {108}\) and extraordinary awareness.\(^ {109}\) Hence, not astoundingly, the Spirit is regarded ‘Spirit of wisdom and revelation’ (Eph 1: 17). Similarly, Paul understands the Spirit as the Spirit of charismatic praise.\(^ {110}\) The Spirit enables charismatic admiring to God,\(^ {111}\) as well as to one another (Lincoln 1990: 346).\(^ {112}\)

The charismatic preaching is noticeable in Pauline passages\(^ {113}\) The Spirit is the cause of inspiration, either more commonly for people’s ministry of proclamation and instruction,\(^ {114}\) or more specifically for their charismatic preaching.\(^ {115}\) 1 Corinthians 2: 4-5 and 1 Thessalonians 1: 5-6 are significant since they compare human utterances and divine force. What is being underlined is the fact that the readers had the common experience ‘of being spoken by the Spirit of God, of being grasped by divine power,… of being compelled with a whole-hearted conviction to accept and affirm Paul’s message’ (Dunn 2010: 215-24).

2.4.1.4. The Spirit as the requester for an ethical living

Pauline epistles illustrate the Spirit as the Spirit of virtuous living.\(^ {116}\) There are some observable

\(^{105}\) See 1 Cor 2: 10-16, 12:1-14; 40, Eph 1:17, 3: 3-5, and Col 1: 9.

\(^{106}\) Cf 1 Cor 2: 6-16; Eph 1: 17; 3: 3-5; Col 1: 9.

\(^{107}\) Cf. 1 Cor 2: 7; 13: 2; Eph 3: 3-5.

\(^{108}\) Cf. 1 Cor 14: 6, 24-26, 29-33; Eph 1: 17.

\(^{109}\) Cf. 1 Cor 12: 8; 13: 2, 8; 14: 6.

\(^{110}\) See 1 Cor 12: 1-14; 40; Eph 5: 18-19; Col 3: 16.

\(^{111}\) Cf. 1 Cor 14: 15; Eph 5: 19; Col 3: 16; cf. 1 Cor 12: 10, 28; 13: 1; 14: 2, 14.

\(^{112}\) Lincoln (1990: 346) says spirituality is related to three terms of ‘psalms and hymns and songs’ (Eph. 5: 19; Col 3: 16), see Eph 5: 14; Phil 2: 6-11; Col 1: 15-20; 1 Tim 3: 16; cf. 1 Cor 14: 26; Eph 5: 19; Col 3: 16.

\(^{113}\) See Rm 12: 7-8, 1 Cor 2: 4-5, 12: 28-29, 2 Cor 3: 1-4; Eph 4: 11, Col 3: 16, and 1 Th 1: 5-6.

\(^{114}\) Cf. Rm 15: 18-19; 1 Cor 12: 28-29; 2 Cor 3:3-4, 6; 6: 6-7; Eph 4: 11; cf. Eph 3: 7.

\(^{115}\) Cf. 1 Cor 2: 4-5; 1 Ths 1: 5-6.

\(^{116}\) See Rm 2: 29, 7: 4-6, 8: 1-13, 14: 17, 15: 30, 1 Cor 6: 18-20, 2 Cor 3: 1-18, Gl 3: 3, 4; 29, 5: 13- 6:10, Eph 4:
similarities between Paul and Judaism at this point. In Judaism, the Spirit also stands in contrast to sin\textsuperscript{117} and flesh,\textsuperscript{118} and brings forth ethical qualities such as righteousness, love, joy, peace, goodness, faithfulness, compassion, mercy, and godliness\textsuperscript{119} (Hui 1999: 111).

Rabens (2010: 171-192) explains that according to Paul, the Holy Spirit enables pious-moral life. The Spirit is a supreme substance which transforms people ontologically by virtue of his divine nature. It is mainly through an awareness of, and a personal bond with God, with Jesus, the Anointed One and the community of faith that people are transformed and empowered by the Spirit for a sacred and moral life (Rabens 2010: 182). More important is the common understanding between Paul and Qumran in that it is the Spirit of wisdom and understanding that promotes ethical and religious living.\textsuperscript{120} What the Spirit reveals, however, is not some esoteric wisdom and understanding having nothing to do with ethical living, ‘but the sort of understanding of God and of his word that elicits righteous living’(Turner 1991: 128). The case of Paul is similar. Romans 8: 14 and Galatians 5: 18 speak of believers being led by the Spirit within an ethical context (cf. Philo Gig. 55). If we ask how they are being led, an obvious answer lies in 1 Corinthians 2: 6-16, 12: 1-14: 40, Ephesians 4: 1-16, 5: 15-21, and Colossians 1: 9-12. It is through the charismatic teaching of the apostles, prophets, and teachers (such as Paul in 1 Cor 7: 40 and elsewhere) and the Spirit-given wisdom and understanding within each believer that

\textsuperscript{117} See Hui (1999: 112) quotes cf. LXX Mi. 3: 8-10; 1 En. 67: 10; 1QH 7: 6-7; 14: 12-14, 25-26; T. Levi 2: 3-4; T. Benj. 8: 1-3; Tg. Neof. Gn. 6: 3; Tg. Neb. 2 Chr. 15: 1-19; Mi. 3: 8-12.

\textsuperscript{118} See Hui (1999: 113) quotes cf. Philo Gig. 28-31; Quod Deus 2; Quis Her. 57; cf. LXX Gn. 6: 4; Jub. 5: 8; Tg. Neof. Gn. 6: 3.

\textsuperscript{119} See Hui (1999: 110) narrates cf. LXX Is. 11:1-5; 32:15-17; 61:1-3; 1 En. 62: 2; Philo Gig. 55; Pss. Sol. 17:37; 18:7-8; T. Sim. 4:4; T. Benj. 8:1-3; Tg. Ps.-J. Gn. 6:3; Tg. Neb. 2 Chr 15:1-19; Is 11:1-5; 32:15-17; 44:1-5; 61:1-3; Wis 9:18.

\textsuperscript{120} In 1QH, the psalmist thanks God for the gift of the Spirit by which he is upheld and does not stumble (7: 6-7), is brought to submission (12: 11-13), is purified (16: 11-12), and is drawn near to God (14: 12-13; 16: 11-12). Here, the psalmist is primarily thinking of the Spirit of wisdom and understanding (9: 30-32; 12: 11-13; 14: 12-13, 25; 16: 6-7).
they come to know God and so learn to live righteously before him.

In fulfilling these Old Testament promises, the Spirit is none other than the eschatological return of God to his new temple and the permanent dwelling or presence of God in the midst of his eschatological people (Fee 1994: 843-5). Paul sees the presence and leading of the Spirit in the believers as the presence and leading of God who is even now affecting a new exodus out of the present evil age for his eschatological people. No wonder, for Paul, the Spirit who is the presence and power of God that affects the new covenant obedience promised in the Old Testament, is the necessary and sufficient factor in the believers’ ethical living (Fee 1994: 371). In place of the Torah, the Spirit has become the dominant identity marker of the eschatological people of God.

Both sanctification in the position and sanctification in the progress of the believers are effects of the Spirit. The texts in which Paul speaks of this effect of the Spirit are numerous. “God chose you from the beginning to be saved, through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth” (2 Th 2: 13). Even if sanctification fundamentally signifies consecration, a once-for-all setting aside of a thing or a person for the commission of God, it has in Paul a strong moral awareness, as can be seen from 1 Th 4: 1-8, where Paul exclaims, “This is the will of God, your sanctification,” and concludes: “God has not called us to uncleanness, but to holiness (Johnston 2008: 9-19).

---

121 1 Cor 3: 16; 6: 19; Eph 2: 22; cf. 2 Cor. 6: 16.
122 Rm 5: 5; 8; 9-11; 23; 1 Cor 2: 12; 3: 16; 14: 24-25; 2 Cor 1: 21; 5: 5; 6: 16; Gl 3: 2-5; Eph 1: 13; 4: 30; 1 Ths 4: 8; 2 Tm 1: 14; Tt 3: 6; cf. Is 45: 14; 63: 10; Ezk 37:27.
124 Jr 31: 31-34; Ezk 36: 23-28)
125 2 Cr 1: 22; Eph 1: 13; 4: 30; cf. Rm 8: 9, 14-15; Gl 3: 14; 4: 6)
126 Cf. TDNT (2006: 389-410) there are a few expressions in the Pauline corpus for ‘holiness’:1. ἅγιος - ‘holy’: an adjective, described in the cultic sense, ‘devoted to God, holy, sanctified, set aside for God and His service’, which also shades over into the denotation of ‘holy, pure, perfect, worthy of God’. The adjective in is also used with reference to persons, such as prophets or ‘saints’, the Holy Spirit, angels, Christ, God, or the Church. It is complicated to uncover references where the adjective is used to the accomplishments or aspirations of Christians. 2. ἁγιάζω -’create holy, consecrate, sanctify, purify, i.e. comprise in the interior circle of what is holy, in both sacred and ethical uses of the word’. The verb is by no means used by Paul to submit to human endeavour; the Trinitarian fellowship is at all times the subject of the verb. He sanctified, sanctifies and will sanctify the people of God. 3. ἁγιασμός -’holiness, consecration, sanctification; the use in a ethical sense for a process’. Greek nouns, ‘expressing
Therefore whoever disregards this, disregards not man but God, who gives his Holy Spirit to you.” The transformation by the Spirit takes place in the mortal bodies of believers: “And if the Spirit of him who raised Christ from the dead is living in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through the Spirit who lives in you” (Rm 8:11).

The Spirit that gives an original encounter of the kingdom also motivates hope and strength for the Christians pilgrimage to fulfil their sanctification, because Christ is our sanctification (1 Cor 1:30) and we all are being changed into Christ’s likeness by the Spirit (2 Cor 3:18). In Romans, the love of God given by the Holy Spirit begets hope and endurance for the subsequent journey. This premise is commenced in Roman 5: 1-5. Having been justified by faith, Christians now live in the hope of the glory to come. And they boast even of their afflictions, for they are convinced that the hope that instigates them will not disappoint them, the goal of sharing the glory of God will be attained by the Spirit (Rm 5: 2-5).

2.4.1.5. Spirit of eschatological out-pouring

To Paul, the Spirit is God’s eschatological gift. It is the completeness of God’s grace that dwells in the believers (Raschke 2004: 213). A deflected phase in Western pneumatology yet underscored both by the official decree of the Second Vatican Council and by the popular decree of the charismatic renewal is the function of charisma in the life not only of individual Christians but of all the baptized (Hocken 2009: 58). Multiple New Testament texts witness to the anticipation of the charisma to be given as a component of the benevolence of the Christian commencement. That anointing with the Spirit was not only a demonstration of the Anointed actions are shaped with -μος’, 4. ἁγιοσύνη ‘holiness’ as a an excellence or state, fashioned as a qualitative theoretical with the addition of - σύνη. Other terms convey the ἁγνός word family: derivatives such as ἁγνός, ‘pure or holy’ and the καθαρίζω word family, ‘I cleanse’, which articulate deliberate deeds from the communities. Since Paul is a ‘Hebrew of Hebrews’ (Phl 3.5), it is only normal that his understanding of the ‘holiness’ word-family finds its source in OT thought. The Hebrew root q-d-sh implies ‘to cut’, ‘to separate’ or ‘to divide’. Thus, the word-family expresses a cut or line by which the ‘holy’ is alienated from what is profane and thus exclusively dedicated to God.

127 The propaganda was approved by Pope Paul VI with a huge charismatic gathering at International Conference in St. Peter’s Basilica, Rome in 1970.
One’s divine Sonship but also his empowering to proclaim the kingdom by means of a ministry of teaching, preaching, healing, deliverance, and as such was also programmatic for the missions of the baptized. The author of the epistles to the Ephesians, after the fundamentals that all Christians embraced in common, through the “one baptism,” goes on to affirm that “to each one of us grace was given according to the measure of Christ’s bestowal” (Eph 4: 7), referring to charismatic grace. The equivalent reflection is remarked in virtually identical words in 1 Peter 4: 10: “As each one has received a gift, use it to serve one another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.” This text appears in the midst of epistles that most critics believe to be based on a baptismal liturgy. The prototype pursues that is already stated by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12-14, where, having spoken of the one Spirit by which Christians are baptized into one body and receive the same Spirit, he explains the diversity of charismata. That these charismata would be noticeable in a certain way from the moment of initiation seems implied by Galatians 3: 1-5, where Paul appeals to the Galatians’ initial experiences of the Spirit, by the anointing of the Spirit as affirmation of the pre-eminence of the gospel over the law. Such at least is the significance of the Markan conclusion which was later added to the Gospel (Mk 16: 14-20).

An alternative facet of the spirituality of the early church in the NT distinguished in Acts 2: 42-7 is ‘wonders and signs’ (2: 43). Luke accounts that ‘many wonders and signs were done through the apostle’ (2: 43), and many signs and wonders were done among the people by the hands of the apostles’ (5: 12). ‘Wonders’ were nothing more than actions which defied the natural order, and the Hellenistic world was full of wonder-workers. But as in the prophetic sign-acts, ‘signs’ pointed beyond themselves to the operational force of the Spirit. Primarily, the apostolic signs were miracles of healings (Acts 3: 1-10, 5: 13-16). These miracles parallel the life of God, the Anointed Son, the first Paraclete. Luke demonstrated that what Jesus did in the church the saints could do as well, specifically, the missio Spiritus is at work among them (Thruston 2005: 66-7).

The relationship between outpouring and repentance to the end that God will gather the exiles from nations far and near exhibits a kinship with Acts 2, where Peter advocates the gathered exiles of Acts 2: 5-11 to repent so as to receive the charisma of the Spirit. In both texts, the
eschatological outpouring of the Spirit is fulfilled, while the promised eschatological ingathering of Israel’s exiles has not yet completely taken place.\textsuperscript{128} The association of the outpouring of the Spirit with repentance and the promised ingathering of Israel’s exilic community in both Luke’s account of the earliest Jerusalem followers of the Way and the desert people of the Way substantiates the existence of a shared awareness of the Spirit and an exegetical tradition gathered around the conception of the eschatological in gathering by means of the outpouring of the Spirit (Hinze & Dabney 2001: 17-21).

\section*{2.4.1.6. Synthesis}

The difference between Paul and Judaism at this point is more difficult to judge. On the one hand, Schweizer and Menzies claim that Judaism sees the Spirit as the source of prophetic inspiration, including authoritative preaching and inspired speech. On the other hand, Turner argues that, unlike early Christianity, Judaism does not make any clear connection between the Spirit and charismatic preaching (defined as expository discourse or address). On the whole, Turner is right, in that most of Menzies’ references do not link the Spirit directly with prophetic proclamation or speech (manner) but rather with prophetic revelation (content), and the remaining texts are rather ambiguous.\textsuperscript{129} Thus, while there appears a discernible difference between early Christianity and Judaism in terms of charismatic preaching (a more specific form of charismatic teaching), this is less true in terms of charismatic teaching in general.

At this point, the difference between Paul and Judaism is even greater than before, since the latter seems to lack any obvious interest in this aspect of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{130} Paul views the Spirit as

\textsuperscript{128} There exist, therefore, an exegetical tradition of prophetic texts which refer to the outpouring of the Spirit; Jl 3: 1-5; Ezekiel 39: 28-29, Isaiah 44: 3 and 59: 21. While Peter, according to Acts 2, cites Joel 3, the presence of gathered exiles and the promise of the Spirit to the hearer’ children suggest that Ezekiel 39 and Isaiah 59 lie also within Luke’s purview.

\textsuperscript{129} Some probable references are to prophetic speech (manner) rather than prophetic revelation (content). But even these are being questioned by Turner (1998a: 22).

\textsuperscript{130} Some possible references are 1QH 16:11-12, b. \textit{Ber}, 31b-32a, and Sir. 39:6. But ‘the spirit’ by which the speaker implores God in 1QH 16:11 could be a human, even if renewed, spirit and not the Holy Spirit.
the Spirit of power.\textsuperscript{131} Here, the Spirit is the source of power either more generally behind Paul’s ministry,\textsuperscript{132} or more specifically for works of healings and miracles\textsuperscript{133} and other Spirit-inspired deeds or qualities such as charismatic preaching and boldness.\textsuperscript{134} Given this close association between the Spirit and power, it is not surprising to find the Spirit being described as the Spirit of power (2 Tm 1: 7), (Fee 1994: 153,735).\textsuperscript{135} Judaism is not wholly different though the emphasis appears to be on military might rather than on miraculous power as in Paul. Thus, the Spirit is the source of power either behind the military might of the judges and the messiah.\textsuperscript{136}

Despite these similarities, there are at least two fundamental differences between Paul and Judaism at this point. First, the Spirit in Judaism stands alongside rather than in contrast to the Torah.\textsuperscript{137} Paul’s antithesis between Spirit and Torah is unique and forms ‘part of his distinctive

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{131} See some obvious Pauline passages (Rm 15: 19, 1 Cor 2: 4-5, 12: 9-10, 28-29, 2 Cor 3: 1-18, 6: 6-7, Gl 3: 5, Eph 3: 16, 1 Th 1: 5, and 2 Tm 1: 6-8).

\textsuperscript{132} Cf. Rm 15: 19; 2 Cor 3: 1-18; 6: 6-7; Eph 3: 7; Cl 1: 29.

\textsuperscript{133} Cf. 1 Cor 12:9-10, 28-30; 13:2; Gl 3: 5; cf. 2 Cor 12:9, 12.

\textsuperscript{134} Cf. 1 Cor 2: 4-5; Eph 3: 16; 2 Tm 1: 6-8; cf. Rm 15: 13; Eph 6: 18-19; Cl 4: 3-4.

\textsuperscript{135} It is somewhat surprising to find Fee consistently dissociating the Spirit from resurrection power, especially in view of the OT motif of the Spirit of creation and life (Ps 104: 30, Is 32: 15, 44: 3, Ezek 37: 1-14) and the frequent juxtaposition of Spirit and power terminologies in Paul. Eph. 1: 19-20 is worth noting since the power at work in the believers is taken to be the same power which raised Jesus from the dead. If, as Fee repeatedly argues, the Spirit is the very power at work in the believers, then the power that raised Jesus must also be related to the divine Spirit. Similarly, if the Spirit determines both the present eschatological existence of the believer (Rm 8: 23; 2 Cor 1: 22; 5: 5; Gl 3: 3; 5: 25; Eph 1: 14) and his future eschatological existence (Rm 8: 10; 1 Cor 15: 44-46; Gl 6: 8) it would be reasonable to think that he is somehow related to the power of resurrection that bridges the two eschatological existences.

\textsuperscript{136} LXX Judg. 6: 34; 11: 29; Is. 11: 2; 1 En. 49: 3; 1QSb 5: 25; 4Q161; Bib. Ant. 27: 9-10; Pss. Sol. 17: 37; 18: 7; Tg. Neb. Judg 14: 6; 15: 14; Is. 11: 2), for miraculous acts (LXX 4 Kgdms. 2: 9-15; Josephus Ant. 8,408; Sir. 48: 12-14; Tg. Neb. 2 Ki 2: 9-15), or for other events or qualities such as being lifted, being transformed, prophecy, courage, and moral strength (1QH 7: 6-7; 16: 6-7; 2 Apoc. Bar. 6: 3; Bib. Ant. 36: 2; Josephus Ant. 6,223; Philo Virt. 217; Sir. 48: 24; Tg. Neb. 1 Sa 11: 6; 1 Chr 12: 19; Ezk 8: 3; 11: 1).

\textsuperscript{137} See e.g., 1QH 12: 11-13; 16: 6-7; 1QS 8: 16; CD 2: 12; Dt. Rab. 6:14; Midr.Ps. 14:6; Philo Decal. 175; Sir. 39:6-8; cf. Sir. 19:20; 24:3-23; Wis. 18:4.
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contribution to New Testament pneumatology’. Second, in contrast to Philo and the rest of Judaism, the Pauline antithesis between the Spirit and flesh is an apocalyptic or eschatological dualism. This apocalyptic or eschatological dualism leads to a key theme in Pauline pneumatology. In contrast to the ‘flesh’ which belongs to the present evil age (Gl 1: 4), the Spirit in Paul is the Spirit of the new covenant and the new creation that brings new eschatological existence-life to the believer (Rm 6: 4; 7: 6; 1 Cor 5: 7; 2 Cor 5: 17; Gl 6: 15; Eph 2: 15; 4: 24; Cl 3: 10; cf. Ezk 37: 14), (Turner 1991: 108-9).

Despite these similarities between Paul and Judaism (especially Qumran), there are also some fundamental differences. First, the means of sanctification is not the same (Johnston 2008: 18). For Qumran, it is the sectarian interpretation of the Law that is the truth. For Paul, the gospel of Jesus Christ is the truth. Second, the Spirit in Paul is not only the Spirit of God but also the Spirit of Christ who mediates the presence and power of Christ and recreates Christ, the last Adam or the new man, in the believers. Third, salvation is no longer a matter of defeating national enemies such as the Romans and their Jewish collaborators, but spiritual forces such as Satan, sin, flesh, and death. It is against these that both Jesus and the Spirit, the two agents of eschatological salvation, are involved. Fourth, neither is salvation a matter of the gathering of the twelve tribes in the land of Israel and the subjugation of the Gentiles under Jewish rule, but a matter of the gathering of the Jewish and Gentile believers in the body of

---

138 We should perhaps add that the Pauline antithesis of the Spirit and Torah is not always absolute (Rm 7: 12-14; cf. Rm 3: 31; Gl 5: 13-23).

139 Cf. 2 Cor 3: 3-18; 1 Ths 4: 8; cf. Jr 31: 31-34; Ezk 36: 23-28; 1 Cor 11: 25.

140 Cf. Rm 8: 23; 1 Cor 15: 44-46; 2 Cor 1: 22; 5: 5; Eph 1: 14.

141 Cf. 2 Cor 4: -6; 6: 7; Gl 2: 5, 14; Eph 1:13; Cl 1: 5.

142 Cf. Rm 8: 9; Gl 4: 6; Phl 1: 19.

143 Cf. Rm 8: 9-10; 1 Cr 2: 6-16; 12: 5; Gl 2: 20; Eph 3: 16-17; 4: 7-11.


145 1 Cr 7: 5; 2 Cr 2: 11; 4: 4; Eph 2: 2; 6: 11-12; 1 Ths 2: 18.

146 Rm 5: 12-8:11; 1 Cr 15: 56.

147 Rm 8: 1-17; Gl 5: 13-6:10.

148 Rm 5: 12-21; 1 Cr 15: 25-26, 54-57.

149 Cf. Rm 8: 2; 1 Cor 6: 11; 2 Cor 2: 14-4:6; Eph 2: 11-22; Phl 3: 3.
Christ through the Spirit of unity.\footnote{Cf. 1 Cor 3: 16-17; 12: 4-13; Eph 2: 18-22; 4: 3-4; cf. Acts 10: 47; 11: 15; 15: 8.}

2.4.2. Two aspects of baptism with the Spirit

2.4.2.1. Soteriological and charismatic

Luke’s pneumatology differs from that of Paul, eventually complementary, but unique. In 1 Cor. 12:13, Paul obviously explicates the baptism with the Spirit as the means by which one is joined to the body of the Anointed One: “For we were all baptized by one Spirit into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, slave or free, and we were all given the one Spirit to drink.” Paul refers to the Spirit as the cause of purification (1 Cor 6: 11) and righteousness (Gl 5: 5; Rm 8: 1-17), of intimacy with the God (Gl 4: 6) and the revelation of God (1 Cor 2: 6-16; 2 Cor 3: 3-18). He describes Him as the cause of ultimate transformation and resurrection (Rm 8: 11; Gl 6: 8). All of these phrases present in the early church had integrated and decidedly shaped pneumatology. Luke, Paul, and John articulate in unison: the Spirit is the very subsistence of believers.

The significant implications of this conclusion cannot be overlooked. The charismatic aspect of the Spirit to which Luke bears witness must be positioned together with the soteriological dimension in Paul’s literatures.

2.4.3. Conclusion

There are noticeable similarities between the prophetic Spirit in Jewish literatures and in Pauline pneumatology. The continuity lies in between the \textit{charisma} of the Spirit in Paul and the prophetic Spirit and power within the Jewish community. The sanctifying Spirit referred to in a range of Pauline literatures is connected to the Spirit of righteousness or moral living within Jewish contexts. The differences between the two, however, are not unimportant. Three key developments from the Jewish contexts to Paul can be noticed. First, the re-acknowledgment of the term “eschatology”: The Spirit is the Spirit of reconciliation that unites the Jewish
community and Gentile believers in the Anointed One, which is the recreated eschatological Israel, Gods people. Second, the idea of eschatological completion: the Spirit is the Spirit of fulfilment, the godly guarantee of his physical presence of the Anointed One in the centre of his followers, his indwelling in their eschatological sanctuary, his inscription of the commandment in their hearts and minds, and his benevolence of the eschatological charisma among them. Third, the subject of Christological prominence: The Spirit is not only the Spirit of God, but also the Spirit of the Anointed One, the eschatological Messiah of the universe. The eschatological people of God are even now being characterized with being a resemblance of the Anointed One through the missio Spiritus.

2.5. Synthesis

This study investigated the NT metaphor of the baptism in the Spirit, and traced Luke’s use of this term. It showed a distinctive Lukan perspective on the baptism of Spirit, which must be understood along with the soteriological in the Pauline epistles. Both perspectives on Spirit baptism are sustained by Charismatic theology, the reception of the life-creating and inhabiting Spirit by every Christian and the baptism in the Spirit, which serves as an anointing for mission and a task.

The recognition that Luke's pneumatology is dissimilar to that of Paul is significant for a Charismatic perception of Spirit baptism, though Paul mentioned the charismata of the Spirit in 1 Cor 12-15. Some Reformed theologians agree that Luke accentuates the missio Spiritus’ empowering of the church for its commission. Berkhof (1974: 165-7) speaks of the “vocational” dimension of the Spirit’s work. Calvin (1960 3.1.2) refers to the bestowal of “explicit powers” and “noticeable graces.” However simultaneously, they uphold that Luke, in a manner analogous to Paul, relates Spirit baptism to conversion and salvation. This vocational or charismatic element of baptism in the Spirit is simply an indication of Luke’s emphasis. In the same manner Reformed theologians can speak of the charisma of the Spirit received at Pentecost as the indispensable component of conversion, the means by which the believers experience the new
covenantal benevolence, redemption, justification, sanctification and glorification, although they might also acknowledge that divine empowerment is prominent in Luke’s account. The charisma of the Spirit is exclusively described in terms of the charismatic narrative in Luke. His narrative reflects more than a unique emphasis; it bears witness to a distinguishing theology of the Spirit for the Charismatic movements. Consequently, the charismatic character of Luke’s baptism in the Spirit and Luke’s unique and Charismatic contribution to Scriptural pneumatology is the key to understand the Charismatic movements. The common thread that ties together the perspectives of the Reformed tradition and of the Charismatic movements is the assumption that the NT presents a relatively unified picture concerning the work of the Spirit in general and baptism in the Spirit in particular.

The next section will investigate the missio Spiritus in the Scriptures, which will assist to recognize the purpose of the anointing with the Spirit in the whole framework of the Trinitarian redemption in this research.

2.6. Missio Spiritus in the Trinity

The Spirit is a person in interaction with the other persons of the immanent Trinity. This reality constitutes the unique action of the Spirit which could appropriately be designated ‘theology of the Spirit’. Pneumatology is to spiritual theology as Christology is to soteriology. Pneumatology as the theological foundation for Christian spirituality must embrace as a theology of the missio Spiritus in the Christian life as a whole, in its individual, communal and even cosmic scopes. Moral and ethical theology must be a part of this superior realm which originates from the missio Spiritus and its Trinitarian characters. The ‘theology of the Spirit’ is embraced as the function of the Spirit in the works of the other two persons and with the Spirit’s own distinctive mission. The impact of each on the individual, community, and cosmos is the focal point of the issue (Hughes 2001b: 83).

The traditional charismata of the Spirit, the Pauline categories, particularly 1 Cor 12-14, are the means of the Spirit. The Pentecostal and Charismatic movement have most likely regained a
dynamic pneumatology in regard to spiritual charismata. However, there is one superlative spiritual charisma, the inhabiting by Spirit himself; individual gifts are the impact on individuals of this utmost charisma, and operate in the Trinitarian continuum of the missio Spiritus. The theological virtues, and the beatitudes, as well as the fruits of the Spirit, appear to be the common consequences of the Spirit-indwelling, into which we are all established at diverse areas of life (Hughes 2005: 220). These charismata can be for the individual and his empowerment, but they are specifically given for communal edification in the spiritual union of the believers and the Kingdom of God.

In the Scripture the ministerial charisma can be bestowed when requested through the determination of the Spirit (1Cor 12: 11), yet it is not primarily for the individual (1Cor 12: 31). Instead, these are granted by the anointing of the Spirit to take part in the redemptive economic work of the Triune God, particularly the building up for the body of the Anointed One in the world as commissioned (Callen 2001: 116-88). The charismata within the superior realm of the Spirit’s Trinitarian tasks are neglected subjects in the conventional Western Christian church for the past decades, and some counterfeit inclinations in Free Spirit, the Pentecostal and Charismatic traditions need corrections. From the perspective of Christian theology, Spirituality is a description of the inhabiting Spirit at work in the believers gratifying the Trinitarian missio in us and in the world as we all mature into the perfect kingdom of the Trinitarian glory.

The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ and assists in the missio Christi,151 as they both assist and serve the creative assignment of God, the Father. But the Spirit has his own task, completing the commission of the Anointed One, by making it universal and cosmic in extent in space and time. This is why John’s Gospel indicates the Spirit to be a second Paraclete (Jn 14: 16). The Anointed One himself is obviously the primary paraclete. He himself declared that He was the Anointed One:

151 Missio Christi was found as a preacher and a prophet to execute the office (Mt 4: 12-7). The Anointed One was a healer to bind up the broken-hearted (Mt 5: 1-12). He was a deliverer to bring liberty to the captives (Mt 8: 12). He was a comforter to comfort all who mourn (Mt 5: 4). Lastly he was a planter to initiate the church (Mt 16: 13-20).
“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour . . . today this scripture is fulfilled in your hearing” (Lk 4: 16-21).

The Spirit neither replaces the primary advocate, nor simply relates to him, but has his distinctive mission to work with as well. The missio Spiritus is never apart from the missio Christi, but has its own criterion and integrity. Without a clear understanding of the missio Spiritus, the missio Christi is reduced, disregarding the ascended and glorified Christ as the Spirit-Giver, and misunderstanding the return of the Anointed One as legendary, with little or no correlation to the Spirit led history between the Ascension and the Parusia (Herron 1983: 155-79).

2.5.1. The threefold missio of the Spirit

The missio Spiritus can be observed as a work with three phases in the process of spiritual development, which are, conversion, transformation and perfection. The primary dimension of the missio Spiritus in the believer is to be labelled ‘conversion’ (Hughes 2002: 118). It is the mission God operated through the Anointed One and the Spirit. Both the Anointed One and the Spirit have their distinctive economies in these three actions. These are described according to

---

152 Herron (1983: 163) remarks on the economy of the history of the interweaving ministries of the second and third persons. The Anointed One is incarnated by the Spirit, endowed and commissioned with the Spirit at his baptism, and empowered by the Spirit in revelation, teaching and miraculous works through his ministry. The Anointed One also yields the Spirit at his death, and then is risen in the power of the Spirit, and imparts the charismata of the Spirit on his disciples. 

153 See Jensen (2008: 83). The notion of three dimensions in the spiritual life became preeminent concepts in Christian life, for instance, the Reformed elucidates the ordo salutis as justification, sanctification and perfection. But this concept of three stages became demoralized as a portrayal of human development by Rahner (1967), particularly by depicting the three stages as purgation, enlightenment, and to become proficient and complete (Hughes 2001b: 91, 93-9). These three concepts are a reverberation of the Spirit’s threefold ministry, which is not subsequent, but coexisting. Accordingly the Trinitarian constitution of the missio Spiritus affects three coexisting phases. One or more of these manifestations may dominate in a personal life, yet none is ever totally missing. It requests the continuing necessity of repentance and confession of iniquities during the process of life.
According to Jenson (1997: 161), the Spirit’s vital function throughout is deliverance within the immanent but eternal life itself, as the Spirit frees God and the Anointed and his Son from each other, and therefore for each other as the third person who unites the interrelation between them. Lee (2004: 287) says that in the mutuality of the relationship of God and the Anointed One, the Spirit of truth guides the disciples into all truth in the absence of the Anointed One (Jn 16:13). The Spirit shares the mission of the Anointed One and both convict the world of sin and create the believers to regenerate and transform them through the inhabiting of the Spirit within the believers and the faith community.

Since conversion takes place in the heart of believers, it is the *missio Spiritus* that delivers the believers from the conflict in the personal lives of the Christian (Hughes 2002: 119-20). It requires ‘self-denial’ after regeneration. The *missio Spiritus* demolishes the forces that weaken a truthful individual and community. At times, it is a long process of remedial cure from traumas that have intensely wounded and distorted the individual and community. Only true repentance motivated by the *missio Spiritus* leads the way from all evil schemes against God. This therapeutic mission is consequence of the inhabiting Spirit as the *missio Spiritus*.

The second stage of the *missio Spiritus* is ‘transformation’. It is the application of the incarnation of the second person of the Trinity, the Anointed One. The Spirit transforms the identity of the believers by uniting them to the Anointed One. The *missio Christi* continues through the outpouring of the Spirit (Jn 14: 16-17; 16: 14).

The third *missio Spiritus* is sanctification of the believers and perfection as component of the consecration of the entire substance universe, the *pleroma* (Callen 2001: 95). The *missio Spiritus* functions as eschatological accomplishment to spiritually unite God and his fearfully and wonderfully made creation (Ps 139: 14). The perfect achievement of the Kingdom of God is the consummation of the inhabiting of the Spirit (Callen 2001: 96). This dimension existed from the initiation of the believer through the inhabiting of the Spirit as *sperma Theou* towards sanctification. This stage is apparent in a mysterious and spiritual union, *theosis*, the full
participation of the Trinity in the perfect sovereignty of God by the *missio Spiritus* (Hughes 2005: 219).

The *missio Spiritus* affects all three phases in the believers toward their new creation (2 Cor 5: 17; Gl 6: 15). The *missio Spiritus* is on a continuum with the regenerated life of the believers’ supernatural existences with God, through the inhabiting of the *sperma Theou* as the imparted source of mystical union which is liberated from the eternal condemnation (Hughes 2005: 220).

2.5.2. Missio Spiritus: regeneration and inhabitation

The *missio Spiritus* can be seen in two ways as regeneration of and as inhabiting in the believers by means of the *missio Spiritus*. This section will investigate the inhabiting of the Spirit as God’s covenantal presence in the believers. Paul is explicit that the inhabiting of the Spirit constitutes the believers as God’s sanctuary (1 Cor 3: 16). While the writer of the Fourth Gospel does not clearly elucidate this truth as explicitly as Paul, it does indicate that the inhabiting of the Spirit enables believers in the Anointed One to rejoice the soteriological reality.

The Spirit dwells in the believers. All Christians rejoices in the inhabitation of the Spirit. The Spirit’s inhabitation in the disciples is comparable to the reception of the Spirit. The reception of the Spirit illustrates the initiation of the inhabiting of the Spirit (Is 44: 3; Jl 2: 28). According to John 7: 38-39 Jesus said:

He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, ‘Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water. Now this he said about the Spirit, which those who believed in him were to receive; for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.’

It does not indicate that the Spirit was not yet operating in the world. But it specifies that the Spirit was not yet received, and in the understanding of John 14:17 those believers were not yet

---

154 Cf. Calvin 3. 2. 39; 1 Cor 2: 12; Rm 8: 14, 16; 1 Jn 3: 24; 4: 13.
inhabited by the Spirit. This text describes that those who have believed in the Anointed One are about to receive the Spirit. Since it confirms that those who believe in the Anointed One have been born of God, this would suggest that there is clear distinction between regeneration and the reception by means of the missio Spiritus (Jn 1: 11-13). The Fourth Gospel reveals the reception of the Spirit (Jn 14: 17; 20: 22). John 14: 17 is informative for determining what is meant by the Spirit will be accepted. In this passage the Anointed One states to his disciples:

And I will ask the Father and he will give you another Counsellor, to be with you forever, the Spirit of truth, the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him. But you know him, for he dwells (meno means ‘to remain in the same place, to stay.) with you, and will be in you (Jn 14: 16-17).

The exegetical confirmation can be observed that believers is to be inhabited by the Spirit (Jn 7:39). While Jesus was with his disciples, He was the source of their faith in Him. After his death and resurrection the Spirit is the source of their faith in Jesus. It affirms that regeneration is the creation of a new capability to perceive, recognize, and believe the unseen truth in John’s Gospel. The texts indicate that the experience of new birth entails the Spirit inhabits in those who are regenerated. Regeneration is not to be compared with inhabiting. The expressions, “what has been born of the Spirit is spirit” (Jn 3: 6), does not identify that the one who is subjected to the

155 For example, evangelist of the Fourth Gospel reports that the Anointed One states, “A time is coming and now is” (Jn 4: 23; 5: 25). This declaration specifies that during the ministry of the Anointed One the eschaton was starting to daybreak. If as the eschaton daybreaks, and those who have not accepted the inhabiting Spirit, and they must wait until after the Anointed One is glorified at the cross to accept this. It cannot be sustained that those who resided proceeding the eschatological era had already received the inhabiting Spirit as eschatological charisma, but they had Jesus, the Son of God with them.

156 John 6: 63 indicates the regenerating ministry of the Spirit. “The Spirit gives life; the flesh counts for nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and they are life”. This transcript points out that words are categorized to the spiritual realms, and that the flesh cannot help to understand a revelational message. If one is to comprehend the words of the Anointed One, which are in the spiritual realms, one ought to be acknowledged by the Spirit. It appears that regeneration takes place when the Spirit makes a person to understand to be alive. In fact, John 7: 39 mentions those who have believed were to receive the Spirit later, but Jesus was with them! And He is the life (Jn 14: 6).
new birth is inhabited by the Spirit, but rather that the one who is ‘born of the Spirit’ is to reside in the spiritual realm.

Rather than residing in a notable temple in a specific city, the Anointed One affirms to his disciples that he is going to prepare their residence with those who faithfully remain in the words of the Anointed One (Jn 14: 23). The Anointed One affirms that the Father, the Spirit and the Son will inhabit those who obey his love commandment (Jn 14: 14-26). This paragraph indicates the believers that inhabiting is to be followed after regeneration. Regeneration brought a fresh faculty to perceive and believe by God’s covenantal promise through the inhabitation of the Spirit. Both were created by means of the missio Spiritus.

The Spirit has regenerated the disciples and has given them the capability to follow and to love Jesus. They are responsible to love Jesus and keep his word, and the Father and the Son and the Spirit will make their home with them (Jn 14: 23-24). As He who has called you is holy, be holy yourselves in all your conduct; since it is written, ‘You shall be holy, for I am holy’ (1 Pt 1: 15-16). Your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have from God. The believers were bought with a price. Therefore they have to glorify God in their body (1 Cor 6: 19-20). This relates to God’s demand that Israel be committed to Him and his word to remain sanctified because he inhabits among them.¹⁵⁷

Like Israel who had to obey the word of God to keep the inhabiting place of God sanctified, the disciples must love the Anointed One and keep his word (Jn 14: 15, 23) to remain the holy residence of God. As formerly the presence of God was mediated by the temple, the mediation of the presence of God through the Spirit is promised to believers (Jn 14: 15-23). What the inhabiting of the Spirit holds for believers is indicated in John 20:22-23. Having breathed on the

¹⁵⁷ The words of the Anointed One in John 14: 23, “If anyone loves me he will obey my teaching. My Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him,” are obviously reminiscent of God’s word to Solomon in relation to the inauguration of the Temple, the indispensable obedience to God who inhabited the sanctuary.
disciples and commanded them to receive the Holy Spirit (Jn 20: 22),\textsuperscript{158} the Anointed One states, “If you forgive anyone his sins, they are forgiven; if you do not forgive them, they are not forgiven” (Jn 20: 23). Under the old covenant, Israelites were obligated to go to the temple to offer sacrifice for iniquities and obtain forgiveness. In the new covenant that sacrifice for transgression has been accomplished by the death of the Anointed One on the cross (Jn 19: 30).

2.5.3. Conclusion

The characteristics of the Spirit are manifested in the area of revelational, soteriological, sanctificational, charismatic and eschatological missions of the Trinitarian economies by means of the \textit{missio Spiritus}. When the believers wholly recognizes the mission of God, the commission of Israel and the assignment of the Anointed One, then the task of Church will be fully acknowledged. Eventually the anointing and assignment of those whom the Anointed One himself commissioned, that is, the body of the Anointed One can be a vigorous instrument to fulfil his purpose and will in the world.

The appropriate highlight on ‘spirituality’ originated from being united with the Anointed One, creating the imitation of the Anointed One is overlooked by a considerable indication: it is only achievable through the inhabiting of the Spirit. To Jenson (1997: 82) the over-highlighting in Western spirituality on participating in the \textit{missio Christi}, while neglecting a call to participate in the \textit{missio Spiritus}, is improperly defined.\textsuperscript{159} The Charismatic movements are perhaps the one exception (Hughes 2005: 210). Their continuing struggle with the Reformed churches describes specifically this predicament on the Charismatic side as does the propensity of the Reformed tradition to disregard of the Spirit’s function in various kinds of manifestations to build the churches of the Anointed One to perfection by consistent increase of faith.

---

\textsuperscript{158} For argument of the hermeneutic preference is that the glorification of the Anointed One is the crucifixion, which authorizes the Spirit to be bestowed in advance the ascension.

\textsuperscript{159} Jenson (1997: 86) decidedly disapproves of the Western tendency, afterward, is to reduce trinitarianism to bipolarity, by allocating the economic operations of the Spirit to the Anointed One.
The next section will research the development of the historical progress of pneumatology to understand the anointing with the Spirit. The history of pneumatology indicates the movements of the Spirit and exposes inappropriate movements in the church about the Spirit in the history of the Christian church.

C. Historical developments on pneumatology

1. Introduction

The historical tradition comprises many views about the Pneuma. As Tracy (1998: 102) reminds us, ‘if a text is a genuinely classic one, it will provoke, challenge, and transform our present horizons’. Scriptural substances are more creative and composite than one might think, given the thrust of various systematic assertions. For instance, theological conversation about “law and gospel” and “creation” has often reduced these concepts to sheer commandments in the first instance and the premise of dependence of their various, complicate and inspired biblical terminologies (Welker 1994: 131-2).

The Early Church Fathers relied on the Scriptures for their theological idiom (Bucur 2009: 27-83). The manuscripts of orthodoxy used in the early Church were the scope to which Scriptural

160 Tracy (1998: 34-9) says that some systematicians are not the only ones at error. Historians are not instructive when they demote the past to the past, refusing to consider the category of dialectic that attaches the past and the present in reciprocal, critical, and significant ways. They approach the past as dead and over, rather than as the living resource it can be when one allows the ancient literature to ‘read’ us even as we read them. Such a posture blocks ‘stray breezes of the Spirit from wafting forward to upset contemporary complacencies.’

161 Welker (1992[1994]: 83-4) is interested in establishing an improved correlation between systematic theology and the biblical tradition for a similar reason. He has addressed the subject of particularity in his work on the Holy Spirit, Gottes Geist, and confirms to his interlocutor that he is definitely not anti-systematic, but he does aspire to account what he observes as reductionistic tendencies in theology. He proposes that resolutions of foremost social and ethical dilemmas presented by a typical theology have often been greatly fashioned by ‘misleading abstractions.’ He is interested in ascertaining a superior relationship between systematic theology and the biblical tradition for a comparable explanation.
language and thought forms, particularly in the field of the Spirit permeated the Fathers’ writings (Mueller 2007: 338-440). The revitalization of the Trinitarian doctrine among the Reformed theologians has involved the resurgence of Scriptural and conventional acknowledgment of the robust relations of the Father, the Son as the Anointed One and the Spirit, as well as engagement with developments in the social scientific perception of individuality (Shults 2005:142).

The research of this section is to evaluate how this permeation was articulated by the ancient materials and how it was outstandingly re-expressed by their successors (Case-Winters2007: 56-9). What is the source of the developed pneumatology which the apostles and Evangelists evidently presume that the reader understands? What is the background of the terminology in these references? How was the NT Pneumatology developed to the extent that Spirit-endowed charismata, Spirit-inspired prophecy, and guidance by the Spirit among other phenomena, were viewed as normative in the church tradition?

2. Diverse developments on pneumatology

2.1. The Spirit as an eschatological mediator of purification

Dead Sea Scrolls describes the Spirit as an eschatological agent of purification. During the centuries preceding the first century C.E., this flexibility with respect to the hypothesis of the Holy Spirit persisted, as the Dead Sea Scrolls illustrate (Heron 1983: 74). In The Damascus Document 7:4 and 5:11-13, the term, the Holy Spirit, substitutes the Scriptural idiom, nefesh, to illustrate that which can be desecrated (Werrett 2007: 93). While Leviticus 11:43 and 20:25 enclose the command not to defile the nefesh, ‘The Damascus Document’ 7:4 depicts sinners who degrade ‘their Holy Spirit, for with blasphemous tongue they have opened their mouth against the statutes of God’s covenant’. Contrast this with the hymn writer’s gratitude to God that he is ‘strengthened by the Spirit of holiness…’, (Werrett 2007: 93) or the words of honour that God has chosen ‘to purity me with your Holy Spirit’ (Werrett 2007: 215-6). Nonetheless beyond afield from the anthropological elucidation of the idiom, the Holy Spirit in ‘The Damascus
Document’ 7:4 is the belief expressed in 1Q512: 4: 21, according to which the Holy Spirit is the eschatological sanctification.

2.2. The Spirit as an absolute gratification giver

The nature of diversity that characterizes these two corpora, the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Scrolls are evident, as well in the writings of the individual first century C.E. author, Philo Judaeus. According to Heron (1983: 67), when Philo illustrates Genesis 2: 7, he endeavours to describe human beings as the borderland between the divine and creation worlds, composed of immortal breath and mortal clay. On the Creation 134-35: ‘it says, however, that the formation of the individual human, the object of sense, is a composite one made up of earthly substance and of Divine breath… nothing else than a Divine breath that migrated hither from that blissful and happy existence for the benefit of our race….’. Philo’s perception of Genesis 2: 7 exhibits an extraordinary kinship with Seneca’s narrative of the human soul as:

The Holy Spirit that indwells within us… . If you see a person who is unterrified in the midst of dangers, untouched by desires, happy in adversity… . Will you not say: “This quality is too great and too lofty to be regarded as resembling this petty body in which it dwells? A divine power has descended upon that person” (Moral Epistles 41.2.4). For both Seneca and Philo, the divine or Holy Spirit is that constituent segment of human beings which partakes in the divine world (Heron 1983: 69).

2.3. The Spirit as a prophetic & revelational Being

Philo’s interpretation of scriptural prophetic ecstasy is analogous to Plutarch’s clarification of the Delphic prophetic inspiration. The vapour of Delphi, in particular, a ‘prophetic current and breath… most holy and divine,” causes a bodily temperament “through which the reasoning and

---

162 A leading Jewish citizen of Alexandria who was born between 20 and 10 B.C.E. and who died approximately 50 C.E, understood the expression, ‘Divine Spirit,’ in various ways.
thinking faculty of the soul is relaxed…” (Volker 2010: 149).

Both involve a momentary failure of psychological control motivated by an external πνεûμα.\(^\text{163}\) Precisely how Philo thought this πνεûμα consisted is not apparent, though Plutarch identifies it as the vapour which arose from the cleft of the rock at Delphi (Heron 1983: 72). The diversity in the divine spirit is palpable in Philo’s autobiographical reflections on the inspiration with which he interprets the Scripture (Volker 2010: 151). In On Dreams 2.252, Philo refers to the invisible voice which he hears:

> “I hear once more the voice of an invisible spirit, the familiar secret tenant, saying ‘Friend, it would seem that there is a matter great and precious of which thou knowest nothing, and I will ungrudgingly shew thee, for many other well-timed lesson have I given thee’” (Heron 1983: 69).

This shape of inspiration diverges noticeably from prophetic inspiration, for Philo’s own encounter entails admonishing, rather than by passing, his mind. The affinities between the prominent Socrates and Philo, at least in Philo’s assessment, embrace an unflustered mind which is taught by the presence of a habitual inspirational friend. Once again, then, the inspiring spirit has undertaken a transformation through its coalescence with Hebraic conceptions of inspiration (Volker 2010: 150).

### 3. Formation of pneumatology

The major reason for the scanty references to the Spirit in early materials seem to be the incomplete differentiation between the Second and Third persons of the Holy Trinity (Spinks 2006: 62). Towards the end of the second century and in the third, extra copious developed theologies of the Spirit instigated the emergence of apologists against them. Particularly important works were the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus of Lyons (ca. 200), Tertullian’s

---

\(^{\text{163}}\) The loss of mental control does not indicate that one is insane, yet became an instrument or medium, delivering divine revelations.
Adversus Praxean, and the De Principiis of Origen of Alexandria (ca. 253/4). These radiate a great deal of light on the questions that were being raised and the experimental answers to them in the generations before the period of more definitive doctrinal formulation that followed in the fourth century (Volker 2010: 152).

3.1. The Spirit in the Trinitarian controversy

3.1.1. The Spirit as the medium in creation and redemption

McGrath (2011: 13) says that Irenaeus’ Trinitarian faith is one of the most important assumptions in Patristic literature in the centrality of worship. For the early Fathers, the function of theology has both a dogmatic and a doxological objective: to determine the foundations for worship of the one, true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The more explicitly doctrinal issues are inclined to dominate the route between Johannine theological studies and Patristics (Lee 2004: 277). Irenaeus resolutely reasserted the distinctiveness of the one God as Creator and Redeemer, the

164 Yet, it might advocate that the function of the Spirit is largely to carry out what he hears from the Father and the Son, because it inevitably requires an ‘integrated oneness’ among them in any works of the Trinity. See John 16: 13-15.

165 The Adversus Haereses unfolds a positive statement of the faith and at the same time refutes in considerable detail the teaching of sundry Gnostic groups, and of Marcion who rejected the Old Testament, and held that the Father of Jesus Christ, the God of love, was not be identified with the Creator of the world, the God of the Old Testament, the jealous God. Many Gnostics subscribed to even extreme views of this world as inherently evil,
character of the world as God’s originally excellent creation, and the authentic humanity of Jesus as the foundation of our salvation (Habets 2009: 49-53). Within his frame of work and at every main point in it, he also distinguished the activity of the Spirit.

Irenaeus pursues the concept of Hellenistic Judaism that identified the divine Wisdom in Prov. 8 with the Spirit (IV. xx.3). The Father has his Word, which is his Son, and his Wisdom, which is his Spirit, and these are his ‘two hands’ by which he created all things (IV. xx.1). The Spirit has thus a double function, in creation and redemption (Briggman 2011: 89). While Marcion and others break the relation between creation and salvation, Irenaeus arrays each in the light of the other, and traces the same pattern in both relations. So he identifies together the Sophia-Pneuma of earlier belief with the Spirit of Christ and of the Father unveiled in the New Testament (Briggman 2011: 104-36). Redemption through Jesus Christ is a creative achievement which at the same time resonates and reaffirms God’s fundamental calling of all things into being, and the Spirit at work in the one is also active in the other (Briggman 2011: 66-7).

3.1.2. The Spirit as the source of life

The significance of the Spirit’s prophetic task for the fulfilment of the incarnation of the Anointed One highlights the Spirit as the source of life. This miraculous event, according to Justin, confirms the achievement of the Spirit’s work and the eagerness about the coming Messiah in the prophets of the Old Covenant. The accomplishment of the messianic prophecies, for Justin, indicates the marvellous function of the Spirit of God as the origin of the life in fulfilling the pledge of the God the Father to his people (Awad 2007: 25-6). The Apostle’s creed formulated at the Council of Nicea A.D. 325 entailed an extended second article, confessing their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God as homoousios, ‘consubstantial’ with the Father, but closed with only a concise confession about the Spirit, ‘and in the Holy Spirit.’ The Christological dispute led on to the question of the Holy Spirit, and when the ‘Nicene’ Creed was maintained that salvation was a matter of escaping from it, and believed in Jesus as a supernatural revealer of the secret knowledge which enabled the soul to rise into spiritual realms, but not as a man of flesh and blood.
approved by the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381, it augmented the third article as follows:

And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Life-giver, who proceeds from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified, who spoke through the prophets.

It reflects the understanding of the status of the Spirit, his origin, his relation to the Father and the Son, the Anointed One and the scope of his activity. The answers reflect the arguments since A.D. 350s. The general comprehension of the Spirit before the new problems arose is illustrated by the creed used in Jerusalem with an extended catechesis for baptismal candidates by Cyril of Jerusalem about the year 350 (Donald 2009: 191). Heron (1983: 66) quotes Cyril’s view on the Third Person, the Spirit in the frame of Trinity explains:

There is only one Holy Spirit, the Paraclete; and as there is one God the Father, and no second Father, and as there is one Only-begotten Son and Word of God, who has no brother, so there is only one Holy Spirit, and no second Spirit equal in honour to him. Now the Holy Spirit is a power most mighty, a reality divine and unsearchable; for it is living and intelligent, a sanctifying principle of all things made by God through Christ.

According to Yarnell (2007: 609), Cyril alerts his hearers against imprudent inquisitiveness into the Spirit’s nature, or inquest of his activity beyond the witness of Scripture. The point is also emphasized, by no means unnecessarily, that not every reference to pneuma in Scripture is to the Holy Spirit (Heron 1983: 77).167

---

166 Yarnell (2009: 610-1) says the Father approves and commands, the Anointed One, the Son carries out the Father’s proposal. The Spirit supports and accelerates the work. The intact activity of God is Trinitarian and marked by the three-foldness of Father, Son and Spirit, yet harmonizing in a single patterned movement.

167 Heron (1983: 65-7) Warnings are also given against Marcion’s disconnection of the Spirit in the Old Testament form the Spirit in the New; against tritheism and Sabellianism; against thinking that the Spirit is a sheer power or energy without his own enhypostatic reality and works, against the allegations of heretics from Simon Magus through Montanus to Mani, the initiator of Manichaeism, to acquire the Paraclete; and against imagining that the Spirit takes fierce possession of humans as evil spirits do.
3.1.3. The Spirit in the *Trinitas*

An improvement on the theme, ‘*Trinitas*’ and the Trinitarian formula “*tres personae, una substantia*” were used by Tertullian (Coppedge 2007: 91). His dispute in *Adversus Praxean* is of interest less for its identifiable contribution on the Spirit than for the new base it found in the more common area of the Trinity. Praxeas was a monarchian.¹⁶⁸ Modalist monarchanism or Sabellianism held that the Father, Son and Spirit were purely consecutive ‘modes’ or ‘manifestations’ of God, as it were, a ‘mask’ which he puts on. Taken to its rational conclusion, this would mean that the same God who had been manifested as the Father was crucified on the cross in the form of Christ; it excluded any relation between the Father and the Son. Dynamic monarchianism was rather different: it described the Son and Spirit as ‘power’ or ‘energies,’ ‘*dynameis*’ emanating from God. They believed that Jesus had been made Son of God by the descent of this Son-power upon him. Although it could appeal, for instance, to the Gospel descriptions of Jesus’ Baptism to support this position, it epitomized a withdrawal from the teaching of the New Testament. Both forms nonetheless illustrate attentiveness of a legitimate exertion, by means of deeper analysis to enable more adequate models and formulations (Heron 1983: 67-8).

In response to monarchianism without ending up with three separate gods, Tertullian asserts that the unity of God is balanced by what ‘the Greeks call *oikonomia,*’ which he translates *dispensation.* ‘Arrangement’ is conceivably the closest English equivalent. In this way he combines God’s oneness with his three foldness, his *trinitas.*¹⁶⁹ The monarchians ‘suppose that the plurality and distribution of the *trinitas* implies a separation of the unity; but the truth is that the unity in deriving a *trinitas* from itself is not thereby destroyed, but dispensed.’ To explain this more precisely he introduces the words *substantia,* ‘substance’ and *persona,* ‘person’:

¹⁶⁸ Monarchianism is positioned at the opposite extremity to Gnosticism: it was extremely adamant about the oneness of God. In the second and third centuries it sustained two major structures, each offering to some extent dissimilar resolutions to the question of how that oneness was compatible with the identification of Father, Son, and Spirit.

¹⁶⁹ Tertullian seems to be the first Latin theologian one who uses the term.
...the one may be all in the sense that all are of one, that is, through unity of substantia; while this still safeguards the mystery of the oikonomia which disposes the unity into a trintias, arranging in order the three personae, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, though these are three not in standing but in degree, not in substantia but in form not in power but in manifestation (Coppedge 2007: 92).\(^\text{170}\)

According to McGrath (2011: 220-2), this exertion of Tertullian’s was enormously influential in determining Western Trinitarian theology. The terminology of trinitas, substantia and persona promptly became standard as did the types he offered to illustrate it. There was yet still a strong notion of subordinationism in his concept. The Father is the whole substantia, but the Son is ‘derivative and a portion of the whole’, the mediator of the creation whereas the Father is the Creator, and his status as Son is given in the act of creation itself. In this regard, later orthodoxy was to find his views inadequate. Later still, further difficulties were to arise with the word ‘persona’ as it gathered the psychological associations still preserved in the English ‘person’. In Tertullian, conversely, it was a more prescribed mark for a perceptibly discrete personal, character, or role (McGrath 2011: 231).

3.1.4. The Spirit as ‘participant’ in the Trinitarian controversy

The same subordinationistic idea is to be found in Origen as well, however within the framework of an infinitely more subtle and inclusive system of notions. He was the marvellous theological and philosophical mind in the early church; the De Principiis, which was only one of his inestimable writings, the first great systematic theology; and the lengthy third chapter of the first book, the earliest chief treatise dealing exclusively with the Holy Spirit. His treatment of it matches essentially into the wider prototype of his reflection (Holmes 2011: 56-7).

\(^\text{170}\) The formal analysis is further illustrated by three models: root-branch-fruit; spring-river-canal; sun-ray-point of focus: so he tries to show how there can be genuine organic oneness, living connection, and yet discernible distinction. In addition, the first stage in the unfolding, the generation of the Son from the Father, is interpreted as God’s speaking-forth of his Word at the dawn of creation, while the Spirit is ‘in the Word’.
Predominant is the notion of ‘participation,’ *methexis* (Cornford 2010: 254-63). It stems originally from Plato, who utilized it to explicate how, what is temporal, transient, and of this world can yet have a relation with what is eternal, unchanging, and above the world. Truth and reality rest in the eternal domain of ‘ideas’ or ‘forms’ which are reflected in the world: everything ‘participates in’ the unchanging ‘form’ which formulates it what it is and is acclaimed in it. Nevertheless the two levels of being remain totally marked: ‘participation’ is not identification, but rather rests on and preserves the divergence (Cornford 2010: 261). Applied to the religious realm, this presented a way perceiving how men and the world can have a connection with the eternal veracity of God. They can participate in him and reflect his nature, but he himself remains unchangeably what he is. Whereas in them it is contingent, dependent, and derivative; in philosophical expressions, it is in God *substantially*, in them as an *accident* (Heron 1983: 70).¹⁷¹

Origen focused on the threeness of the triune God. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are three hypostases (Cornford 2010: 257). Each is a distinct person from all eternity and not, as Tertullian had suggested, only manifested in the economy of God (Coppedge 2007: 92). He proceeds beyond Tertullian in developing the scheme of the eternal generation of the Son ‘as the radiance of the eternal light’ (*De Princ*. I. ii.2-6), the extreme qualitative dissimilarity between Father and Son remains. He also extends, notwithstanding tentatively, the suggestion that the Spirit was ‘the first of all that have been brought into being by God through Jesus Christ’ (Cornford 2010: 258). Origen identifies the hypostases. This assigns a narrower sphere of operation to each of the three, corresponding to their descending power, but simultaneously enabling the illustrations in Christian terms of the equivalent to Plotinus’ mystical ascent.¹⁷²

¹⁷¹ Conford (2010: 254) says Origen does not place the Father, Son and Spirit on one level, through cooperatively; as substantially and inherently good, wise and holy. There is also a hierarchy within the Trinity. Though the Son and Spirit ‘excel all created beings to a degree which admits of no comparison,’ ‘they are themselves excelled by the Father to the same or even a greater degree’.

¹⁷² Heron (1983: 69) refers to the Neo-Platonist philosopher, Plotinus, who mentioned the three hypostases: the
The grace of the Holy Spirit is added that those creatures which are not holy by virtue of their own being may be made holy by participation in the Spirit. Thus they derive existence from God the Father, rationality form the Word, sanctity from the Spirit. Again, when they have once been sanctified through the Spirit they are made capable of receiving Jesus, the Anointed One in the respect that he is the righteousness of God… Then when all the stains of pollution and ignorance have been removed and purged away, he receives such advancement in purity and cleanness that the being which was given by God becomes worthy of God, who bestowed it in order that it might attain its purity and perfection: so that the being is as worthy as is he who gave it existence (Greer1973: 10).

By any reckoning, this was a luminous accomplishment of theological and philosophical synthesis and integration, but the end result raises two fundamental questions. Is it adequate to delimit the work of the Spirit so narrowly, in effect restricting it to a preliminary progression of sanctification? Or undeniably to the implications of Isa. 63: 9, ‘In all afflictions he was afflicted and the angel of his presence saved them'? These became major issues in the fourth century, when the heirs of Origen divided between the orthodox and Arian parties (Heron1983: 72-3).

4. Missio Spiritus

4.1. The Spirit as the originator of the word

To Coppedge (2007: 93), Origen retained an elevated belief of the divine authorship and

---

173 Scholars might have tendencies to interpret the descriptions of the Spirit, the third person in the Trinity in the Church Fathers’ era as a hierarchal order rather than to place him as the one who functions to harmonize the Trinity.

174 Heron (1983: 189) notes that Didymus of Alexandria is a striking example of a spiritual successor to Origen whose pneumatology was intensely influenced by Origen’s, but whose orthodoxy compelled him, without ever truly conceding the fact to build only on one side of the master’s thought.
inspiration of Scripture. He formulated a theory of the “inerrancy” of Scripture, but his theory of the full reality of all Scripture applied only to the spiritual sense of the text, not to the ordinary or literal sense. Coppedge (2007: 94) writes that for Origen it encloses numerous mistakes, unattainable statements, and yet imaginary fundamentals. He held to what may be phrased the ‘analogical inerrancy’ rather than to the ‘literal inerrancy’ of Scripture. Certainty in the divine inspiration of Scripture was one of the two fundamental presumptions Origen’s exegetical, theological and apologetic labours (Elowsky 2009: 23). Origen was resolutely persuaded that:

The holy books are not the compositions of men, but as a result of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit by the will of the Father of the universe through Jesus Christ, these were written and have come down to us (Elowsky 2009: 24).

On the actions of the Holy Spirit Origen sees the Spirit as the one who ‘composes’ or ‘supervises’ the formation of Scripture (Malarty 1993: 22). Accepting the scope and core of Scripture as inspired, he believes that Scripture is perfect and free from internal inconsistency without error. Heron (1983: 79) summaries it:

There is in the sacred discourses nothing crooked or perverse, for all are clear to those who understand. And since there is nothing crooked or perverse to such a person, on this account he sees a profusion of peace in all the Scriptures, even those that seem to hold a contradiction and to opposite to one another.

Holmes (2011: 225) says Origen views the words of Scripture are without miscalculation. Lest the implications of such statements for the Christian’s approach to Scripture be overlooked, Origen, when discussing Mark’s and John’s accounts of the Baptist, states quite categorically that ‘believers cannot say that either of the evangelists makes any faults or misrepresentations’ (Holmes 2011: 226).
4.2. Deification via charisma of the Spirit

The term, “theosis” was developed theologically by Irenaeus, Athanasius, and the Cappadocian fathers (Clinton 2003: 5). It is frequently designated as “deification” or “divinization”. Clement of Alexandria was chief to practice the terminology of deification (Russell 2006: 1-2). Deification in the patristic foundations indicated two notions: theosis, participation in God and the inhabitation of the Anointed One (Gavrilyuk 2009: 653).

For Irenaeus an extraordinary correlation exists between man and God who created him ‘in his image and likeness’ (Gn 1: 26), for it is only by way of the charisma of the Spirit of God that man, who is the ‘image’ of God attains to ‘likeness’ to God and so to his own completeness (Kharlamov 2008: 118). It is likely that for Irenaeus deification is achieved by the charisma of grace of God. Quite a few of his comments coincided with characteristics of the Greek fathers in general on the intrinsic link of creation and redemption; the creative and re-creative energy of the Spirit; the renewal of human nature in God’s image through Christ’s incarnation; the summing up of all things in Christ; the object of salvation as theosis, divinization,’ the making of man like God; the twofold action of the Word and Spirit throughout (Kharlamov 2008: 117-23).

Speaking of the deification of man’s nature by union with Christ (Boersma 2011: 42), according to Boersma (2011: 41), Irenaeus speaks of ‘establishing the Spirit of God in their hearts’ and that ‘He made men like unto Himself, that is, in their own power’. Irenaeus’ deification can be traced over against the Gnostic concept of salvation as escape from the substantial world (Boersma 2011: 41). Khalamov (2008: 117) explains Athanasius comprehensively, metaphorically, and unswervingly relates deification not only to his fight against Arius, but to his criticism of heathen practices and elevation of Christian deification. Behr (1997: 44) observes Irenaeus advocates the

---

Russell (2006: 1-2) elaborates the Church fathers designate the term, “deification” in three manners: nominally, analogically and metaphorically. The nominal construes Scriptural use of the term ‘gods’ to human beings merely as a designation of admiration. Like Moses was a god to Pharaoh; or the believers convert sons and gods by grace in connection with the Anointed One who is Son and God by essence. The metaphorical usage is multifaceted. It has two distinctive applications, the virtuous and the realistic. Deification in the moral application takes them to attain a likeness of God by means of ethical exertion. The realistic application believes that they are transformed in the same nature of God.
incarnation as guaranteed redemption. God became human that we might become divine. Irenaeus describes it this way:

“How could we be joined to incorruptibility and immortality, unless, first, incorruptibility and immortality had become that which we also are, so that the corruptible might be swallowed up by incorruptibility and the mortal by immortality, that we might receive the adoption of sons” (Behr1997: 43-4).

Gregory reflects that it is an overemphasis to define that “humans become God,” since a difference between the Creator and creature permanently exists (Billings 2005: 333). Nonetheless, the deification in which some charismatic advocates it as their foundation for prosperity theology in this world, entailing good health, wealth, and fame etc., has no theological relation with the deification of the Irenaeus (Olson 2007: 193). The notion on deification in Irenaeus, Augustine, and Cyril dogmatically influenced to Calvin’s focal view on it. Scriptural and patristic etymology of involvement, adoption and union with the Anointed One was derived from the Church fathers, which was engrafted in Paul and John (Billings 2005: 333-4). According to Kharlamov (2008: 122), even Athanasius writes ‘For in him was made man that we might be made God; and He manifested Himself by a body that we might receive the idea of the unseen Father; and He endured the insolence of men that we might inherit immortality.

5. Charisma according to the Church fathers

5.1. Charisma as evidential elements

In the apostolic church the charismata of the Spirit were prominent in their practical ministry and worship (Philips 2011: 48), but by the fourth and fifth centuries the remarkable charismata were deemphasized and the Spirit came to be an idea gradually becoming more under the control of the clerics of the church.176 A sacerdotalism replaced the priesthood of believers, and a

176 Nash (2008: 105-6) says by the middle of the second century, there appears to have been a common decline both
sacramentalism appeared to constrain the Spirit to the rituals of the church. In the prevalent view baptism with the Spirit and fire was deemed as subsequent to water baptism, Spirit baptism was frequently connected to the ceremony of confirmation (Ferguson 2009: 17-20), at other times to a particular combination of love or increase of power.

Early authorities who refer to the charismata in the framework of Christian commencement are Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom and Philoxenus. What is notable is that the decline of the charismata is not simply noted but bewailed, for these authors saw that charismata belonged to the apostolic office. For Hall (2009: 203) this aspect is extensively subdued in the mainline churches today given the scriptural and other Patristic substantiation of a charismatic anticipation related with Christian initiation.

A dispensationalist view maintains that the charismas were destined for the apostolic era, only to witness to the truth of the message, to move the church initiated, but ceased afterwards, according to divine plan. This, however, has never been the teaching of the Catholic Church, although individuals at times have advocated it (Hinze & Dabney 2001: 59). An analysis of the early Christian literature signifies an enduring assurance of the authenticity of the charismas, in charismatic manifestations and in the critical implication of the living presence of the Spirit. It is referred to in extant writings as an element in the faith, as having been spoken by the prophets, as being given to the church, but usually in a considerable formal way, lacking the newness and dynamism of the New Testament. It is as if awareness of it had been successfully cultivated, swallowed up in the emerging church institutions.

---

177 Bloesch (2000: 354) expounds a plausible argument that the charisma of the New Testament church was overshadowed by glowing ritualism and legalism in the post-apostolic church. In Sohm’s view the consecrated vigour was first recognized with charisma, then with office and finally sacrament. His assessment that the church in apostolic times was completely lacking in structure and hierarchy is open to question.

178 Ferguson (2009: 18-9) expounds while the original baptismal rite comprises the laying on of hands and also sometimes an anointing with chrism, slowly baptism with water became separated from the other parts of Christian initiation. Finally a second rite or sacrament resulted, called at first consignation, then confirmation.

179 Augustine’s description of jubilation is a late fourth or early fifth century witness to the continued existence of Paul’s singing in tongues, although called by a different name.

180 Chrysostom bewails that the church of his day, was bereft of the charisma. Gregory the Great says that the imminence of the Antichrist can be known from the decline in the church of the charismata, such as prophecy, healings and miracles, thus leaving the church all the more susceptible to the prodigies of the Antichrist.
even down to the eighth century. This has been meticulously documented in the work of McDonnell & Montague (1982: 59-75), on writers from Tertullian at the end of the second century, to Hilary of Poitiers in the middle of the fourth century. In his treatise on baptism, in his Catholic period, Tertullian describes the initiation rituals of the church of North Africa. He addresses the neophytes:

> Therefore, you blessed ones, for whom the grace of God is waiting, when you come up from the most sacred bath of the new birth, ask your Father, ask your Lord, for the special gift of his inheritance, the distributed charismas, which form an additional, underlying feature of baptism. Ask, he says, and you shall receive. In fact, you have sought, and you have found: you have knocked, and it has been opened to you (McDonnell & Montague 1982: 63).

Tertullian is describing a ceremony of antiquity. The baptized, on coming up from the waters, stretch their hands and inquire for the charismas of the Spirit. Tertullian assumes that they have received at least some of the charismas they asked for. Hilary, in referring to his own baptism, records:

> We who have been reborn thorough the sacrament of baptism experience intense joy when we felt within us the first stirrings of the Spirit. We become steadfast in hope and receive the gifts of healing. Demons are made subject to our authority. These gifts enter us like a gentle rain, and once having done so, little by little they bring forth fruit in abundance (McDonnell & Montague 1982: 63).

### 5.2. Charisma as transformation faculty in baptisms

In the second century church there is a growing inclination to connect the impartation of the Spirit to ritual ceremony (Phillips 2011: 48). Baptism is seen as the seal of the Spirit (Montague 2001: 214). Affirmation was dispensed by the laying on of hands often direct after baptism allegedly as an additional an extraordinary endowment of grace for the service of God (Phillips 2011: 49-51). The church father usually explained that the outwards seal is baptism the inward
seal is the Spirit. Lampe (1977: 248) remarks:

It is sometimes dangerously easy to become so fully preoccupied with detailed problems of the manner of the seal’s bestowal-baptism, consignation, the imposition of hands - and to become so far confused by the patristic tendency to apply the term “seal” to external rites, that the essential truth that the seal which is impressed upon the faithful is in the last resort only an outward sign, but the activity is through the presence of the Holy Spirit.

Origen was acquainted with the use of *charisma*, consecrated oil, in the rituals of initiation into the Christian community. However he did not connect the bestowal of the Spirit to this rite. He considered it as a ceremony that represents either faith ‘in the anointed with oil’ or ‘the inward unction of the Spirit’ bestowed in baptism. Irenaeus viewed the word and the spirit as the two hands of God: both are indispensable for the awareness of salvation in the lives of the believer (Irenaeus *Adversus Haerescs* 4. 20.1).\(^\text{181}\) Origen avoided the suggestion that Christian unction consists of two parts, a negative cleansing and a positive sealing (Litfin 2007: 149-150). Although he correlated the remission of sins as closely as possible with visible baptism, he was adamant that visible baptism has meaning and efficacy only when related to Spiritual baptism (Bloesch 2000: 80).\(^\text{182}\) Cyril acknowledges a second kind of faith,\(^\text{183}\) ‘a special gift’ that enables us to do things beyond human power. He sometimes saw the rite of baptism climaxing in an anointing with chrism. In his view martyrs do not need baptism by water, since they experience a baptism of blood. Irenaeus recognized the *charismata* of the Spirit and considered that those who accepted prophetic *charismata* and speak in other tongues truthfully declared the mysteries of God (Litfin 2007: 89-91).\(^\text{184}\)

---

\(^{181}\) See debate in Heron, 1983: 87.

\(^{182}\) Origen also referred to a ‘baptism by blood,’ martyrdom, which washes away our sins and allows us to take our place under the heavenly altar.

\(^{183}\) Bloesch (2000: 81) says Cyril added to the list of Spiritual gifts chastity, virginity, readiness for martyrdom and voluntary poverty.

\(^{184}\) Litfin (2007: 90) says Tertullian believes persons who engage in a charismatic ministry have become truly spiritual, while those who despise the Spiritual gifts remain deficient or carnal Christians. They possess the image of God but have not yet received the fullness of the Spirit, while he occasionally spoke of a post baptismal anointing,
To Cyril of Jerusalem the ceremony does not save, but baptism with repentance faith saves. “Upon you also, if you possess sincere piety, the Holy Spirit will descend,” the water may bestow the benevolence of the church on the person concerned, but not the Spirit (Tugwell 1972: 74). Cyril’s view was that the medium of the descent of the Spirit is not the ‘seal’ given in baptism but the laying on of hands. McDonnell & Montague (2012: 215) says Tertullian exhorted the newly baptized as they emerged from the baptismal font to pray for a “distribution of the charismata”. 185

Few theologians have emphasized the efficiency of the sacramental rituals of the church more than Augustine (Litfin 2007: 213-6). He assumed that in baptism we are stamped with a character indelibilis. At the same time he was convinced that the outwards rite has little power without personal conversion and commitment. Faith and conversion of the heart can permeate what is lacking in baptism. Even in his anti-Pelagian period he did not believe the sign has actual power to affect grace. Now and again he alluded to a rite of chrismation that assumed the status of a sacramentum distinct from baptism.

In the history of the Christian church, not only in the patristic era but also in the great charismatic movements of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Keenan & Keenan 2010: 30), the gospel has mightily been preached with the manifestations of the Spirit, particularly in the challenging summons of St. Dominic (1170-1221), Francis (1181-1226), and Clare (1194-1253). In both the Eastern and Western church initiation was regarded as unfinished with confirmation. In the West the laying on of hands, in which chrism was administered as the crucial factors of the initiation ritual. In the East chrism was observed as the seal of the Spirit. It is in confirmation that one receives the fullness of the Spirit. In addition to chrism and the laying on of hands, the sign of the cross was ultimately added to the baptismal rite of initiation. It was such an influential sign that it came to be identified with the Pauline seal of the Spirit and was regarded as the

charismation, he seems not to have regarded this as a sacramental sign of the gift of the Spirit. 185 See Tugwell (1972: 56).
The completion of baptism (Litfin 2007: 189-91). In the West confirmation developed into a sacrament of the empowering of the Spirit. Its peculiar function was to equip Christians for spiritual warfare. It did not serve as much for the remission of sins as for the increase and endorsement of righteousness. Whereas baptism was the sacrament of the new birth, confirmation came to be considered as the sacrament of growth and Spiritual maturity.

The anointing with the Spirit accompanied with the spiritual *charismata* as well as prophetic utterances (Menzies 2007: 113). To investigate prophetic *charisma* occurred in the early church will essentially help to understand the formation of pneumatology in the Christian history.

6. Montanist issues

6.1 The New Prophecy as the prophetic charisma

A mystic movement, Montanism, called ‘the New Prophecy,’ emerged during the second half the second century (Tabbernee 2007: 4-6). The Movement was promptly and resolutely rejected by the church at large, while it later won a notable supporter in Tertullian of Carthage, their first great theologian. By this time it seems to have shed some of its original features, the date of the advent of the New Jerusalem had passed in 177 AD, however, it appealed to him because of its ethical firmness and its confidence in the active, communicating presence of the Spirit. The tension between the appeal to instantly inspired authority and the government of the ecclesiastical establishment is vigorously expressed in some of his later writings: The same challenge was to be raised repeatedly about other movements in the history of the church.

---

186 Marjanen (2008: 185-6) explains the movement began in Phrygia with Montanus and his female followers, Maximilla and Priscilla, who were convinced that through them the Paraclete was delivering fresh revelations with new instructions for the life of the church, and announcing the imminent descent of the New Jerusalem at Pepuza in Asia Minor.

187 Tabbernee (2007: 12-7) expounds the Montanists heralded the new age of the Spirit and the fulfilment of Christian baptism in a baptism of the Spirit. They were enthusiastic to reclaim the charismatic gifts, including prophecy and speaking in other tongues (*glossolalia*). This movement was also characterized by an ascetic rigorousness: fasting laws were severe, and second marriages were strictly forbidden.
Its initiator Montanus regarded himself as the mouthpiece of the *Paraclete* who would bring in an order of progression, and that prophecy would cease. They awarded the writings of their own prophets the same authority as to Holy Scripture and accepted an expanded canon. They also looked forward to the imminent end of the world, which included a millennial kingdom.\(^{188}\) Combining pre- and postmillennialism, they enunciated a dispensation of the Spirit prior to Christ’s second coming and the millennium.

Similar to the majority sectarians they harboured a negative or judgmental attitude towards the rest of Christendom.\(^{189}\) Montanism was officially condemned by the Asiatic synods before A.D. 200 and with some reluctance by Pope Zephyrinus. According to Adolf von Harnack, Montanism recaptured the vitality and enthusiasm of the New Testament church. John Wesley and many Pentecostals have viewed this movement with reverence and even admiration (Tabbernee 2007: 4-6).

### 6.2. Defences and critiques

Bulter (2006: 21-8) says Apollonius, probably a catholic bishop residing in the Roman province of Asia rather than in Phrygia, wrote his anti-Montanist polemic in the first decade of the third century. They only extant section of his anonymous’ treatise are those preserved by Eusebius (Bulter 2006: 33). Apollonius not only assails the founders of Montanism but also a second generation of Montanist prophets and leaders.\(^{190}\)

Tertullian became attracted to ‘The New Prophecy’ by reading the very same literary collections

---

\(^{188}\) Tabbernee (2007: 9) expounds virgins often accompanied Montanus wearing heavy veils so that their faces were hidden from all men until the eschaton. It was customary for their wives to live apart from their husbands so that the Lord might find them pure (Knox 1951: 52).

\(^{189}\) Marjanen (2008: 186) illustrates the Montanist emphasis on the “more complete” nature of the revelation imparted by the Paraclete via Montanus, Maximilla, and Priscilla led to charges that the Montanists distinguished between the way in which the Spirit related to the church at the time of Pentecost and the alleged ultimate coming of the Paraclete.

\(^{190}\) Wilhite (2007: 169) sees, according to Jerome, Tertullian recorded a treatise on ecstasy initially consisting of six books, to which a seventh was added, refuting the charges of Apollonius.
of Montanist oracles which Apollonius condemned (Wilhite 2007: 167-70). In Tertullian’s view, ecstasy is the capacity of the soul ‘to stand out of itself’ and the means through which authentic prophecy is articulated (De Labriolle & Wilson 2003: 52). Just as in dreaming, the body is asleep but the soul remains active; in the ecstatic state, a prophet’s typical sensory functions are suspended whereas the prophet’s own human spirit is surpassed by the Spirit of God. Nevertheless this does not implicate that the prophet is either mad or demon-possessed, even if the phenomena accompanying the ecstatic state may seem peculiar. Evidence that a prophet is not deluded is the capability to remember and correlate spiritual insights obtained in the ecstatic state (De Labriolle & Wilson 2003: 138-9). Reminiscence is an exclusive component of the charisma of prophecy, showing that, even in the ecstatic state, the prophet is still in restraint. Memory permits the subject of the prophecy to be verbalized and tested by the community of faith (Bulter 2006: 31).

Tertullian tenaciously declines that the Montanist prophets introduced novelties (Tabbernee: 2001a: 115). To him, what the opponents of Montanism denounced as novelties were merely the ethical applications of what Christ had previously taught. Jesus would have told his disciples about these particular moral applications however the church was not yet prepared to accept the complete burden of the rigorous implications of the gospel. On his elucidation about John 16: 12-14, according to Wilhite (2007: 170), Tertullian argued that the Paraclete simply taught what Christ had instructed. The Paraclete is not an innovator. He speaks only what Christ commanded; a repeater rather than an institutor; the determiner of discipline, not of doctrine.

---

191 Wilhite (2007: 168) says, after becoming a Montanist, Tertullian labelled the Catholics ‘psychics’ or animal men” and the Montanist ‘neumatics’ or Spirit-filled; the montanists saw themselves as the illuminati, the particularly enlightened.

192 According to Wilhite (2007: 168), historically speaking, many of the pneumatological charges levelled against the Montanists are blatantly erroneous. Belief in the Holy Spirit’s continued activity in the post-apostolic church was not unique. Other modern writers see Montanism primarily as a reform movement that worried about what we might call secularization: not particularly in theology, intensely concerned with practice. Recent historians have suggested that Montanists held on to traditions of Biblical prophecy and moved some inklings of its ecstasy character to the centre.

193 Tabbernee (2001a: 371-3) argues Tertullian’s defence of the charge that ‘The New Prophecy’ introduced unwarranted novelties provides a way for him to dispute that the content of Montanist prophecy is not incompatible with the rule of faith. His defences assume rather than deny the concept of progressive revelation.
Whenever the Paraclete reveals something through The New Prophecy, it is not a novelty but a return to the fundamental principles of the message of Christ (Dunn 2004: 6-8).

But Tertullian restricted progressive revelation. He distinguishes cautiously between ‘regula fidei,’ the previously comprehensive body of Christian doctrinal reality handed down from Christ via the apostles and ‘disciplin’, the incomplete body of instruction on Christian behaviour (Trevett 2002: 214-22). In terms of Pneumatology, this peculiarity presupposes credence in the continued revelatory activity of the Holy Spirit in the church. Tertullian’s defence of his distinction was unreasonable since it was the same Holy Spirit who is operational in the church for the completion epoch. The distinctive feature was not any hypothetical disconnection between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete, but a distinction in the individual’s willingness to heed what the Paraclete had to declare to the church (Trevett 2002: 216-3).

In spite of Tertullian’s defence of Montanist Pneumatology and his claim that Pentecost was the commencement rather than the end of the Spirit’s extraordinary working in the church, several opponents of The New Prophecy accused Montanists of distinguishing between the Spirit and the Paraclete (Tabbernee 2001a: 376-7).

---

194 Dunn (2004: 7) views Tertullian believes that the Paraclete’s ultimate revelation was postponed to the time of the Montanist prophets since the church was not ready for it until then, but now through the interpretative, Christ-dependent revelation of the promised Paraclete, those willing to entertain it can learn how to act in the age of Christian maturity.

195 Tabbernee (2001a: 381) says an anonymous work called *Adversus Omnes Haereses*, attaches to the end of some manuscripts of Tertullian’s *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* reports that all Montanists share the common blasphemy of teaching that while the Holy Spirit was in the apostles. Some later opponents claimed that Montanists taught that the Holy Spirit had not come at Pentecost. Others, more accurately, complained that Montanists taught that the fullness of the Holy Spirit had not come until The New Prophecy.
7. The Charismatic movement

7.1. Monastic spirituality

The expansion of monastic spirituality postulated a twofold blessing of the Spirit. In baptism one obtains the remission of sins; in monastic commitment one accepts the comprehensiveness of the Holy Spirit (Dunn 2003[2000]: 6-11). The second one was often envisaged as a ‘second conversion’ or a ‘second Pentecost.’ For the desert monks a dedication to the monastic vocation was rewarded by a living attentiveness to the Spirit and a life that manifests the charismatic and the miraculous (Bluxton 2009: 6). The commissioning to life in a monastic spiritual order was viewed not as the seal of the Spirit, but as a new empowering of the Spirit for vocation. Conversion subsequently intended a retiring from the world and a commitment to the religious life. Bernard of Clairvaux called the monastic life a ‘second baptism’, a ‘second regeneration’ that regains the divine likeness in the human soul and makes us Christ like (Bluxton 2009: 11-2). Similarly Thomas Aquinas described the taking of the monastic cowl as a ‘second baptism’ and reinstated the sinner to the status of innocence that he or she enjoyed when first baptized.

Although the charismatic gifts of the Spirit continued among many of the mystics of the church, they were increasingly questioned by clerics and theologians who regarded spiritual safety as reliant on right order and right theology. In the fifth century Theodore of Mopsuestia affirmed that ‘without a doubt’ the marvellous charismata of the Spirit accompanied the effusion of the Spirit in the Apostolic age, but they have ceased long before to locate a place among us (Ferguson 2009: 40). As the gifts were more and more relegated to the periphery by the theologians and ruling authorities of the church, they instigate movements with pious passion to try to fill up a growing spiritual emptiness.

---

196 Rivington (1842: 286) says John Chrysostom (c.347-407) argued that the verification of the Spirit is character, not the exhibit of charismatic forces. The extraordinary gifts of the Spirit participated in a convinced function in the apostolic church, but now the challenge was to live a holy life by means of faith working by love.
7.2. Mystic pieties

7.2.1. Experience of the divine presence

From the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, Christian mysticism connotes an unswerving familiarity of the divine presence (Bachrach & Kroll 2005: 1), one that is indescribable and ecstatic. The early Jewish and Christian mysticism is a chief aspect of Jewish and Christian apocalyptic ideas, even while the ancients themselves describe these experiences as apocalypses (DeConick 2004: 34-67). There the cerebral or noetic attraction is in tension with the emotional or affective draw in Christian mysticism (Macquarrie 2005: 113). The word mysticism often evokes ecstatic visions, hurtful asceticism, and esoteric instruction (King 2010: 323). Yet, Macquarrie (2005: 261) argues that mystics are an enhanced reflection of people who demonstrate common human inquisitiveness, eager to search religious devout mystery, and eventually uncover a profound private intimacy with God. The relentless heart of early Jewish and Christian mysticism is the assurance that God or his demonstration can be experienced instantaneously, not just after death or eschatologically (De Conick 2004: 53).

The gnostic Christian mystics do not instruct an anti-cosmic dualism, but an ethical dualism that seeks to retrieve the world for the gospel. They see grace as gratifying nature rather than antithetical to nature. The objective in life is not an elevated category of awareness but love, demonstrated in humble service. The mystics distinguish polarities of eternal and temporal, Spiritual and material, inside and outside, but they do not view these as dichotomies. In sharp distinction to enthusiasts and Gnostics, the mystics tend to harbour a profound distrust of

---

197 Bachrach & Kroll (2005: 18) describes the Flemish mystic, John of Ruysbroeck, returned to the mystical vision when he affirmed that the way to recognize God is to enter ourselves in a simple mode where we meet God “without intermediary”.

198 Noted mystics of the church in the east were Origen, John Cassian, Evagrius Ponticus, Gregory of Nyssa, Macarius the Great, Maximus the confessor, Symeon the New Theologian, Pseudo-Dionysus, John Tauler, Bernard of Clairvaux, Bonaventure, John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila, among others. Protestants who have embraced a mystical spirituality are Jakob Boehme, Gerhard Tersteegen, William Law, Hans Derrick, Eberhard Arnold, Evelyn Underhill and Douglas Steere. A spiritual writer like Pseudo-Dionysius exerted a profound impact on both west and east.
ecstasies and vision. Nonetheless they do not spurn them, believing that these things are generally left behind in the higher stages of faith (Bloesh 2000: 92).

Mystics, unlike most religious enthusiast, confirm an efficacy of exclusively sacramental spirituality. It entails a direct experience which means that the mediation of the church can be bypassed. Mysticism calls on trust in God beyond the accomplishment of the senses. It goes beyond outward signs and rites. Nelson (2009: 138) quotes Eckhart’s confession, he said:

‘To seek God by rituals is to get the ritual and lose in the process. Indeed, all the sacraments point only to one spiritual truth. For this cause does not cling to the symbols, but acquire to the inner truth!’

Mystics are not inevitably religious enthusiasts, since they commonly embrace what merely is a foretaste of the glory that is yet to be revealed, not the magnificence of its fullness.¹⁹⁹ They do not advise separation from the church, but promote deeper immersion in the life of the church (Nelstrop, Magill & Onishi 2009: 186).²⁰⁰ This has not protected them from being suspected by the prelates of the church who have appropriately feared that a plea to supernatural occurrence constitutes a challenge to church authority.

### 7.2.2. Charismata with faith

Although the mystics were emphatic that faith involves experience, they generally sustained that faith may thrive yet when ‘felt-experience’ is deficient. Revealing the influence of Neoplatonism, mystic writers tend to hypothesize four stages in the spiritual life: purgation, illumination, union and ecstasy. Similar to many mystics, Bernard of Clairvaux taught an experience of the Holy

---

¹⁹⁹ DeConick (2004: 38-9) illustrates mystics who instruct the deification of the human person through faith, are quick to accentuate that in this process our humanity is not terminated, but transfigured instead.

²⁰⁰ The Spirituality that has dominated both Roman Catholicism and eastern Orthodoxy is suitably depicted as mystical rather than Gnostic. Nonetheless mysticism as a spiritual movement has always existed in tension with the institution church, with its hierarchy and sacraments (Nelstrop, Magill & Onishi 2009: 187).
Spirit before conversion. In his view, the Spirit ‘communicates Himself’ when he works miracles with signs and prodigies and other supernatural operations which he effects by the hands of whomsoever he pleases, renewing the wonders of bygone times, so that the events of the present may corroborate our conviction as to those of the past. Without denying the legitimacy of charismatic vision, Woods (2011: 113-28) notes the mystic, Eckhart echoed the reserve that many mystics harbour towards such an experience:

aware of it or not, people crave for the great experience; they want it in this form, or they want that good thing, and this is nothing but self-will. . . we ought to get over amusing ourselves with such raptures for the sake of that better love, and to achieve what men need most through loving service (Woods 2011: 124).

The Quietists treated the charismata of the Spirit with significant mistrust. Through an unpretentious faith of the gospel the consolation of the Lord is received, but is dwelling in none of them, Satyavrata (2009: 34) explained the reason for his concern:

These supernatural gifts nourish in secret the life of the old nature. It is an ambition of the most refined character, since it is wholly spiritual. But it is merely ambition, a desire to feel, to enjoy, to possess God and his gifts, to behold his light, to discern Spirits, to prophesy in short, to be an extraordinarily gifted person for the enjoyment of revelations and delights leads the soul little by little towards a secret coveting of all these things (Satyavrata 2009: 35).

To Mystics, the Trinity is the mystery of love, a reciprocal indwelling of the Three in each other, as the lover in the beloved. Hunt (2010: 162) observes that John of the cross comprehends that there is a correlation between the encounter of the lovers and the intimacy of their lovemaking to articulate the mysterious Trinity, each living in the other in unlimited love. Satyavrata (2009: 35) writes John of the Cross also voiced the mystic distrust of what is of the highest regard to religious enthusiastic:
“In order to say a little about this dark night, I shall trust neither to experience nor to knowledge, since both may fail and deceive; but while not omitting to make such use as I can of these two things, I shall avail myself… of divine Scripture; for, if we guided ourselves by this we shall be unable to stray, since he who speaks therein is the Holy Spirit” (St. John of the Cross 2008: 65)

While recognizing the proper place for the charismata of the spirit, John of the Cross warned against the dangers of dishonesty and extreme affection (Hunt 2010: 165).

7.2.3. Manifestations of charismata

The proceeding cautions should not let us to disdain the fact that the charismata of the Spirit have been very much in evidence among the mystics.\(^\text{201}\) Martin of Tours was a prominent healer and exorcist and also experienced frequent visit from angels (Jestice 2004: 550). Bernard of Clairvaux was bestowed with the charisma of healing, miracles and wisdom (McGuire 2011: 37). Teresa of Avila was endowed with visions and governance. Occasionally it was reported that she fell into the trance by the Spirit, being literary elevated up from the surface (O’ Donoghue 2006: 4-43).\(^\text{202}\) John Tauler was gifted with the charismatic preaching; he could ablaze an entire area with his flaming speech (Bloesch 2000: 95).

Glossolalia was the verification of the Spirit with many of the mystics. Intermittently it took the form of xenolalia, speaking in an alien dialect mysterious to the utterer and glossolalia, ecstatic

\(^\text{201}\) Bloesch (2000: 94) says some persons were healed instantaneously when this saint finished the mark of the cross over them. Hildegard of Bingen (1098-1179) was gifted with charisma of healing, guidance and management. It was said that scarcely a sick person approached to her who was not cured. Catherine of Siena (d. 1380) endowed the words of knowledge and wisdom, deliverance, discernment of the spirits and prophecy. She is also believed to have healed her follower of the disease and to have reproduced wine in a wine barrel. Nicholas of Flüe (1416-1487) supposedly had the charisma of astonishing fasting and lived as a solitary person.

\(^\text{202}\) McGuire (2011: 38) says Teresa endured unyielding that the uppermost excellence does not entail in emotions of spiritual pleasure nor in excessive trance or visualizations nor yet in the spirit of prophecy, but in conveying your determination into conformity with that of the Almighty God.
utterance in an unidentified language, and *hetero glossolalia*, listening in another specific dialect when the utterer who is communicating in his or her native language. The mystical belief also had the phenomenon of jubilation-prayer without utterances or prayer with groans too intense for utterances (Rm 8:26). If *glossolalia* is demarcated as preconceptual prayer, then jubilation as many of the church fathers and mystics enunciated it qualifies as *glossolalia*. However jubilation is not a solid articulated dialect but nonverbal, uttered prayer. It entails largely of non-verbal resonances, the expression of calls and exclamations of enjoyments. Jubilation may occasionally express the form of *glossolalia*, nonetheless it suitably belongs to a altered category. Expressively, the mystics by no means correlated their cries of euphoria to the *glossolalia* of Pentecost in the manuscript of Acts. Many of them denoted to jubilation as “mystical inebriation,” which customarily relates to the primary phases of the Christian devotion (Woods 2011: 2-8).

For the most part the mystic belief, to its recognition, pursues to embrace together the *charismata* of conversion, water baptism and the baptism of the Spirit. This rejuvenation cannot be confined to a sole experience, but it is something that repeatedly happens. For Meister Eckhart the spiritual soul experiences afresh the “out flowing of heavenly affection” that imitates us more and more to the divine nature of God (Woods 2011: 10-13). The mystics have reserved thriving the New Testament cry to perfection, love of enemies (Mt 5:48) and the anticipation of actual growth in the Christian life through the working of the Spirit.

### 7.2.4. Charisma vs. synergism

The Reformed traditions have time and again criticized mystics to entrust a much more decisive part to the human will than to divine mercy and favour in acquiring the *charismata* of the Spirit (Brown 2011: 19). Habitually the mystics instructed that the human will must be enabled by grace to create the supernatural ascent. The final *charisma*, ‘contemplative union’, is exclusively a *charisma* of grace, while our labours can consolidate the manner for this union. No one can produce it, but before obtaining this *charisma*, one is indebted to sanctify one’s conscience of all specific iniquities. Seraphim of Sarov educated that one could procure the Spirit throughout
prayerfully reciting the name of the Anointed One, Jesus (Bloesch 2000: 96). John Chrysostom believed that ultimate union with Christ would not be promising except we had cleansed ourselves by practicing virtue:

“When we purify our soul from lies, cruelty, fornication, impurity and cupidity, when we become kind-hearted, compassionate, self-disciplined, when there is no blasphemy or misplaced jesting in us, when we become worthy of it, then what will prevent the Holy Spirit from drawing near and alighting within us? And he will not only draw near, but will fill our hearts” (Chariton 1999: 174).

To Hunt (2010: 167) John Chrysostom was convinced that it is within our power to be filled with the Spirit. The contemporary restatement of the mystical tradition is an exertion to convey together sacramental intercession, human collaboration and divine grace. The grace of the Spirit is present in the baptism with water, as well as the grace of the Father God and the grace of the Son, the Anointed One. However, that baptism with water is not complete; the baptism with the Spirit is demonstrated in a deficient believer’s life…. the query of Paul to the Ephesian disciples, “did you receive the Holy Spirit?” (Acts 19:2) is requested of every one. It would not be adequate to depend on it that we have obtained the mystery or sacrament of the Spirit after our baptism, through anointment with the Holy chrism. The request is whether and how this seed of the Spirit has established within the soul. Gillet argues that just as baptismal grace encompasses beyond the sacrament of baptism in the firm sense, so the charisma of the Spirit cannot be entirely acknowledged with the anointment or a charisma(Woods 2011: 113-5).

Synergism is a principal stand in Christian mysticism. The spiritual experiences are decisively independent by the cultural framework in which they take place. It also means that it is not inevitably unspeakable; the essentials of mysticism can be learned and habituated (Segal 2006: 32). Before someone is illumined, he is requisite to assume self-sanctification, to enable him sympathetic to the Spirit. This indicates that Christians are co-redeemers with the Anointed One, Jesus since we attain eternal sanctity by the grace of the Spirit.
In Reformed theology all the merit for our salvation belongs to the Anointed One since he works salvation within us by his Spirit, but the believer is led and empowered by his Spirit to manifest and demonstrate this salvation. The Reformed theology acknowledges the human will to redemption initiated by the *charisma* of the Anointed One through the Spirit. Some mystical traditions also use this language, but reformed Protestants see mysticism as a precarious concession with a philosophical perception.

Reformed theology considers the apostolic interpretation of the gospel as normative for faith and the way of life, and to a lesser extent the Reformers’ elucidation by the Spirit of this interpretation. The consensus of the undivided church of the first centuries is also treated with the utmost respect, though the witness of the church is always secondary to that of Scripture. Scripture is also observed as the norm with which to measure the church tradition, the Spirit has the final authority regarding scriptural hermeneutics.

### 7.3. Conclusion

Occasionally the Charismatic movements seem to be mysterious. Mystery is not the same as mysticism, a term that raises mixed emotions. Ackermann (2009: 30) argues mystery can be a division or factor of belief and a progression or a manner of life, and an effort to communicate perception of the presence of God (Ackermann 2009: 31).

In the early church days, the Spirit is described as the creator who gives gratification and purification to humans and provides a prophetic revelation to escort them to eschatological consummation. During the course of church history the role of the Spirit was identified in the debates among the various scholars as the source of Life, the third person of the Triune God. There are traces of *charismata* received with the sacraments in the history of pneumatology. The Spirit was seen as the originator of the Word and the source of *charismata* to transform the believers to become like God.
The charismata of the Spirit are indispensable elements for the believers. It is a transformation faculty particularly in baptism. These evidences indicate that the gifts of the Spirit did not cease entirely. They remain that there have been at least a sprinkling of gifts of the Spirit throughout the centuries. The history of the church testified to the Spirit’s declaration to be the supreme God, the one cause of everything apart from evil, who accomplished all the revelations of God in the written Scripture and in the universe. However, the circumscription of the operations of the Spirit has also been an issue. It caused spiritual chaos in the Orthodox Charismatic Society. Some condemned it, others supported it. Either He is the one who gives power to the charismatic community through the anointing with the Spirit in order to prepare in advance the day of the Lord or the one who institute the Orthodox community by the same anointing and form them in their vocation in which they were commissioned in distinctive and unique ways.

The charismata which are demonstrated by the anointing with the Spirit should not be misinterpreted or deserted as a whole. We embrace the treasure of the gospel in cracked vessels (2 Cor 4: 7). But if we nonetheless confirm that the Spirit has not discontinue speaking to the body of the Anointed One by means of his exclusive demonstration of the anointing by the Spirit, then, we acknowledge the implications of his on-going work in God’s emancipating history for our hermeneutical and theological efforts.

The following chapter will investigate the theology and the empirical experiences of the Charismatic movements in relation to the anointing of the Spirit which is the main theme of this research and provide evidence to uncover its identity in these movements.
Chapter III Theological characteristics of the anointing with the Spirit

This chapter will highlight tensions between the Charismatics and Reformed perspectives on the theological characteristics of the anointing with the Spirit and argues for their theological relatedness. Crucial to the argument is the nature and character of the Charismatic movement, the importance of experiences of the Spirit to their spirituality, and their reaction to the world. A detailed experiential investigation to test the adequacy of the Charismatic categories will be presented. Unique characteristics and experiences of the prominent contemporary leaders of the Charismatic movement will be researched and compared to the Reformed views to see whether these two distinctive views can be harmonized with or are incompatible with the Scriptural perspectives. The next section will assist to understand their connections in the pneumatological perspectives of both traditions.

A. Charismatic perspectives

The Charismatic views synthesized the refurbishment of charismatic gifts with the imminence of the Second coming of the Anointed One. The heart of the charismatic significance is the anointing with the Spirit (Macchia 2010: 76). This was fundamental to charismatic distinctiveness and spirituality and was utilized to interpret their experience of actuality and their perception of church history (Archer 2004: 193). To Charismatics the Spirit was acknowledged as an authentic partaker in the hermeneutical dialogue. The Spirit articulates in, by, and through, people and also speaks through Scripture. Pneumatology as a methodological device could direct theologians in the finding and explanation of natural phenomena of the Charismatic movements (Vondey 2010a:87). In this way the Spirit precisely unlocks the mystery of experience of charismatic communities, which serve *Doxa Deo* (Vondey 2010a:88).

1. Methodology

A methodological transferral happened in the academic area in the 20th century that has
irretrievable consequences for a modern pneumatology. Newton and Einstein charted essentially
dissimilar trails that offer totally unrelated structures for the pneumatological attempt (Vondey
2009: 3). Pneumatology after Einstein is positioned in a different frame established by the
concepts of order, reasonableness, rationality, equilibrium, and movement. These ideas afford the
huge encounters with a contemporary understanding of the Spirit. Nonetheless these conceptions
can be instrumental to examine and discern the authenticity of the Charismatic movements in the
Christian churches.

**1.1. Scriptural verifications**

The word and Spirit are the mediation of God to communicate or to interpret Himself to the
world (Williams 2009: 55). Hermeneutics is an unending exertion: the anointed communities are
interpreting and being interpreted for mission. They have been changed as the Spirit leads the
community, shaping their meaning and reality and practices as we contend with texts and with
each other (Brown 2007: 162). It means that the Spirit is active both in restating the Scriptural
message in contemporary terminology (meaning) and applying it to contemporary situations
(significance) (Kraft 1979: 261-312). This is basically the same position taken by Pinnock
says pneumatological comprehensions of Scriptures do not put aside the history of interpretation
of various texts, but such reading does permit the *sensus plenior* (surplus of meaning) of the
Scripture to understand it. In this sense, the Charismatic movements contribute to formulating
their theologies according to the variable circumstances by means of the anointing with the Spirit

While the *missio Spiritus* continues to be dynamic within God’s redemptive history, God’s
revelational history has articulated itself definitively for all time within the historical period of

---

203 See Kraft (1979: 261-312), the activity of translating Scripture is one in which the line between meaning
(hermeneutics) and significance (theological method) may be blurred, particularly if one is dealing with a translation
whose objective is dynamic equivalence (e.g. TEV) as opposed to a more literal translation (e.g. KJV or RSV). The
NIV is halfway house between these two approaches.
the Anointed One’s incarnation and the apostolic eyewitnesses (Cullmann 1967: 295). That Scripture specifies the ‘experienced power’ was obvious both in Scriptural hermeneutics and in miraculous manifestations that attended the ministries of apostles and others (Brown 2007: 148). This history of revelation gives meaning to the entire extent of redemptive history for both the Reformed and the Charismatic.

The universal Church’s commitment to the Trinitarian dogma and the doctrine of the hypostatic union is proof that Christians regard certain post apostolic formulas not merely as human endeavours but as insights given to the body of the Anointed One by the Spirit of God (Oliverio Jr. 2012: 232).

What is proposed is that historical theology should perform a mediating function between exegesis and Scriptural theology on the one hand and dogmatic on the other hand. This approach is termed a consensual theological methodology. The consensual approach takes seriously the Scriptural witness that the Spirit will guide his people in all truth (e.g. Jn 16: 13) that it gives priority to the testimony of apostolic eyewitness set forth in the New Testament.

The missio Spiritus fundamentally guarantees that the primary focus of guidance is on the Anointed One’s community, the Church through the anointing with the Spirit. It releases the prospect of new insights that may raise the God’s anointed community rooted upon the Scriptures and their experience.

1.2. Experiential hermeneutics

The experiencing charisma of the Spirit, accompanied by anointing with the Spirit in a spectacular and momentous manner is one of the most significant theological distinctive within Charismatic movements (Cartledge 2010: 81). Bradnick (2008: 934-36) says that Charismatic hermeneutics is fundamentally framed to assimilate all aspects of the spiritual experiences. It does not affirm mere subjective consequences of the interpretive formula, but it invites interpreters to convey their experiences be examined in their hermeneutical texts and theological
structures. The experienced evidence in the Charismatic movements will be investigated along with the impact caused by those empirical cases.

Archer (2004: 143) says that a charismatic hermeneutic is distinctive because not only does Scripture illuminate experience, but experience also reflects Scripture. In retrospection of the historical charismatic hermeneutics, the Charismatic acknowledges both the authority of Scripture and the authority of experience (Archer 2004: 63). It indicates that the Scripture proposes a structural frame of theology and provides its proper content and comparable context to the experience of the Charismatics into a creative dialectical cooperation. The Charismatics experienced the manifestations of the charismata by the anointing of Spirit in their understanding of Scripture and Scripture was also determining their experiences of the Spirit.

Since charismatic hermeneutic is to a degree empirical in character, the charismatic perspective on experiential phenomena should not resist scientific and systematic annotations. Yong (2002: 305) remarks:

‘The goal of theological interpretation, after all, entails within its course not only truth as pragmatic and utilitarian, but also truth as systematic consistent. Dyadic correspondence between propositional and doctrinal content with the diverse arenas of knowledge includes the sciences’. 204

This would permit for energetic adaptation between science and theology that does not compel one to be subsidiary to the other, as both can cooperate to a developed recognition of reality. Since the Charismatic hermeneutic allows a discursive assimilation between science and theology, it is defendable not only to employ methodical perspectives on emergent schemes, but also to permit science to inform theology.

Charismatic hermeneutic that integrates observational or empirical regulations permits

204 Bradnick (2008: 935) says Charismatic hermeneutic theology should hold systematic and scientific data together with phenomena such as emergent intricacy, and use these remarks to illuminate Scripture and theology.
replacement perspective for theology since it can amass and integrate a broad facet of knowledge. Experience may illuminate or necessitate doctrine, to an extent, permitting theological inspiration that entails a variety of knowledge and that flourishes to new theological indications. The Charismatic movements can suggest a distinctive perspective on empirical phenomena due to its pneumatological emphasis. The Charismatic have generally highlighted the dynamic function of the Spirit in the world, and developments in contemporary pneumatological theology, in which a more vigorous form of Trinitarian theology is formulated. A rational analysis to the experiences of the Spirit may contribute to developments of pneumatological theology.

1.3. Applicational hermeneutic

The Charismatic hermeneutic in the exegetical method holds elements uncommon to the movement and ethos in its application (Pietersen 2011: 87-91). Menzies (1985: 10-4) advocates the implementation of inductive and deductive methods of analysis. This should be applied at the stage of authentication. The question is whether this truth or message is demonstrated. In terms of Charismatic liturgy, Hattingh (1984: 222-23) entitles this the awareness of truth, as contrasted to the mere assertion of a conception regarded to be true because they are Scriptural. Charismatic exegetical methodology cannot be separated from a vibrant phenomenology in its application (Village 2011: 151-3).

Ervin (1985: 33) indicates the need to hypothesize a pneumatic epistemology, which guides a hermeneutic grounded on ‘pneumatic’ connection with the human authors of the Scripture. Autry (1983: 87-9) remarks on the methodological difficulties of the diversity of

\[205\] Village (2011: 153) notes the arguments within the Charismatic movements have principally been in America, although it has resonances in Britain. Mark Stibbe (1998), responding to denunciation from John Lyons (1998), entails what he comprehends as seven crucial characteristics of charismatic understandings of scripture, specifically: ‘experiential, analogical, communal, Christological, eschatological, emotional and practical’. Analogical analysis for Stibbe means that contemporary experience is interrelated to both the ‘over-arching meta-narrative of Scripture’ and to specific scriptural stories. The trial is requested in the question ‘Is there applications of experiences of what the Spirit is operating in our lives and in our communities?’

\[206\] Ervin (1985: 34) advocates that the writers who wrote the Scriptures were predominated and inspired with the
modern hermeneutical values encountered by thoughtful persons. He criticizes that numerous new methodologies to interpret a manuscript are rooted upon apprehensions that are irrelevant and unrelated to Charismatic movements. Charismatic hermeneutics is based on Peter’s interpretation in Acts 2: 4 (Litwak 2005: 161). There are significant rudiments for the whole comprehension of the procedure of scriptural elucidation. Autry (1983: 34) advises a methodology of hermeneutics which identify the need for thoughtful usage of a variety of theories within a fundamental structure.  

Autry (1983: 99) advocates a methodology of interpretation which will repeat the Charismatic apprehension for stability with an evocative Scriptural history, for the forceful and truthful interaction of God in human history, and for orthodox exegesis based upon the objective of the author and for the emergent concern for human existence and community.

The charismatic movements have persisted in experiential and applicational methodological theology in the contexts of redemptive histories since the apostolic era. Its emergence has influenced a historical and spiritual impact on the Christian churches in the twentieth century.

2. Historical emergence

2.1. Pentecostalism

Blumhoter (1999: 33) views Pentecostalism as one of the most significant spiritual movements, which transcended institutional borders (Clifton [2005] 2007: 14) of the twentieth century. The doctrine of the Spirit has been given tangible reality in the emergency of a religion that appeals

---

207 Autry (1983: 101) notes important essentials such as history, language, experience, transcendence of self, and correlation in the community in their proper interrelation.
to Pentecost as well as to Calvary for its stimulation and motivation. The theology of the baptism
Charismatic Pentecostalism arose in the United States, but it has expanded far beyond its country
of origin, and the great majority of its adherents are in foreign lands.\textsuperscript{208} Extra noteworthy
denominations are the Pentecostal Holiness Church, the Apostolic Faith movement, the Open
Bible Standard Church, the International Church of the Four Square Gospel, the Pentecostal Free
Will Baptists, etc. The Apostolic Overcoming Holy Church of God\textsuperscript{209} in Brazil has experienced
speedy Pentecostal progression. Pentecostal churches are to be established in the Evangelical and
in the Methodist charismatic churches (Bloesch 2000: 185).

The Pentecostal churches at present comprise the largest family of churches in Christendom after
Roman Catholicism. Including believers within other denominations, Pentecostals are now
approaching 250 million adherents (Lefevere 1996: 5). In Latin America Pentecostals encompass
the largest grouping of Protestants, totalling 20-25 per cent of the population in some countries.
It is also growing rapidly in Africa and Asia and is even altering the religious scene in Europe.\textsuperscript{210}
From 1985 to 1990 the mainline churches in Britain registered significant losses; whereas in the
same period independent churches (mainly Pentecostal) gained almost 30 per cent. Henry P. Van
Dussen, a past president of Union Theological Seminary in New York, made this astounding
confession: ‘I have come to feel that the Pentecostal movement with its emphasis upon the Holy
Spirit is more than just another revival. It is a revolution in our days… comparable in importance
with the establishment of the original Apostolic Church and with the Protestant Reformation
(Bloesch2000: 179-80).

\textsuperscript{208} Among the largest Pentecostal denominations in the United States are the Church of God in Christ (over seven
million members), the Assemblies of God, the Church of God (Cleveland, Tenn.), the Church of God of Prophecy,
the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World and the United Pentecostal Church (the last two being oneness churches),
and the Vineyard Christian Fellowship. The leading Pentecostal Churches in Britain are Elim Pentecostal Church,
the New Testament Church of God and the Church of God of Prophecy. In Scandinavia the Philadelphia Churches
are prominent in Germany, the Mülheim Association of Christian Fellowships (now known as the Union of Christian
Assemblies). Pentecostal churches in Brazil for Christ; the Congregation of Christ; and the Assemblies of God.

\textsuperscript{209} Take note that this church is part of the Oneness movement in Pentecostalism.

\textsuperscript{210} One of the largest congregations in the world is the Yoido Full Gospel Church in Seoul, Korea, a mega church of
750,000 members.
Pentecostal theology represents Charismatic spirituality in the Anointed One-centred theology. The main ideas of Pentecostal spirituality signifies the “Full Gospel”, the idea of the Anointed One’s fivefold role as Redeemer, Sanctifier, Baptizer with the Spirit, Healer, and the coming Judge (Kärkkäinen 2010: 224). Pentecostal movements deserve unusual treatment, since their understanding of the works and gifts of the Spirit reflects emphases that deviate markedly from traditional or mainline Christianity. Simultaneously, their call to the Scripture as well as to the renewal and revival movements in the history of the church is sufficient to keep most of them within the purview of orthodoxy. This is not to discount that cultic movements within the Pentecostal movement have caused considerable embarrassment among ecumenical Pentecostals. The principal challenge confronting the student of Pentecostal history is to ascertain whether this movement can start a transformation of the whole of Christendom (Bloesch 2000: 180).

2.2. Catholic Pentecostalism

Catholic Pentecostalism is particularly significant, for it reveals the breadth of the Pentecostal revolution (Lado 2009: 5). It began at Duquesne University in Pennsylvania in 1967 and spread rapidly throughout the country and overseas. Tongues are accepted as one of the gifts of the Spirit but not as a proof of having the Spirit. Some Catholic Pentecostals sees the baptism with the Spirit as the fulfilment of conversion. They practice the laying on of hands for Spirit baptism, not as a new sacrament, but as a catalyst that makes baptism and confirmation operative. For them the baptism Spirit embraces the ontological reality given in the ceremony of baptism and the realistic moment when this reality comes to consciousness (Bloesch 2000: 187). Religious Fox (2009: 1-3) says to Seymour, an initiator of Pentecostalism, ‘speaking in tongues’ was to be considered as “one of the signs” that contained the baptism of the Spirit, but not the genuine evidence of Spirit baptism in a person’s life.

211 The Catholic charismatic movement tolerates for a Pentecostal experience that is auxiliary to the customaries of the church. However, ‘baptism in the Spirit’ is not something substituting water baptism and confirmation. Rather it may be understood as a renewal of these ceremonies, convincing of oneself to all one’s ritual grace (Bloesch 2000: 54).
communities that have grown out of the Pentecostal revival in the Catholic Church embrace ‘the Word of God community in Ann Arbor, Michigan; people of the Praise community in South Bend, Indiana; the Emmanuel community in Paris; and the Maranatha community in Brussels’ (Bloesch 2000: 187). Pentecostal spirituality has also penetrated evangelical religious communities: the Brethren of the Common life, the Evangelical Sisterhood of Mary, Bethany Fellowship, and Community of Celebration. Mother Basilea Schlink, founder of the Evangelical Sisterhood of Mary in Darmstadt, Germany, distinguishes between conversion and spiritual gifts by the anointing of the Spirit, but contends that tongues are only one of the evidences or manifestations of the Spirit (Schlink 1968: 58). Cultic Pentecostalism is still another or multifaceted movements that require attention (Bloesch 2000: 188). They embrace to Oneness Pentecostalism, which repudiates the Trinity and discards the trinitarian formula for baptism (Ankerberg & Weldon 2011 [1996]: 38-9). In the United Pentecostal Church baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ is a condition for salvation. Speaking in tongues is seen as the prime sign that one is really baptized in the Spirit. Ankerberg & Weldon (1996 [2011]: 41) says to UPC, the Spirit is only a power or influence, not a person. Churches that appeal to new revelations that are often valued above the Bible include the Church of the Living Word, founded by John Robert Stevens, and the United House of Prayer for All People.

2.3. Charismatic movements

The Charismatic movement acknowledged as neo-Pentecostalism, and traced out of the Pentecostal surge of the early twentieth century (Woodhead 2004: 394) is an extraordinary growing phenomenon. The Pentecostals and Charismatics make up approximately one-fourth of Christians worldwide, and the numbers are simply predictable to raise (Yong 2005: 12). The modern charismatic movement has expanded, is far more complicated, and has actually become a global phenomenon. They embrace a broad multiplicity of views on gender and race.

---

213 MacNutt (1974: 89) says that the Charismatic movement has penetrated Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, United Church of Christ and Roman Catholic Churches. Even Eastern Orthodox Churches have been affected. Numerous paraparochial companionships have sensed the influence of the charismatic movement: the Blessed Trinity Society, the Order of St. Luke the physician and Camps Farthest out. Magazines that have appeared out of neo-Pentecostalism include Trinity, Logos, New Covenant, Charisma, Charisma Digest and New Wine.
It has the same doctrinal emphases as the Pentecostal movement, but one of the foremost premises on which they diverge is that whereas the charismatic movements are trans-denominational, the Pentecostal movement is peculiarly denominational (Burgess & McGee 2002: 88, cf Ojo 1988: 176). The early movements among the Charismatics were described as immature, mislead, frisky, insane, and even demonic. Exceptions normally were critical to the contentious physical manifestations that come with the revivals and that produced the Charismatics’ derogatory nick name “holy roller”. This brand was often capriciously used to illustrate the unorthodox performances of falling (Carrin 2002: 2), jerking, jumping, and rolling on the floor that opposed conventional social customs and religious expectations (Vondey 2010: 200). It is not a fundamental innovation on the Christian scene, for it can be shown to have deep roots in the Christian tradition. Its emphasis on a fresh outpouring of the Spirit, and the impending termination of the world were predicted in Montanism, Anabaptist spiritualism, Quakerism and fundamentalist millenarianism (Bloesch 2000: 180). The movement began in 1960 when Dennis Bennett, rector of St. Mark’s Episcopal Church in Van Nuys, California, received the baptism of the Spirit and the gift of tongues. However the origin of Charismatic Pentecostalism as a spiritual movement of renewal can be traced to the beginning of the twentieth century by a former Methodist minister, Charles F. Parham and his student, an Africa-originated preacher, W. J. Seymour (Hammonds 2008: 4).

Parham opened a bible college in

---

214 Carrin (2002: 3) says that the “falling experience” was not novel to the believers. In the 1742 New England revival, Jonathan Edwards declared that if there will be a vigorous impact of the Spirit of God in a varied assembly, it will cause in some way or other a tremendous visible commotion. To Carrin, modern Christian who renounces the “falling” experience is merely proving their unawareness of church history and God’s sovereignty.

215 Bloesch (2000: 186) narrates noteworthy frontrunners in the extensive Charismatic movement include T. B. Barratt of Norway; Lewi Pethrus of Sweden; Donald Gee, English Pentecostal pastor and author; George Jeffreys and Stephen Jefferys, founders of the Elim Pentecostal Church in Britain; David du Plessis, ecumenical Pentecostal who has worked closely with the World Council of Churches; Oral Roberts, healing evangelist and founder of Oral Roberts University; Gordon Fee, Pentecostal biblical Scholar teaching at Regent College in British Columbia; Pat Robertson, founder of 700 Club; Paul and Jan Crouch of the Trinity Broadcasting Network; William Branham (d. 1965); healing evangelist who aligned himself with the Oneness movement and Reinhard Bonnke, international evangelist and head of Christ for All Nations, which is dedicated to worldwide mission; Prophet T. B. Joshua, healing evangelist a founder of Synagogue Church of All Nations, Lagos in Nigeria.

216 Hammonds (2008: 1-5) says in 1905, Parham established a Bible school in Houston, Texas. Among those who joined the school was W. J. Seymour, a black Holiness preacher. Some scholars hold that the Pentecostal movement originated in 1896 at a revival in Cherokee country, North Carolina, led by William F. Bryant, a layman.
Topeka, Kansas, and encouraged his students to search the bible to ascertain whether there is any evidence for the baptism of the Spirit. When they subsequently began speaking in tongues, a new revival movement was born. Parham then began to bring ‘the Pentecostal message’ or ‘the full gospel message’ to various other cities. Those sympathetic to his doctrine began meeting in a house and then in a larger building on Azusa street. The Azusa street mission began to attract national attention as thousands received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The beginning of the Charismatic movements can conceivably be recognized to a convergence of ideas and events that begot the anticipation for an eschatological outpouring of the Spirit, which would bring new life to a church that had lapsed into formalism and creedalism (Bloesch 2000: 184).

3. Theological distinctive

This rapidly growing religious movement (Hunt 2009: 249-50)\(^{217}\) has also been a source of controversy because some critics believe it teaches a prosperity theology or a religious idea that God desires material wealth for those he favours. Claiming that religion can solve the spiritual, physical, and financial problems\(^{218}\) of vulnerable populations living in the global south is problematic. Characteristics of the Charismatic Movement include, “spiritual warfare,” “faith healings,” and the belief that the supernatural shapes everything. Spiritual warfare encourages believers to view daily life as an on-going struggle between divine and demonic spirits. Pentecostals frequently engage in deliverance rituals to rid their possessions of evil influences and to cure physical illnesses. Religious scholars discover that it is difficult to classify Pentecostalism because it is a new movement with different strains. However, most agree that

---

\(^{217}\) Hunt (2009: 245) says the Spirit imparts not only sanctification but missionary power and fervour. The baptism of the Spirit enables one to bear witness to the Anointed One in the world. It is said that the Charismatic communicate the gospel not simply through verbal concepts but also through social embodiment.

\(^{218}\) Oyakilome (2007: 27) is impacting the whole world over with his charismatic healings and gifts through the anointing of the Spirit. He is a founder of Christ Embassy and Love World Television Network in Nigeria. He teaches that God has given you divine health, absolute prosperity, unending success, abundant joy and indescribable peace, and to experience these and other wonderful blessings of God in one’s life and teaches that you must first see yourself with the eyes of the Spirit walking in these blessings.
Pentecostals have a deep personal faith rooted in what is written in the Bible. Unlike Evangelical Christians, Charismatic Pentecostals routinely entertain miracles through the Holy Spirit and have ecstatic experiences, such as speaking in tongues, prophesying, and faith healings. This shape of Christianity is growing rapidly.  

3.1. Characteristic of the anointing

The anointing of the Spirit is a vigorous instant experience obtained with, which is different from Christian conversion and for an intensifying of the boundaries Spirit baptism, which portrays as an eschatological invasion from God’s dominion (Clifton 2007: 19-20). Hagin (2004: 69), a most influential Charismatics leader in the twenties century, expounds the characteristics of the anointing, which is an invisible reality in the Charismatic movements. To Charismatic, the anointing is transmittable, measurable (2 Ki 2: 9), tangible, even an anointing can revive a dead man’s bones (2Ki 13: 20-21). Heward-Mills (2011:146) explicates the anointing can be demonstrated in seven ways as follows: terminated, living, sharing, modified, diminishing, enhancing, and reintroduced. It is likely to lose any obtained charisma including the anointing of the Spirit (Obisakin 2007: 210). According to John anointing has a persevering gift: it is educational, adequate and upright (Jn 6: 59; 7: 14, 28, 35). Tucker (2009: 20) indicates the anointing proceeded from God into the church is on the increase. Hagin (2004: 76) believes that there are laws that govern electricity in the natural realm, there are invisible, yet actual power governing the anointing in the spiritual realm. Cain (2009: 138) says electronics can be an

219 Some scholars attribute this growth to faith’s ability to bring order, stability, and hope to people who live precarious lives. Religious scholars argue that understanding Pentecostalism’s rise, it is necessary for anyone seeking to understand the global south, because it influences everything from politics, to women’s rights, to economic growth.

220 See Oyakilome (2006: 8-9) ‘The Seven Spirits of God.’ He is hosting more than 3 million congregants in a single service. He does not agree with Hagin that anointing is measurable. Because we are like Jesus immeasurably anointed, so we can accommodate the power of the Spirit, since we are united with the Anointed One, Jesus. He says that when we believe in Him, we are not only justified but also sanctified, simultaneously possessing the very same nature of God. Furthermore, he regards the doctrine of justification as theology of deification of the believers, which supports his prosperity theology in soul and in spirit and in financial surplus in present era, since they have been transformed as small gods who are carrying with the same divine nature of the Anointed One. Another Charismatic leader, Prophet Kobus van Rensburg in RSA, extends the deification theology of Oyakilome’s. He preaches even ‘immortality’ of believers in the present life.
instrument to transfer anointing. There are anointing to heal and anointing to preach and teach. Anointing will work for an individual or for a whole crowd (Mt 14: 34-36). Jesus ministered with and without anointing (Hagin 2007: 15-37). Anointing within is not referring to being baptized with the Spirit, or being filled with the Spirit, as the Scripture terms it. It is a separate experience of the New Birth (Hagin 2006: 11). Hagin (2007: 26) taught that one can be baptized by the Spirit after conversion.

3.1.1. Phenomenon of anointing

Bonnke (1995: 43-44), one of the most distinguished international evangelists on the African Continent, affirms that the anointing of the Spirit is fully Scriptural. However, his concept of anointing is totally different from that of other Charismatic leaders. He believes that one can be anointed by the Spirit only once. He claims:

The whole concept of another and new anointing, as if the original had faded away, is strange to the New Testament thought about the eternal Spirit. Anointing is self-renewing. It is the Spirit of newness. ‘He abides in us’ (Jn 1: 2; 27), (Bonnke 1995:48).

In the Old Testament all who served God had to be anointed. This is replaced in the New Testament by the Holy Spirit for all believers. Anointing is one of the synonyms of the baptism in the Spirit (Bonnke 1995: 37). Bonnke’s anointing is exclusively connected with the transition of his ministry when he was prayed for over by George Jeffreys221 whom many consider to be the greatest British revivalist since John Wesley. Bonnke (1995: 38) refers to the time when he had been touched by him:

“I dared to go and ask, and he (Jeffreys) heard my voice and invited me in. There he prayed

221 Bonnke (1995: 38) says Jeffreys is renowned in the Charismatic communities as a man who filled the greatest halls, pioneered in the face of universal opposition the glorious message of Jesus Christ, as Saviour, Healer, Baptizer and coming King from the charismatic position.
with me, and it was as if his mantle had come upon me, to use a scriptural expression”.

Subsequent to ‘mantle anointing’ to obtain the baton from the previous anointed ministry, it was confirmed by the anointing with fire poured out on the chosen one, which is the anointing with the Spirit for mission. It is a different experience to Rodney Howard-Browne, who was born in South Africa and moved to the States. According to him, through the outpouring of the Spirit, he is the man who brought namely, ‘the Toronto Blessing’ that has mightily impacted the Charismatic communities over across the world. He reveals his personal encounter with the Spirit. He got desperate during a prayer meeting in July 1979 and made a decision. He said:

“God! tonight is my night! Lord! either you come down here and touch me, or I’m going to die and come up there and touch you…”  I shouted, “God, I want your fire! Let the fire fall here tonight like it did at Pentecost!”… The Spirit was poured out on me that night, I shouted for about 20 minutes. I didn’t give up, even when my voice began to get hoarse. Suddenly, the power of God hit at the top of my head and went all the way down to my feet! It felt like liquid fire-like someone had poured gasoline over me and set me on fire. My whole body was tinkling (Howard-Browne 1995: 10-12).

Howard-Brown had an unusual experience. To be thirsty is an indispensable element to be permeated by the anointing like other Charismatics to him. Receiving the anointing is not limited to the laying on of hands (Hagin 2007: 88-9).\textsuperscript{222} Hagin describes the anointing experience that took place in his meeting on the second Sunday night of September 1939. He writes:

\begin{quote}
“I don’t know what I said and I couldn’t see anything or anyone. It was as if a cloud or dense fog filled the church premises, but here the glory had come down and I didn’t know one word I had said for 15 minutes. It had been a glory cloud. . . In that service everybody who didn’t have the baptism was baptized and everybody who was lost or backslided got back to
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{222} Hagin (2007: 101) says that the hand of the Lord was anointing in Ezk 8: 1; 37; 1 “The hands of the Lord fell there upon me, and carried me out in the Spirit of the Lord”.
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God. It wasn’t my preaching that did it; it was the anointing. The glory cloud still appears quite frequently in our healing meetings and other services. People have seen it. It comes in and fills the room. It is at times like that, that people receive healing without anyone ministering to them, because the anointing is there” (Hagin 2007: 99).

Herzog, a Jewish American, charismatic leader distinguishes between ‘the anointing of God’ and ‘the glory of God.’ The latter is of a higher realm than the anointing by God (Herzog 2007: 23). Rankin (2008: 59) says “beyond the anointing’ is to enter into the Most Holy Place”. Some Charismatic leaders consider both are overlapping one another, when the glory or presence of God appears, an anointing follows. Yet to Herzog, there is a clear distinction between them, the former one is lower than the latter one. Herzog (2007: 21-42) said when the higher realm is present, we don’t need to lay on hands for the sick.223 Herzog explains that when the glory of God comes, there is no time and space in that realm, which is indicated by an instant healing, miracles, signs (gold dust) and wonders (instant weight-loss and so on) that take places (Herzog 2007: 21-42).224

To charismatic movements, aspects of the anointing with the Spirit entail experiential, emotional, sensational, physical, phenomenal and evidential for missions of the believers.

3.1.2. Anointing and faith

Healing is based on two conditions; one is the measurement of the capacity of anointing that operates, and other is the capacity of the faith that cooperates with the present anointing (Hagin

---

223 Herzog (2000: 56-73) distinguishes between the lower manifestation in Acts 2, only there was a marked presence of the Spirit, but in Acts. 4, 5, the higher manifestation, there is a greater glory, even the shadow of Peter healed the sick and all the people’s needs was met by the manifestation of the glory of God. As the early believers pray “Lord! Stretch out your hand (the glory of God’s manifestation) to heal and perform miraculous signs and wonders through the name of your holy servant Jesus.” He testifies about his experience that when the glory of God present, he is transported in the Spirit as the evangelist Philip (Act 8: 39).

224 Herzog (2007: 23-9) compares the glory of God with the mysterious sound waves. As a sound wave breaks out with the utterance of a word, the presence of God’s glory creates an atmosphere where miracles and healings break out.
Heagin differentiates between two ways of healing: by faith or by anointing. There are two kinds of manifestations in healing: instant and gradual manifestations. When healing is received through the anointed word through faith, in the word of God, it is not through anointing. The strong and mightier healing anointing occurs instantly on multitudes. Hagin describes it as the presence of God or the glory of God. Faith is the medium to receive the promise of God whether or not the anointing is present. Faith is moved by the word, not by feeling, in most cases the anointing comes with a tangible feeling. Every new commission or new office requires a new anointing with the Spirit (Henry 2011:78). Yoder (2004: 21) says the apostolic mandate demands a crucial anointing to accomplish it. The apostolic *charismata* released upon the initial twelve disciples (Mt 10: 1-42) were the same anointing, which were afterward transferred to their disciples to participate in the same commands (Rampesad 2005: 90). The Charismatic uses the term ‘anointing’ in the concept of the gift of the Spirit. Various anointings are implanted within the Spirit of God and they are being operated or activated according to the callings the Spirit bestows on the believers (Easton 2008: 291).

To activate anointing, faith is required to sustain and claim it\(^{225}\) (Mt 14: 36; Mk 5: 34). Hagin (2007: 129) insists that it is necessary to keep the switch of faith tuned on the need of healing. Both faith and anointing is important to Hagin.\(^{226}\) Unbelief will stop the flow of God’s anointing (Mk 6: 1-6), faith of the crowd can help or hinder the anointing, when the power of anointing is present, one must tap into the water. The key to understand the anointing is the word of God. Wigglesworth, a British charismatic leader, renowned as ‘the apostle of the faith’ never neglected to line up the word of God with the anointing by the Spirit, he says:

> None of you can be strong in God unless you are diligently and constantly listening to what

---

\(^{225}\) Joshua (2006: 6) exclaims a motto in his healing ministry, ‘God does nothing without his Word’. He activates the anointing in him by faith, based on the written Word.

\(^{226}\) However, some charismatic leaders, such as Hagin (2007: 99) and Hinn (1996: 170) have confusedly described their experience of reception of the anointing with the Spirit, which was bestowed upon them unexpectedly, not recognizing of their faith in some occasions, while it was an indispensable factor to receive and accept it according to them.
God has to say to you through the Word. You cannot know the power and the nature of God unless you partake of His inbreathed Word. Read it in the morning, in the evening, and at every opportunity you get. After every meal, instead of indulging in unprofitable conversation around the table, read a chapter from the Word, and then have a season of prayer. I endeavour to make a point of doing this no matter where or with whom I am staying (Wigglesworth 1999: 161).

Wigglesworth (1999: 163) indicates that some conditions are prerequisites to receive the anointing of the Spirit. He wrote “when sin is out, when the body is clean, and when the life is made right, then the Holy Spirit comes and faith brings the evidence.” Purification precedes the baptism with the Spirit. He cried out:

But, oh! the baptism in the Holy Spirit! The baptism of fire! The baptism of power! The baptism of oneness! The baptism of communion! This is the baptism of the Spirit of life that takes the man, shakes him up, builds him up and makes him know he is a new creature in the Spirit, worshiping God in the Spirit (Wigglesworth 1998: 198).

To Wigglesworth, the baptism with the Spirit entails the anointing, regeneration and conversion and mighty power leading to sanctification, which is the undivided ultimate *charisma* of the Spirit through faith in which the word of God is being operated. For the charismatics, faith is an essential cause to experience the anointing with the Spirit.

3.1.3. Anointing and sanctification

The Charismatics have also been divided over the second blessing. Those following W.H. Durham deny sanctification as a distinct work of grace. One is sanctified at conversion and has no need of a further change. They espouse the finished work of grace rather than a second work. The anointing is that divine inducement from above, not a desire of one’s emotional feelings. It does not occur with years of experience, status and positions. But it is endowed by laying aside
every sin and transgression that easily assails us. Sanctification is a requirement to experience
the anointing with the Spirit (Henry 2011: 29). In their view Christian experience involves only
two steps: conversion and baptism with the Spirit, which brings the power for witnessing. The
Assemblies of God and the Four Square Gospel are among the churches that hold to the finished
work of grace, conceiving of sanctification as progressive rather than instantaneous. A distinction
is often made between baptismic Pentecostals, holding to the finished work, and the Methodistic
types, holding to the second blessing of sanctification.

Some Charismatics speak of a third stage beyond salvation and Holy Spirit baptism: the
experience of ‘ascension.’ A few even hold to a fourth stage: ‘total shattering’ whereby there is
complete redemption from one’s religious ego. Others teach the experience of being ‘slain by the
Spirit,’ through the anointing by the Spirit, which takes place after or at Spirit baptism. In this
experience one is physically knocked down or overcome by the Spirit. Hagin (2003: 23-46)
taught that ‘an anointing within,’ is the ‘redemptional sealing’ and ‘an anointing upon,’
‘ministerial endowment’ is to be a powerful witness. Du Plessis (1970: 70-73; 99-106), called
‘Mr. Pentecost’, speaks of a ‘baptism of fire,’ subsequent to the ‘baptism in the Spirit’ resulting
in inward purification.

3.1.4. Baptism with the Spirit

The one denominator that relates all Charismatic Pentecostals together is the Pentecostal
experience, often called the baptism with the Spirit (Albrecht 2008: 147).227 This experience is
interpreted in several different ways, so that it tends to be an obstacle to Pentecostal unity. It is

---

227 Albrecht (2008: 148) says this emphasis became the anchor of all its other features, such as speaking in tongues,
healing miracles, holiness, and prophecy. Even after the movement had subsided, baptism with the Spirit became the
surviving milestone. Perhaps it occupied such a central position in the charismatic renewal because, though an inner
experience, its physical manifestation in speaking in tongues is easily noticeable. It is the one chief doctrinal peaks
of the Pentecostal movement which happened to be non-controversial among Pentecostals and Charismatics alike.
The perception and elucidation of the other doctrines of the Charismatic movement are as varied as the people who
illustrate them.
mostly seen as an energizing or empowering experience that equips the believer for mission. Some circles identify it with the experience of full sanctification; others sharply distinguish it from this experience.\textsuperscript{228} A few Pentecostals, such as du Plessis, make a distinction between the baptism of the Spirit (which occurs at conversion) and baptism in the Spirit, which is subsequent to conversion (Gillespie 1996: 27).\textsuperscript{229} Under these circumstances the kingdom of God is easily politicized into a conquering phalanx with solidarity instead of spiritual unity. Uniformity and solidarity are confused with unity and spiritual power.

3.1.5. Anointing and \textit{charismata}

The signs of the manifestation of the Spirit play a prominent role in charismatic spirituality. Yoder (2009: 130) says, when anointing with the Spirit comes, audacity captures us, “our voices can reverberate God’s voice”. Roberts says (1995: 167-170) when anointing comes on the believers, they cannot control it. The anointing takes a role as a means to declare like God and perform like God. However, many theologians in this movement warn against seeking after signs. Tugwell (1972: 52) declares, ‘There is mysticism, and there are miracles, which are worldly and serve the ‘Prince of this world’. Some of the so-called signs are ‘signs precisely of the recalcitrance of our nature under the operation of grace’ (Tugwell 1972: 53). By contrast, in mainstream Pentecostal theology Christians are encouraged to expect signs of the movement of the Spirit, which make the believers certain of being in the Spirit. The Reformation theology do not need to look for evidences of standing in the sight of God, for faith itself brings the assurance that you are loved by God and forgiven through the sacrifice of the Anointed One (Bloesch 2000: 228).

\textsuperscript{228} Some Pentecostals hold that the Spirit is only \textit{with} the believer at his or her conversion and that the Spirit comes to dwell \textit{in} the believer at a later time. Others contend that the Spirit comes to dwell within us at conversion (Albrecht 2008: 146).

\textsuperscript{229} Bloesch (2000: 190) says the Mühlheim Association of Christian Fellowships in Germany discards the assessment that the baptism of the Spirit is a second experience after the new birth and confirms the Reformed view that in conversion we are baptized into the body of the Anointed One, Jesus. Arnold Bittlinger, who has been vigorous in the charismatic movement in German Lutheranism, maintains that there is only one baptism with water and the Spirit. United Pentecostals are persuaded to consider the new birth as comprising repentance of iniquity, soaking in water in the name of the Anointed One, Jesus and the baptism with the Spirit.
The Charismatic are also agreed that the *charismata* of the Spirit did not cease with the apostolic age but were intended to fortify and edify the Christian community throughout its history. Pentecostal ecclesiology emphasizes the Spirit’s anointing and filling as virtually a requirement for a believer’s full participation in Christian life, in a kind of synthesis with the Catholic emphasis on apostolic mission and the Protestant emphasis on the priesthood of all believers (Work 2006: 10).

The *charismata* that are given special attention among Pentecostals and Charismatics are healing, prophecy that speaks a direct word from God that has bearing on the present or future situation; the discerning of spirits, which enables one to know whether a prophecy or witness comes from God or the devil, the word of wisdom, which brings divine illumination to the issue at hand; the word of knowledge, which brings healings and allows one to penetrate the deeper recesses of another person’s being, and the working of miracles, which equips one to transmit the life-giving energy of the Spirit to those in need. These *charismata* are generally viewed as manifestations of the Spirit through the anointing with the Spirit rather than permanent endowments (Schroeder 2007: 53-70).

3.1.6. Anointing and healing

To the Charismatics, healing has always been a fundamental component of the gospel (Pattison 2007: 120). In the first decade of the new millennium the term, ‘healing’ has surfaced as a

---

230 Bloesch (2000: 49-51) John Wesley and also numerous Puritans made a discrepancy between faith and the fullness of the faith, which was perceived as a *charisma* bestowed exclusively to the chosen. Reformed tradition was tending to make observance to a doctrinal formulation as a mark of being to the member of the Anointed One.

231 Work (2006: 11) says some Charismatics have even revived the title ‘apostle’ for describing some of their leaders.

232 Schroeder (2007: 63-9) notes Vatican II suggests a church focused on and even determined by the Spirit. Pentecostalism’s historical preoccupation with tongues as the necessary evidence of the baptism of the Spirit and the goal of all Christian discipleship suggests the same.
popular emblem in both civil society and the Christian church.\(^{233}\) The conception of healing appears to embrace the personal need to resolve agony and injury, to realize communal cooperation and the commitment to one another, with wisdom and prudence, the assistance to acknowledge the occasion of commotion has relinquished to a new circumstances of absolute peace. Metaphors of healing have emerged in many charismatic churches (Kay 2009: 237), as a ministry not only to the sick but also to those anguishing other calamities. The Christian ritual of anointing the sick presents the symbolic paradigm of healing. Healing liturgies affect the perceptions of people themselves, of their communal relationship, and of the world in hurting or agonizing situations, by participating in the visible sense of the Anointed One’s crucifixion (Morrill 2007: 2-4).

Divine healing is a significant element in the Charismatic movement. It is not the power of thought or knowledge but absolute faith in the living Anointed One who replies to the faithful promise for his people by compassion (Roberts 2002: 64-7) and through grace that causes healing for those in need.\(^{234}\) While some particular contexts in the Scripture, in which few cases for healing is performed by using a medium or material (2 Kg 13: 21; Acts 19: 11-12),\(^{235}\) there is frequent misuse of healing practices, such as the covering with scarves, handkerchiefs, or vials of oil that allegedly facilitate these material substances to transmit divine power of healing in charismatic movements. The Charismatic emphasis on healing depends fundamentally upon the theology that observes disease as a primary symptom of sin. They believe that all transgression and iniquities, which is the very cause of every kind of sickness and diseases, were abolished by the crucifixion of the Anointed One on the cross. Consequently, the request for healing is simultaneously a demand for battle against the powers of sickness and death. The Charismatics do not at all times recognize that sickness can be a means for the glory of God. Long (2009: 92)

\(^{233}\) Pattison (2007: 119-21) exclaims news accounts covering an array of human tragedy (e.g., hurricanes and their aftermath, clergy sexual abuse, rape, school shootings, and murders) invariably include quotes from affected parties bespeaking their desire for healing in the given situation.

\(^{234}\) Morrill (2007: 3) explains among many charismatics, the healing power is attributed to the power of one’s faith and not simply to the free determination of God. They are repeatedly drawn to the incongruous conclusion that those who are not healed are deficient in faith.

\(^{235}\) The Charismatics believe these extraordinary miraculous cases happened due to the anointing with the Spirit.
argues that God conquers sickness and diseases either by eradicating them or empowering us to undergo it. Sickness is drawn from the kingdom of disorder that is at present transitory through the triumphant resurrection of the Anointed One. Diseases are interconnected to demonic possession or oppression by a demon in the period of old and new covenant. In the contemporary society that encompasses the Zeitgeist of the new covenant era, the psychological infirmities were generally connected with demon possession. Yet a thoughtful investigation of the text unveil that the Anointed One treated the demonically possessed in a different method from those who were simply sick either in psyche or in body. Monden (1966: 159) observes:

The Anointed One was habituated to touch the sick in a way which symbolizes his compassion. However in the presence of the demon-possessed, as though he is to disclaim someone undeserving of his presence, he commands, but briefly and acerbically: “Be still, and go out of this man.” He utilizes absolute domination without sympathy or dialogue. No merely psychological explanation of demon-possession can validate this radical dissimilarity in the attitude of the Anointed One (Monden 1966: 159-61).

In the Charismatic movements, the ministry of deliverance is deeply grounded on the hypothesis that the definitive adversary of humanity is Satan or demonic forces. Illness and diseases are attributed not only to transgression or iniquities, but recurrently to a demonic invasion. In the exorcism of the evil forces, what is necessary is not merely a prayer or petition for healing, but by the form of the laying on of hands and the authoritative command in the name of Jesus, the Anointed One who delivers people out of their hopeless misery. Demons are frequently conceived of as the diseased or animistic, as discarnate spirits in the hunt for mortal bodies to inhabit. Some Charismatics are liable to trace demons’ origin from the underworld, drastically dissimilar to angels from heaven.

---

Monden (1966: 123) remarks that on occasion the Anointed One did not discourse with the demon (cf. Mt 8: 26-34; Lk 8: 25-37). On the other hand, the Anointed One repeatedly rebuked the demons and would not allow them to speak (Mk 9: 24-7; Lk 9: 41-2). In his unwavering confrontation with the chief devil in the desert, the Son of God exceptionally responds to his evil adversary to confirm the predestined redemptive work of God (Mt 4: 1-11; Mk 1-12-13; Lk 4: 1-13).
3.1.7. Anointing and prosperity

The term, ‘anointing’ is a crucial element for the guaranteed present prosperous life in the Charismatic movements (Sesley 2009: 116). The concept, ‘anointing’ is used with the same meaning as ‘blessing in every way’, and ‘spiritual charisma’ in a specific area’, and ‘power to breakthrough’ in the Charismatic circles. The Charismatic believes the anointing over the lives of the believers will affect their children after them in diverse ways whether in finances or good health. Their posterities are fully covered in their prosperity (Adeyemi 2005: 49). Anointing itself is not for healing the physically sick (Jm 5: 14-15), the sick is healed through the prayer of faith. Generally ‘anointing’ is used in close relation with ‘charisma’ among African Charismatics. The anointed is frequently used to describe a person whose ministry is so charismatic that it produces tangible results (Sesley 2009: 117), like the reversal of evil and the realization of successes and prosperity: ‘anointing for change,’ ‘anointing for a breakthrough’ ‘anointing for socio-economic revolution’.

The next section will indicate some of the theological questions on the charismatic movements to be reconsidered when it is observed through the reformed perspectives.

4. Theological considerations

4.1. The Spirit in the Trinity

The Charismatic movements are unified in their manifestation of charisma through the anointing with the Spirit however it has never been a monolithic movement. One of the major divisions revolves around the doctrine of the Trinity. Almost one-fifth of American Pentecostals are Unitarian. The so-called Oneness movement stresses the unity of God though seeing this unity in Jesus Christ, who is equated with Jehovah. This movement is now known as “Jesus only”, and baptisms are administered not in the name of the Trinity but in the name of Jesus. Some Pentecostals like the Bible Way, a charismatic Jesus communal movement, envisages God
as the eternal Spirit who is everywhere present. Jesus, in whom the spirit dwelt, is acknowledged as the Son of God. Cultic Pentecostals, like the Way, hold to an Unitarianism of the first person (Larson 1982: 176-180).

This singular emphasis on the Word has many dangers through the development of a rationalistic-analytic use of the Word. Through it the truth or principles of Scripture are developed, and applied without the profession of faith and the call to conversion. This is especially dangerous for the unity of the Charismatic movement. Its adherents place all divine reality in a single divine person who is both Jesus and the Word.

The Scriptures do not operate on such Unitarian assumption. The Anointed One said that “it is the Spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. “The words that I have spoken to you are Spirit and life (Jn 6: 63)”. In context this is a Trinitarian text: John 6.63b is the summary of Jesus’ authority in the discourse. His words come from the Father (Jn 12: 49; 14: 10, 24, etc.), are empowered by the Spirit (Jn 3: 34) and therefore can give eternal life (Schreiner 2008: 464). This is in agreement with the reasoning of Paul that it is the Spirit who knows the deep things of God and reveals them to humankind: Those who receive this revelation can speak with the wisdom that the Spirit gives; they have the mind of Christ (1 Cor 2: 9-16). Zechariah 4.6 says: “This is the word of the Lord unto Zerubbabel saying, not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit saith YHWH of hosts”. Though this is an Old Testament text, the word of God and Spirit stand parallel to the fulfilment of the promises of God.\footnote{The summary text is 2 Timothy 3.16a: ‘All Scripture is God-breathed’. The word of God comes and fulfils its own commandments and promises only because of the union of the holy word and the Holy Spirit. This statement does not allow for a static deposit of truth. The word is divine in its origin, dissemination and propagation.} This word goes forth, derived from God, by the continued activity of the Holy Spirit to fulfil the nature of its holiness in those who hear. As the Christ imparts his nature in believers, the Holy Spirit is no less the agent of the fulfilment of his nature in believers. Holiness of nature is paramount for both Christ and Spirit because holiness of nature is ontological to both Christ and Spirit. There can be no endowment with the power of the Spirit that is not also an experience in righteousness and purity.\footnote{There can be no endowment with power that is not also an experience in holiness, which affects behaviour by}
4.2. The Faith movement

The Faith movement in the Charismatic groups is also called the Word of Faith and Positive Confession (McConnel1995: 718-20). The movement has its philosophical source in the writing of E. W. Kenyon (1867-1948), who attended the Emerson College of Oratory in Boston, a spawning ground for New Thought ideas. Kenyon began as a Congregationalist, then switched to Unitarianism and then to New Thought. He finally ended in Christian Science, but he sought to relate the insights of the so-called metaphysical movement to the burgeoning Pentecostal revival (Parker 2008: 49-52). One of his chief converts was Kenneth E. Hagin, founder of Rhema Bible International who has provided a significant theology for the contemporary Charismatic movement. Other Charismatic leaders who teach the Faith confession theology include Kenneth Copeland, Fred Price, T. L. Osborn, Robert Tilton, Charles Cowan and Marilyn Hickey. To some degree the Faith philosophy has intruded into the ministries of Paul Crouch, Oral Roberts and Pat Robertson, though the evangelical note is much more prominent with them.

The Faith movement teaches that the universe runs according to spiritual laws, and humans have to discover and apply these laws to their situation (Parker 2008: 63-4). The way to be healed is to confess that you are healed and not waver in this belief. One “conquers error by denying its verity.” Faith becomes a superhuman effort to alter human consciousness and thereby dispel sickness. As in the New Thought movement, pain is overcome by denying its sensory evidence and affirming the goodness of God and the efficacy of Christ. Fred Price, a guest speaker, declared in a chapel service at Oral Roberts University (Sep. 19. 1990), “it’s not God who heals you, it’s your faith” (McConnel 1995: 94). We simply need to confess the beneficence of God and then claim this beneficence for our healing. A gnostic element is apparent in this movement, whose adherents regularly “base their teachings on truths revealed directly by the Spirit, things

radically changing the ground of behaviour. Power without perfection in love is flawed, even if that power is perceived as being infinite. For this reason the promise of Acts 1.8 is also a promise of love and holiness according to the nature of the agent of that power who is the Holy Spirit. So God whose love and holiness are perfectly united in the divine being does not impart the power of the Spirit without also imparting his love and purity.
they ‘never saw before’ in the Bible.” They claim that “difficulties are only suffered by Christians, when they fail to exercise the laws of faith.” (Bloesch 2000: 189)

The Faith movement and indeed the New Thought movement on the whole are not bereft of biblical support.\textsuperscript{239} The Psalms urge God’s people to meditate on the law of God (Ps 77: 12; 119: 15; 143: 5), which will be a source of healing (Prv 3: 8; 4: 20-24). Paul enjoins believers to fix their mind on those things that are edifying and uplifting (Rm 8: 5-6; Phil 4: 8; Col 3: 2). By contending that health and prosperity follow inevitable form of a right faith attitude, they deny the salutary role of cross bearing, which often involves the sacrifice of the comforts and goods of the world (McConnell 1995: 178).\textsuperscript{240} They remind us, however, that sickness does not belong to the new order of the kingdom of God and that the fullness of salvation involves the overcoming of sickness as well as sin. Yet Scripture teaches that we can triumph over sickness inwardly and that physical healing is not the essence of salvation (cf. Lk 17:11-19).

Spirituality becomes a profession of faith with little emphasis on the actuality of personal transformation. A further danger is a mantra-like use of Scripture quotations. Scripture is quoted with guaranteed results in matters of salvation, healing, physical protection, material wealth and other personal desires and ambitions. The claim of faith is confessed as reality where there is no actual evidence of the claim. It becomes easy for individuals to confuse reality with confessional claims. So righteousness and holiness are claimed as positional reality in the place of actual and personal righteousness and holiness (Gause 2009: 95-110). Positional sanctification takes the place of actual purification and crucifixion of the old nature. This is sometimes even applied to healing with the claim that healing has occurred by the declaration of God, but the infirmity is still present in the body (Gause 2009: 97-9).\textsuperscript{241} 

\textsuperscript{239} Faith teachers correctly discern the power of thought to affect the way to meet the challenges of life. Nevertheless they gravely misunderstand the character of faith, which has its basis not in the human will, but in God.

\textsuperscript{240} A number of Faith teachers are unfavourable towards Paul for accepting poverty and suffering. McConnell (1995: 177) reacts with this refutation: “What they fail to recognize is what Paul knew so well: to believe in the crucified Messiah is to submit to the claim of his cross”.

\textsuperscript{241} Gause (2009: 98) acknowledges that many Trinitarian believers have made these kinds of claims. The point is that such claims are consistent with the theological/philosophical epistemology of Unitarian Pentecostalism, and not
4.3. Demonology

For many decades the ethos of modernity relegated the demonic to the background, but with the collapse of an unwarranted faith in reason and the rise of post-modernity, the demonic is coming back and is in fashion (Curtis 2006: 101). The flourishing of shamanism and animism in the wider culture, manifested in the Satanist and new age movements, attests to the emergency of a new cultural paradigm that makes place for the demonic powers of chaos that threaten cultural stability and integrity.242 The Charismatic Pentecostal revolution reflects and promotes the fascination with the demonic, though contemporary academic theology has been slow to incorporate this theme in its enterprise.

Yong (2005: 95) says the demonological viewpoints of the Charismatic movements are traditioned much less officially through theological treatises but rather through the testimony, the sermon and other popularly fashioned and marketed materials. These Charismatic thoughts sustain a relation with pre-modern Christian views in many respects. While the demonic played a prominent role in reformation theology, particularly with Luther, the Enlightenment treated the demonic as a relic of our mythological past. It could be tolerated as long as it was understood poetically. For Schleiermacher reference to the devil belongs to “our treasury of song” but should not be a theme in dogmatics (Sundberg 1993: 16). The deists tended to deny the existence of the devil in their theology “the spiritual world was depopulated and God stood alone, his truth is made known by the powers of rational man” (Sundberg 1993: 18).243 Demons are not angelic

with Trinitarian Pentecostalism.

242 Shamanism and animism are palpable in the new interest in Native American spirituality and in such cults as Wicca, the Unification Church and Theosophy.

243 Rudolf Otto (d.1937) powerfully challenged the rationalism of the modern era by focusing attention on the non-rational aspects of faith and the eschatological nature of the kingdom of God. Yet he could not escape the spell of the Enlightenment, insisting that the healings and exorcisms of Jesus could largely be explained in psychosomatic terms. Paul Tillich, who was markedly influenced by Otto, gave still more credence to the idea of demons, but viewed them as symbolic of dark and sinister powers within the structure of being. Much of what Tillich says can be incorporated into the biblical, evangelical vision. His error lies in reducing the demonic to an “it” rather than “he”. To Tillich the demonic is a creative-destructive force that subverts human integrity and stability. Karl Barth interpreted the
persons, but forces of disruption that can only unravel and destroy. They exist through the act of
divine negation, which accompanies the act of divine creation. Their power is that of the lie,
which is unmasked when exposed to the light of truth. The demons can be formidable
adversaries to humans, but they are no match to the living God and have already been conquered
through the victory of Jesus the Anointed One (Yong 2005: 96-101).

The dismissal of the demonic has contributed to the vacuity in theology.\(^{244}\) The Charismatic
movements have powerfully reaffirmed the New Testament picture of demonology, but have not
always discriminated between what is purely cultural and what belongs to the essence of
revelation. Demons are sometimes depicted as spirits from the netherworld rather than fallen
angels whose origin is the realm of pure spirit rather than a primordial chaos. Some Pentecostals
speculate that demons are spirits of a pre-Adamic race of being, who were corrupted by Satan
and his angels. They seek embodiment in human and even in animal form, because they long “to
escape the intolerable condition of being unclothed” (Basham 1972: 219-20).\(^{245}\) Sometimes
evangelicals and Pentecostals portray demons as scum and filth, thereby insinuating that they
belong to a lower order of beings, subhuman more than superhuman.\(^{246}\) The practice of repeated
exorcisms in Pentecostal circles belies the apostolic doctrine that once we become Christians we
are protected against demonic possession. Reformed theologian and biblical scholar, Boogaart
(1997: 19) describes what he calls “the kick-the-devil theology” as rampant in the Charismatic
movement to reduce the devil to a malignant force that can be expelled by ritual techniques
rather than an angelic adversary of God and humanity who can be adequately dealt with only
through Jesus Christ himself.\(^{247}\)

\(^{244}\) Not all sickness caused by demonic assail are physical or even emotional in nature. Several take the shape of an
internal deformation of the soul. Some degree of deformation is presumed in all cases of demonic entrapment.

\(^{245}\) Osborn (1992: 144) describes them as drifting, discarnate spirits “seeking a body in which they can enter and
find expression to carry out their assignment of evil.”

\(^{246}\) Osborn (1992: 143) says ‘our spirits are from God. Demon spirits are from Satan.” One can perceive a type of
gnostic dualism in Osborn.

\(^{247}\) Boogaart (1997: 23) has an Origenistic inclination when he looks forward to God’s kingdom and the restoration
of the devil and his followers to God’s kingdom. Origen believed in the universal restoration of all things,
apokatastasis. He says that the demons were initially children of light and that we as Christians are summoned to
The Charismatic movements’ foundation of the ‘all-healed theology’ in the kingdom of God that delivers from disease as well as from guilt and sin is the connection of disease with sin in the New Testament. Both belong to the kingdom of evil or nothingness that is being driven out by the advancing kingdom of God. Boogaart (1997: 22) says Harnack claims that “Jesus does not distinguish rigidly between sickness of the body and of the soul; He takes them both as different expressions of one supreme ailment in humanity”. At the same time it is much too simplistic to assert that devils are the cause of sickness, since it trends to exonerate humans from personal culpability in their predicament.248 The origin of many illnesses is shrouded in mystery and is therefore inexplicable, and it would be a profound mistake to attribute these afflictions to either human or demonic sin, though people would not be vulnerable to sickness had not sin weakened them from the beginning.

Demon possession must be clearly differentiated from subjugation to demons. All of unredeemed humanity is in the grip of demonic control. Since the Fall, the whole of humanity has been in captivity to forces and powers beyond their control: the devil, sin and death. But demon possession in the narrow or technical sense refers to a state of bondage in which human freedom is not only impaired but entirely subverted. In demon possession our actions and even our words are directed, if not dictated, by the devil.249

---

248 Some illnesses may be ascribed to demonic effects, but in these instances humans share the blame, seeing as they allow themselves to be enticed by the Tempter.

249 Welker (1994: 87-98) describes it as the suspension of “the free configuration of the will” of the possessed person. “Without the free involvement of the affected person, he is restricted to his own hurt and to his own endangerment ... To the disadvantage of the incapacitated persons, the demons unforeseeably debilitate their will, bring them in this domain.” He points to Mk 9: 21 as illustrative of the self-destruction that demonic possession precipitates.
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4.4. Glossolalia

The conventional Charismatic dogma of the baptism with the Spirit, particularly acknowledged as subsequent to conversion and regeneration and substantiated by speaking in tongues, has been contested in modern times, chiefly on Scriptural and hermeneutical foundations (Clifton 2007: 6-15). For most people, the practice that characterizes Charismatics is speaking in tongues, by the scholars labelled glossolalia, with differences among Pentecostals. Some contend that speaking in tongues constitutes the evidence of Spirit baptism and others that it is only an evidence or even a possible evidence of it. Macchia (2004: 37) says that a cosmic eschatology has been embodied by the charismatic theology of tongues. He notes the Charismatic interpret ‘Spirit baptism’ as an enablement for evangelism as demonstrated by intensified charismata of the Spirit, particularly speaking in tongues (Macchia 2006: 109). The phrase to ‘groan’ in tongues is world transforming through the upcoming revelation of the Anointed One as universal Lord (Althaus 2003: 191).

The original or classical Pentecostalism assigns a prominent role to speaking in tongues and the experience of Spirit baptism is commonly assumed to be a glossolalic experience. The Charismatic believes that the more people speak in tongues it will lead them into deeper levels of the spiritual stage of the anointing with the Spirit. Cartledge (2002: 85) argues that this perception of the gift of speaking in tongues expresses it as a mark of divine-human encounter, particularly related with the perspective of prayer and worship and representing a sense of closeness, loveliness, wonder, might, and faith-edifying.

The Charismatic believes that speaking in a tongue is the initial, physical evidence of, and

---

250 A number of Pentecostal leaders such as T. B. Battatt of Norway and Lewi Pethrus of Sweden have been willing to admit that Spirit baptism may occur without glossolalia.

251 Jones (1997: 211) narrates of some charismatic churches that see glossolalia as the primary evidence of the reception of the Spirit to empower for witness. Pastor Samuel Edestav of the Philadelphia Church in Sweden was one of them. The Elim Pentecostal Church in England rejects the doctrine of tongues as the initial sign of receiving the Spirit. The Mühlheim Association of Christian Fellowships asserts that tongues speaking is a natural human gift and that the Spirit may use it as he wishes. The Church of the Living God permits tongues but only in recognizable language and disclaims the view that tongues is the initial evidence for Spirit baptism.
primary sign of someone who has received the baptism of the Spirit (Prothero, Queen & Shattuck, Jr. 2009: 244). This belief is in part based on passages from the Scripture, such as Acts 2: 4-11: “And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.” Their theology is partly based on personal experience. This baptism is not like water baptism in which the individual is sprinkled or immersed in water. The believers are spiritually immersed in the Spirit or they invite Him through prayer to reside within their being or soul. Believers desire this experience because it gives them spiritual power to live holier lives. The charismatic’s pray in tongues is relatively noisy in a community worship setting (Nathan 2009: 157). The function of the Spirit is essential to the Charismatic’s life. Queen argues that while the scholar’s voice is important, it is equally important to hear the viewpoint of the experienced (Queen 2009: 128).

The Charismatics commonly regard glossolalia, not only as a gift of the Spirit, but as an evidential sign of the anointing of the Spirit (Keener 2007: 178-183). The pivotal question is the nature of the glossolalia. The Pentecostal scholar, Spittler (2003: 335) describes it as “the religious phenomenon of making sounds that constitute, or resemble, a language not known to the speaker. It is often accompanied by an excited religious psychological state”. Many charismatics regard tongues as an actual language unfamiliar to the speaker (xenolalia). Some portray it as an ecstatic language, a state of rapture that the mind cannot grasp or contain. According to Charles W. Conn, a former Church of God executive, “the known tongue is not the stammering of excited vocal organs, but rather the clear utterances of spiritual ecstasy” (Deshane 2003: 289) elaborates on the morphology of receiving the baptism of the Spirit in eight phases. The first phase is the invitation through a sermon to begin 'seeking' or through direct invitation by someone praying over a believer. The second phase is the believer’s response to the invitation by the speaker. A positive response is indicated by believers going to the altar or by informing the one who has been praying for the believer at the altar that he or she wishes to be baptized in the Spirit. The third phase starts with the ‘seeker’ beginning to pray and requesting through prayer that the Spirit fill him/her. The fourth phase begins with mentors/believers praying for the ‘seeker’ to receive the baptism either in the native language or in ‘tongues.’ The fifth phase involves the mentors and believers in anointing the seeker by placing their hands on the seeker’s forehead, shoulder, back or arm. The sixth phase occurs when the ‘seeker’ and/or mentors offer praise to God through prayer or verbal expressions. The seventh phase happens when the seeker indeed believes he or she received the baptism of the Spirit which is indicated by her or him speaking in tongues and heard by those around. The final phase manifests congratulatory remarks, hugs or handshaking from fellow believers when seekers do receive the baptism in the Spirit.
In the Charismatic chrism there is a mixture of *glossolalia* and *xenolalia*. The miracle of Pentecost was that every person heard the apostles speaking in his or her own language. There was a miracle beyond psychological explanation (Keener 2007: 179-181). The “tongues” in the church of Corinth were probably ecstatic speech, not foreign language (Deshane 2003: 259).

Samalin (1972: 22-5) says scholars are indeed divided on the nature of the tongues experience. Bloesch (2000: 193) regards “*glossolalia*” as an automatism similar to unconscious inscription. Ira Martin observes it as a form of psychosomatic catharsis, characteristic of a personality modification. Whereas in hypnotism one has rapport with others, somnambulism is characterized by lack of rapport with others (Turner 1998: 233). The linguist, Samarin (1972: 235) contends that “*glossolalia*” is a perfectly human, perfectly normal (albeit anomalous) phenomenon. *Glossolalia* is “sometimes associated with some degree of an altered state of consciousness,” and “this occasionally involves motor activity that is involuntary… In any case the subsequent use of *glossolalia* (that is, after the initial experience) is *most often independent* of dissociative phenomena”. Keener (2007: 179) says Wayne Gates, a pastoral care theologian, holds that tongues may be a form of “parataxic speech”, and the expression corresponds with Jean Piaget’s egocentric speech (Keener 2007: 180). Those who begin to speak in tongues “have no language but a cry”. On both the psychological and spiritual levels maturation can be traced from private unintelligibility to social communicability.

From the theological perspective one might say that this phenomenon has two sides, the psychological and the supernatural. Only the first is open to direct empirical investigation. The proof is just too imprecise to offer a steady basis for conventional Pentecostal instruction that “initial tongues” is programmatic and provides the foundation for continuing universal accessibility of tongues for individual prayer (Turner 1998: 233). One can acknowledge that the

---

253 A number of Pentecostals dislike the term ecstasy when applied to tongues, for this seems to eliminate the personality. The Holy Spirit enables us, but he does not overwhelm us to abrogate our personality. Pentecostals are inclined to attribute any sign of the complete transcendence of personality to demonic influences.  
254 Samarin (1972: 22-26) gives a supportive cure to this analysis.
Spirit may be present in the insensible supervisory of an individual who prays in tongues. Yet this reality can be distinguished both in faith and in the Spirit. The confirmation of the authenticity of one’s experience results in the fruits of a Christian life.

5. Conclusion

Charismatics suggested that their spirituality may be the most viable form of Christianity for post-Western and post-colonial world. The distinctiveness of Charismatic theology of the Spirit is characterized by two interrelated features: eschatology and missionary enthusiasm. The Charismatics were convinced that the twentieth-century outpouring of the Spirit signalled the initiation of the return of the Anointed One to establish his Kingdom. Consequently “eschatological imminence” causes considerable evangelic missions to emerge in the fast expansion of the movement (Kärkkäinen 2010b: 229).

The anointing of Christ with the Holy Spirit was the beginning of the mission of God’s chosen people in the Charismatic movements. These movements are signified by the explosive manifestations of the Holy Spirit. But although the outpouring of the Holy Spirit was promised by God the Father, there are many unsolved issues. One of the main aspects of the ministry of the Spirit, of its redemptive ministry, is weak in the Charismatic movements with their subjective, experiential, phenomenal, human-centred, and materialistic experiences. Although, the ministry of the Spirit should be actualized in a sanctified life, it shows a lack of responsibility for the contemporary society.

In spite of some critiques and pessimistic aspects of the Charismatic movements, the other dimensions of and angles on the anointing with the Spirit will be researched from the perspectives of the Reformed traditions in the following section.
B. Reformed perspectives

1. Introduction

The era of Reformation in the sixteenth century signalled the recovery of a theology of the word and the Spirit of God, both essential remedies to heal the tragedy, trauma and sickness that humans encounter, as it was evident in Irenæus and Augustine during the earlier centuries. In their treatment of both Christ and Scripture the Reformers propounded a sacramental view that distinguished between the sign and the thing signified, while at the same time regarding them as inseparable. Against the Spiritualist and enthusiasts of their time they insisted on God’s deigning to meet reformers through external signs - baptism, the Lord’s Supper and preaching in particular (Wood 2009: 2-6).

This Chapter will expound the Reformers’ pneumatology to untie the significant role of the anointing with the Spirit, particularly in the area of baptisms and confirmations and its effect on the soteriological substances. Specifically the characteristics of the *missio Spiritus* and the missions of men will be investigated. The medium of the Spirit in relation to the anointing of the Spirit as well as the theological reformed views on the doctrine of justification and of sanctification in relation to the anointing of the Spirit will be researched.

2. *Missio Spiritus*

The *missio Spiritus* is highlighted as the vital cause to anoint his people by outpouring of his Spirit, in which the demonstrations of *charismata* are accompanied to empower and equip them for their predestined commissions. Calvin testified in his *Institute of the Christian Religion* that his theme was neither predestination nor extrinsic justification, but regeneration understood as

---

255 Counting a major strand in Roman Catholicism, they warned against ritualism, which made mystical union with the Anointed One, wholly contingent to ritual performance.

256 The Anabaptists agree with the magisterial Reformers that word of God and the Spirit belongs together, thus rendering external rites superfluous.
the lifelong sanctifying process worked within the believers by the *missio Spiritus* (Lindberg 1983: 140).²⁵⁷ God’s love does not cancel the demands of the law,²⁵⁸ but it goes beyond these demands through the *missio Spiritus*. The satisfaction of the law is not a condition for God’s forgiveness but the means by which his forgiveness is communicated to the believers.

2.1. The Spirit as the animator of creation

The work of the Spirit in the redemption of believers did not begin at Pentecost. The Spirit is at work since creation as God’s creative breath, the origin of all movement and all life (Pannenberg 2004: 12). The same Spirit, who in creation animates all life, upholds and qualifies our human nature (Kuyper 1969: 106). In all its forms the activity of the Trinitarian God in creation is an activity of the Father by the Anointed One and the Spirit (Briggman 2012: 166-72), a submission of the Son to the Father, and the glorifying of both through the consummation of their work by the Spirit (Guntun 2003a: 74).

Kuyper says that the churches have always confessed in the Liturgy:

‘The same Spirit which dwelleth in Christ as the Head and in us His members.’ The same Spirit who performed His work in the conception of our Lord, who attended the unfolding of His human nature, who brought into activity every gift and power in Him, who consecrated Him to His office as the Anointed One, the Messiah, who qualified Him for every conflict and temptation, who enabled Him to cast out devils, and who supported Him in His humiliation, passion, and bitter death, was the same Spirit who performed His work in His resurrection, so that Jesus was justified in the Spirit (I Tim 3: 16), and who dwells now in the glorified human nature of the Redeemer in the heavenly Jerusalem (Kuyper 1966: 110).

²⁵⁷ In his later works Calvin’s emphasis shifted to predestination and in certain strands of Reformed Orthodoxy the call to live the Christian life was subordinated to an emphasis on the eternal decrees of God.

²⁵⁸ Calvinist tradition maintains a respect for the law of God even while affirming that salvation comes through faith in the gospel. It wants to do justice to the legal dimension of Christian salvation without falling into legalism in which good works becomes a condition of grace.
The connection of the Spirit with “breath” is an association with life; breath is that which distinguished alive from lifeless (Case-Winters 2007: 160). Therefore, the Reformed traditions do not purely identify the spirit of evolution and environmental science with the Spirit and as such with the Triune God (Bergmann 2005: 319).

2.2. The Spirit as the operator of redemption

The Redemption is truly the manifestation of the power of the Spirit and the means to disclose the life of the triune God to the human race (Awad 2007: 39-43). It is evidently the purpose of Scripture to emphasize the fact of the inability of the human nature, which Christ had adopted to accomplish as the work of the Anointed One, the Messiah, without the constant operation and powerful leading of the Spirit, whereby he could be the instrument of the Son of God for the performance of his wonderful work (Kuyper 1966: 100). Pannenberg indicates the essential significance of the function of the Spirit as mediator of the communion of the Anointed One with God and the operator of redemptive involvement of believers in Christ (Pannenberg 2004: 267-8). The Spirit is viewed as implementer of the believer’s union with the Anointed One, which establishes them as bodies of Gods family and permits them to partake together in the perichoretic consecrated community of the Trinity. Hereafter, the Spirit operates in a communal way to reunite the body of the Anointed One to one another, to God (Grenz 2003: 259-267).

According to Kuyper (1969: 103), the Spirit could not become flesh; the Son alone could. Applying these two principles to the person of the Anointed One, his human personality could not dispense with the constant in-shining of the Spirit. Nor could the Son according to his own nature take the place of the Spirit; however in the divine economy, by virtue of his union with the

259 First, God has so created human nature that without the Spirit it cannot attain to virtue or holiness. Second, the work of the Son according to the distinction of three divine Persons is other than the work of the Spirit with reference to the human nature.

260 Kuyper (1969: 105) illustrates that the Father has not delivered all things to the Spirit. The Spirit works from the Son; but the Son depends upon the Spirit for the application of redemption to individuals. The Son adopts our nature, thus revealing Himself to the whole race; but the Spirit alone can enter the individual souls to glorify the Son in the children of God.
human nature, he is ever depended upon the Spirit (Kuyper 1966: 102-105).

2.3. The Spirit as accomplisher of sanctification and deification

Any and all sanctification that occurs in the life of a believer is ultimately the work of the Spirit (Walker 2003: 79). 261 2 Thessalonians 2:13 says, “God has from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.” The triune God who created the universe also sent the Son into the world in order that the humanity may be united through the Spirit with divinity (Briggman 2012: 173-81). This is one of the seminal formulations of theosis, deification (Kärkkäinen 2010a: 28). However, the Reformed reflections imply that there is an ontological union with the Anointed One achieved in theosis, not a transformable union with him, as some Charismatics advocate. In arguing against the views of Servetus and Osiander, Calvin contends that the divine substance is not mixed with the believers’ own but a vigorous or spiritual union is obtained through the mysterious power of the Spirit in union with the Anointed One to the believers (Habets 2009: 101). 262 Sanctification is purely the missio Spiritus in the believers’ lives in submission to God’s will, endowing them to mature in the image to the Anointed One (Grenz 2003: 574). God’s purpose is for the body of the Anointed One to manifest or imitate his own image in a depraved world, due to the proficient missio Spiritus. In the same manner, the body of the Anointed One is to be characterized by communal righteousness and transformation (Grenz 2003: 267). The Spirit works to sanctify both individuals and the body of the Anointed One.

2.4. The Spirit as the provider of evidence

The Princeton theologian Warfield (1909: 32), called Calvin ‘the theologian of the Holy Spirit.’

---

261 Oslon (2005: 67) says a large number of the Charismatics have believed that that entire sanctification is possible before death.

262 Habets (2009: 101) says that Calvin charged the emanationistic anthropology of Servetus by which believers partake in the real essence of God (Inst. 1. 15. 5), while Osiander believed to equate the bond of union between the divine Persons and between believers and the Anointed One. To Calvin, the two are not balanced (Calvin 1960: 3. 11).
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To Calvin, the Scripture is the school of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is the author of Scripture through which he invites men into his mission (Ferguson & Zaspel 2010: 23-54). They are the scribes of the Spirit. Scripture must be confirmed by the witness of the Spirit. Scripture is self-authenticated. The testimony of the Holy Spirit is the ground of our faith in Scripture; that ground is Holy Scripture itself. But the witness of the Spirit is the cause of our certainty with respect to Scripture (Vidu 2007: 111). Calvin says that the testimony of the Spirit is more excellent than all human reason. For as God alone is a fit witness of Himself in his word, so also the word will not find acceptance in men’s hearts before it is sealed by the inward testimony of the Spirit (Calvin 1960: 1.7.5).

For Calvin, the *testimonium internum Spiritu Sancti* is the core of convincing of the Scripture, more specifically the way the Spirit teaches readers to read their own life and experience as mirrored in it:  

> Let this point therefore stand: that those whom the Holy Spirit has inwardly taught truly rest upon Scripture, and that Scripture indeed is self-authenticated; hence it is not right to subject it to proof and reasoning. And the certainty it deserves in us, it attains by the testimony of the Spirit (…). We seek no proofs, no marks of genuineness upon which our judgment may lean; but we subject our judgment and with it to something far beyond any guesswork (…) (Calvin 1960: 79-80).

The texts of Scripture comprise the written words and its contents, which are not vague nor transcending, and yet embraces all that testifies to God’s attributes and purposes in the contemporary realities of the believers. The *missio Spiritus*, his presence in the body of the Anointed One, is manifested in experiences and practices, either visible or invisible, in which the church engages under God’s guidance (Vidu 2007: 105-6). Mann (2007: 8) observes Luther insisted, against the Enthusiasts, that the Spirit works only in conjunction with the word. While

---

263 Calvin (1969: 1.7.4) testifies that the same Spirit therefore, who has spoken through the mouths of the prophets must penetrate our hearts to persuade us that they faithfully proclaimed what had been divinely commanded.
the timing of the Spirit remains a mystery, the location will always be where the word is preached. “Thus it pleased God not to give the Spirit without the word, but through the word, that he might have us as his co-workers, who proclaim on the outside what he himself works by the Spirit within, wherever he wills” (Luther Works 18: 695, cf Mann 2007: 8).

2.5. The Spirit and the Anointed One

The Anointed One works though the Spirit and the Spirit works for Him. Pate (2011: 271) says He is depicted in the ontological pattern-a man anointed by the Spirit who thus performed prevailing actions and miracles to advance the kingdom of God. The Scriptural prototype vindicates faith in the Anointed One with the consequence of immediate conversion and instantaneous reception of the Spirit. Canlis (2010: 97) explicates that there is a crucial union between the human Jesus and the Father, and from the divine essence to the divine person of the Spirit, in Calvin’s doctrine of the Spirit. This unlocks a new dominion for the Spirit’s role in the Anointed One where the Spirit has his own meticulous task from the Father in conceiving, anointing, and empowering the Anointed One’s mission.

The Reformed professes the efficiency of the Spirit in uniting varied people to join the body of the Anointed One (Allen 2010: 171). The Spirit is the bond by which the Anointed One unites believers to Himself. At the same time the Spirit makes them, through his secret energy, to enjoy the Anointed and all his benefits: the Spirit works for the Anointed One (Calvin 1982: 221-229). The Spirit bestows on the believers nothing apart from Christ and Christ bestows on them nothing but through the Spirit. The Holy Spirit and the Lord Jesus Christ are distinct but at the same time they are inseparable. Calvin maintains an *equilibrium*: the Spirit is not without the word, and the word is not without the Spirit, with an appeal to Isaiah 59:21 “My Spirit which is upon you, and my words which I have put in your mouth…”, Calvin says the church is “ruled no less by the voice of God than by the Spirit.” The word becomes efficacious through the Holy

---

264 Calvin (1965: 86) writes in his commentary: Christ now tells them that the Spirit will not come to set up a new kingdom, but rather to confirm the glory given to Him by the Father.
Calvin even stresses that without the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the word can do nothing (Calvin 1960: 3. 2. 33).

3. Missions of men

3.1. Subsistence in the Spirit

The presence or absence of the *charismata* of the Spirit makes a distinction between the elect and the apparently rejected (McDonald 2011: 257). By the Spirit the believing community is enabled to live with the foundational truth of its election and the awareness that the only truly Anointed One is the Son (McDonald 2011: 260). The perception about Spirit and flesh in Romans 8 is essential to understand sanctification. In Romans 8 Paul does not say that the believers resist the flesh, or encourage believers to live or walk according to the Spirit. He is merely trying to illustrate the definite status of two groups of people presented in Romans 8, the unconverted and the converted. Throughout the chapter, the unconverted, are referred to as those who “walk according the flesh,” while, the converted, believers, are referred to as those who “walk in the Spirit.” In both instances the use of the participle “walk” describes “a sphere in which one lives or ought to live, so as to be characterized by that sphere” (Bauer 2000: 803). Thus, the idiom “walk” implies that action or submission of the person is anticipated. Along with the participle “walk,” the terms “in” and “according to” express a concept that is not “behavioural” but “positional” (Moo 1996: 486). The conditional particle, “if indeed”, is a form of strengthening the ostensive force (Wallace 1996: 694). When our position is in the Spirit, we are no longer under the control of the flesh. It doesn’t signify that sin doesn’t entice us and cause us to fall, but that “in the Spirit” we are no longer under the obligation to sin.

---

265 Therefore the Spirit, promised to us, does not have the task of inventing new and unheard-of revelations, or of forging a new kind of doctrine, to lead us away from the received doctrine of the gospel, but of sealing our minds with that very doctrine which is commended by the gospel (Calvin 1. 9. 1).

266 Moo (1996: 489) says this seems to designate that the believer’s life ought to be characterized by the activity of the Spirit.

267 Wallace (1966: 695) says this axiom is a first class condition, which is assumed to be true for the sake of dispute. Thus, if the Spirit of God truthfully does inhabit the believer, then the believer is not in the flesh but in the Spirit. The believers are in the state of the Spirit and are thinking about the things of the Spirit.
The Spirit empowers the community of believers to signify God to others and others to God (McDonald 2010: 130). McDonald (2010: 34) says Barth views the charisma of the Holy Spirit as definitive in the election of God: revelation to the individual, the actuality of reconciliation, and to be elected to salvation are one.

In contrast to Romans, Galatians 5 presents more of an exhortation to believers to live or walk according to the Spirit. In Galatians 5:16 Paul uses the same verb as Romans 8, “walk,” but this time it is in the imperative because he is urging believers to “walk by the Spirit.” The phrase “by the Spirit” is a concept of sphere or of means, which presents the idea of “walking in the realm of the Spirit” or “walking by means of the Spirit” (Wallace 1996: 158). Thus, in Galatians Paul is exclusively unfolding the life of a believer and urging them to live “by the Spirit.” Galatians 5 is a relatively distinctive set in Scripture. In verses 19-21 Paul narrated a list of acts that categorize the sinful nature. In contrast to the acts of the corrupt personality, Paul noticeably presents the works of the Spirit in 22-23. These are the marks on the barometer of all distinctive categorized movements of Christianity in the reformed tradition as well as in the Charismatic movements. These acts of the Spirit grant a substantial manner of life that permeates the believers. Through these fruits of the Spirit a believer can be known as indwelt by the Spirit.

3.2. Faith in the baptisms

Martin Luther was adamant that the work of salvation involves a two-sided baptism - with water

---

268 To Wallace (1996: 161), the term “flesh” in Galatians is used to refer to the sinful nature or the evil desires of that nature, but is not a positional standing as Romans 8 presents it. Paul is not comparing the positions of unbeliever and believer, but exhorting Christians to abstain from the evil desires that characterize the flesh. By means of the Spirit, the believer may experience victory over the wicked desires of the flesh that stalk them from the depraved human nature.

269 Wallace (1996: 160) sees these acts of the sinful nature are what Paul is warning the believers to be on their guard against. Anyone who claims to be a believer but continues in any of these acts without seeking help should question whether or not they are truly “walking” by means of the Spirit.

270 The believer’s life ought to be obviously characterized by the activity of the Holy Spirit: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control.
and with the Spirit. Baptism with water and the word is the channel or sign of baptism with the Spirit. It is the divinely ordained means that the Spirit uses to cleanse the believers’ hearts. Therefore water and the word are veritable means of grace. “We are baptized in God’s name, with God’s word, and with water. Thus our sin is forgiven, and we are saved from eternal death”.

It might appear that Luther endorsed the Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Yet he was convinced that baptism has no salvific effect unless it issues in repentance and faith. What generates or revivifies the believers is not the outward appearance but the spiritual baptism that endures throughout life.

Luther contrasted personal holiness, which is always incomplete, with the alien righteousness of Jesus Christ that covers our sinfulness, thereby making us acceptable to God. Inwardly we remain sinners, but in faith we have the power to battle against sin and overcome it. The Christian is therefore both a righteous and a sinner at the same time (simul iustus et peccator). Our righteousness is outside ourselves in Jesus the Anointed One. The relation of baptism to salvation is that of promise and fulfilment, not cause and effect. The promise may not take effect until many years later (Luther’s Works, 1957: 22, 287). It seems that for him baptism with water is the beginning of a salvific process that includes repentance, faith and sanctification.

Philip Melanchthon has frequently been treated as mediator between the diverse factions in the Reformation, and this conceivably accounts for ambiguities in his theology of baptism and salvation (Schofield 2006: 182). To Melanchthon, faith is the primary intellectual consent to the promises of God.272 The Spirit works through the mind to grant that certainty to the heart. Melanchthon understands justification in exclusively forensic terms as a legal verdict that desires to be appropriated by faith (Bromiley1998:225-7, 233-4).273 Pannenberg (1998: 87) argues that Melanchton failed to give proper recognition to the integral relation between justification and

---

271 Bloesch (2000: 99-100) says Luther was not constantly steady in his theology of baptism. He occasionally referred to baptism itself as the means of assimilation into the body of the Anointed One and other occasions to the Spirit as the union of living communion with the Anointed One.


273 Bromiley (1998: 225) argues that the baptism of the Spirit becomes the central guarantee that what faith holds is true. When the mind is convinced of the foundation of rational evidence it then moves the will and heart to belief.
water baptism. The indwelling of Christ by his Spirit entails justification. Faith is both induced by the Spirit and simultaneously prepares the way for the renewing work of the Spirit in a person’s life.

Theodore Beza, Calvin’s successor in Geneva, diverged from his adviser at several points. Beza distinguished between two works of grace: the first is the gift of faith and the second is sanctification (Kendall 1979:35). Faith is annulled if it is not ratified by the second. It is the second work of grace that brings assurance, since the first grace may not persist (Venema 2007: 69-71). According to the Heidelberg Catechism, faith is not only a convinced knowledge by which one cleaves to all that God has revealed to the believers in his Word to be true, but also a solid truth that not only others, but that they too have been bestowed forgiveness of iniquities, everlasting justification, and redemption, approved by God out of grace (Bavinck 2008b: 26). Faith thus inherited from the Reformers an exclusive, autonomous, spiritual connotation. It was distinguished fundamentally from the faith of which we articulate in daily life, and also from the historical and temporal faith, or faith of miracles. It was not just reception of divine reality, but it is also became the tie of the soul with the Anointed One, the means of spiritual intimacy with the living God (Bavinck 2008b: 28).

3.3. Inner baptism of the cross - with water and Spirit

Reformers were challenged by radical revolutionary Spiritualists like Thomas Müntzer and the Zwickau prophets, who proclaimed the emergence of a new age of the Spirit (Bloesch 2000: 102). What is crucial to our faith is not any external sacrament but only the inner baptism in water and the Holy Spirit (Künk 1978: 194-5). Müntzer tried to replace Scripture with the direct

---

274 Venema (2007: 69-74) observes this contrasts with Calvin, who referred to a twofold grace (*duplex gratia*) rather than to two divided blessings. In Calvin’s view there is no forgiveness without inward cleansing, no salvation without assurance.

275 Bloesch (2000: 101) writes they hoped to establish a theocracy as an expectation of this age. Müntzer and his followers spoke of an inner baptism of the cross that alone is the key to our salvation.
enlightenment of the Spirit and justification by faith with the experience of the cross.\textsuperscript{276}

Evangelical Spiritualists like Kaspar Schwenckfeld and Sebastian Franck advocated a baptism of the Spirit and a new age of the Spirit (Hillerbrand 1996: 106). For them the inner word, not the letter of Scripture, is the exclusive authority to faith. Their emphasis was on both the experience of the indwelling Christ and the demonstration of the fruits of faith in a Christian life.\textsuperscript{277}

Andreas Karlstadt, a former associate of Luther but who subsequently embraced Spiritual thoughts, challenged Luther that the sacrament is not a means of grace, since forgiveness is to be established only in the cross of Christ (Lindberg 1983: 57-74). Karlstadt denied baptism of infants and regarded the Lord’s Supper only as a memorial of Christ’s death. Baptism should follow rather than precede the inner experience of regeneration. Karlstadt charged Luther for being negligent on moral reform and called for ‘a faith rich in love and a love rich in faith’ (Brauer 1971:160). Karlstadt’s theology demonstrates the influence of German mysticism, especially of John Tauler and the anonymous author of the \textit{Theologica Germanica}. Karlstadt promulgated an evangelical theology of the Spirit in which the Spirit was not even subject to Scripture.\textsuperscript{278}

\textbf{3.4. Baptism with the Spirit and with fire and blood}

Anabaptists affirmed with the mainline reformers that salvation is entirely by the grace of God but they remained open to certain Catholic themes.\textsuperscript{279} Besides water baptism the Anabaptists

\textsuperscript{276} Bloesch (2000: 102) writes Müntzer upheld the “bitter Christ,” which he contrasted with the “sweet Christ” of Luther.

\textsuperscript{277} Hillerbrand (1996: 107) notes Spiritual baptism alone is critical for our salvation. They did not acknowledge the outwards rite as divinely constituted or redemptive.

\textsuperscript{278} On Luther’s repudiation of Karlstadt, Sundberg (1993: 16-7) maintains that in Karlstadt the individual conscience becomes the sole criterion of faith.

\textsuperscript{279} Bloesch (2000: 358) says several men could also be classified as spiritualists, since they raised the Spirit above the Scripture. Theological leaders in this movement were Melchior Hoffman, Jacob Hutte, Hans Denck, and Leonhard Schiemer.
taught a baptism with the Spirit and added a baptism with fire and blood (Wood 2009: 125). Blood baptism generally refers to martyrdom, though it may also entail continuing persecution under the cross. Baptism of the Spirit is the inward baptism to be followed by a public baptismal. For Hoffmann the inner baptism is the most significant and crucial for salvation. The emphasis ultimately came to be placed on outward suffering in the world. The baptism of blood was not uncommonly viewed as the baptism with which the Anointed One himself was lastly baptized. Occasionally it was assumed more corporately than independently: the travail of the upright remnant (Bloesch 2000: 103).

In Anabaptism the three catholic sacraments of baptism, penance and extreme unction were transformed into three actions of grace: adult repentance, a life of dedication and penitential suffering, and the benediction of martyrdom. The last was seen as the oil of the Spirit. All three acts were called baptism. Like the spiritualists the Anabaptists refuted baptism as a means or sign of grace (Lindberg 1983: 63). Many Anabaptists maintained that children are innocent before they come to distinguish between good and evil. It is a substantial break with the Augustinian doctrine, which was essentially confirmed by the reformation.

Anabaptists are occasionally portrayed as predecessors of the Charismatic movement of the twentieth century. Nevertheless there are noticeable differences. For the Anabaptists the baptism of the Spirit is fundamentally a salvific experience that entails much suffering. For the Charismatics this baptism is primarily for ministry, and involves an effusion of power. It is an enjoyable experience more than an experience of endurance under trail (Williams 1962: 51, 382-83, 858-59). As in Pentecostalism the Anabaptists spoke of human preparations for Spirit baptism-seeking, praying, and obedience to God, renouncing sin, believing and separation from

280 Bloesch (2000: 103) says some Anabaptists believed Spirit baptism included a life time of travail; others anticipated a much short-lived period, possibly only an hour of extreme torment.

281 According to Lindberg (1983: 64), Menno Simons said that Christ is the preeminent sign of grace, he alone and was prefigured in the Old Testament. Baptism signifies what takes place in the believers, or even what they do. It is a pledge of obedience of the believer rather than a rite in which we accept the forgiveness of sins. Again, it was not uncommon among Anabaptists to argue that children are saved by virtue of Christ’s atonement without baptism.
the world. The Spirit comes, not only through hearing the word, but also through bearing the cross in faith. Like the revolutionary Spiritualists many of the Anabaptists suppose that we are currently entering the new age of the Spirit (Finger 2004: 530), which is the groundwork for the eschaton itself.  

4. The medium of the Spirit

4.1. Anointing vs. omnipresence

Van Drunen (2010: 325) explicates the Reformers confirm the doctrine of the two kingdoms in classic reformed theology that the Spirit of God governs all human organizations and activities, but controls them in two vitally unlike ways.  

The omnipresence of God is the only source able to rule and govern the two kingdoms. Kuyper (1966: 106) resolves the difficulties concerning the anointing with the Spirit. The Christian church, confesses that the Spirit is the true and eternal God, therefore omnipresent: Hence no creature, stone, or animal, man or angel is excluded from His presence. He is omniscient and omnipresent as Psalm 139:7-12 states his omnipresence through his Spirit. Neither in heaven nor in hell, in the east nor in the west, is there a spot or point where He is not present. This simple consideration is of the greatest importance, for it follows that the Spirit can never be said to have been among Israel, but not among the nations; or to have been present after the day of Pentecost where He was not before. All such representations directly oppose the confession of his omnipresence, eternity and immutability.  

And to  

---

282 Finger (2004: 530) says Melchior Hoffmann regards himself as one of two witnesses prophesied in Revelation who are commissioned to equip the believers for the final judgment. Like Thomas Müntzer the Anabaptists integrated in their theology a postmillennial idea, plausibly inherent from the Joachim movement.

283 Van Drunen (2010: 325, 348-389) analogizes the Spirit moves and rules among the spiritual kingdom (the church) as redeemer in the Anointed One and rules the civil kingdom, the state and all other social organizations as creator and sustainer, and thus these two kingdoms have significantly different functions, and manners of government. But in much post-Kuyper, the Reformed ideas have implicitly or explicitly been avoided through refutation of the doctrine of the two mediatorships of the Anointed One and other thoughts that connected Kuyper to the earlier natural law and two kingdoms doctrines.

284 Kuyper’s logical explanation for the omnipresence of God is that one cannot go from one place to another, for he
presume that He is omnipresent at one time and not at another is inconsistent with his everlast ing Godhead (Horton 2010: 87-91). The testimony of John the Baptist, ‘I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode on Him, ‘and Luke’s statement ‘The Holy Spirit fell on all of them who heard the word’, may not therefore be understood as though the Holy Spirit came to a place where He was not before. It is impossible. But David’s description of omnipresence applies to local presence in space, but not to the world of spirits.

Kuyper (1966: 102) emphasizes the word-law. God’s omnipresence is to all space, but not in every spirit. Since God is omnipresent, it does not implicate that He also dwells in the spirit of Satan. Hence it is clear that the Spirit can be omnipresent without dwelling in the wicked human soul (Gn 6: 3) and that He can descend without changing place, and yet enter a soul hitherto unoccupied by Him; and that He was present among Israel and among the Gentiles and yet manifested Himself among the former and not among the latter. From this it follows that in the spiritual world He can come where he was not; that he came among Israel, not having been among them before; and that then He manifested Himself among them less powerfully and in another way than on and before the day of Pentecost.

The Spirit operates upon people in a twofold ways, from without, and from within (Kuyper 1966: 105). The Spirit of the Lord bestowed on Samson an enormous corporal power. Aholiab and Bezaleel are endowed with artistic ability to construct and decorate the tabernacle. Joshua is enhanced with military brilliance. This graceful equipment could not guarantee the salvation of

\[285\] Kuyper (1966: 103) illustrates, according to the analogy of faith in God, that there must be laws that govern the spiritual world as there are in the natural world to control the world; yet owing to our limitations we cannot know them. However in heaven we shall know them, and all the glories and particulars of the spiritual world, as our physicians know the nerves and tissues of the body. Kuyper’s own understanding of God’s omnipresence is to be completed through the establishment of God’s Kingdom throughout the universe through his word.

\[286\] Kuyper (1966: 101-4) illustrates the twofold manner of the Spirit that the difference is similar to that in the treatment of the human body by the physician and the surgeon; the former acts upon it with medicines taken inwardly; the latter with incisions and outward applications. Even though it is a defective comparison, it may illustrate faintly the twofold operation of the Spirit upon the souls of men.
their souls, yet it might be external to achieve God’s mission. Salvation by grace through faith is to be the only way in OT and NT times according to the Reformed tradition. The endowment with the Spirit becomes more lasting when it assumes an official character as in Saul. Although in him we find that the best evidence for the endowment of the charisma is only outward and temporal. The difference between the two operations is apparent. A person who is externally endowed may become enriched with an external charisma, while spiritually he remains in the state of internal desolation. Or having received the innermost gift of regeneration, he may be observed without any external talent that embellish him, yet sustains an enhanced innermost being.

The three aspects of the movements of the Spirit are: First, the omnipresence of the Spirit in space, in heaven, and in hell, among Israel and the nations. Second, there is a functional operation of the Spirit according to his preference through the proclamation of the word of God (Bavinck 2008b: 441-7), which is not omnipresent yet, dynamic in heaven, but not in hell; not among the nations. Third the work of the Spirit with the individual either from without or from within, and imparts the abiding gift of salvation by grace accepted through faith.

The outpouring of the Spirit is substantiated on the day of Pentecost as the beginning of the Anointed One’s particular operation on and after that day, that consists in the extending of the mission Spiritus to the spiritually united believers (Bavinck 2008b: 389-441). When the inhabiting of the Spirit was imparted to the whole body of the Anointed One on the day of Pentecost, the elect had become one body in the Spirit.287

The saints of the Old Covenant did not obtain what was promised, since God had foreseen something better for us, that apart from us they should not made perfect, waiting for that

287 Kuyper (1966: 111) explains that the spiritual union of the elect did not exist among Israel, nor could it exist during their time. The spiritual union of the elect was possible only through the incarnation of the Son of God, His death, resurrection, ascension and outpouring of the Spirit. The elect is a person consisting of body and soul; therefore he is partly at least a visible body. And only when the perfect man was given in Christ, who could be the temple of the Spirit, with body and soul, through the inflowing and anointing of the Spirit become established in and through the body thus created in His elect.
perfection until the formation of the body of the Anointed One into which they also were to be incorporated (Hb 11: 40). The tarrying of the outpouring of the Spirit did not prohibit the individual souls of the saints of the Old Covenant to receive saving grace by means of the *missio Spiritus*. John, the author of the Fourth Gospel asserts that the Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified (Jn 16: 7). The apostles were born of the Spirit before Pentecost (Jn 13: 10) and received the authorized *charisma* of the Spirit on the evening of the day of the resurrection (Jn 20: 22), even though the outpouring of the Spirit on the body of believers was manifested on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2: 1-4).

The anointing of the Spirit, in ministerial perspective, cannot guarantee salvation of the one who have obtained it, since it functions as instrumental to accomplish the unique assignments of God, endowing upon the particular chosen ones for a particular time and space, and in different ways. The Anointed One, as the glorified head of the church, having shaped his Spiritual body with the mysterious union of the elect, on the day Pentecost poured out his Spirit on them. Since then the Spirit never departed from the body of Christ. The Reformed churches upheld at all times. The Spirit joins the church to its head, the Anointed One (Jn 16: 14; Eph 1: 13, 22, 23; 1 Jn 4: 13; Calvin 3:1:1-3). That is symbolized by the sacrament of baptism in the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (Mt 28: 19).

**4.2. Anointing as a mark of fulfilment**

The outpouring of the Spirit was not confined to the first day of Pentecost, but afterwards recurred in an adapted form according to Acts, yet still extraordinarily, as on Pentecost (Kuyper 1966: 103). No one would deny that there is an outpouring of the Spirit today in the churches. Without it there can be no regeneration and no salvation. According to Kuyper (1966: 104), the Pentecost signs are deficient, e.g., there is no more speaking with tongues. Kuyper distinguished between the ordinary outpouring which occurs now and the extraordinary in the early church era at Corinth, Samaria.

According to Kuyper’s view on the outpouring of the Spirit, it is apparent that petition for
another outpouring or baptism of the Spirit is erroneous and without genuine importance (Kuyper 1966: 107). Such prayer essentially denies the significance of the Pentecost miracle. For the Spirit that descends and resides with the believers can no more come down in the same manner. He is here. The outpouring of the Spirit is described in various forms in the Pentecost (Acts 2: 2-4). They were authentic, not simply figurative, metaphoric or only outwardly noticeable. Symbols are proposed to characterize or indicate and awaken the attention to something. The outpouring of the Spirit is one of God’s promises, which promise the coming of the day of the Lord, that great and extraordinary Day of Judgment. Pentecost signifies to the universe the final great miracle proceeding the dreadful day of the Lord. It prefigures the signs attending the return of the Anointed One, according to the prophecy of Joel 2: 28-32 quoted in Acts 2: 19-21: blood, fire, and vapour of smoke, the essential manifestations of the end time of the world’s history, it’s very last conflagration (Bavinck 2008b: 664-677).

4.3. Faith and charisma

According to Reformed thought, the calling of the community of believers is to witness to the world of their faith in Christ, which is a charisma of the Spirit (Eph 2: 8). It is because those outside the believing community, in Barth’s words, “living as the rejected” in spite of their election (Barth 2010: 126). The charismata of the Spirit were the indispensable medium for the implementation of the Anointed One’s mediatorial office (Trueman 2007: 96).

For genuine doctrinal beliefs to function, it entails authentic reference. The task dogma communicates to faith, and faith should not exclude dogma, which is considerably more than a rational indication of statistics and thoughts. That the believer advances to faith exclusively on cogent knowledge is fundamentally wrong. Spiritualism, from Montanism to contemporary Charismatic movements, demonstrates a propensity to eradicate rationality from belief, or even to invite the irrational (Clifton 2007: 7-8). Doctrinal development usually arises principally in contexts where tradition has become forged, but it is fundamental for peoples to go beyond the socio-cultural linguistic boundaries of their unique setting and custom. Doctrines can be seen to be authentic or unconstructively unreal. If not authentic, doctrine does not guide the community,
but is guided by it (Vanhoozer 2005: 97). To the Reformed, faith occasionally requires beyond reason, but does not oppose reason (McGrath 2004: 9). Faith works whether a detectable charisma is demonstrated in the emergent contexts or not.

4.4. Glossolalia as marks of the anointed

The ‘glossolalia’ may be viewed as a type of prayer, since the one who prays in tongues addresses God (1 Cr 14: 2, 14). According to Kuyper, it is not full or complete, since prayer, in the deepest sense involves understanding as well as the spirit (1 Cr 14: 15). It could be regarded as signified and intuitional prayer (Beck 2007: 26-7). When accompanied by interpretation it becomes complete prayer. It enables one to give voice to concerns that have not yet been conceptualized (Beckford 2006: 117). For the apostle Paul ‘speaking in tongues’ serves private edification. It should not be practiced in public unless it is followed by interpretation.\(^{288}\) Luke (Acts, 2: 1-18) associates tongues with missionary power. The gift of tongues equips one for service to the gospel. It is a sign of total surrender and openness to the Spirit.

Kelsey (1960: 197) views “the strangeness of the unconscious contents not yet integrated in consciousness demands an equally strange language”. This is how he explained the frequency of glossolalia among the early Christians.\(^{289}\) Tongues are given for private edification, but they may benefit the church indirectly by leading to the charismas that build up the body of Christ like prophecy, teaching, service and preaching.\(^{290}\) The movement of the Spirit on us and in us is a miracle and this is imperceptible. Tongues should not be celebrated as a higher kind of prayer.

\(^{288}\) A person who prays in this manner should also pray for the power to interpret (1 Cr 14: 13). Paul discouraged tongues in public meetings under any circumstances (1 Cr 14: 34). Yet on the basis of Pauline theology tongues are certainly permissible for private devotion. Paul boasted that the he spoke in tongues more than all of them (1 Cr 14: 18).

\(^{289}\) Kelsey (1960: 212) saw that Christianity demands a break with established patterns of living and thinking. It gave rise to a new experience that could not be entirely absorbed by the consciousness. Those who speak in tongues seek a readjustment to a new horizon, a new way of living and coping, however, the life they are seeking are already reserved in the life in the Spirit.

\(^{290}\) Carothers’ treatment (1972: 38-8) of tongues says that they may also enable us to draw closer to God and thereby give us power to witness. Nonetheless, tongues are mysterious but not necessarily miraculous.
(Chiu 2007: 237). Paul referred to “things that cannot be told, which man may not utter” (2 Cor 12:4). This is not to discount or underplay the positive benefits that accrue from speaking in tongues, and those whose prayer life is going nowhere may be encouraged a new method of conversing with God so long as they are solidly grounded in Scripture.

Kuyper noted the difference between the two tongues in Acts and 1 Corinthians: the miracle of tongues on the day of Pentecost was intelligible to a large number of hearers of different nationalities; while in the Corinth churches it was understood only by a few who were called interpreters (Kuyper 1966: 135).

There is no verification that the miracle of tongues on Pentecost was spoken in one of the known languages which was not previously attained. The miracle of tongues was created by the vocal organs not by an operation of the mind, but as the enablement of the Spirit on those organs. Consequently it must be admitted that there may be two possibilities. First, that for a time one may be deprived of the usage of his vocal organs. Second, the usage of these organs may be appropriated by the Spirit who enables one (Kuyper 1966: 138). It could have been a hear-wonder; that God made the hearers hear the words spoken by Peter in their own languages.

Baptisms in the Reformed tradition are closely connected with one’s salvation, departing from the view of anointing by the Spirit in the Charismatic movements in which both baptisms and anointing are being identified as interchangeable. The following section will examine baptisms as focal elements in salvation from the Reformed perspective.

---

291 Kuyper (1966: 137) compares two kinds of tongues: the miracle on Pentecost made the impression of speaking to different hearers in different tongues so that they were edified. However, this is not a fundamental difference. On the ground of it the miracle of tongues is one class; with the distinction, however that on the day of Pentecost the miracle appeared perfect, but later on incomplete. Therefore, the mightiest operation of the Spirit is seen first, then those less powerful. It is precisely the same as in believers’ own heart. On Pentecost there was the miracle of tongues in its perfection; later on it was a weaker measure in the churches.
5. Baptisms as soteriological substances

In the early church, prominent theologians like Origen and Tertullian maintained a post-baptismal imposition of hands, which supposedly mediated the *charisma* of the Spirit. Augustine sturdily certified baptismal regeneration but simultaneously made a place for a post-baptismal anointing that conveys the unction of the Spirit. Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315-386) remarks that the Spirit baptizes at the moment of immersion, but also in a ‘mystical chrism’ that verifies baptism (Bloesch2000: 54). There are an obvious breach between those who establish the completion of baptism in a rite of confirmation (Thornton Dewar, Mason) and those who see the *charisma*, the anointing of the Spirit, as fully communicated in the sacrament of baptism (Jensen, Lampe, Bruner). The first query is whether the ancient performance of laying on of hands was part of the baptismal ritual or a sacrament in its own right. Whether the anointing with oil is a supplemental ornamentation of baptism or the visible symbol of a new noticeable *charisma* that imparts power for the commission?

5.1 Baptisms in the Anointed One

Calvin (1960: 4.15.12) holds the indivisibility of the water baptism and regeneration by the Spirit through faith and the righteousness of the Anointed One. For Calvin baptism is the seal and union with the Anointed One (Calvin 1960: 4. 15. 6). To be completely efficient baptism must be obtained in repentance and faith, and this embraces an explicit experience of God’s grace and love. While Calvin advocates that conversion and faith are the fruits of the gift of the Spirit, he nonetheless made a place for human preparations for obtaining this gift. Yet these arrangements are achievable only through the preceding *missio Spiritus*. Calvin permitted for a lawful repentance that arranges the way for genuine repentance; the latter proceeds only from the awakening to faith.

To Calvin the crucial intention of the Spirit is to unite the followers into the organism of the Anointed One (Calvin 1960: 3.1.1). The commission of the Anointed One is to regenerate them...
through faith in him in order that they become a ‘new creation’ (Nixton 1980: 263). The Spirit is poured out so lavishly that the believers might all be transformed jointly to be the people of God and to entertain Him (Calvin 1960: 3.1.2). Yet while the primary missio Spiritus is the pardon of iniquities and newness of life for the believers, the Spirit is also bestowed to manifest the power of the Anointed One by some remarkable charismata. Even if the miracles have ceased since Pentecost, the Spirit proceeds to invigorate the believers in order that they may believe in their heart unto righteousness and their tongues may be formed unto genuine confession (Calvin 1965: 82). Spiritual power is still being bestowed by the Spirit of God to equip the believers to deliver the message of God to others (William 1990: 185).

For Ulrich Zwingli the Spirit baptism is something relatively dissimilar to water baptism. It indicates internal illumination and calling when the believers are acquainted with God and cleave to the Anointed One (Bromiley 1998: 277). He permits that Spirit baptism has an external sign, the gift of speaking in tongues, but it is bestowed rarely and barely to a few’. Yet he asserts that only the internal baptism of the Spirit. The sacramental symbols are not so much means of grace but are external testimonies of grace.

5.2. Verifications of baptism

The Reformers vigorously rejected the catholic sacrament of affirmation, which indicated a supplementary grace of the Spirit for service in the name of the Anointed One (Bavinck 2008b: 515-20). Luther said this ceremony ought to be discarded, first because it was not recognized by the Anointed One, and second because it detracted from baptism. He affirmed that no further charisma of the Spirit is indispensable after baptism. The believer is sealed with the Spirit in baptism and there is not required to be sealed again for authentication. Simultaneously, according

---

292 William (1990: 187) remarks on how some of Calvin’s insights on the charismata of the Spirit can be appropriated by the Charismatic.

293 Zwingli in fact elucidates a threefold baptism: immersion in water, how one is individually committed to the Christian life; Spirit baptism, by which one is internally illumined and called; and teaching baptism, which indicates the external teaching of salvation that pursues the rite of baptism. All three may be designated ‘baptism,’ but to him only the baptism of the Spirit a requisite element for redemption (Bromiley 1998: 276).
Bloesch (2000: 105), Luther acknowledges the necessity for catechetical instruction, highlighted by the benediction of laying on of hands, which he describes as a *ceremonia sacramentalis*. He wrote:

> Would that there were in the house of God such a laying on of hands as there was in the apostolic epoch, whether we desire to designate it affirmation or healing. However there is nothing to remain of it nowadays except what we ourselves have invented to garnish the office of bishops that they may not be totally without work in the church (Bloesch 2000: 105).

Whereas Luther was unyielding that the Spirit is bestowed in baptism, he did not break entirely with catholic customs in its confirmation of an auxiliary *missio Spiritus* in the baptized believers (Bavinck 2008b: 527-9). He occasionally made a difference between *gratia* and *donum*. Through the genuine faith by grace the believers obtain remission of transgressions. Through the *charisma* of the Spirit they are enabled to battle against iniquities and to master it. The Spirit is an energetic agent, not only bringing them to faith, but also creating a *charisma* that animate faith.

Grenz (2003: 257) insisted for further works of the Spirit apart from the gift of faith. He advocated that the Samaritans had obtained the Spirit baptism although they had not yet experienced the charismatic gifts or the noticeable grace of the Spirit in Acts 8. In relation to the Ephesians in Acts 19 he developed the observation that they had received the Spirit of regeneration when they were baptized, but were still deficient in the “noticeable graces” that affirmed and endorsed their baptism. Calvin recognized the baptism of John the Baptist and his disciples as a legitimate baptism causing the pardon of transgressions, but the baptism with the Spirit and with fire of the Anointed One endows the dynamic power for commission.

Calvin identified Luther’s disagreement to sacramental verification for the same cause. He rejects authentication as an explicit resentment against baptism, which eradicate its function. To Calvin it is a forged guarantee of the devil, which drifts the believers away from the truth of God.
However, according to Bloesch (2000: 78) both Luther and Calvin were erroneous with regard to the practice of affirmation. In the early church affirmation was a significant part of the missional assignment, nonetheless this does not entail that their interpretations were not in harmony with the objective of the Scripture. Other reformed theologians also asserted to maintain the form of confirmation (Bloesch: 2000: 123).

6. Theological characteristics

6.1. Justification and sanctification through the Spirit

The reformed tradition retained the apostolic call to holiness but sharply differentiated it from the medieval conception. The doctrine of justification is an essential reality of the Reformed tradition. Mostert (2009: 195) says the doctrine of justification attains an eschatological connotation in the Reformation that is alien to the Charismatic movements (Hamm 2004: 198). Luther and Calvin were resolute that salvation is a free gift of God going out to the undeserving. By the secret energy of the Spirit we come to enjoy the Anointed One and all His benefits. The double grace, justification and sanctification are distinctive but cannot be separated. Where righteousness of faith is, there is Christ, and where Christ is, there too is the Spirit of holiness who regenerates the soul to newness of life. Faith cannot receive the righteousness of Christ without the Spirit of sanctification.

Horton (2011: 220) explicates, that to Luther, faith not only suffices for justification, but is the

294 Bloesch (2000: 97) says John Knox favoured a renewed ceremony of affirmation that embraces a benediction with the laying on of hands. Martin Bucer advanced a liturgical ritual of evangelical affirmation. He highlighted the inevitability for a communal reconfirmation of faith. It principally consisted of a revitalization of baptismal pledges. The prayer Book of 1549 needs all affirmation nominees to profess the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer and the Ten Commandments, and the response to the queries of the catechism.

295 Luther (1956: 187) warned, “He who tries to get to heaven by means of a holy life, good work, and personal merits, deceives himself. He, who does not confess himself a sinner, can find no access to the Lord Jesus; for Christ did not die for his own, but for the sinner’s sake”.

296 Mostert (2009: 196) advocates we receive it only by faith, and faith itself is a work of the Spirit within us. Once we have faith, however, we are challenged to demonstrate our faith in a life of good works. Our works do not earn or procure our salvation, but they show whether our salvation is genuine.
stable foundation of the believers’ revitalization. Faith not only justifies; it “unites the soul with Christ as a bride is united with her bridegroom. Calvin emphasized on the role of the Spirit as the bond of the believers’ union with the Anointed One. All supernatural charismata are found in Him alone, by the Spirit alone who works faith in the believers. That believers are in Christ and that Christ is in them are both due to the mediation of the Spirit. But faith is the principal work of the Spirit (Horton 2011: 223-4). Therefore to the reformer, faith is the medium to secure love between the Anointed One and the sanctified.

Sanctification is by grace through faith just as justification is by grace through faith. Justification and sanctification cannot be separated, but they must not be confused with each other (Walker 2003: 72). They are two different works that are irrevocably connected. Calvin explains that just “as Christ cannot be divided into parts, so the two things, justification and sanctification, which we perceive to be united together in him, are inseparable” (Calvin 3.11.6). Luther insisted that both our justification and sanctification are hidden from ourselves in Christ. The Spirit works sanctity within us, but this is a matter of faith and hope rather than assured possession. The saints of God will always appear to themselves as common profane. Their growth in sanctity is measured by their heightened consciousness of their own sin. Progress in sanctification is not the same as an increase in empirical piety. Sanctification involves a constant return to the alien righteousness of Christ, on which our hope of salvation rests (Jenson 1997: 80, 87, 97-8, 245).

Calvin (1960: 4. 19. 8) exclaimed the call to holiness, but he held out the hope that the Christian could make demonstrable progress in sanctification. Personal holiness is not the condition for faith but the true evidence of our faith. Our goal is Christian perfection (Bloesh 2000: 110), though we must never presume that we have arrived at this blessed state. Holiness involves an

297 To Calvin (1960: 3.16.1), there are three major distinctions between sanctification and justification. First, sanctification is often referred to as a progressive work, while it is closely connected with justification, whereas justification is the positional standing. Calvin advocates that “Christ, therefore, justifies no man without also sanctifying him”. The second key distinctive between the two is that justification is perfect in this life while sanctification is not. The believer is fully justified before God through Jesus Christ and is continually progressing through sanctification by the power of the Holy Spirit. Finally, the last major distinctive is that justification is entirely God’s grace, whereas in sanctification God’s grace and human’s eagerness by grace as well.
unceasing struggle against sin, death and the devil.

Anabaptism placed even more emphasis on the holy life, which was seen, not only as the fruit of grace, but its crown (Friedmann 1999: 95).\textsuperscript{298} The Medieval tendency to posit levels of spiritual attainment reappeared in Anabaptist spirituality. According to Friedmann (1999: 96-7), Leonhard Schiemer referred to three kinds of persons: the carnal person, the lethargic or inert person and the spiritual or alert person.

6.2. Evidence and experience by the anointing

The question arises whether one can attain certainty concerning the anointing of the Spirit, because it is invisible and intangible at least in the reformation traditions. Whether there are external evidences that can assure one that the Spirit has indeed been imparted was an issue in the early church, and it continues to be one today.

The experience of the Spirit conserves the independence of subjects to express it in the varied and vivid patterns of spirituality (Bergmann 2005: 309). However reformation theology do not need to look for evidences of the believers standing in the sight of God, for faith itself gives the assurance that they are loved by God and forgiven through the sacrifice of the Anointed One. John Wesley, and also many of the Puritans, made a distinction between faith and the full assurance of faith, which was seen as a gift given only to some (Carrin 2002: 1-4). To Jonathan Edwards Christian practice is the cardinal sign that the believers have been endowed with the Spirit (Carrin 2002: 2). Protestant orthodoxy was inclined to make adherence to a creedal formula the badge of belonging to the body of the Anointed One.

\textsuperscript{298} Friedmann (1999: 96-7) says there are three kinds of grace. The first grace occurs when we experience the light of the Spirit and try to resist sin but cannot do so through our own resources. The second grace is given to cause us to hunger and thirst for righteousness, the third grace enables the believer to overcome all carnal tribulations and to be victorious in every trial. The Anabaptists held out the hope of a higher righteousness that was attainable through the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, but they involve human effort and cooperation.
The signs of the manifestation of the Spirit play a prominent role in the Charismatic movement. However, many theologians in this movement warn against seeking after signs. Tugwell (1972: 52) declares: ‘There is mysticism, and there are miracles, which are worldly and serves the ‘Prince of this world.’” Some of the so-called signs are ‘signs precisely of the recalcitrance of our nature under the operation of grace’. By contrast, in mainstream Pentecostal theology Christians are encouraged to expect signs of the movement of the Spirit, which make the believers certain of being in the Spirit.

A person’s experience affects for one’s life to form one’s identity either in the manner of positive or negative. However, the one who purses it repeatedly should verify it according to the authentic truth. The result of experience stays within through faith by grace. Faith itself is the evidence, which is the result of experience.

While mainline reformers emphasize the objective character of both Christ’s atonement and the sacramental sign of baptism, they nevertheless stressed that the fruits of Christ’s salvific work must be experienced and appropriated in faith and repentance. Just as important as the promise of redemption given in baptism, is the evangelical experience of an awakened heart. Luther could say that our faith is certain because it places us outside ourselves in the promises of Christ that never deceive (Luther 1956: 387). At the same time, he was equally convinced that Christ’s saving work also takes place inside oneself through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Hoffman 1976: 84). In his words, “no one can correctly understand God or his Word unless he has received such understanding immediately from the Holy Spirit. But no one can receive it from the Holy Spirit without experiencing, proving and feeling it” (Luther 1956: 299). Yet for Luther experience is not the basis or source of faith, but faith is the medium even when experiential confirmation seems to be lacking. He could even describe faith as a sort of knowledge or darkness that nothing can see. Yet the Christ of whom faith takes hold is sitting in this darkness as God sat in the midst of the darkness of Sinai and in the temple (Luther 1956: 129-30).

Like Luther, Calvin sometimes left the impression that the rite of baptism has saving efficacy. It
is in baptism that God regenerates us and “engrafts us into the society of his church and makes us his own by adoption (Calvin 1960: 4.17.1).” Calvin (1851: 508) insisted that “the literal baptism avails hypocrites nothing, for they receive only the naked sign: and therefore we must come to the Spirit of baptism, to the thing itself”. One cannot claim to be saved unless one experiences this salvation through the power of the Spirit. It is not enough to know Christ as crucified and raised up from the dead, unless you experienced also the fruit of this. We must feel how powerful his death and resurrection are and how efficacious they are in us.

The Anabaptists were emphatic that baptism with the Spirit is not an external rite but an internal experience. Even more important than outward baptism by water is the inward or Spiritual baptism, which involves faith repentance and suffering. Their unique contribution was the conviction that Spiritual baptism is not a momentary uplift but a life of endurance under trial. It involves not only the joy of salvation and the consolation of the Spirit but dying with Christ in the bearing of the cross.

6.3. Diminished *charisma* by the anointing

To Pannenberg (2004: 12) the imparting of the Spirit as *charisma* is only an intermediary phase in the work of salvation history. Some theologians of the reformation affirmed the decisive role of the Holy Spirit in creating faith and holiness, but they generally downplayed the role of the Spirit in empowering for ministry. While they had much to say on the gift of the Spirit, they regarded the gift or *charismata* by anointing of the Spirit with considerable reserve. Although making a place for the Spirit’s sanctifying work they were not convinced that the Spirit’s miraculous work continued past the apostolic age. The reformers rediscovered the *charismata* of preaching and teaching, though these did not remain *charismata* but became offices.

According to Kolb (2009: 42-7), Luther in particular, was profoundly sceptical concerning claims of visions, dreams and ecstatic experiences. His theology of the word refused to grant such phenomena a revelatory status. While not denying that such things occur, he contended that we must test them to ascertain their agreement with the word and faith. Luther acknowledged
that signs and wonders were accompanied in the ministry of the apostle, but he insisted that they were restricted to the apostolic period. If the need arose and the gospel was threatened, the Lord might work such in our midst once again, but this is not the prerogative of the church. Luther was especially disturbed by the claim to such gifts by the Anabaptist and Spirituals, whom he denounced as self-appointed “heavenly prophets.” Miracles and signs do not prove the genuineness of faith:

It is true that such gifts and deeds certainly have occurred in the name of Jesus and the will be given to none except the church of Christ. Nevertheless not all persons who have such gifts are righteous but can indeed be false Christians. For such things are given to the church not by the persons but rather by the Holy Spirit in order that those in the office and in relation to the church do many and great things which do not profit them but rather others (Luther 1962: 275).

Calvin urges us to fill ourselves fearlessly with the gifts of God’s Spirit (Reid 2000: 103). Calvin (1965: 257) states that with God’s Spiritual benefits, He feeds us in the hope of the heavenly life (Calvin 1965: 254), and, in so doing we cannot do amiss (Calvin 1884: 550). Yet the context of such statements indicates that Calvin was thinking of the salvific gifts of forgiveness and the new life in the Spirit rather than the preternatural or extraordinary charismata of the Spirit. With regards to the office of prophets Calvin concluded “that one does not have it now to such excellent degree as it was then, as is evident. For God has diminished His gifts, because of the ingratitude of the world (Gibson &Watson 2009: 81-4). The gift of healing “was a temporary gift, and also quickly perished partly on account of men’s ungratefulness (Calvin 1960: 4.19.19),” On the sign of miracles he argued that though Christ does not expressly state whether he intends this gift to be temporary, or to remain perpetually in

---

299 Reid (2000: 102) says Calvin seemed to be more open to the gifts of the Spirit: “God does not disappoint us when he promises us his gifts. Hence both pardon of sins and newness of life are certainly offered to us and received by us in Baptism. Therefore let us not doubt that the son of God displays the power of his Holy Spirit over us, that he makes us to experience his gifts, according to our need”.

300 Sometimes, Calvin (1884: 551) had in mind the so-called seven gifts of the Spirit in Is 11:1-2, which are promised to every believer.
his church yet it is more probable that miracles were promised only for a time in order to give lustre to the gospel, while it was new and in a state of obscurity. The *charisma* of the Spirit is not just for individual believers but is given for the building up of the fellowship of believers, and the continuous benevolence of new power to the church. The event of Pentecost in Acts 2: 1ff. implicates that the Spirit does not guarantee only the individual believer of fellowship with the Anointed One, but the fellowship of believers with him (Pannenberg 2004: 13)

Within the Anabaptist perspective Finger (2004: 603) highlights the three aspects of the salvific centre: the communal, the individual and the missional. They have a different spiritual atmosphere. The charismatic gifts, also sometimes called mystical phenomena, were much in evidence in the various Anabaptist traditions: miracles, healing, prophecy, tongues, dancing in the Spirit and so on. Yet these gifts were ordinarily not elevated above the demands to live a Christian life. The *charismata* of the Spirit were intended for the service of ministry and the building up of the body of the Anointed One.

**7. Conclusion**

The Reformed theologians have insisted that the gospel should not be reduced to either justification or election. The work of the Spirit includes the Charismatic manifestations to perfect the churches of the Anointed One. Calvin says (Calvin 1960: 3. 2. 33) the *charismata* of the Spirit with which God empowers his church and guides her to perfection through constant growth of faith, in which prepare the believers to receive them. The gospel is the good news that the Anointed One came into the world to save sinners by placing them in a right relationship with God through his substitutionary sacrifice on the cross and by engrafting them into the righteousness of Christ by the purifying *missio Spiritus*. This gospel needs to be received in faith and repentance and demonstrated in a life of lowly service, faith working through love. It also needs to be manifested in the practice of the Spiritual *charismata*, which both build up the church and empower the church to reach the spiritually lost for the gospel. The life of the Christian should be overflowing and bountiful in every aspect of life by the outpouring of the
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Spirit that evidenced the explosion of spiritual *charismata* and a profusion of fruits of love and obedience.

A theology firmly rooted in the mainstream reformation will also insist that the Spirit establishes the believer in the mysterious, in the sense of believing in the spiritual apprehension of truths that are beyond understanding, union with Jesus the Anointed One through personal faith and repentance, sealed by the rite of baptism. While recognizing the pivot of ritual in faith and worship for healing even in Charismatic movements, the Reformed traditions decry the aberration of ritualism in which the free movement of the Spirit is blocked by an almost idolatrous trust in the efficacy of ritual performance. While acknowledging the critical role of the sacraments in Christian devotion, however, there are profound reservations concerning sacramentalism in which the sacramental rite is believed to have automatic efficacy.\(^\text{301}\)

In this theological perspective, pneumatology becomes spirituality. The person of the Spirit is integrally to his commission: to seal the fruits of the Anointed One’s atoning death and glorious resurrection in the hearts of all those chosen to believe. The role of the Spirit is not only to enlighten the mind, but also to empower the will of believers to live in daily repentance and obedience. The work of the cross must be applied by the missio *Spiritus*, who seals the fruits of the Anointed One’s redemption in the believers and empowers them to live a life of victory over the powers of sin, death and the evil one (Bloesch 2000: 34).

In this analysis of the reformers’ idea of restricted demonstrations of the Spirit in the apostle’s

\(^{301}\) Bloesch (2000: 33) views, against the symbolist, the Reformers contend that God really does communicate with people through outward signs. Yet while the outward sign has an important role in confirming and deepening the believer’s faith, it must never be confounded with the thing signified, the gifts by the anointing of the Spirit. The sign is not extraneous to the reality that it represents, but it is always distinct from this reality. In the Reformed view the elements of Holy Communion do not change into the body and blood of Christ, yet they become vehicles of the Spirit as the believers have faith in their work of the Anointed One. On the other hand, Reformers affirm the objectivity of Christ’s mysterious presence in the Eucharist but not an automatic saving efficacy. If you partake of the sacrament without faith and repentance you will be eating and drinking judgment on yourselves (1 Cor 11: 27-32).
era only, it is judged to be miscalculated and misconstrued. The *charismata* manifested in the anointing with the Spirit has not ceased nor diminished throughout the history, nevertheless they have been manifested in particular and various forms and manifestations to suit different circumstances.

Some ambiguities were found in the pneumatology of the Reformers about how trials can be conquered by the power of the Spirit in their present lives. Subsequently some questions arise of how to overcome numerous sufferings, such as sickness, diseases, evil influences in our cultures and surroundings; whether our sinful nature limits the *missio Spiritus* who has been working continually since the beginning of the cosmos. According to Gibson (2009: 83) Luther believed that miracles and signs do not prove the genuineness of faith, however, according to Mark 16, genuine faith is always accompanied by miracles and signs.

The following chapter systematically recapitulates and evaluates the researched issues that remain to be resolved. Four systematic areas are studied with diverse hermeneutical methods: pneumatology that identifies the ethos of the anointing by the spirit on the basis of previous biblical and historical researches; soteriology in which the redemptive *missio Spiritus* is to be restricted, eschatology, in which one will testify to the extent of the establishment of God’s kingdom in relation to the anointing with the Spirit, and ecclesiology that will provide the appropriate sphere for all contemporary spiritual movements. The distinctive theological differences and consensus as well as some contributions of both sides between the Charismatic movements and the Reformed tradition will be evaluated, with some suggestions and further perspectives for both sides.

Whether the charismatic believer’s doctrine of justification through the anointing with the Spirit is in line with that of the Reformed tradition will be examined in detail. The former believe that they situate their identities as righteous ones, being transformed in nature, by imputation of the righteousness of Christ, while the Reformed tradition recognizes that the believer stands before God as justified, not by being transformed in nature, but by God’s grace being sanctified through
faith in the Anointed One.

The second area to be examined is the soteriological extent and boundaries of the anointing with the Spirit. The consequence of the anointing with the Spirit for the doctrine of justification and for the sanctification of the believers’ lives; how the emphasis on receiving the anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movements effects the sanctification of the society and the community. An investigation of the immanent presence and economy of the Trinity will provide a clue to understand the anointing of the Holy Spirit in current Charismatic movements.

The eschatological study will identify to what extent God’s kingdom is fulfilled through the anointing with the Spirit in its relation to the doctrine of justification and to the sanctification of the believers according to Reformed assessments. The ecclesiological study will inspect how the anointing with the Spirit has been applied in the Anointed One’s church and will propose a sound application for the contemporary churches.
Chapter IV Assessment and evaluation

A. Introduction

The rapid growth of Charismatic churches around the world, particularly in the Two-Thirds World, makes it difficult for churches in the West to ignore this movement and its theology. Charismatic churches around the world are growing with such rapidity that one scholar recently suggested the Charismatic movement should be identified as “the most successful social movement of the past century” (Swindle 2009: 145-6).

The implications in related to charismatic distributions for the contemporary church will be indicated. The central and distinctive message of the Charismatic movement is based on the anointing of the Spirit. From the earliest days of the modern Charismatic revival, the Charismatics have declared that all Christians may, and certainly should, experience a baptism in the Spirit “dissimilar from and subsequent to the experience of a new birth” (Swindle 2009: 151-4). This understanding of Spirit baptism flows naturally from the conviction that the Spirit came upon the disciples at Pentecost (Acts 2), not as the source of the new covenant existence, but rather as the source of power for effective witness. This understanding of Spirit baptism has given the modern Charismatic movement its identity, its unifying experience, and its missiological focus. This section looks at the manner in which the Reformed tradition has understood the New Covenant metaphor, baptism in the Spirit through which the anointing with the Spirit is manifested.

B. Pneumatological assessment

In examinations of the pneumatological theology of the Charismatic movements, questionable issues constantly appear about how Christians can distinguish the charisma of the Spirit. The Christian hypothesis is that there are other spirits, besides the Spirit of God, conceivably impious ones-human beings, traditional, even demonic, which predominantly are functioning in the world.
and in the religions (Yong 2004: 191-2). The characteristics of pneumatological anointing of the Spirit are revelational, soteriological, sanctificational, charismatic and eschatological missions of the Trinitarian economies by means of the *missio Spiritus*.

This chapter will assess some hermeneutical issues, the primal queries on the anointing by the Spirit that entail discernment of *charismata*, principles to verify the genuineness of *charisma*, and restrictions of the charismatic prophecies on the basis of previous biblical and historical researches.

1. Discernment of the *charisma*

The *charismata* of the Spirit can be discernable and verified within the perspective of critical and scientific rationalism (Ngong 2010: 9). The Scriptural command “test the spirits to see whether they are from God” (1 Jn 4: 1) is particularly decisive for the test of the pneumatological theology of the Charismatic movements. The problems the Corinthians faced were not that they lacked spiritual gifts but how the gifts should function and how to discern true gifts from artificial or even demonic ones.

Dunbar (2009: 58-9) says there is no *charisma* of the Spirit called the gift of ‘discernment’. It is the discerning of Spirits.\(^\text{302}\) The spiritual *charismata* of modern Charismatics, which they receive through the anointing of the Spirit, are analogous to, but distinguishable from the divinely authoritative *charismata* performed by the apostles (Poythress 1996: 72). Since there is no firm distinctiveness, apostolic instruction and the Scriptural canon have exclusive divine authority. On the other hand, since there is correlation, contemporary spiritual *charismata* are still indisputable and constructive to the Church. There might be a way between inclusive endorsement and extensive dismissal of modern charismatic *charismata*.

---

\(^{302}\) Dunbar (2009: 59) recognizes that there are several divisions of spirits in existence: spiritual examples of the discerning of angels; of the discerning of the Spirit; of the evil spirits.
We need to make several essential distinctions to develop this observation (Poythress 1996: 72). According to Scripture, every believer united to the Anointed One, is made a prophet, a priest and a king in a broad perspective. The requirement of testing later works with Scripture is implied by the irrevocability of the revelation in the Anointed One (Hb 1: 1-3), the foundational teacher of the apostles (Eph 2: 20), and the fact that the canon of Scripture is complete. The Reformed and the Charismatics have consensus on this view.

2. Intuitive or discursive

Many noncharismatics, together with the Reformed, raise some questions about the intuitive usage of charismata of the Spirit since they argue that they are innately indistinguishable. If no one can decide whether they conform to Scripture, then they undermine the exclusive role that the Scripture plays in the Church’s foundation. But not every intuitive charisma is a dilemma (Poythress 1996: 83).

In the present age a dream might simultaneously be the result of individual mental dispositions or a means created by God to convey to people the awareness of various types of circumstantial context (Mt 1: 20; 2: 12-3, 19). However dreams are not perfect, nor add an additional revelation

---

303 The four distinctive levels of charismata of Poythress (1996: 73-89) are first, that there are the messianic charismata: the Anointed One alone has the fullness of the Spirit to endow him as ultimate prophet, king and priest in an authoritative way. Second, there are the apostolic or foundational charismata: the Anointed One designated the apostles as eye witnesses (Acts 1:21-22), on the basis of what they had directly seen and heard, and the work of the Spirit inspired them to testify authoritatively for all times. Third is the level of prominent, repeatable charismata: people may be legitimately acknowledged by the Church when mighty charismata are demonstrated in instruction and administration. Conventionally, Reformed ecclesiology has indicated this level as a “special office.” It comprises pastors, teachers, elders and deacons in the Church. Finally the charismata are in the participation of every believer.

304 See on the charismatic evaluation Grudem (1988: 277-297); Gaffin (1979) 89-93.

305 The instruction substances of the vocal charismata, its contingent substance and its relevant substance are to be evaluated independently. Its instruction substance is similar to an extemporaneous discourse with no a manuscript. If the substance is intuitive, the narrator is not deliberately attentive to texts on which the dialogue is based. But even if the narrator is not intentionally responsive to texts, the listeners may turn out to be aware of texts that are applicable. If the substance is Scriptural, such texts do exist. If the substance is not Scriptural, then the dialogue is not to be alleged. For this reason this category of substance is discernible (Poythress 1996: 83-4).
to Scripture. They are fallible mental occurrences simultaneously they are means in the process of fulfilling the eschatological consummation (Jl 2: 28-32; Acts 2: 17). Mark and Revelation illustrate that there is no inherently enhanced spirituality to either Mark’s discursive substance or Revelation’s depicted metaphorical substance, and neither in Reformed nor Charismatic theology. The Spirit shaped the canon by inspiring both categories of procedure. Other incidents are opposed to the Scripture. Both categories of procedures may be non-inspired. The attitude of both may be influenced by demons (2 Tm 2: 24-26; Lk 8: 32; Acts 16: 17-18). Both procedures may be of imperfect and bewildered nature, due to the common unreliability of human beings. Much of the applications used to evaluate trustworthiness is appears in all human associations.

In both Charismatic and Reformed circles, different kinds of charismata operate through a range of progressions. It is superfluous to state them all. The more contentious types of charismata require particular consideration. They are the vocal charismata that charismatic traditions categorize as a word of knowledge, a word of wisdom, prophecy, discerning spirits, tongues, and interpretation of tongues in 1 Cr 12: 7-11 (Poythress 1996: 83).

The Charismatic movements believe that the gifts of prophecy, discernment of spirits, and tongues prolong in the Church, while the Reformed argue that they ceased with the office of the apostles and the completion of Scriptural revelation (Grudem 1988: 175). In terms of the

---

306 Dreams can be a good illustration. Many westerners view dreams as principally a creation of the insensible or unrestrained psyche. Apparently there were many ordinary, usual dreams in the NT period as well. But some dreams were revelatory (Mt 1: 20-24). Acts 10:10 suggests that God may utilize a typical human experience such as hunger as a means through which he reveals a suitable image or vision.

307 Granting that modern instinctive procedures are all imperfect, basically they are no danger to the exclusive authority of the Scripture. Nevertheless many people may still discover some obscurity in recognizing how to discern them. How can the legitimacy of the essence be discerned? If instinctive procedures have any credibility, will they be seriously accepted in applications, because they cannot be unswervingly examined with Scripture? We are liberated to remain in suspicion and are well advised to remain in suspicion, by virtue of the unreliability of all present instinctive procedures. If someone’s instinctive procedures have been untrustworthy, we discredit what he speaks in ratio to his untrustworthiness. If we have no earlier understanding of someone’s instinctive procedures we discredit what he speaks in more or less the way we would do with any seemingly well-intentioned foreigner.

308 The finest debate about continuance is perhaps in Grudem, Gift, building on Grudem (1982: 186). For termination see Gaffin (1992: 304-318); Gaffin and Grudem (1992) 177-180. The texts on these controversies are
earlier categorization, all these contentious gifts are intuitive charismata. They are controversial since their source is more ambiguous and more personal, as their base is nondiscursive (Blomberg 2006: 188-193). In contrast, discursive charismata are not debatable because they conform to Scripture although they are still defective.\(^\text{309}\) Hence discursive charismata are required to be tested against Scripture as the ultimate standard. Nonetheless everyone in Scripture-based groups is contented with such charismata because they recognize the necessity for interpreting the Scripture (Blomberg 2006: 191-2).

Intuitive charismata have difficulties. Some Charismatics believe that since the source is more intuitive, personal, and private, it is also more directly the work of the Spirit, and consequently less subject to mistake than the other charismata. However such beliefs are evidently erroneous.\(^\text{310}\) An ostensibly marvellous performance may occur from forged resources (2 Th 2: 9). Therefore discursive and intuitive charismata are both treated in pneumatological theology with all other spiritual charismata without special favour. Analogous to all gifts they are to be tested for their consistency with Scripture (1 Cor 14: 37-38).\(^\text{311}\) Discernment is consequently indispensable in examining the substance of the instruction, whether the charisma implicated is discursive or intuitive.\(^\text{312}\)

Since the Spirit is operative in the lives of believers, all these substances may be depicted as extensive. However, Gaffin and Grudem position the mainly coherent spokespersons of the two major circles.

\(^{309}\) Authentic speakers may speak about the reality from the Scripture. But erroneous speakers may attempt to broaden their profanation. Erroneous utterances are may be more hazardous if they cannot present implausible discourses that comply with Scripture to maintain their ideas.

\(^{310}\) For instance, the gospel of Luke is nothing less inspired than the book of Revelation.

\(^{311}\) Poythress (1996: 84) says it is unproblematic to analyse a manuscript-based discourse. The manuscript is unambiguous, and the audiences can instantly approach it. They can evaluate what the speaker says in the manuscript. But there are still problems. A distorted heretic may misread a script, while a sound speaker may be found wandering away from the script with an inappropriate observation.

\(^{312}\) Poythress (1996: 81-7) views different ways are required to discern the substance. Discernment may generally be discursive for some to groups of people. They keep in mind a Scriptural text that conformed what the speaker preaches or that opposes it. Others may detect intuitively. They sense that what the speaker is saying is correct or erroneous. They cannot refer to an unambiguous manuscript. But they immediately discern, conceivably on the foundation of having being accustomed and knowledge of the Bible. Their accumulated awareness operates instantaneously in their thoughts to provide them with the intuition to discern.
Spirit-operated. The Spirit ministers in unfathomable ways. But He also governs by means of the knowledge of Scripture that He himself has created (1 Cr 2: 10-16). People primarily use discursive or intuitive practices. However human account does not oppose the truth that the Spirit is operational. Diverse categories of people assist each other.

Circumstantial substance, which is not “a direct word from God”, is acknowledged through someone according to the will of the preacher of the word, but is just circumstantial information. Leaders in charismatic circles admit that people might announce prophecies or speak in tongues according to the flesh. They discern that some intuitive practices are psychologically produced (McDonnell 1976: 145-6). This type of occurrence causes the most problems. But this content is not especially unusual in substance from knowledge achieved through noticeable means (Poythress 1996: 85).

3. The Christological criterion

The hermeneutical standard must initiate with the Anointed One, as He is related to the Spirit. The Spirit’s charismata, distributed by the anointing with the Spirit are discerned by discerning the Anointed One, Jesus, and He is discerned by the Spirit. The Johannine narrative provides the Christological criterion for discernment of the Spirit: “every spirit that does not confess that Jesus is from God is the spirit of the antichrist” (1 Jn 4: 3).\textsuperscript{313} Christian truth for discernment should be based on the Scriptural normative standards, with the distinctiveness of the Spirit as the Spirit of the Anointed One. Charismatic discernment of the Spirit is ultimately measured by Jesus, the Anointed One. The Spirit of God is professed to be none other than the Spirit of Christ (Rv 2: 3). An obvious Scriptural and systematic criterion, professing the lordship of Jesus, the Anointed One can identify and discern dogmatically the Spirit’s charismata (Yong 2004: 198).

\textsuperscript{313} The direct objective in the Johannine setting is to present means to discern Gnostic distortions of Christian belief within the early church. In the contemporary religious pluralism, however, the circumstances are interreligious and the discernment became intricate since other religions may have various definitions of the truth, holiness, and diverse criterions to detect it.
A hermeneutical principle is to discern Jesus, the Anointed One and His body assembled as the church. Paul provides the standard of discernment: “no one can say ‘Jesus is Lord’ except by the Spirit” (1 Cor 12: 3). Another standard discerns the Master, the Anointed One through the Spirit in the way the *charismata* of the Spirit can be discerned. Even the affirmation of the Anointed One’s lordship is unavoidably uncertain since “Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven” (Mt 7: 21), which is vital for the request of the ethical circumstances.

In hermeneutical perspectives the Scripture is the exclusive and truthful criterion that ought to direct the *charisma* of discerning the spirits for discernment (1 Cor 12: 10), while the Spirit distributes them through the anointing by the Spirit. The significance of these Pauline and Johanine axioms, “the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life” and “the words I have spoken to you are spirit” (2 Cor 3: 6b; cf. Jn 6: 63) can be analysed in three spheres. The words of the Anointed One are inspired by the Spirit and is identified with the word as God-breathed (2 Tm 3: 16 and 2 Pt 1: 21). Only the Spirit inspires the reader to understand the Scripture (1 Cor 2: 10-16). The interpretation of Scripture should be applied to a life according to and in the Spirit. The joint power of this pneumatological structure is formulated in the vibrant interaction of the Spirit and the word of God. Mere literalism is deficient for religious discernment. Discerning the *charisma* of the Spirit requires an explicit hermeneutic able to recognize the life and worldviews in its diverse manuscripts of the Scripture (Flynn 2004: 171-3) as well as its broadening to suitable proportional varieties to accommodate realities, in order to verify its commensurability (Yong 2004: 194).

Discerning the Spirit of the Anointed One is required to embrace flexible practices along with dogmatic identifications. The existence and moral values of the believers are undividable. The standard of the Christological criterion is to transform people’s lives and communities. The encounter with Jesus, the Anointed One through the Spirit does not occur by means of imaginary perception. The empowerment by the Anointed One with the *charisma* of the Spirit is necessary to carry out the missions of God’s kingdom.
4. Synthetic discernment

A key idea of the pneumatological theology about the discerning charisma of the Spirit includes that it should be directed by the Scriptural and ecclesial perspectives (Yong 2005a: 72). A professing believer acknowledges the facts according to theoretical and normative Scriptural and ecclesiastical perspectives. The discernment of the Spirit’s charisma should also be considered in the context of the action (Flynn 2004: 172). All discernment should be established on the first two principles in actual material, socio-economical, historical, and political situations. Discerning the charisma of the Spirit via Scripture, historical tradition, and the standard of the Anointed One, consequently necessitates discernment of the circumstances in which such action takes place (Kinghorn 2005: 51-2). The discernment of the Spirit’s charisma should become known through a dialectical verification (Flynn 2004: 173). The problem is how to discern the new ministries of the Spirit, using the forgoing criteria and how the Spirit can reveal fresh insights while sustaining continuity of both existence and action. A pneumatological approach highlights that even the criteria for discerning the Spirit’s charisma require being sensitive and consulting afresh at every occasion. Fourth, the discernment of the Spirit’s charisma on this side of the eschaton ought to be authenticated ethically and morally. The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control (Gl 5: 22-23).

314 This attempt, however, does not identify the infallible character of biblical interpretation as it appears from a range of hermeneutical viewpoints. It also recognizes that the ecclesial and doctrinal perspectives are acknowledged at a later stage. The recovering and re-establishing of both the Scriptural and ecclesial tradition is essential to discern the truths (Yong 2005a: 71-7).

315 Flynn (2004: 173) says Discernment of the Spirit is particularly intricate if we accept the Spirit as the foundation of existence, inspiration, and newness. There is tension between tradition and freshness.

316 Christian reflection cannot be withheld where the Spirit is operative where such fruits are manifested. One question is instantly asked. Does not this ethical standard eventually make it hard to discern the Spirit from sheer humanism? Yet the notion of “sheer humanism” emerges and is to be perceived only naturalistically, not from the perspective of divine inspiration. In that case, religion is distinct but not disparate from humanism, the fruit of the Spirit, though is definitive, even if not ultimate.
5. The authentication of prophecy

The Reformed and the Charismatics have argued about whether “prophecy” in the NT and the early Church was divinely motivated and infallible. Did it acquire complete godly authority? Gaffin (1992: 97) says that it was inspired. Grudem (1994: 209) argues that it was not.\(^\text{317}\) The circumstantial substance necessitates particular awareness. One of these is the realm of prophecy, the \textit{charisma} of a word of knowledge (1 Cor 12: 8). The \textit{charisma} of the Spirit can be operative via intuitive substance to generate human predictions (Thomas 1999: 123-6; 143). It can also work through discursive substances to create human predictions (Grudem 1996: 235).\(^\text{318}\) Neither is inherently more divine than the other, and neither is inherently more imperfect than the other. Neither category of prophecy is an additional godly utterance challenging obedient believing reaction but is merely a presumed idea about a potential situation to be assessed as would any other prophecy be assessed (Thomas 1999: 143-4). Previously you did recognize that prophecies produced from intuitive substances are not in some extraordinary godly division and are just as imperfect as prophecies shaped from discursive substance (Sandford 2007: 61-6), and you are prepared to apply understanding. You neither absolutely refuse nor unquestioningly acknowledge these prophecies.

A personal prophecy in the form of a command, introduced by “The Lord says” is unsuitable, perplexing and perilous (Sandford 2007: 61). This introduction is used to describe as a faultless oracle. Yet without the precarious preface, an authority similar to some group seems to intimidate the adequacy of the Scriptural revelation.\(^\text{319}\) Charismatic movements have

\(^{317}\) Grudem (1994: 209) says many people suppose that the result of this argument is decisive for the upcoming of the charismatic movement. Nevertheless, the effect of the dispute is nowadays barely a practical distinction.

\(^{318}\) Grudem (1996: 235) explains that many people may deny that weather forecast and economic calculations are actually a comparable case since they are calculative rather than instinctive in nature. Undoubtedly one who makes the predictions tell from a presumption. However normal people who review the reliability of the predictions nearly never acknowledge the contemporary meteorological particulars or economic principles, nor do they recognize the details of the data on which the principles operate so as to produce a particular prediction. In real cases one judges reliability along general human ways.

\(^{319}\) The Psalmist writes, “Blessed are they whose way is undefiled, who walk in the law of the Lord” (Ps 119: 1). To be unblemished, all that is required is to “walk in the law of the Lord.” No additional regulations or instructions are required. The “law of the Lord” provides the entire teaching in uprightness. In the same way 2 Tim 3:16-17 specifies
occasionally had improper occurrences where the manipulative have implemented these commands to inflict slavish submission to their caprices. Some forceful groups have employed commands to attain egotistic private intentions. The sensible threats, as well as the risk of violating the sufficiency of Scripture, urge you to apply prudence (Evans 2005: 2) and even mistrust about additional-Scriptural oracles (Thomas 1999: 148-9). Additional-Scriptural oracles deserve explicit scrutiny. In some incidents they might not actually be additions to Scripture but relative applications of Scripture. Applicatory substance is required in that area. Normally applications utilize both Scriptural oracles and insight about the world. Only with some insight about the world can you discover that the application is not inappropriate.

When one presents remarkable instructions, these instructions may occasionally be a blend of Scriptural standards with surrounding substance. At times intuitive processes bring forth both the Scriptural standards and the surrounding substance. Then the one who present a word is not capable deliberately to identify where the word is taken from. It is merely a word with an innate source. Even if it is not reliable, it may still in some incidents be a command that is essentially a legitimate application of Scriptural standards.

Consequently there is an indisputable prospect that legitimate orders may issue from instinctive procedures. But prudence is required to discern such words. The perception of others, both perception about the Scripture and perception about the circumstances and the people concerned, ought to be implemented to assess what reaction is suitable (Sandford 2007: 71-84). It ought to be clear that you distinguish that the Lord loves cheerful service (2 Cr 9: 7), not slavish submission to commands that are troublesome or tyrannical (Mt 11: 28-30; 1 Jn 5: 3).

According to Gaffin (1992: 303-312) prophecy has been ceased with the completion of the apostolic epoch and the finalization of the canon of Scripture. Contemporary phenomena are

---

320 For instance, the statement “Preach the good news” spoken to others, unites the Scriptural standard in Matt 28:19 with the contextual essence about the charismata of others.
imperfect and are therefore not equal to NT prophecies. While modern instinctive procedures which are in essence instruction are comparable to prophecy, they are like a current sermon that is expounding the apostolic message (Thomas 1999: 150-1). Consequently the guidelines about spiritual charismata, as uttered in 1 Corinthians 12-14, are still relevant. What the Charismatics label ‘prophecy’ is not actually the prophecy revealed in the NT. It has a fallible similarity. It is a spiritual charisma for a defective dialogue through perceptive progressions, compared to a sermon, which is a spiritual charisma for a defective dialogue through rational procedures. Contemporary instinctive procedures surrounding the essence of the gospel are not equivalent to inspired Scriptural prophecy. They can, however, operate in the ministries of the Spirit, like the surrounding substance in rational procedures.

Grudem (1994: 211) believes that prophecy continue, although such prophecy is imperfect like the inspired prophecy of the OT. It is a spiritual charisma for a defective address in the course of instinctive procedures. If the substance is Scriptural, its authority originates from the Scripture. If the substance is contextual, it does not adjoin to the Scripture, and is not divinely trustworthy. For this reason it is merely a report and has no exceptional authority. Consequently Grudem arrives at the same conclusion as Gaffin (Poythress 1996: 93). Therefore it is not necessary for Gaffin and Grudem to be in conflict about the current phenomena.

They simply diverge on the brand of phenomena and about whether the NT phenomena were indistinguishable or purely equivalent to the present phenomena (Sandford 2007: 60-1). Both Gaffin and Grudem previously conceded the unreliability of the present phenomena. Given this theological combination, there is at present an agreement on the explanation of the practice of these charismata in the Church. But Grudem merely elucidates the category of prophecy. He states that prophecy is deficient but continually revelatory. It constantly originates from God and is still significant for the edification of the Church. Gaffin and others think explanation is too intricate to take hold of or to categorize. How could phenomena be revelatory and not identical with the sufficiency of Scripture? Essential instruction cannot be inserted into the Scripture, but can simply rearticulate what is already in Scripture (Sandford 2007: 60). It is consequently
apparent that neither type of essence intimidates the sufficiency of Scripture.

6. Cessationism versus continuationism

Dissimilar theoretical structures, in between “Cessationism and Continuationism” are in the clash about *charismata* of the Spirit. Dominant are dissimilarities in recognizing crucial ideas related to the disagreement, interrelated to the office of a prophet. These contain ‘prophecy,’ ‘prophet,’ ‘revelation’, and others. Additional vital problem is whether if the *charismata* would violate the standard of Sola Scriptura when these were demonstrated.

The Cessationist confirms that a prophecy, formerly confirmed, as an unfailing, equivalent authority as transcribed approved prophecies.\(^{321}\) The continuationist verifies a prophecy would not hold innovative doctrinal content and highlight that all true prophecy specified nowadays should be unwavering with the Scripture.\(^{322}\) The examination is authenticated by adjudicating the doctrinal content of a new prophetic message against the instructions of the Scripture. If the content or implications of a prophecy contradict the teachings of the Scripture, the prophecy in interrogation is untrue. Hence, they determine that contemporary prophecies do not denote an infallible foundation of authority for the Church and the standard of Sola Scriptura is not violated.

Prophecy is an utterance of the word of God with accurate relevance to specified circumstances, created under the direct inspiration of the Spirit (McIntyre 2004: 226). The Spirit also imparts the *charismata* which are suitable to the operation of the *Pneuma* (McIntyre 2004: 226). It is palpable that the contemporary Charismatic movements are indebted greatly to the Reformed tradition. However, the vital subject, that has subjugated a great deal of Reformed pneumatology, has been the idea that the *charismata* of the NT had authenticity for the apostolic era only (Kimber 2011: 3-6). This is traditionally identified as cessationism. Warfield, an intense apologist of the Princeton theology, located the *charismata* outside the expectation of the current

\(^{321}\) Some reformed cessationists are such as Richard B. Gaffin, John F. MacArthur, and O. Palmer Robertson, etc.

\(^{322}\) A reformed continuationist, such as Wayne Grudem categorise twofold of prophets between “foundational and non-foundational prophets” (Grudem 1988: 88).
Church. Warfield assailed with the spirit of the modern Charismatic movement. If miracles, together with the unusual *charismata* of the Spirit, are not probable in the Church in the present day, the Charismatic, by definition, is not legitimate. This is unquestionably a critical question. Warfield wrote a volume on the subject of the cessation of the *charisma*. His intention is to observe the principal analyses which have been constructive to the continuation of the *charismata* beyond the apostolic era. In his research he confined the manifestations of the *charisma* of the Spirit to the apostolic era (Warfield 1953: 6).

An emergent number of evangelical leaders, together with the Pentecostals, recognized that they have much in common, and by the 1940’s laid aside earlier prejudices of charismatic perspectives. After twenty years, a phenomenon called the Charismatic movement exploded, reaching into practically all Christian denominations. Reformed, Lutheran, Presbyterians, Methodist, Anglican, Baptist, and Holiness evangelicals, along with Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox, discovered that within their churches “speaking in other tongues” followed by “baptisms with the Spirit” were practiced. The *charisma* of prophecy, noteworthy healings, and additional unusual manifestations of the Spirit were no longer confined to Pentecostal and Charismatic churches. The fortress of cessationism was faced with a serious assault (Carlson 2010: 143).

The colossal effort of Ruthven, on the cessation of the *charismata*, is unquestionably the most inclusive evaluation of the cessationist problem generally accessible. Ruthven stresses that cessationism is a notion with debatable traces. The origin of cessationism did not initiate within conventional Christianity but within Judaism and Christian factions during the first three centuries of the Christian age (Ruthven 1993: 24).\(^{323}\) Ruthven (1993: 24) notes Augustine previously had defended for the cessation of the *charismata*, but afterward altered his

---

\(^{323}\) Ruthven (1993: 25) notes that cessationism is inquisitively to be recognized to Montanism. Augustine, quoted by Ruthven, in his dispute with the Montanists, asserts that extraordinary manifestations did, actually, carry on subsequent to the apostolic period. He protests in *City of God* 22.8 that contemporary miracles are comparatively unidentified not because they no longer take place, but merely due to incorrect message and ones are accustomed to distrust them.
Ruthven, in his examination of the writings of John Calvin, observes some uncertainties in Calvin’s instruction on the feasibility of contemporary charismata of the Spirit. Calvin advocated the restriction of extraordinary phenomena to the endorsement of the apostles and exclusively to their Gospels, while he was less inflexible about cessationism than numerous of his supporters in that he detained to the conventional belief that in unconverted regions, apostles and prophetic charismata could reappear to authenticate the gospel (Ruthven 1993: 34). To Calvin, the function of the charismata of the Spirit was fundamentally a means of endorsing the Word of God.

Warfield’s cessationist argument was established on his assessment of Calvinism. He relied on the human rationale to resolve even theological questions. To him, the demand for phenomenal miracles opens a category of additional-scriptural revelation that endangered his belief structures (Ruthven 1993: 52-53). Ruthven denied that Warfield had an inappropriate perception of God’s Kingdom. Its substance is basically that of warfare against of Satan’s kingdom with its devastating effects (Mt 4: 23; 9: 35; 10: 6, 7; 12: 28…) (Ruthven 1993: 195). The Kingdom theology of G.E. Ladd, an evangelical Presbyterian, differs from Warfield’s views on eschatology. Ladd’s analysis accentuates the present epoch as a battle region in which followers of the Anointed One are empowered to wage war against the devastative onslaught of Satan (Ladd 1993: 79-211).

According to Menzies (2004: 87), Ruthven analytically invalidates the cessationist concept of Warfield. Ruthven (1993: 87) affirms that Warfield fails to explain the many explicit Scriptural commands to search for, desire and utilize the very charismata he alleges have ceased. The Scripture remains the norm for the Christian church for its beliefs and practices (Ruthven 1993: 87).
7. Synthesis

Some of the implications for the modern church are indicated: What the Charismatic and the Reformed tradition embraced in common are acknowledged. It is approved that Calvin and the other great Reformed theologians have accurately examined Paul. Calvin appropriately underscores the *missio Spiritus* in regeneration and justification that make the sacraments effectual. The Spirit is the “internal instructor” who abides in us and bears witness to the truth in our hearts (Rm 8: 16). Every Christian has received the life-creating inhabiting Spirit (Jn 6: 63). There is no Christian without the Spirit (Rm 8: 9); there is no Christian experience apart from the *missio Spiritus* in our lives. In 1 Corinthians 12:13 Paul refers to the salvific work of the Spirit with two metaphors: we are all baptized with one Spirit into the body of the Anointed One and all were made to drink of one Spirit.

Charismatics refer to Luke’s understanding of baptism in the Spirit. They believe that there is more to be said about the ministerial role of the Spirit on this issue than that which is elaborated on in the epistles of Paul. Charismatics have a unique and particular contribution to biblical theology of the Spirit by their interpretation of Luke’s Gospel. The clarity and dynamism of Luke’s contribution is lost when is interpreted through Pauline lenses. Luke has a distinctive voice that the church should attend the area of charismatic manifestations of the Spirit through the anointing with the Spirit.

Charismatics believe that the NT speaks about two baptisms in the Spirit, one that is soteriological and joins the believer to the body of the Anointed One (1 Cr 12: 13) and the other is missiological and equips the believer for his/her commission (Acts 1: 8). Charismatics believe that it is correct to accept Luke’s terms and they call the Charismatic gift a “baptism in the Holy Spirit.” The baptism in the Spirit is promised to every believer, to all servants of God (Acts 2: 18). The Charismatics believe that the correct perception of the Charismatic gift of “the baptism in the Spirit is obscured when Paul’s terms are employed to see it as the *charisma* of the Spirit received at conversion.
The trend in the Reformed traditions has been to understand Luke in the perspectives of Paul. Paul attends to ministerial concerns in the church while Luke writes a missionary manifesto. Conceivably this elucidates why the Reformed thought about the Spirit have centred more on his work through the word of God and sacraments, the “internal spectator” of the Spirit, and less on his commission to the world. The Reformed theologians are inclined to correlate the Charismatic gift with conversion and justification and sanctification, which effectively dulls the intenseness of Luke’s connotation. When the Charismatic gift of the Spirit is understood in soteriological terms, Luke’s missiological focus and the prospect of it is misplaced. This often leads to the idea that while all experience the soteriological element of the Charismatic gift at conversion, only a few selected receive the charismata of missiological empowerment. Yet Luke calls on the believers to keep in mind that the church, by virtue of its reception of the Charismatic gift, is a prophetic community (1 Cr 12; 14; 15) empowered for a missionary commission (2 Cor 4-7; Eph 4; Rm 1, 15).

8. Conclusion

This section has assessed several hermeneutical problems like the important issues of anointing by the Spirit that include the discernment of charismata and limits of the charismatic prophecies as experiential and applicational perspectives upon previous groundwork of the biblical and historical investigations.

The Charismatics have seemingly fallen into a dilemma about their instinctive procedures in their operating charismatic manifestations of the Spirit, due to the deficiency of its corroboration with the authority of Scripture although they think that their knowledge are inspired and ought to bear divine recognition. If their conclusion is correct, the acquired knowledge should be comparable with the authority of Scripture. The Reformed believe that they should eliminate this category of procedures and solely rely on the adequacy and exclusivity of Scriptural authority. The Charismatics believe that such knowledge is not seriously dissimilar to the imperfect nature
of contemporary causes. However, both perspectives require some consideration. But the distinction between instruction of the essence and conditional essence is the problem. The instruction of the essence either repeats Scripture or is invalid.

No contemporary wonderful occurrence, no matter how astonishing or marvellous, can fundamentally be compared to Scripture. They must be tested with Scripture as the norm. It may be a forged phenomenon (2 Th 2: 9-11). Even if it is a repetition of a Scriptural truth, it is still infected by sinful human reaction. It may disclose an idea about modern circumstances. It may be a confused permutation of authenticity and inaccuracy. All such experiences are examined with Scripture as the trustworthy standard.

C. Soteriological assessment

The Charismatic and the Reformed tradition have reasoned for the inclusive role of the Spirit in the dominions of soteriological perspectives, in relation to the anointing with the Spirit. This section will assess soteriologies of both the Reformed and the Charismatics in relation to the baptism with the Spirit, in which the redemptive *missio Spiritus* is to be initiated. The emphases of both assertions will be reaffirmed on their soteriological perspectives. This section examines the compelling manifestations by means of the anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movements should be operated in their implicational bases under the confined area of doctrine of justification and sanctification.

---

324 The essential mistake is to confuse the participation of God with the need of participation by human creatureliness and human sin, and to doubt the participation of God in the life of his creation. God is involved in the growth of meadows and in the breezing wind: “He makes the meadow nurture the livestock” (Ps 104: 14). But the growing meadow is not inspired. Even if people are not fully aware of all the implications of their beliefs or expressions or visualizations, there still are such important information and influences from facets of their individualities.
1. The Reformed perspectives

1.1. Soteriological affirmation on baptism with the Spirit

The charismatic perception of Spirit baptism as enabling force for mission distinctive from conversion has not been recognized by various traditions within the Christian churches, together with the mainstream of reformed scholars (Bartlett & Brown 2009: 232). The baptism with the Spirit is linked with the regenerating work of the Spirit according to Calvin. He states, “he baptizes us in the Spirit and fire (Lk 3: 16)” in order to bring us to “the light of faith in his gospel…so regenerating us that we become new creatures” (Calvin 1960: 3.1.4). He portrays the Spirit as “the bond by which Christ effectually unites us to himself” (Calvin 1960: 3.1.1) and refers to the Spirit as the “secret energy of the Spirit, by which we come to enjoy Christ and all his benefits” (Calvin 1960: 3.1.1). This soteriological work of the Spirit is initiated with Spirit baptism in Calvin’s writings. Calvin does barely show awareness of the Spirit’s work to empower for mission.

While Calvin articulates the Spirit as the “inward teacher,” (Calvin 1960: 4.14.9) that illuminates the mind and opens the heart of one who hears the gospel, he does not emphasize the *missio Spiritus* for empowerment to proclaim the message. Calvin rejected the idea that confirmation, a ritual subsequent to water baptism, was a true sacrament. Some insisted that though the Spirit was bestowed in water baptism for rebirth, in confirmation equipped the believer “for spiritual battle.” But Calvin (1960: 4.1.5) argued that this rite is not fully supported by Scriptural evidence. He concludes: “We see the oil, ‘the gross and greasy liquid’, nothing else”.

Calvin (1960: 4.19.8) accepts the reception of the Spirit on formerly baptized followers in his negation of confirmation (Acts 8: 16). He states that Luke does not reject that those who believe in the Anointed One with their hearts and admit him with their mouth are gifted with any *charisma* of the Spirit (Rm 10: 10), rather, Luke views it as the reception of the Spirit, by which power is demonstrated and detectable *charismata* were bestowed”. Calvin (1960: 4.19.6) contends, however, that those marvellous *charismata* manifested in the apostles’ ministries,
which were distributed by impartation, have correctly ceased and existed just for a period.

Some scholars in the Reformed reflection may consign the emphasis on somewhat unusual positions for termination of the *charismata* of the Spirit. Barth, for instance, distinguishes more obviously between baptism of with the Spirit and water baptism (cf. Macchia 2004: 164-76). But the Reformed beliefs essentially classify Spirit baptism as the cause of God’s extraordinary transformation of the believer. Among the prominent Reformed scholars, Hendrikus Berkhof (1964: 46-56) acknowledges the constructive role of the Charismatic movement. He views Spirit baptism in terms of rebirth, but he observes it as comprising of three essentials: justification, sanctification, and vocation Berkhof recognizes the charismatic empowerment in the vocational dimension of Spirit baptism and criticizes Calvin for chiefly disregarding it. Nevertheless Berkhof also reproves the Charismatics for identifying Spirit baptism exclusively in vocational concepts.

1.2. Justification and sanctification

Luther and Calvin highlight justification, the authorized symbol, which states a forensic and declarative decree of being reckoned righteous in the presence of the divine court (Story 2009: 70). Although the Arminians argued that justification is the pardon of sins, the Reformers contended that it is the obliteration of iniquities and guiltiness through the Anointed One. Sanctification is observed as included in God’s righteousness, and therefore sanctification always flows from justification (McKenny 2010: 291), right through the life of believers (Porter 1993: 398). 1 Cor 1: 30 testifies ‘God is the source of your life in Christ Jesus, whom God made our wisdom, our righteousness and sanctification and redemption.’ Through Christ we are justified before God, our relationship to Him is put right and we become his children through the work of the Spirit who joins us to Christ (Rm 8: 14-17); ‘and we all, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another, for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit’ (2 Cor 3: 18). Through the work of the Spirit in us we are daily sanctified to become more like Jesus (Rm 8: 9-11).
Berkouwer (1952: 93) argues that ‘the heart of sanctification is the life which feeds on this justification’. He also states that ‘Genuine sanctification, let it be repeated, stands or falls with this continued orientation towards justification and the remission of sins’ (Berkouwer 1952: 78). Correspondingly, the work of the Holy Spirit relates Christians to the redemptive suffering and death of Christ, allowing ‘the work of the Spirit to be founded through faith upon the forgiveness of sins: and any sanctification whatever must spring from this forgiveness’ (Berkouwer 1952: 93).

Torrance (1956: 101) argues that sanctification is the continued unfolding, development, and maintenance of justification. Kuyper (1966: 270) says, ‘It wounds the very heart of the Reformed confession when the pulpit aims at sanctification without zeal for justification’. The Reformed tradition needs to be understood as a reaction and aversion to the perceived ‘works-righteousness’ of the Roman Catholic Church. However, the danger is to demote sanctification to the ‘back-seat’ of justification, thereby making the Christian life into a repeated circular movement that requires in humility and repentance to embrace the union with Christ (McKenny 2010: 292). Berkouwer’s extensive discussion of sanctification is followed by an entire chapter on ‘humility and sanctification,’ whereby any Christian growth necessarily means a corresponding growth of sin and guilt consciousness (Berkouwer 1952: 104).  

1.3. Deification vs. union with the Anointed One

Deification provides a perception of redemption that argues beyond the traditional views on punitive substitution and ethical thoughts of atonement. Undoubtedly, the emphasis upon the transforming divine charisma and distinctive of the Charismatic movements are assimilated in deification, rather than in forensic concepts (Gavrilyuk 2009: 656).

325 Berkouwer (1952: 103) argues that sanctification is not a ‘process’ or moral process, but it is being holy in the Anointed One, and having part, through faith in his righteousness (1 Cor 1: 30).

326 Deification implies various concepts in its characteristic aspects: adoption, sanctification, forgiveness, justification, illumination, perfection, transfiguration, glorification, regeneration, imitation of the Anointed One, new creation, mystical union, and eschatological consummation (Gavrilyuk 2009: 651-2).
Billings (2005: 315-334) studies the probability that Calvin’s theology comprises a subject of deification in the ideas of union, participation and adoption of the Reformed thought. However, for Calvin, it is dissimilar to a norm of theosis established among the Greek fathers (Gavrilyuk 2009: 653-4). The historical scholarship indicates the harmony on deification between Palamas, Aquinas, Luther, and Calvin embraces an account of participatory notions (Gavrilyuk 2009: 655, cf. Cavanaugh, 2000: 271-9).

Calvin analytically discards a transformative union between humanity and divinity (Billings 2005: 317). For Calvin, participation in the Anointed One is closely interrelated to ecclesial koinonia and communal actions of love (Billings 2005: 317). Calvin develops his theology of imago Dei in the Institutes, designating it a “participation in God” (Inst.1.2.1). Billings (2005: 321) says Calvin observes the ultimate union of divinity and humanity is obvious in them missio Spiritus of provenience as well as in God’s “charismata” of faith and sanctification to believers.\(^327\) For Calvin, the union with Christ and the modus of divine inhabitation is not by means of the “infusion” of the “substance” of God into the believer. Rather, he upholds that believers are “united with Christ by the secret power of the Spirit” (Inst. 3.11.5). Through this union in Christ, believers become united with the Trinity. Calvin confirms what he clarifies about 2 Pet 1:4 that in the union of creator and creature in redemption, the former does not eliminate the latter (Calvin CR 55:446). In Calvin, the forensic imputation of Christ’s righteousness and the mystical union with Christ is sustained in the contiguous relationship.

According to Calvin, the unity of the Trinity develops to integrate the believer. However, this union does not transform us “consubstantial with God” like a fourth participant of the Godhead, but it is in the Anointed One, through” the grace and power of the Spirit (Inst. 1.15. 5).\(^328\)

---

\(^327\) Calvin (Inst. 4.1.2-4) highlights union with Christ in his death and resurrection in baptism, and the life of the Christian as participation in Christ (Rm 6: 1-11). Calvin underlines the adoption of believers as the offspring of God, given admittance to the Father through the Spirit, who implores through the believers (Rm 8: 13-6).

\(^328\) For Calvin, the union with Christ signifies a concept of progressive sanctification. The believers are “participants
For Calvin, the consummation of Christian sanctification is found on the doctrine of deification in the soteriological framework. Nonetheless, Calvin’s doctrine of deification is distinctive. Full humanity united with God rejects synergistic transformation in relation to theologies that are normally recognized as “prosperity theory derived from miscalculation on the doctrine of deification” in the Charismatic movements.

2. Charismatic perspectives

2.1. Affirmation of charismatic anointing

Most Charismatics have asserted that the Spirit came upon Jesus at the Jordan in order to equip him for his messianic task (Lk 3: 22; 4: 18-19). This is the unambiguous message of Jesus’ dramatic sermon at Nazareth. The striking parallels between Jesus’ pneumatic anointing at the Jordan and that of the disciples at Pentecost suggest that Luke interpreted the latter event in light of the former: Pentecost was for the disciples what the Jordan was for Jesus. The logical corollary is that at Pentecost the Spirit came upon the disciples in order to enable them to fulfil their divinely appointed task.

The Charismatic have affirmed that for Luke the “promise” with reference to the Spirit (Lk 24: 49; Acts 1: 4, 2: 33, 38-39) refers to the gift of the Spirit of prophecy promised by Joel. This “promise,” initially fulfilled at Pentecost, enables the disciples to take up their prophetic vocation to the world (Acts 1: 8). The message is repeated for emphasis, it comes at the end of his Gospel (Lk 24: 49) and at the beginning of his record of the mission of the early church (Acts 1: 4), to insure that one will not miss it. Indeed, the message that emerges from each of these texts is unified and clear. The Charismatics understand the anointing with baptism, according to Luke, to be the source of prophetic activity that came upon the disciples at Pentecost in order to equip

not only in all his benefits but also in him. “Indeed, day by day, he grows more and more into one body with us, until he becomes completely one with us” (Inst. 3.2.24). This union with Christ is unbearable without a participation in the Spirit, who unites the believer to the Anointed One (Inst. 3.1.2, cf. Canlis 2004: 171-83). Through Christ and the Spirit, believers are participated in the Father (Inst. 1.13.26).
them for their prophetic vocation to witnesses. To Charismatics, “baptism with the Holy Spirit” does not cleanse the disciples nor grant them a new ability to keep the law; rather, “baptism in the Holy Spirit” drives them forward in the face of opposition and enables them to bear bold witness to the Anointed One.

2.2. Soteriological traces of charismatic views

The conventional viewpoint is that the modern charismatic movement is an extension of the Wesleyan holiness revival movements of the nineteenth century. But Menzies (2007: 260-82) views it is an over-simplification. In truth, the modern Charismatic movement is indebted in the Reformed tradition alongside its Wesleyan lineage.

Menzies (2007: 261) notes that Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) is recognized to be the greatest theologian to emerge in North America. He might be acknowledged a predecessor to consecutive renewal movements, together with the modern charismatic movements. Against furious resistance from associate clergymen, Edwards urged the believers to search for God for an intense, life-transforming private experience. His message and instruction were characterized by its ardent perspective on the subjective phase of Christianity. He was concerned to discern between authentic and forged religion. In his own life he demonstrated what the Charismatics later called “the anointing” of God. His ‘Treatise Concerning Religious Affections,’ published in 1746, is renowned as one of the greatest works written on religious psychology. He had a passionate insight into the work of the Spirit in believers’ lives, and how to discern between justifiable and illicit religious experience (Menzies 2007: 262).

Edward Irving was an inhabitant of Scotland who discarded the view that the charismata of the Spirit ceased with the apostolic epoch, and stated that believers ought to anticipate the Spirit to be poured out upon them in their own life times (Menzies 2007: 263). He mistakenly assigned apostles and predicted the impending return of Jesus, the Anointed One (Menzies 2007: 263).
advocates that the sanctification and redemption of depraved humankind should be credited to the Spirit’s particular function. For Irving, the sanctification and redemption are the enormous manifestation of the Spirit’s power and the revelation of the energetic life of the triune Godhead to the humankind (Awad 2007: 38). Charles G. Finney (1792-1873), an attorney in the state of New York, was transformed by the Anointed One in a Presbyterian Church. He left the Presbyterian Church and joined the Congregationalists, another denomination in the Reformed tradition. He and his co-worker at Oberlin, President Asa Mahan, were upholding the idiom “Baptism in the Spirit.” Finney’s reminiscence of his ministerial experience is often depicted in terms of being “overwhelmed by the presence of God”. Finney (1908: 18) notes that conversion to the Anointed One is not to be identified with the reception of the commission to the world. He taught that the outpouring of the Spirit will be bestowed on believers through persistent prayer (Finney 1908: 19). He explained his unexpected experience of the Spirit.

But as I turned and was about to take a chair by the fire, I experienced a forceful baptism of the Spirit. Without any anticipation of it, there was not any such an experience by me, without any remembrance that I had ever perceived the thing referred to by any person in the world, the Spirit came down upon me in a manner that appeared to penetrate me, body and soul….I wept out loud with enjoyment and love; I factually yelled out the unspeakable gushing of my heart (Finney 1908: 20).

This account captures the centre of Finney’s approval of an attractive profound experience of God that is accessible to believers, what he acknowledged to be an anointing of the Spirit, as an empowerment for commission.

Most of the early Pentecostal groups came from the Wesleyan Holiness atmosphere. The impact of Methodism is obvious. John Wesley instructed that the purpose of the Christian life was to reach for a state in which the “root of sin” is eliminated, something analogous to a sinless
perfection. Although what some would disapprove of as deficient theology, Wesley remained a heritage in the Christian churches of a desiring and anticipation of profound experiences of God, which is the characteristic of most revitalization movements, to encourage an expedition of devotion to all believers (Menzies 2007: 267). By 1910 Wesleyan Pentecostalism was the vogue. During the following decade, non-Wesleyan denominations appeared, and by 1920, the non-Wesleyan section of the Pentecostal movement emerged as the major torrent of the worldwide Charismatic movement. The Assemblies of God serves as an example of this development.

North American Fundamentalism was the result of an alliance of the Reformed scholastic theology based at Princeton Theological Seminary and of Scofieldian “dispensationalism,” a hermeneutical coordination that characterized a premillennial eschatology. Princeton became the prominent defender of orthodox Protestant theology in the States during the extended and debatable history of the “Fundamentalist-Modernist” dispute. Warfield (1953: 38) declined to argue the feasibility of modern miracles, selecting rather to handle explicitly with the miracles quoted in Scripture. By retreating into this contractedly-defined boundary, Warfield focussed on

---

332 Wesley (1964: 252-267) described this with the expression “perfect love.” This was attained through following a disciplined experience of the Spirit that his supporters named “entire sanctification.” Pushed by critics for a characterization of what this means in relation to the possibility of committing of iniquities, Wesley gave a limited definition of sin: “an awareness of disobedience of identified law”. The reformers had spoken of sin in total concepts as any disobedience of God’s will, whether or not the person was aware of the infringement. By diminishing the clarity of sin, Wesley was able to convey the subject within the limits of individual liability. Wesley favoured the affirmative term of complete consecration, “perfect love,” but his opponents would not make him disregard the insinuations on the unconstructive part of the equation, how this knowledge influenced one’s capability to sin or not to sin.

333 Menzies (2007: 267) views Wesleyan followers, who formerly taught a two phase soteriology, adapted their instruction to a three-phase concept. First, redeemed by God’s grace; second, sanctified; and third, filled with the Spirit.

334 The apologetic efforts of the Princeton scholars, mainly Warfield and Machen, are still positive materials. Advocates of Modernism had basically abandoned the possibility of scriptural miracles, and therefore had thrown critique on the conventional beliefs of the atonement of the Anointed One, Jesus as the son of God, his physical resurrection, his substantial revisit to earth as the Judge of the Almighty. The Princeton apologists offered prevailing debates defending scriptural Christianity. Modernism took over the device of American mainline Christianity by artifice rather than by dialogue of the relevant questions.
the core of the argument. He agreed with the viewpoint held partly at least by the reformers.\textsuperscript{335}

It is important to recognize the role of Fundamentalism was on the Charismatic movement in the Assemblies of God, a Pentecostal denomination. More than 200 titles by dispensationalist-fundamentalist writers were published by the Gospel Publishing House during the years of the Fundamentalist-Modernist debate Menzies (2007: 268-9).\textsuperscript{336} The outcome is that the Charismatics, such as the Assemblies of God, are still inclined to use the terms of a now basically abandoned structure of eschatology, by using terminology of dispensational theology in ways entirely opposite to the Scofield’s (Boyd 1949: 57).\textsuperscript{337}

2.3. Soteriological traces of justification and sanctification

The Keswick movement recuperated the second-blessing belief of Wesley. A vital message of Keswick was the rejection of the “annihilation of sin principle,” that was vital to Wesleyan seekers of holiness. They believed that sanctification is not a status of being, but the everyday state of a cleaned Christian living. Their soteriology reverberate the Reformed perception. Together with this weakened holiness expectation, Keswick sought the Spirit to be empowered

\begin{enumerate}
\item[335] Warfield (1953: 39) explains this perspective basically classified the \textit{charisma} of the Spirit into ministerial \textit{charismata} (sermon, instruction, administration, etc.) and spiritual \textit{charismata} (1 Cor 12: 8-10). Nowadays these demonstrations of the Spirit are typically labelled \textit{charismatic} gifts. Warfield’s argument against spiritual \textit{charismata} was articulated in his work, “Counterfeit Miracles” published in 1918. His aspiration to shun debates over a diversity of mystical manifestations in the modern context leads Warfield to become the major theological antagonist against the contemporary Charismatic movement.
\item[336] It is noteworthy that the eschatology of the Assemblies of God that originated from the classes presented by C.I. Scofield and Ralph M. Riggs, chief scholars in the shaping years of the Assemblies of God, changed the interval dispensationalism of Schofield to the Church era as the era of the Spirit (Menzies 2007: 269).
\item[337] A sturdy spirit of affinity with Fundamentalism continued sensitive in the Charismatic movement even after the World Christian Fundamentals Association at a meeting in May, 1928 in Chicago. They approved a declaration renouncing any relation with the faith healers and tongues-speakers. The editorial column in the \textit{Pentecostal Evangel}, on August 18, 1928, expressed the offended spirit of the Charismatic, who reacted to the Fundamentalist criticism with an announcement confirming unity with Fundamentalist principles despite of the denunciation that had been articulated. The editors longed for the day when the Charismatic would no longer be repulsed (Boyd 1949: 58-9).
\end{enumerate}
for their commission (Smith 1962: 25).

The significant influence of the Keswick movements which the Charismatic movement experienced was that of the Christian and Missionary Alliance. It began as a comparatively free alliance of churches which accepted the four-fold ideas: Jesus the Anointed One as Saviour, Healer, Sanctifier, and the Coming King. A.B. Simpson’s instruction on sanctification characterized the concepts of the “inhabiting Christ,” which was the identification of the progressive sanctification system of the Keswick convention. Gordon’s notion of sanctification, which appears to follow Simpson, accentuates the progressive character of sanctification. Gordon insisted on a complementary work of the Spirit, distinguished from regeneration and subsequent to it, which he called “Baptism in the Holy Spirit.” Gordon acknowledged it to be a specific endowment with power for ministry (Gordon 1894: 74). The theology of Keswick advanced the Charismatic movements that identified the baptism in the Spirit with speaking in tongues by since the 1890’s. This is reflected in the theology of the Assemblies of God, the Pentecostal denomination normally renowned as the most broadly member of the Charismatic movements.

A considerable part of the modern Charismatic movement originated from non-Wesleyan resources. A standard manuscript of doctrinal instruction adopted extensively throughout the Assemblies of God, presents a soteriology noticeably based on Reformed dogmas, rather than on Wesleyan. This is clear from their declaration concerning justification:

> Justification is the magnificent proclamation that the offender is not guilty. In the eyes of God the iniquities are vanished, detached from us “as far as the east is from the west”, which is an inestimable distance (Ps 103: 12). Micah 7: 18-19 notes it marvellously, “Who is God like you, who pardoneth iniquity and passseth by the transgression of the remnant of his

---

338 According to Smith (1962: 27-9), these views, the refutation of the annihilation of inner iniquity and the stress on premillennialism, faith healing, and the charismata of the Spirit, unlocked an extensive contravene in the holiness movement lines.
heritage? He retaineth not his anger forever because he delighteth in mercy. He will turn again, he will have compassion upon us; he will subdue our iniquities; and thou wilt cast their sins into the depths of the sea” (Menzies & Horton 1993: 105-6).

The text points out three consequences of justification, or “positional righteousness.” The punishment of iniquities has been annihilated, the believer is restored to divine favour, and finally, the believer has received the righteousness of Jesus Christ. This matches a typical Reformed theological text generally used in colleges (Berkhof 1950: 256-264). The doctrine of sanctification is a contentious point between the Charismatics and the Reformed that agree on the purity of the believers. Charismatics between 1910 and 1920 were evidently separated into two sides, mostly identified by dissimilar perspectives on sanctification. The former Wesleyan perspective not any longer prevailed. Those Charismatics who presented a similarity to Reformed soteriology developed progressively more dominant during the subsequent years.

2.4. Synthesis

The evangelical Reformed tradition had an essential influence on the modern Charismatic movement. The Charismatic renewal is more complex than a mere annex of Methodism. Menzies (2007: 280-291) indicated that the present Charismatic movements are obligated to the Reformed tradition. It is a simplification to state that the Charismatic movement is but an addition to the Wesleyan movement. A considerable part of the Charismatic movement, demonstrated by for instance the Assemblies of God, are indebted to the Reformed tradition more than to the Wesleyan beliefs (Menzies 2007: 281-82).

The Charismatic accentuate that the requirement that individuals be “regenerated” 339. In this...

---

339 Positively, not all charismatics have expressed their belief in this way. Many, actually, have instructed a “three phase soteriology,” in which one is first regenerated, then “entirely consecrated,” and, finally, “filled with the Spirit.” This instruction was commonly underlined by Wesleyan advocates who merely supplemented the “third work of grace” to their theology when they uphold the Charismatic ideas, particularly in the early periods of the movements. Therefore, some have unconsciously resonated two types of Christianity. However other 21st contemporary groups such as Chris Oyakilome, Kobus van Rensburg, in the Charismatic movements hold
aspect the Charismatics have common ties with other believers of Christianity, particularly those who categorize themselves as evangelicals. Donald Gee (1949: 83), one of the prominent British leaders in the Charismatic movement, is adamant that Charismatics have actually supplemented nothing to mainline orthodox Christianity, but should be observed as simply reminding the Church of its historic foundations. Even if the phenomena of the Charismatic movements caused their denunciation by practically all areas of the Christian church during its former years, the Charismatics usually tried to uphold their adherence to the beliefs of conventional mainstream theology.

The Charismatics, while strongly related to evangelical standards, have not been confined by conventional theological values about the work of the Spirit. They have claimed that the heart of orthodox belief does not exclude the probability that God empowers the believers in the contemporary era with the charismata depicted in Acts. Charismatics affirm Scripture’s indication that there is an experience, obtainable by all Christians that are distinguishable from the regeneration. The “Baptism in the Spirit,” in which the charismata by the anointing with the Spirit are to be manifested, is recognized to be an empowerment for transforming societies. The anointing with the Spirit is acknowledged by the Charismatics, as an empowerment for mission (Acts 1: 8). The Charismatic movement emerged as an extensive missionary ministry all over the world for the last century. There are correlated principles related with this Charismatic experience of the Spirit. Many Charismatics adopted the phrase “reality” to articulate the intense and profound intimacy they had experienced and encountered through the “manifest” presence of God in the charismata of the Spirit enumerated in I Cor. 12:8-10.

2.5. Conclusion

The Charismatics movements are a reaction against a cold Calvinistic tradition, doctrinal inflexibility, and a depersonalized approach to the Christian life. Authentic liberty is not just the reformed redemption from guilt, hell and its pangs, but the liberty to love with God’s love ‘deification of the believers’ in the first phase, in the doctrine of justification.
bestowed in the mind by the Spirit (Inst. 1960: 3.1.2). The Spirit communes with the experience and life of the believers in the life of the Anointed One by means of the anointing of the Spirit’s presence and power. The Spirit of the Anointed One is the Spirit who will lastly re-establish completely God’s love in the hearts of believers. The notion of sanctification is interwoven with love and the guarantee of a new covenant (Jr 31), a new mind and Spirit (Ezk 36) and which then guide believers to a voluntary will to love rather than to violate. True Love is the verification of sanctification, completed through the Spirit. Scriptural perfection, unlike the idea of Charismatic perspective, is unpolluted love occupying the heart and governing all the words and deeds, and a perfection\textsuperscript{340} that required and enhance in love; accordingly Christians are built up to maturity through the Spirit who inhabits them.

Charismatic soteriology is pneumatological. This is in contrast to soteriologies that disconnect the work of the Anointed One and the Spirit. The Anointed One provides salvation objectively and the Spirit accomplishes salvation subjectively. Consequently the soteriological work of the Spirit is expected subsequent to and subordinated to the work of the Anointed One (Yong 2005a: 82). However, sanctification should not to be placed under the perspective of justification, nor is justification to be immersed into sanctification, rather it should be situated along with of justification. It is significant to remind that ‘whole sanctification’ does not indicate ‘innocent perfection’ but a perfection of absolute love for others and desires in which a person is capable to live beyond determined offense (Mt 5: 38-48). Paul highlights the centre of Christian living as ‘faith working through love’ (Gl 5: 6). The anointing by the Spirit or the outpouring of the Spirit reveals the Creator’s love for His chosen ones and continues to uncover the missions of Triune God, and perfects the sanctified community until the Parousia.

\textsuperscript{340} It is vital to state that the word, ‘perfect’ (τέλειος) is frequently interpreted as ‘fully mature’, or ‘complete’. In this respect, a lot of preachers and scholars repeatedly misread Mt 5: 48, ‘Be ye perfect (τέλειος) as your Father in heaven is perfect (τέλειός), which in the context means ‘without prejudice’ in expressions of salutation, tolerant, and affectionate towards opponents; Luke’s account (Lk 6: 36) also reads, ‘Be merciful (οἰκτίρμονες) as your heavenly father is merciful (οἰκτίρμων)’ with the love of not showing favouritism.
3. Synthetic Soteriological perspectives

In this section, the synthetic Soteriological aspects of justification and sanctification are studied in the Charismatic and the Reformed traditions. The theological arguments as to how the missio Spiritus in the Charismatic and the Reformed tradition have been researched. Frequently a range of writing emphasizes one characteristic to the neglect of other characteristics.

3.1. Justification and sanctification: extent and boundary

The Spirit has crucially and vigorously affected individuals and their communities by justification and sanctification by means of the baptism or the anointing of the Spirit in both the Charismatic and the Reformed tradition (Allen 2010: 80-4). An assessment of the Pauline manuscripts reveals the believers’ justification and sanctification through the work of the Spirit. The God’s irresistible grace calls for his elect in his unconditional love. The progression of sanctification to Christian maturity in ethical clarity and love continues with justification of the saints. Then they carried to consummation at the Parousia.

Paul used metaphors from the traditions of his day. “Justification” is a legal symbol: to be justified is to be pardoned but also a description of the covenant relation ‘to cause to be in the right relation with God’ ‘to be put right with God’. It is not a deification that the Charismatic advocates. They misunderstand the term ‘justification’ as the state of ‘divinely sanctified’, transformed with same divine nature of the Creator, and instruct their followers it as the ‘concept of deification’ of the believer, in which they believe themselves are created as new creation, species that never existed before, much more superior being than to the first man Adam, simultaneously and as ‘physical small gods’ who don’t need to be sick, hungry, and poor. For that reason, the Charismatic movements resolutely establish their theologies in the present contemporary perspectives, not in eschatological perspectives, although the anointing with the Spirit is poured upon the believers under the circumstances of imminent eschatological perspectives.
3.2. Justification, a problematic analysis

The theology of the anointing by the Spirit in the Charismatic movements has been affected by the way in which the doctrines of justification and sanctification have been studied. This section assesses and evaluates what have been argued in the previous chapter about the doctrinal perspectives of the Reformed tradition, the defining of the term “justification”, whether Scripture bears witness to a rather specific concept that refers to God’s declaration that sinners are not guilty in his sight by virtue of the imputed righteousness of Christ (Inst. 1960: 3.11.2-4), and of the Charismatic movements, whether justification in the Scripture includes not merely the forensic element of imputed righteousness, but also the element that the Charismatic recognize it as the divine foundation of infused righteousness.

McGrath (1986: 24) remarks that the Reformers’ definition of justifying righteousness as the alien righteousness of Christ imputed to sinners “marks a complete break with the conventional tradition up to this point”. The Reformed definition observes justifying righteousness as passive or external to the person who obtains it, as opposed to a vigorous inner ethical substance (Burnett 2011: 425-7). To the Reformers, justifying righteousness is imputed, not infused. The veracity of infused righteousness is not deprived of, but is positioned under the subject of sanctification. While the Reformers maintained that justifying righteousness never subsists separately from sanctifying righteousness (Lane 2011: 397-401), they nevertheless established a “theoretical distinction” where one had previously not subsisted (McGrath 1986: 22).

The Reformed tradition generally tried to make a clear distinction between faith and deeds, assigning faith as the sole requirement to immediate justification and deeds as the vital requirements to progressive sanctified spiritual maturity. Yet within the early Lutheran-

See Luther’s commentary (1956) on Galatians as well as Calvin (1960: 3.11.3). Luther (Luther’s Works 1956:27.86) described a more affirmative correlation between faith and deeds, regardless of his clear distinction between gospel and law and wrote regarding Gal 5:19 that a true believer would also refrain from the wishes of the flesh, which is sanctification by means of the faith through which he is vindicated. In the Reformed tradition, even Calvin (1960 3.1-21) could mention the initiation of justification and its constant progression.
Reformed tradition there subsist two excellent instances of labours to formulate a constructive correlation between the imputed righteousness of justification and the real righteousness that pursues the liberated divine grace of pardon. The Lutheran theologian, Paul Althaus similarly observes Luther assembling an optimistic relation between imputed and real righteousness (Althaus 1966: 232-41).\footnote{Althaus (1966: 233-40) is adamant, however, that the actual righteousness that belongs to the believers in spe is not a sufficient foundation for justification while it cannot account for past iniquities. Consequently justification at all times uncovers its source in the imputed passive righteousness of the Anointed One. Those who are already in the Anointed One as well as those exterior to Him must benefit themselves of the imputed passive righteousness of Him. Another concise elaboration is useful, see McGrath (1986: Iustitia Dei 2.10-14), for an examination of Luther’s curative analysis of justification.}

The view that justification is a continuing process locates a somewhat dissimilar analysis in the work of Martin Bucer. His dogma of “twofold justification” portrayed both “iustificatio impii” (justification of the ungodly) and “iustificatio pii” (justification of the virtuous) McGrath (1986: 34).\footnote{McGrath (1986: 34-35) regards Bucer’s advance on his two-fold justification as the impact of Erasmian ethics.} Explicitly Bucer notes a further affirmative correlation between imputed and actual righteousness than either Luther or Calvin, relating the term “justification” to both imputed and imparted righteousness (Inst. 1960: 3.14.1). Bucer contends on the foundation of Paul’s usage of the verb “to justify” in Romans. He refers to a few cases to verify that Paul never employs the term ‘justify’… without emerging to address no less of this imparted righteousness than of the total salvation, the forgiveness of iniquities” (Bucer 1972: 162). According to Bucer, Paul applies the term “justify” in a manner that embraces infused or imparted righteousness as well as imputed righteousness.

John Calvin and the Reformed beliefs would afterward refer to the impartation of infused righteousness as sanctification. The Charismatics are probably indebted to the deification theology of the Roman Catholic tradition by referring to the Spirit’s impartation or anointing with the Spirit in baptism, active righteousness as iustificatio pii, since the phrase iustificatio impii is replaced and transformed by the Anointed One’s imputed righteousness. Bucer argues that the believers is justified in the presence of God (coram Deo) as an offender (iustificatio
and thus exclusively by means of the Anointed One’s imputed righteousness, since one’s actual righteousness is never sufficient to receive forgiveness from God (Bucer 1972: 38). On the other hand, *iustificatio pìi* refers to the fact that the believers’ actual righteousness is affirmed in the presence of other people (*coram hominibus*) that the believers’ iniquities have been pardoned in God’s presence on the foundation of the Anointed One’s imputed righteousness. On the basis of his exegesis of Romans, as well as his understanding of the historical tradition, Bucer and other Reformers tried to attain an interceding view with Rome, with whom the love and good deeds, that for Luther are the fruits of justifying faith, are inclined to be sustained within the very notion of justifying faith (Wright 2006: 20).

### 3.3. Sanctification at the Parousia

The Charismatics and the Reformed generally have a common view of the *missio Spiritus* in sanctification according to its trail in the history of the church. There are numerous debates about the Spirit’s function in sanctification that concern the Pauline core: salvation, ‘in Christ’, justification, reconciliation, adoption, redemption, the new creation, glorification and others. The term, ‘sanctification’ employs metaphors from the Judeo-Christian life to articulate facets of the salvation occurrence and understanding, which is undoubtedly the ministry of the Spirit joined with an accountable reaction from human beings. But the ‘holiness movements’ in which the charismatic movements are involved have different perceptions of the Spirit’s function in

---

344 Bucer (1972: 161-2) remarks that it requires an enormous extent of righteousness from the Spirit of the Anointed One to achieve it in believers when they have faith in God, it will never be sufficient to credit them to be righteous in God’s present, for they stay unworthy servants even when they have accomplished all their assignments.

345 Wright (2006: 21) says that a current researcher whose view is analogous to Bucer’s is Fuller, who utilizes Paul’s phrase “the obedience of faith” (Rm 1: 5) to formulate an indissoluble tie between faith and deeds. Fuller (1991: 84) identifies redeeming faith as persistent faith that “works itself out in love” (Gl 5:6). The Augustinian implications of Fullers expression should not be overlooked even if Fuller’s effort is basically exegetical and does not interrelate with the pre-Reformation belief.

346 God’s grace of sanctification is insolubly united with the divine providence and commitment to the believers in the course of carrying them through sanctification to consummation at the *Parousia*. God offers sanctification to them and he is involved in the life-long progression of implementing holiness in the lives of believers (1 Th 5: 23) by means of the continuing irresistible grace and guidance of the Spirit (1 Th 4: 8). The human reaction is involved in the procedure in which imperatives and exhortations follow God’s grace, which leads to achievement at the Parousia.
sanctification. The views of the Reformed, Wesleyans, and the Holiness and Pentecostal torrents require to be traced (Curtis 2006: 100). The present stage has been characterized by multiplicity, by irritable splits, accusations of heresy, and mocking. Frequently one aspect of Paul’s expression of sanctification is emphasized in manuscripts and reflections (Munyenenyembe 2011: 39-45).

The *missio Spiritus* in sanctification was rephrased by Wesley’s supporter, John Fletcher, who related ‘baptism of the Spirit’ with Wesley’s ‘entire sanctification’ (Fletcher 1836: 526). Fox (2009: 45-6) says John Palmer (1974: 5) comprehended that perfection can be obtained in the ‘altar call theology’, which was recognized in a confessional faith-declaration of the ‘second blessing’. The Keswick movement also related the baptism in the Spirit with ethical commitment (Fox 2009: 48). Charles Jones passed over Wesley’s prominent term of ‘the perfection of love’ as a progression… and accentuated that ‘entire sanctification’ can be achieved in the present (Owens 2008: 33). Habitually, the *missio Spiritus* as the Fire-Baptizer was highlighted in expressions of the cleansing and purifying function of the Spirit. An important Pauline description for the consecrated life is stated in 1 Thess. 4:1-12 with careful commands for sexual and communal morals. Wood (2011: 69-76) says that perfect consecration is achievable in this life with no apparent distinction between that which is urged and the assured and complete flawlessness of sanctification at the *Parousia*.

347 Fox (2009: 47) saw the impact of the Keswick movement, and mainly its belief about sanctification in the development of Pentecostalism, has been argued among Pentecostal and Charismatic scholars (Vinson Synan, Donald Dayton).
348 The Holiness movements group underlined seclusion from the world for personal sanctification, which accentuated strict principles of individual behaviour and self-restraint (Owens 2008: 34).
349 While the Social Gospel supporters aimed at compassion and contribution to the poor, the holiness cohorts lacked endeavours for social and communal justice.
350 Wood (2011: 71-6) writes the holiness movement was shortly held by the Nazarenes, Wesleyans, Church of God and a number of Pentecostal assemblies. These denominations put emphasis on a progressive and total sanctification to be actualized in the present life, which is acknowledged to be the baptism in the Spirit. The Church of God further separates sanctification into refinement, holiness, vocation, and persuasive proofs in life. The supportive passages to connect the Spirit with sanctification are randomly cited from the Pauline letters, without the scope of Pauline beliefs about the *missio Spiritus* in sanctification.
351 Woods (2011: 69-7) assumed that one who looks for progressive sanctification searches inevitably for something less than total sanctification and does not seek sanctification at all (1 Jn 1:8; Rom 3: 23).
Due to the impact of the Azusa-Street movement in 1906, the leaders and followers of numerous churches in the Pentecostal holiness streams were required to believe in the power of the Spirit, with particular awareness of the *charismata* of the Spirit (Kay & Dyer 2011: 19-40). The wide-ranging movement were united and conversant. Wesleyan view of sanctification, while claiming the Pentecostal occurrence, since the majority of Pentecostal followers were bred from the holiness movement (Owens 2008: 31-2), the consecrating action of the Spirit in the ‘second-blessing’ thus is seen to purify and to equip believers by the baptism in the Spirit as a third role of the Spirit (King 1976: 69). Other renewal movements that played an important role in Pentecostal-Holiness movements, emphasizing the second work of the Spirit are the Church of God and the Church of God in Christ. These movements stressed the Spirit’s role in redemption, purification, and equipping the believer with manifestations of the Spirit. A split was kindled by W.H. Durham (1914) in the early Pentecostal churches, when he promoted ‘The Finished Work’, which consigned sanctification to the conversion experience, based on the Anointed One’s accomplished work on the cross to be pursued by the Pentecostal baptism in the Spirit (Owens 2008: 53).

To the Reformed, holiness is the status of the believers through the declaration of God, created

---

352 The term ‘holiness Pentecostal’ classified the holiness group of the late nineteenth century and the Pentecostal renewal of the early twentieth century (Alvarsson 2011: 21).

353 Even though King (1976: 70) employs a subjective figurative hermeneutic, he argues for the doctrine of the Spirit’s total sanctification, which leads to the dynamic baptism in the Spirit according to King’s explanation of a range of narratives in Acts.

354 The dogmatic extension includes a division of the Spirit with no reference to the *missio Spiritus* in sanctification in International Pentecostal-Holiness Church. Nevertheless, there are two extensions relating to both sanctification and total sanctification. Helpful texts on the Spirit are cited exclusively from the *Paraclete* paragraphs in the John’s Gospel.

355 Owens (2008: 51-3) advocates of the ‘finished work’ developed into organizations, the Assemblies of God and the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel with a charismatic figure, Aimee Semple McPherson. Sanctification or the *missio Spiritus* in sanctification was frequently acknowledged in these movements. The 16 essential beliefs were maintained in the Assemblies of God and there is no essential belief that elucidates the character and role of the Spirit, even if it does embrace truths related to God the Father, and Jesus, the Anointed One simultaneously, tongues as a primary verification is included in the 16 beliefs, but sanctification is articulated as disconnection from evil, consecrated life, with identification in the Anointed One.
and provisioned by God through the sacrifice of his Son to whom they are joined by the 
dwelling of the Holy Spirit, which shapes the fundamental basis of their original call and 
consecrated the community. Sanctification is redemption, just as much as justification is 
redemption. It is bestowed by grace through faith that is worked in them by the Spirit (1 Cor 1: 
30). It is not elective or dispensable, but essential and inevitable (Owens 2008: 51-2). Paul 
confirms the interconnection of sanctification in connection to past reality, present experience, 
and future awareness in the missio Spiritus (2 Th 2: 13). For Paul, redemption unites past, 
present, and future. Likewise the Spirit’s sanctifying work through the believers’ obedience to 
God’s words is vital in the three temporal stages. Sanctification is the Spirit’s present role in 
believers that will be accomplished at the Parousia, when the Anointed One will be glorified in 
his saints (2 Th 1: 10). A charismatic theologian, Fee (1994: 79) notes that ‘it is of more than 
passing interest that he should describe their conversionin terms of ‘sanctification’ or 
‘holiness’… Thus, ‘sanctification’ in Paul, as 1 Cor. 1.30 and 6.11 affirms, is not a second work 
of grace’. In Romans 6, Paul states that ‘sanctification’ is united with the experience of believers’ 
redemption and cannot be alienated from this experienced reality.

3.4. Soteriological consensus

The Charismatic’s views on sanctification are to some extent analogous to the Reformed 
tradition. The two-fold function of sanctification is expressed in the Charismatic perspective: 
positional, instantaneous and practical, progressive aspects of sanctification. The Spirit’s part is 
to be complemented by a believer’s part. It notes that ‘the whole work of sanctification is the 
work of the Spirit which receives by far the greatest attention in the New Testament. It takes 
precedence over witnessing, evangelism, giving, and every other form of Christian services’ 
(Horton 1977: 258). At the same time, the Assemblies of God holds the baptism in the Spirit as 
the second major crisis experience. The Foursquare Declaration of Faith 29 does not relate 
sanctification to ‘The New Birth’ (justification), although it does speak about the reception of the 

356 Horton (1977: 257-9) observes Wesley’s commitment to ‘perfect love’ in ‘sanctification’ does not receive full 
treatment; however, Horton’s works do reflect a commitment to the fruit of the Spirit as expressions of the sanctified 
life.

Holiness also has the future in view, in the light of the return of the Anointed One (1 Th 3: 13; 5: 23). Paul positions sanctification against the broad background of the return of the Anointed One, Jesus. ‘And may he so strengthen your hearts in holiness that you may be blameless before our God and Father at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints’ (1 Th 3: 13).

The preposition ‘before’ (ἐμπροσθεν) is used elsewhere in 1 Thessalonians\(^ {357}\) and appears in a ‘reverential way … when one is speaking of an eminent person and especially of God’. Therefore, sanctification (through love) is expressed in view of the certainty of the Parousia of the Anointed One, Jesus, when all persons, attitudes and behaviours will be transparent before him.

Paul prays that the process of holistic sanctification will be completed at the Parousia. Sanctification has in view the entire human person. Paul is also confident that such complete sanctification is assured, ‘He will do it’ (5.24). God will ultimately do what only he can do, perfect a believer in sanctification. The affirmation of complete sanctification at the Parousia is not intended to lay a heavy burden upon his readers as if the entire weight is placed upon human performance. The wish-prayer provides the assurance of God’s primary agency in sanctifying the believer, his keeping the believer in power, who is empowered by the Spirit. The future goal is spoken of in the language of confident expectation of a divine activity; the Trinitarian-fellowship is committed to this eschatological goal.

As an aid in the divine process, Christians are exhorted to cooperate with the process, which God has set in motion by virtue of his holy call, his holy nature, the on-going charisma of the Spirit, the privileged new position of being ‘saints’ and the eschatological goal of blamelessness at the

\(^{357}\) 1 Th 1: 3; 2: 19; 3: 9.
Parousia. Thus, the Reformed and the Charismatics are expected to follow Jesus by fulfilling these truths. In the present age, there is a real and powerful struggle in that the believer lives in both ages: the present age and the age to come.\textsuperscript{358} Paul indicates that in the present age, believers struggle with the appropriate behaviour to be consistent with their call. He raises the rhetorical question of the possibility of committing sin all the more so as to experience more grace and then responds in Rom. 6.2 with ‘by no means! How can we who died to sin go on living in it?’ Rom 6.12 says: ‘therefore do not let sin exercise dominion in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions.’ Other passages, which contain biographical material, reveal Paul’s awareness of his own divided self (Rm 7; Phl 1: 6; 2: 14-16; 3: 12-15). Paul is ever aware that he has not attained complete sanctification: Not that I have already obtained this or have already reached the goal; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own (Phl 3: 12).

\textbf{3.5. Conclusion}

The Charismatic and the Reformed tradition have argued for the comprehensive function of the Spirit in the realms of soteriological perspectives, in relation to the anointing with the Spirit and argued for a consistency and inconsistency between both activities linked to justification and sanctification.

Charismatics probably feel more at home with the values of the conservative evangelical community than elsewhere. However, experience has shown that the Charismatics are not merely Charismatics who speak in tongues. There have been more heated debates between the Reformed and the Charismatics than between them and any other group. What a Charismatic hermeneutic looks like, and how it will function, remains part of both the descriptive and prescriptive functions of Charismatic theology. But the movement has a distinctive approach to Scripture.

If the Spirit is the presence of the Anointed One today, the ministries performed by the Anointed

\textsuperscript{358} The texts of Romans 6 and 1 Thessalonians 4 speak the language of struggle of the sanctifying process and thereby, reflect the tension of the ‘already but not yet’.
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One must be continuing until the *parousia*. The all-surpassing power of God through the Spirit to actualize the redemptive work of the Anointed One in the midst of our broken earthly existence ought to be consummated (Bezuidenhout 1984: 97). It is the purpose of the Creator to fulfill his word and to reveal the unambiguous contents of Scripture in the lives of mankind and to establish His kingdom in his creation so that God may be all in all (1 Cr 15: 28).

Hermeneutics is essential to comprehend the Charismatic movements, particularly on the doctrine of justification. The Reformed and the Charismatic have consensus to glorify the Creator, in identifying themselves as redeemed persons without their own merits. Both the Reformed and the Charismatics observe it with the lens of their own merit from the Anointed one. However, each emphasizes the doctrine of Justification from their views. The soteriological sphere, in which humans identify themselves, is the basis of both approaches. While the former restrict them to the imputed righteousness, the latter locates themselves on higher positions by the same work of the Anointed One, even up to having the same nature of God.

Nonetheless, the Charismatics fail to see that there is an extent of limitation to the Anointed One’s earthly work, even in relation to the crucifixion. It does not mean that the glorious redemption of Christ is insufficient for mankind and the universe, but his accomplished work never raises the creation up to the perfect nature of God in them. It is not the limited boundary of redemption; it is a time-bound limitation to be completed at His coming kingdom on the earth. Sound reformed doctrine requires eschatological sanctification with justification. An emphasis on the requisite of sanctification by faith does in no way moderate the requisite of justification by faith (Owens 2008: 51). The Scripture holds both for the body of the Anointed One. Sanctification cannot be achieved by the anointing of the Spirit in the perspective of the Charismatic movement, since it is not a means, but a purpose of God to make the believers holy according to the image of the Anointed One. God inhabits them through the Spirit.

We hold the treasure of the gospel in fractured pots (2 Cr 4:7). But if we nonetheless affirm that the Spirit has not stop speaking to the body of the Anointed One by means of his unique
manifestation, anointing by the Spirit, we recognize the implications of his on-going work in God’s redemptive history for our hermeneutical and theological labours. The Spirit was uniquely present in the person of the Anointed One and the Spirit-inspired apostolic eyewitness belongs to the Anointed One at the centre of redemptive history.

D. Eschatological assessment

The outpouring of the Spirit has been bestowed on the believers in the eschatological epoch. This section will assess the anointing with the Spirit is to be poured to prepare them to be the bride of the Anointed One, in whom it should be testified and applied to the extent of the establishment of God’s kingdom.

1. Anointing and imminent judgement

The Charismatic eschatology directs people to an affirmative dedication in the emancipation of the creation (Cartledge 2010: 182). To all Christians, eschatology must not merely be about the end times and the last stage of a theological system. The Charismatics proclaimed the restoration of the charismatic gifts as a mark on the imminent coming of the Anointed One. However, both the rise of fundamental dispensationalism in Reformed tradition and emphasis on a realised eschatology, neglecting the coming eschatology in the Charismatic movements (Baumert 2004: 179) have weakened the substance of this eschatology (Althaus 2003: 87). It should be a vibrant anticipation that affects the entire Christian life (Macchia 2008: 320), as the eschatological nature of the Spirit dwells within the believers (Flynn 2005: 318). An eschatological declaration is presented in the one who receives the Spirit and is forced and filled by the Spirit in the New Testament (Barth 2004: 464). The eschatological Spirit is moving towards the other, crossing restrictions in redemptive affection, transcending exclusion and rejection (Ling 2007: 85).

According to Grenz (2005: 258), Pannenberg wants to refurbish eschatology to its equitable location. He places eschatology as the autonomous centre of systematic theology, rather than simply a division of ecclesiology. He connects both pneumatology and eschatology as
inseparable and supportive of one another through ecclesiology. The outpouring of the eschatological Spirit demonstrates an epoch of new substance (Ling 2007: 1-28) and of catastrophe and devastation.

Anointing with the Spirit precedes the eschatological judgment of the nations (Acts 2: 17-21; Jl 2: 10, 28-32; Hg 2: 7). The eschatological dimension of the presence and movement of the Spirit crucially influence the personality of the other: it is not on the foundation of one’s past or present that we should categorize and recognize him or her, but on the basis of one’s future (Collins 2009: 108). The Spirit is poured out (Acts 2: 17-18; Jl. 2: 28-29). These passages can be divided into three parts and each begins with a converted perfect. The first section (Acts 17-18) speaks of the outpouring of the Spirit. In the second section (Acts 19-20) Peter affirmed that Joel proclaims the signs on the day of the Lord. The final section (Acts 2: 21) contains the concept of calling. Peter structured his sermon that the pouring out of God’s Spirit would inspire them to call upon him (Acts 2: 14-21). This gracious outpouring of the Spirit would be upon “all flesh”. Acknowledging Peter’s inspired object for this phrase is indispensable for an appropriate perception of the covenantal fulfilment. Kaiser (1989: 114-5) thought that ‘all flesh’ refers to all people without exclusion, including the Gentiles. Of importance to his view is the fact that this structure is utilized throughout the OT to mention to or embrace Gentiles. Kaiser (1989: 119) upholds that it never refers to Israel only.\footnote{Joel 2: 29 say that the Spirit will be poured upon slave men and slave women.}

The signs of Joel 2: 30-31 provide eschatological and apocalyptic perspectives. God promises marvels that will emerge before the announcement of the dawning of the great and dreadful day of the Lord’s coming. As the wicked were punished by the plague of locusts, so the ultimate day of the Lord will be a day of judgment days. But God’s objective with pouring out his Spirit is that the people would be prepared as his faithful servants to preserve the judgment of that day for the neighbouring wicked nations (Jl 2: 32; Ch 3). All the innate intricacies in the interpretation of apocalyptic metaphors are in attendance here. Treier (1997: 23) advocates two chief possibilities as the background of these symbols. The first is the actions of God in the exodus event, together
with the plagues in Egypt. The second is the metaphors of war. Neither is out of pace with Joel’s theological perspectives, who is highlighting the day of the Lord as deliverance for God’s people but judgment for the wicked (Smith 2010: 91). In any case, however one understands the signs, obviously Joel anticipated apocalyptic events to declare the coming day of the Lord and to call for a faithful reaction. Redemption is announced (2: 32) to those who will call on the name of the Lord. This term indicates “exclusive dedication” only to God, as the guarantee of redemption. To illustrate the redemption, Joel addresses Mount Zion and Jerusalem, which imply “solidity and protection”. Even though this verse cannot be detached from the spiritual transformation, its crucial focus is on entire redemption. Joel provides the guarantee of an upcoming deliverance to call for a present repenting reaction.

While Joel confirms that God will pour out his Spirit in the last days, he also indicates that God will give signs that the “Day of Judgment” is at hand. For those who reply with loyalty to Yahweh, there is no terror of wrath but rather the blessed expectancy of life in the Spirit. The Spirit will reveal God’s presence through a burst of revelatory action among all the Israelites without any societal dissimilarity.

Three prophetic books, analogous to Joel 2, exhibit this prototype. The quivering of the heavens emerges in Joel 2:10; 3:16; Haggai 2. The latter phrase with its noticeably eschatological indication refers to signs in the heavens and on earth (Smith 2010: 78). The nations amass

---

360 The prophecy depicts the eschatological splendour that the sanctuary will receive (Hg 2: 6-9). Yahweh is the divine warrior, the imminent judge, and ultimate conqueror. Yahweh will devastate the opposition of the nations (Hag 2: 20-23) and assert to the treasures of the world. Due to his eschatological conquest he will receive his riches from the nations (2: 8; cf. Jl 3: 5; Zch 14: 1, 14) and dedicate it to the adornment of his dwelling place. Enormous wealth will thus be present at the coming epoch. It will stream out from the sanctuary and encompass the whole earth.

361 According to Smith (2010: 89), it is commonly granted, that Haggai is embedded in Zion theology. Von Rad upholds that Zion theology embraced two essential eschatological patterns: first, a war phase in which the nations instigated a combined battle in opposition to Zion, which terminated in the return of Yahweh with quake and dimness, an enormous fight and the ultimate protection of Zion; and a second pattern relating to the pilgrimage of the nations to Zion in adoration and worship. In the latest debate Haggai 2 has been positioned within both...
themselves to battle against Yahweh when He intervenes on behalf of his own people. Allen (1976: 101) remarks that this setting operates the horrifying conventional pattern of the defacement of sun and moon, which would cause the wicked to faint from terror and anxiety of what is to occur to the world.

On the basis of the reflections above, Peter and Joel’s proposed indication are not to the recently crushed revolutions in the east, nor to the sequence of world monarchies that rose and fell in the Near and beyond since 490 B.C. Joel’s intention was to address his own era. It must be acknowledged that the quivering of these chronological empires is a foreshadowing of the approach of the ultimate quivering. However this development initiated at Babel, was confirmed at Sodom and Gomorrah, and prolongs over all ages. The demise of consecutive world kingdoms may also be seen as signs of the ultimate eschatological triumph. The enhancement of the sanctuary by Darius, and then Herod, and the presence of the Anointed One may be recognized in a comparable manner. But Joel’s principal indications in the light of these reflections must be to the final consummation of the epoch, not to the intervening phases.

The Spirit’s redemptive history is mostly observed as eschatological. This is frequently recognized as the perfecting of the missio Spiritus (Gabriel 2007: 205-207). The anointing with the Spirit is seen as a reality with an eschatological aspect. He is poured out on God’s people to prepare and equip them to meet the upcoming dreadful judgment day of the Lord which will be a universal judgment. The mission of the Church initiated by the anointing with the Spirit originated in revelation and is a reactive not an impulsive act. A dogma or confessional formula is a communal and binding indication of the gospel set before the believers in the scriptural witness (Webster 2005: 73-75).

2. Anointing and eschatological sanctification

Sanctification is a clear statement of fact, which embraces the past, present and future experience perspectives. The most noteworthy cosmic signs were the involvement of Yahweh in opposition to his adversaries. These proceedings bring horror and confusion upon Yahweh’s enemies, whose militaries turn and attack one another.
of Christian believers. It should constantly be carried in the anointing with Spirit. At the same
time, the call to holiness is a command and exhortation, which is to be a goal, designed to
motivate Christian attitudes, conduct and word. For Paul, sanctification is an expression of God’s
will for each Christian and each Christian community (1 Th 4: 3). To affirm sanctification means
that God is on the believer’s side (also the dedicated community); the call to sanctification means
the empowerment of Christians to live in a victorious manner by breaking with sin by means of
the power of the Spirit. It also means genuine freedom and wholeness of life, with the confidence
of the Parusia’s consummation.

The key word for the sanctified life is ‘consistency’. There is to be a consistency between the
divine provision and the process, which leads to the final consummation at the Parousia (Story
2009: 91-3). The people of God are to live consistent and with integrity; their lives are to
correspond with the nature of their individual and corporate call. There is no ‘otherness’ without
love. In living a life ‘set-apart’, the people of God are to be ever mindful of the lost and broken
people around them. There can be no ‘holy club’, which does not have a compassionate
perspective upon society’s broken people. When holiness is divorced from a personal bond of
love (divine and human), it is separated from the original call and inner dynamic of the Spirit of
grace.

Throughout the Scripture, there is a clash between the moralistic idea of the ‘holy’ and the
prophetic concept of the ‘holy’. The prophetic understanding of holiness points to the issue of the
heart and its inner motivations and its own inner being. The prophetic outlook helps people to
realize the human impossibility of achieving perfection by moral conduct; Christian people are
unable to wipe out their human guilt by their own performance. Instead, holiness is given as a
gift from God, not from people. He graciously grants the new condition to those who confess
their inadequacy and failure. On-going dependence upon God is the only criterion for genuine
holiness.\footnote{Jesus, the Anointed One and his apostle Paul both oppose the mentality of the taboo and the moralism of
casuistic law; they both resist the narrow moralism that concentrates upon the external and visible religious taboos
of ‘holiness’; they both affirm the need for genuine repentance of genuine sin, and thus, they stress the need for
on-going dependence upon God.} God unites us with Christ’s holiness (1 Cr 1: 30) through the on-going work of the
Spirit in us to transform us into the likeness of Christ (2 Cr 3: 18).

At the time of the *Parousia* of the Anointed One, sanctification will be complete when the human will, the human battleground, will be fully dedicated to the divine will; there will be no further need to ‘work at’ the consistency factor.\(^3\) Von Rad (1965: 213) says, ‘If God’s will ceases to confront and judge men from outside themselves, if God puts his will directly into their hearts, then, properly speaking, the rendering of obedience is completely done away with, for the problem of obedience only arises when man’s will is confronted by an alien will’. At the time of the *parousia*, the fundamental problem of consistency will be fully resolved, for there will be genuine integrity between what one is and what one does and says. Finally, the Reformed and the Charismatics are to be sure of the divine promise that God is faithful to perfect his work of sanctification, ‘He will do it’ (1 Th 5: 24).

Sanctification and justification are inseparable, so does faith and deeds. The will of God is to sanctify us. For the sanctification and justification of the believers God anointed us with the Spirit. The anointing with the Spirit is for the sanctification of the individual and the community as well. The out-pouring of the Spirit is meant for service to God and the other. Scripture reveals that sanctification of the individual and of the community of saints is to be carried through their commitments by the author and finisher of faith, the Anointed One.

Eschatological imminence should be the foundational theology for both traditions. But, there are difficulties in reaching consensus between the Reformed and the Charismatic movements, since, the movements on the Charismatic side are varied, with their many forms and theologies and doctrines throughout the history of the church.

---

\(^3\) Jeremiah had prophesied the new covenant in which God will put his will directly into the human heart, through the activities of speaking, hearing and obeying (Jr 31: 31-34). This is fulfilled with the coming of the ascension of Christ.
E. Ecclesiological assessment

The ecclesiological assessment of this section will describe tasks and commitments of those who are gifted with the *charismata* of the Spirit as well as will suggest some ministerial applications for the contemporary churches.

1. Missional anointing

In the research of the anointing of Ancient Near Eastern Literature, the Scripture’s own texts of the anointing of installation of priests was legitimized with commission, it was not from ANEL influence but from Scriptural lineage from Aaron (see chapter 2: 20-5). Remarkably specified by the OT, the anointing with the Spirit did not perpetually reside in the community of Israelis. The *charismata* of the Spirit are functions of the body of the Anointed One, inspired and empowered by the Spirit (Rm 12: 4-8; 1 Cor 12: 4, 7, 11). The church as the heart of the communal outworking of the gospel is fundamentally charismatic in nature, basically dependent on the Spirit’s inspiring and enabling the words and powers by which the body of Christ builds up.

The anointing of the Spirit was poured out upon noticeable distinguishing individuals, such as kings, prophets and priests. It was also a mark and sign of offices consecrated by the anointing with oil to carry out the definitive assignment of God to fulfil his sovereignty over the earth, not as a security of their professional position. The pneumatic *charisma* as a prophetic empowering for the commissionable vocation is specified in the reading of Acts 2: 38-39. When the believers entirely identify the task of God, the assignment of Israel and the mission of the Anointed One, then the commission of Church will be fully acknowledged. Eventually the Church as the body of the Anointed One can be a vigorous instrument to fulfil his purpose and will in the world.

In ecclesiological perspective, the anointing with the Spirit can be recognized as the ministry of the Spirit poured out upon the believers with charismatic demonstrations, to redeem God’s people and to make them acquainted with the Anointed One. It has a close association with the
presence of God and with the establishment and consummation of God’s Kingdom across the earth.

2. Ethical community: purity and love

Purity is the way to walk in the anointing of the Spirit. The purpose of anointing with the Spirit is to transport God’s people to holiness, blamelessness, and sanctification as a bride in eschatological perspective (Ravenhill 2007: 109-10). Appropriate ecclesiology focuses as much on the capability of such a pneumatological perception as it does on Christology and the election of God (Badcock 2009: 110). The anointing with the Spirit has a solid objective to create purified and sanctified peoples. Paul generally employs the language of an on-going process, including both imperatives and exhortations to sanctification. The language speaks about the human response involving choices of freed-will moral agents. By virtue of their call and position as ‘saints’, Scripture summons the people of God to conduct themselves in ethical purity. A collaborative representation of spiritual maturity can provide to combine doing justice, loving-kindness, and walking humbly with God (Shults, & Sandage 2006: 199). While ‘holiness’ is a matter of the new status of the people of God, it is also taken for granted that a purposeful ‘holiness’ will produce ethical results, changes in attitude, words and behaviour; humans are accountable for their choices. By their response to the gift of sanctification humans are exhorted to respond in a way that is consistent with their call. They are to be fully engaged in the process. In numerous texts an inner link is forged between God’s provision and the process.

---

Sanctification is far more than personal growth in Christian behaviour. For example, in 1 Cor. 1: 2, Paul uses the substantial ‘saints’ (ἅγιοι) and the perfect passive participle ‘having been sanctified’ (ἡγιασμένοι) in reference to the Corinthian believers. These are the same believers who have been filled with the Spirit, but are sadly characterized by schism, party-spirit, law-suits, charismatic confusion, sexual immorality, and other personal and social disorders. The terms ἅγιοι (‘saints’) and ἡγιασμένοι (‘having been sanctified’) can have no reference to spiritual growth among the Corinthian Christians since the moral decay of their personal and communal life is almost non-existent. Only by God’s call are they regarded as ‘saints’ and ‘sanctified’, i.e. ‘set apart unto God’. Similarly, in 1 Cor. 1: 30, the Corinthians are said to be ‘in Christ Jesus’, who became ‘the wisdom from God, righteousness, sanctification and redemption’ (Shults & Sandage 2006: 199-201).

2 Th 2: 13; Rm 12: 1; 15:1 6; 1Cor 1: 2; Cl 1: 22; 3: 12; Eph 1: 4; 5: 27.
Appropriate ethical responses are regarded as sacrifices that parallel the cultic service of the OT (Rm 12:1). Ethical personal conduct honours the divine agency of sanctification (Adewuya 2001a: 79). The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are directly involved as the primary agents of sanctification (Story 2009: 81). Holiness implies an on-going relationship with God, which is lived out as Christians are ‘led by the Spirit’ (Rm 8: 14) in their ethical behaviours, and thereby promote the health of the community. The very power of ‘holiness’, which raised Jesus from the dead (Rm 1: 4) is called the Spirit of holiness, who declared with power the resurrected Son of God, and is now the very power, which transforms attitudes and behaviour.

Without appreciation for the divine love, there is no motive for sanctification. Sanctification appears as Christian love is directed to both inside and outside the community. Although the term ‘holiness’, ‘sanctification’ appear frequently in Paul’s letters, referring to God’s call or provision, affirming what God’s people are; ‘saints, sanctified, a holy temple, a holy people’, the same terms are frequently used to refer to sanctification as a process. The implication is clear; in treating sanctification or holiness as a process, you are not directed to a few but to a veritable host of exhortations to the anointed community as well as to the world.

---

366 Ethical sanctification is to be differentiated from the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Paul’s concern is not for the Spirit’s power for gifted service but for holy living.

367 Romans 8: 18-25 looks to the consummation of believers, when God’s unfathomable love will finally and fully be expressed, when the ‘not-yet’ of the eschatological proviso of ‘already but not-yet’ will be removed. They have experienced the unfathomable love of Christ and have been empowered by the Spirit; these truths supply the incentive or empowerment for sanctification. In a similar manner, Paul prays that the Philippians ‘love may abound still more and more’ that they may be sincere and blameless (Phl 1: 9-11).

368 Scriptural examples describe that walking in love, present your bodies as a living sacrifice, glorify God in your bodies, fruit of the Spirit, forgive one another as God in Christ has forgiven you, have no anxiety in anything, let the mind of Christ be in you, bear one another’s burdens, and the list goes on. Usually, the imperatives or exhortations are grounded in some expression of God’s transforming grace, his provision of redeeming love, his grace in setting apart (sanctifying) a people who are called and constituted as a holy nation or people, and are to proclaim the mighty grace of God who has called a people out of darkness into his marvellous light (also in 1 Pt 2: 9).
3. Communal sanctification

The society mainly operates under the law of ethical norms and systems and is influenced and tarnished by sin, trespasses and injustice. Only social ethics based on eschatological awareness can really identify both the need for and weakness and wickedness of the social structure, since it observes those schemes involved in the struggle between the demonic and divine realms for dominion of God’s creation, of man and human rapport (Regan 2007: 195-7).

Genuine holiness is not to be found in a mystical type of holiness, which is solely concerned with a cloistered withdrawal of the human spirit into an inner relationship with the Spirit. The Spirit is the sanctifying faculty of the communities (Nikolaev 2007: 125). According to Devries (2007: 207), Barth says, in speaking of “faith”, he is mentioning that particular element - mighty power to save the sinners -that “makes a believer a believer” in both being and action. Just as God is a God whose being is in action, believers are shaped by the mighty work of the Spirit. True holiness is found within the sphere of Christ’s body and is to be channelled through that body. Garcia (2008: 356) indicates how union with the Anointed One functions in the reformers’ thinking. The Reformers recognize that the apostle Paul tries to unite the believers’ good deeds to the everlasting life in union with Christ. (Garcia 2008: 251). Sanctification is lived out in the context of the dual love-commandments: love for God and love of the neighbour, which naturally cohere as one commandment. Through a faith-union experience with Christ, one is incorporated into the Body of Christ; this is the sphere of the Spirit wherein holiness as love is expressed (Denney 1892: 129-30).

Adewuya (2001a: 98) argues that for Paul, sanctification is far more than Western individualistic holiness but is communal holiness. ‘Such communal holiness is to be conceived of in terms of a dynamic on-going relationship with God, a covenant relationship to be sure, lived out by grace, in faith and practice throughout every sphere of life … although the relationship with God is primary, the relationship with others is indispensable’. The imperatives, which reflect a call to

---

369 Adewuya (2001a: 97-9) elaborates on the parallel between 2 Cor 6: 14-7:1 and the holiness code in the LXX of
holiness, are a call to realize what is inherent in the call.\textsuperscript{370} It is not that the call ‘to be holy’ is already potentially realized, because one has been graciously positioned in a holy state because of God’s very call (Story 2009: 85).\textsuperscript{371}

In Paul’s thinking, ‘holiness/sanctification’ is both a provision and a process. As a condition, holiness belongs to the believer because God has already set one apart for himself. Holiness is the declarative work of the Trinitarian-fellowship. To be sure, ethical behaviour must follow, but the new behaviour is grounded in the primary call of God. While sanctification may include the primary experience of initiation into the Christian life, it also signifies ‘the end’ (τέλος) towards which the justified strive, to eternal life (Rm 6: 22-23). In many texts, Paul expresses a concern for moral purity, which he contrasts with lawlessness (vss. 19-23) and sexual immorality (1 Th 4: 1-8).

Sanctification is to be demonstrated in the context of the world and not through a life of ‘perfection’ found in a cloistered environment. The world in its sinfulness is still God’s world and as such, is the object of God’s love. The community of faith finds its strength in the worship and instruction of the sanctuary and discovers its mission in the world. Consequently, sanctification involves the personal relationship with the Anointed One, Jesus, who himself lived on earth in active engagement in the world. The evidence of God’s grace and love is a changed

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{370} When Paul discusses the nature of the Church in Ephesians, he affirms the vital relationship between holiness and love. The exhortations are placed within the broad background that highlights the nature of the Church as a holy community without blemish, due to the sanctifying and cleansing work of the Trinitarian-fellowship. The entire paragraph (Eph 5: 21-33) is a remarkable paradigm of the provision of divine sanctifying grace that will surely energize the human response in terms of the imperatives or exhortations, such as mutual submission. (Eph 1: 15).

\textsuperscript{371} Story (2009: 86-9) notes that sanctification occurs through the on-going provision of the Spirit (1 Th 4: 8). Thus, the initial call, the on-going process and the ultimate goal are surrounded by the atmosphere of holiness, since saints are all grounded in the divine act that sets them apart for dedication to his service in loyalty through the Spirit that empowers them to realize their holiness.
\end{footnotesize}
life that brings forth good works, specifically the fruit of the Spirit to a world that always remains the object of God’s incredible love. The mission of the Anointed One’s churches is in proclamation of forgiveness and reconciliation in an unjust world (Hinze 2004: 247).
Chapter V Conclusion

This study explored the role of the Spirit, particularly the anointing with the Spirit, his role in hermeneutics and theology, and how understanding of the *missio Spiritus* may produce more productive consequences in the continuing dialogue between the Reformed and the Charismatic traditions.

The Spirit interprets Scripture, but at the same time confined Himself by it. Specifically the results of grammatical-historical exegesis, as opposed to exegesis controlled by the authority of the teaching office, constitute the check that controls our interpretation of Scripture. The kingdom has already been substantiated but has not yet been consummated, as the continuing *missio Spiritus* is not yet fully or infallibly revealed to us. Such a stance both affirms the constant *missio Spiritus* in Scriptural hermeneutics, and advocates caution in our attempts to discern what the Spirit would instruct us in specific situations, since the progress of God’s redemptive history during the present interval between the Anointed One’s two advents is hidden from mankind. The followings are some critiques on the Charismatic movements.

A. Critique

1. Miscalculation of confined revelation in hermeneutics

The *missio Spiritus* continues in hermeneutics and the explanation of the revealed revelation in the Scripture. He leads us to the revealed truth and gives us an on-going revelation but only within the confined area of the revealed revelation. Hermeneutics is used for the science of Scripture interpretation. It is a crucial building device in all theology. The Charismatics tend to base much of their teaching on very inaccurate principles of hermeneutics, in which the text is used to be interpreted out of context and the synthetic understanding of the Scripture. Gordon D. Fee (1994: 185-9), a prominent Charismatic theologian has written:

Pentecostal and Charismatic, first, their attitude toward Scripture regularly has included a
general disregard for scientific exegesis and careful thought-out hermeneutics. In place of scientific hermeneutics there developed a kind of pragmatic hermeneutics—obey what should be taken literally; spiritualize, allegorize, or emotionalize the rest …. Second, it is probably fair and important to note that in general the Charismatic’ experience has preceded their hermeneutics. In a sense, the Charismatic tends to exegete his experience.

The task of hermeneutics is to discover the connotation of the text in its accurate setting: to draw denotation from Scripture rather than reading one’s presuppositions into it. Over-emphasized spiritualizing and allegorizing endanger the readers unless the text itself calls for it. Luther, Zwingli and Calvin respected Scripture. The motto *sola scriptura* was evidently the call of the Reformed (Buttrick 1994: 23).

Some principles for sound hermeneutics were advocated by Reformed traditions. The literal principle, it does not mean a slavish, rigid literalism, but Scripture in it its normal sense (Sailhamer 2009: 113), including figures of speech like parables hyperbole, simile, metaphor and symbolism. The literal meaning of a Scriptural ‘word’ was the historical meaning of the ‘thing’ designated by the word. In Reformed hermeneutics, the *senus literalis* of Scripture does not reflect in the ‘thing’ itself, but in the linguistic meaning (Jewish connotation) of the Scriptural ‘word’ (Sailhamer 2009: 12-4). Theologians have spoken of the *usus loquendi*, meaning that the words of Scripture are to be interpreted the same way words are acknowledged in normal daily use. Next is the historical principle is that a text has a cultural, geographical, and political setting in which the passage was written. Finally, the grammatical principle gives a clue to comprehend the syntactical structure of a passage which is the solution to its denotation. Fourth, the synthesis principle puts Scripture together with Scripture to disembark at a lucid and unswerving connotation (MacArther 1993: 113). The Reformers used the expression *scriptura scripturam interpretatur*. Finally, as the practical principle, the text should be applied to the reader for the purpose intended by the authors of Scripture.

372 The terms of Scripture were either proposed in their accurate meaning, in which occasion they designated to the things, or they could be adopted in a typological denotation, in which incident they designated to upcoming spiritual truth.
One of the Charismatics’ misinterpretations of the Scripture text is related to the ‘anointing’ in 1 John 2: 27:

“The anointing which you received from Him abides in you, and you have no need that anyone should teach you; but as His anointing teaches you about all things, and is true and is not a lie, and just as it has taught you, abide in Him.”

John was referring to heretics and antichrists who lead people astray. It is reassuring us that we can know the difference between heresy and the truth regarding the gospel of the Anointed One by remaining in him as He taught them (cf. 1 Jn 2: 22). Many charismatics and even sincere people misuse it to justify their lack of study and learning, and then continue to misinterpret Scripture. That would be inconsistent with Ephesians 4: 11-12, which says “God gave pastors and teachers, for the equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ.” It is precisely that kind of error for which the charismatic movement has become a breeding ground.

The Charismatic’s miscalculation in their hermeneutics confuses them to interpret the texts of the Scripture and emphasize it only in their theology of the revealed and finished work of the Anointed One, while disregarding the progressive consummation of the Anointed One’s work. The Charismatic theology of deification of the believer ought to be applied only to the coming Kingdom and the indwelling of God in the believer.

2. **Experience as the indispensable factor?**

Bloesch (2000: 179-187) sounds a critical warning to the Charismatic movements to be wary of spiritual sensualism, the search for higher experience of the divine. When signs and wonders become the principal focus of ministry, faith begins to erode (Sandford 2007: 63-5). It is obvious that the Charismatics have accentuated experience over theology (Yong 2004: 209). Although
faith involves feeling, our mandate is not to cultivate feelings but to grow in faith. Faith itself is an experience but one that is not accessible to psychological observation. It is an experience that not always bypasses the senses. The authority of Scripture is the foundation of Reformed theology. Beck (2007: 235) argues that Bavinck highlights that faith does not rely on evidences. To Bavinck the ultimate objective of revelation lies in the eschatological awareness of God (Beck 2007: 247). According to the Reformed tradition the Spirit is the *principium internum* of theology, but faith is not called a *principium internum* (Beck 2007: 238). Faith must not be reduced to experience, but faith will entail experience, not only of God in his awesome holiness, but also of God in his inexpressible joy and abounding love. Yet often faith directs us in experience, not always in it, which is the medium for relating to God’s revelation; it will finally take us out of ourselves into the service of God in the darkness of the world. Therefore experience should be verified and proved by the unchangeable legitimacy of the Scripture, not the Scripture be subjugated by the experiences. The evidence of our new birth by the Spirit of God lies in the depth of our devotion to God our Father, not in visible experience itself (Bloesch 2000:17).

Against the symbolists, Bloesch (2000: 31-45) contends that God really does communicate to us through outward signs. Yet while the outward sign has an important role in confirming and deepening the believer’s faith, it must never be confounded by the *charisma* of the Spirit. The sign is not extraneous to the reality it represents, but it is always distinct from this reality. In the Reformed view the elements of Holy Communion do not change into the body and blood of Christ, yet they become vehicles of the Spirit to strengthen the believers in their faith in the Anointed One and their dedication to God and their neighbour (Bloesch 2000: 33).

Luther explicates: “Faith directs itself towards the things that are invisible. Indeed, only when that which is believed in is hidden can it provide an opportunity for faith.”

Calvin (1960: 1. 9. 1) agrees: “it is His will that we should shut our eyes to what we are and have, in order that

---

373 Cited by Barth (1968: 39), cf. Luther: “The richness by which we are justified and saved is not visible: it must be believed …even though I sense sin, death, and contrary feelings.” Luther’s Works, ed.(1956: 27)
nothing may impede or even check our faith in Him”. To the Pentecostal *glossolalia* is a palpable proof of God’s intervening in the human being (Story 2009: 71). Story (2009: 72) asks whether Luther is closer to the biblical witness when he describes faith as “impalpable” and “insensible”\(^ {374} \) The Charismatics often point to Acts 4:29-30 to show that signs and wonders belong to the ministry of the church. Yet what we have in these verses is a petition not for the performing of signs but for the preaching of the word with the recognition that signs and wonders would follow. Forsyth believes that speaking in tongues may be a consequence of the baptism of the Spirit, but it is not an unequivocal sign. The pagan can also be moved in this way (1 Cor 12: 2). The Charismatic worship is sometimes more *seelisch* than *geistlich*. Beck presciently warned that “the deepening of spiritual life” should not be confused with “the quickening of spiritual sensibility” (Beck 2007: 236).

What gives the Charismatic revival some promise is that it has fostered a spirit of self-criticism among many of its leaders.\(^ {375} \) At present, there is a growing reluctance to view tongues as the primary evidence of having received the Spirit. Du Plessis (1974: 103) considers much speaking in tongues as chaff: “It looks bad when adults act like children. Some must come to maturity”. In his opinion, “love, not tongues, is truly a sign that one is full of the Holy Spirit” (Du Plessis 1974: 106).\(^ {376} \) Spittler (1976: 115) says R. Hollins Gause, dean of the Church of God Graduate School of Christian Ministries, makes this remarkable confession: “We sometimes exalt the secondary benefits of Spirit-baptism to a primary level…Charismatic manifestations are made the tool of the individual and are subjected to his will”. Christenson (1972: 106) warns without the Anointed One-empowered offices of authority, without Spirit-bestowed missions to guide the life, the fire of the Spirit can also effortlessly convert into desolate fire, and scorch itself in a short demonstration in spiritual pyrotechnics (Christenson 1972: 106).

---

\(^ {374} \) Cf. Luther: “Since these divine blessings are invisible, incomprehensible, and deeply hidden, nature cannot attain or love them unless it is lifted up through the grace of God.” Luther’s Works, 29: 216.

\(^ {375} \) Harper (1968: 39) in the charismatic renewal movement admits that “it is tragically possible to receive a baptism in the Spirit and they remain basically self-centred - a person out for kicks and the sensuous enjoyment of meetings, rather than the costly following of our Lord in self-denying zeal.

\(^ {376} \) Basham (1973: 105) writes that “it is primarily the fruit of the Spirit which produces character, and character – not miracles – is the major issue in determining whether a man is a true or false prophet.
The wider charismatic revival movement makes this trenchant observation, Fromke (1965: 85) says:

There are many who exercise spiritual gifts, even as the Corinthians did, who are exceedingly carnal. We have allowed our people to assume that gifts are an evidence of being spiritual, when really they are given to babes that they might become spiritual. Proof of this misunderstanding is evident in Charismatic movements where freshly fads and fashions hold sway instead of a godly simplicity of life. Nonetheless all the while our folk manifest so little true hunger or appetite for the revealed truth from God’s Word.³⁷⁷

Another critic from within the Charismatic Movements, Gillespie (1966: 123) shares this candid admission:

“Growing up as a Pentecostal I learned to think that the more miracles, dreams, healings, and visions I had, the more it showed I was spiritual. I felt good whenever I could manifest the supernatural…”

For some, the absence of the “supernatural” is evidence that truth and faith in God’s presence are absent. The Scriptures declare that we are put right with God by faith in Jesus Christ. For some, as it was for me, this truth has been either muted of replaced by a “faith” in the miraculous (Gillespie 1996: 124).³⁷⁸ According to McArthur, a persistent reformed theologian, there are only two basic approaches to biblical truth. One is the historical, objective approach which is Reformation theology and the other is the personal, subjective approach, which emphasizes the human experience of God, a methodology of historical Charismatic movements (MacArthur

---

³⁷⁷ 1Cor. 3 reads that the Triune God’s economy without jealousy and strife one another in contrast to the carnal Corinthians, anointed with charismata (cf. Bloesch 2000: 208).
³⁷⁸ Gillespie (1996: 125) shares his personal struggle that led him out of the United Pentecostal Church to form an independent evangelical congregation. He still regards himself as a Pentecostal, since he strongly affirms the important role of the gifts of the Spirit in the Church’s ministry, but his message is now focused on justification by faith alone.
Experience is the basis upon which numerous charismatic belief structures are founded. One experience that is the hallmark for being charismatic is their excessive stress on the baptism of the Spirit as a post-conversion experience (Williams 2007: 283). Experience is also authoritative to the Charismatic they most frequently refer to experience to authenticate their instruction (Packer 2005: 162). The Charismatics crave the experiences described in Acts. They have assembled a doctrinal system that views the extraordinary events of the early apostolic age as necessary hallmarks of the Spirit’s working-tokens of spiritual power that are to be routinely expected by all Christians for all time.

Non-charismatics, including the Reformed, are often accused of opposing emotion and experience. However, in an authentic spiritual experience, emotion, feelings and the senses often become intense, transcending the normal. These may include strong feelings of remorse over sin, a mighty sense of trust that surpasses the pain of a traumatic situation, an over-powering peace in the midst of trouble, the overwhelming sense of joy related to confidence and hope in God, intense sorrow over the lost, the exhilarating praise in understanding the glory of God, or a heightened zeal for ministry. Spiritual experience by definition is an internal awareness that involves strong emotion in response to the truth of God’s word, amplified by the Spirit and applied by him to us personally (MacArthur 1992: 26). The Charismatics err because they tend to build their teaching on experience, rather than understanding that authentic experience happens in response to truth. Irrational mysticism is also the heart of the charismatic experience. It has subverted biblical authority within the movement and replaced it with a new standard: personal experience (MacArthur 1992: 34).

---

379 Williams (2007: 282-3) observes Charismatics generally believe that after someone becomes a Christian, he or she must seek diligently for the baptism of the Spirit. Those who receive this baptism also experience various phenomena, such as speaking in tongues, feelings of euphoria, visions, and emotional outbursts of various kinds. Those who have not experienced the baptism and its accompanying phenomena are not considered Spirit-filled or otherwise incomplete Christians.

380 MacArthur (1992: 35) believes that mysticism is a system of belief that attempts to perceive spiritual reality apart from objective, verifiable facts. It seeks truth through feelings, intuition and other internal senses. Objective data is usually discounted, so mysticism derives its authority from within and an internal awareness supersedes external reality. Mysticism is at the heart of modern existentialism, humanism, and especially of many forms of paganism.
The Charismatic historian Synan (2001: 78) records, by the 1890s, that most Holiness people were equating the baptism in the Spirit with the reception of the signification experience. Both the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements of today are based on experience, emotion phenomena, and feelings. Christenson (1968: 40), a well-known Lutheran charismatic wrote about the significance of experiences of the Spirit:

“There is a sound biblical theology for the baptism with the Holy Spirit. But the baptism with the Holy Spirit is not a theology to be discussed and analysed, it is an experience that the one enters into”.

Even Peter built his theology on experience that it reads:

We have the prophetic word made more sure, to which you do well to pay attention as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star arises in your hearts. But know this first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one’s own interpretation, for no prophecy was ever made by an act of human will, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God (2 Pt 1: 19-21).

Nevertheless, Peter’s point was precisely the issue that so many Charismatics fail to understand: all experience must be tested by the more sure word of Scripture. The major flaw in the charismatic movement is that it calls on experience rather than on Scripture. No one should seek experience in preference to Scripture. All experience must be qualified and validated by the Scriptures. When Charismatics make experience the major criterion for truth, they reveal “avowed anti-intellectualism”. The whole of God’s revelation is geared to perception, thought, knowledge, and understanding. Experience will grow out of what we believe and it must constantly examine and evaluate our experience in the objective truth of God’s Word (Mt 22: 37; 1 Pt 1: 13).
Illuminism or spiritualism is another nuisance of the Charismatic movement. In this deviation the internal glow or private revelations are more authoritative than sacred Scripture (Mahaney 2010: 400). The Church of the Living Word confesses that there are truths yet to be revealed by the Holy Spirit that will enable us to continue our walk with God and witness the full restoration of his church for our time (Martin 1980: 260-96). Such a position does not contravene biblical revelation, but it prepares the way for “truths” that go beyond the parameters of Scripture. The Brazilian Congregation of Christ sometimes portrays the Spirit as a higher criterion than Scripture. In Reformed theology the Spirit is not a second criterion alongside the word enlightened by the Spirit. Some Charismatic groups err in the opposite direction by highlighting the empowering ministry of the Spirit but not his illuminating ministry so that divine revelation is portrayed as unswervingly accessible to human reason and imagination (Hocken 2009: 92).

The Reformers affirmed Sola Scriptura, the truth that the Scripture alone is the authoritative revelation and thus denied the Apocrypha a place among the inspired writings. The Reformed doctrines have always affirmed that God’s special, saving revelation to mankind is restricted to the teaching of the Scripture. It advocates that if the Scripture is complete, then it represents a closed system of truth. Scripture is a closed system of truth, complete, sufficient, and not to be added to (Dt 4: 2; 12: 32, Jd 3; Rv 22: 19-19). It contains all spiritual truth God intended to reveal (MacArthur 1993: 59).

According to Mahaney (2010: 499-401) the ‘Now defunct Daystar’ community in Minneapolis allowed for the possibility of new inspired writings and new prophets. The Full Salvation Union, a Pentecostal Quaker group, regards the writers of the Bible but not the book as inspired. It asserts that God’s direct guidance of an individual takes precedence over the Bible. When faced with biblical truths contrary to their position, some of these people reply: “The Holy Spirit has not revealed this to me in this way.” MacArthur (1993: 59) says if it involves a secure and complete standard of reality, then the instruction of Scripture may be determined and dogmatically affirmed. If God is still permitting novel revelations, then the truth of God is still being gradually exposed, and if this was the incident, our obligation would be to authentically attend to contemporary prophets as they loosen God’s truth in fresh and stronger demonstrations than we discovery in Scripture.
Charismatics struggle to explain how the supposed revelation they receive through tongues, prophecies, and visions fits with Scripture. Hodges, a charismatic theologian, has admitted to a dangerous issue about new revelations. He writes:

> Prophecy was never intended to usurp the place of ministries of government or of a gift of wisdom. Paul teaches that the body is not made up of one member but of many and if prophecy usurps the role of the work of wisdom or the word of knowledge, the whole body is dominated by one ministry, which is prophecy. In other words, the whole body becomes ruled by the prophetic member. The idea that the voice of prophecy is infallible has confused many people (Hodges 1964: 20).

Since the book of Revelation was accomplished, no new transcribed or uttered prophecy has ever been accepted by Christians as divine truth from God (MacArthur 1992: 72). Some charismatics would say that people misunderstand what they mean by prophetic utterance and new revelation; however it might often violate the attitude, sphere and the drawn limited standard of the Scripture.

The only test of a true prophet is the truthfulness of his prophecies: “How shall we know the word which the Lord has not spoken?” When a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord who has not spoken?” When a prophet speaks in the name of the Lord, but it does not come about or come true, that is a thing which the Lord has not spoken. The prophet has spoken presumptuously (Dt 18: 21-22).

The contemporary charismatic perspective that makes every prophet an instrument of divine revelation cheapens both Scripture and prophecy, by permitting them. The Charismatics have opened the floodgates to false teaching, confusion, error, fanaticism and chaos (McArthur 1990: 82). Some apologists\(^\text{384}\) for modern charismatic prophecy have attempted to devise a theory in

\(^{384}\) Some imagine that the distinction between Old Testament and New Testament prophecy negates the principle of
which God somehow enables contemporary prophets to deliver a message that is a true word from him, but not as authoritative. Hamon (1991: 63) writes:

Of course, prophetic ministry has not been given to the church in order to supersede the Bible. Anyone “additions” to Scripture given as prophetic messages and accepted as infallibly inspired would be counterfeits. Instead, prophetic ministry brings illumination and specifics about what have already been written, personalizing it for believers.

The Reformers fought against errors with the principle of Sola Scriptura. The Charismatics have abandoned that crucial precept. Now the true church in the twenty first century must fight for the supremacy and sufficiency of God’s Word (MacArthur 1992: 99).

4. The pursuit of phenomena

Miracles in Scripture are termed ‘signs and wonders’. They implicate supernatural extraordinary forces explicitly related with God’s servants and are not simply abnormal actions, concurrences, sensational occasions, or typical irregularities (Belmonte 2012: 6-14). The Charismatics believe that the Spirit’s methodology has never changed in related to miracles. Hocken (2009: 57-61) wrote “the first church was a creation of the Spirit, and He has not changed; but in every generation. He wants to repeat what He did in the first Christian Church through the first leaders and members”. According to Van der Lann (2010: 218) Du Pless is argues that the miracles and events described in the book of Acts should be normative throughout the church’s history. His view reflects the thinking of most charismatics. Some actually believe

Deuteronomy 3: 1-5; 18: 20-22. They claim that prophets in the church age are not to be judged according to the truthfulness of their prophecies, for the New Testament prophecy is different in character from Old Testament prophecy. The warning in Revelation 22 is to the described truth, not mentioning the prophetic charisma of the Spirit to add already on written revelation (Rev 22:18-19). Grudem (1988: 80) argues for two levels of New Testament prophecy. One is apostolic prophecy and the inerrant written Word of God. The other is the gift of prophecy, which is meant to edify, encourage and comfort. Yet he believes these messages may not always be one hundred per cent accurate (Grudem 1988: 80).

385 Ex 7: 3; Dt 6: 22; 34: 11; Nh 9: 10; Ps 135: 9; Jr 32: 21; Dn 6: 27; Jn 4: 48; Acts 2: 43; Rm 15: 19; 2 Cr 12: 12; Hb 2: 4)
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that the phenomena of the contemporary age prove that God is conferring new revelation, authenticated by fresh miracles, through the action of the current days’ apostles (Zahl 2010: 78-80). Many Charismatic believers are adamant that God desires to perform miracles for every believer and assume that certain men can legitimately allege to the apostolic office today.

However, the Scripture does not exhort believers to seek any miraculous manifestations of the Spirit. The Reformed tradition believe that at least three characteristics of the miracles in Scripture help us to see why God has worked; miracles performed the new eras to reveal God Himself; miracles authenticated the messengers of revelation, and miracles called attention to confirm the delivered messages.

The Charismatics remind the mainline churches that worship is something deeper and richer than sermonic proclamation, but too often the much sought after spontaneity in worship services results in attempts to manipulate the emotions of those present (Burns 2008: 102). A disregard for worship practices has been prescribed, since frequently absence of Scriptural truth and foundation. Incongruously in many occasions the fresh setup solidifies into a configuration at least as unbending as any of its precursors.\(^\text{386}\) Criticism should be on the deviation of ritualism in which the free movement of the spirit is hindered by an almost idolatrous belief in the efficiency of ritual performance. Although the critical role of the sacraments in Christian devotion is acknowledged, however, thoughtful reservations are reserved concerning sacramentalism in which the sacramental rite is believed to have automatic efficacy.

Praise choruses take the place of the great hymns of the church, and the sermon in the sense of Scriptural exhibition is replaced by inspiring testimonies and prophecies. Du Plessis (1970: 106) confesses, “I have seen too many shouting Christians go to sleep when the word is preached. They live on ‘milk’ and choke on the ‘meat’ of the word”. He warns against “charismania” who is expecting charismatic activity to take the place of the natural exercise of human faculties or

\[^{386}\text{Bloesch (2000: 199) says worship sometimes degenerates into performance, and it is human dexterity and technology that are celebrated rather than the glory of God. While recognizing the pivotal for ritual in faith and even worship of healing in charismatic movements.}\]
the ordinary ministries of the body of the Anointed One’s office (Du Plessis 1970: 107).

The term ‘Third Wave’ was coined by Wagner (1985: 15). He says that the first wave was the Pentecostal movement, the second the Charismatic movement, and the Third Wave is joining them. Like the Pentecostals, the Charismatics, and the Third Wave adherents aggressively pursue ecstatic experience, mystical phenomena, miraculous powers and supernatural wonders, while tending to underemphasize the traditional means of spiritual growth: prayer, Scripture study, and instruction of the word, persistence in submission, and in fellowship with other believers. The Charismatic movement promotes a spiritual devastation precisely because it discourages people from discerning the truth by using Scripture and sound reason. Instead, truth is appraised subjectively, usually through signs, wonders, or other mystical means (Burns 2008: 103).

The descent of the Spirit is unpredictable and uncontrollable by the human mind (Sontag 1987: 200). Those who experience the given charismas by the Holy Spirit and their accompanying exaltation, are often blinded to the fact that ultimately they may not care much for the God who is the source of these gifts. Most human beings prefer a God who is rationally confinable, one whose actions are fixed. Faced with such a secure divinity, frail beings can be comfortable in the security that such a necessity provides to an uncertain humanity. Blinded by the ecstasy of divine descent, we may fail to see that the God who enters human life in this mode does not have to give us any guarantees (Liardon 2005: 124-5). It is not that divinity is not capable of holding to its word. God’s power guarantees that to us. But to feel ourselves possessed by an ecstatic spirit does not tell us in itself whether the uplift is divine or demonic, creative or destructive. They are at risk in following such a God, whereas the theologically deterministic views of fore-ordination offer greater security. The Charismatics are often fooled when they experience an emotional upsurge, and therefore they need further tests, other than ecstatic possession, to be sure of the

387 According to MacArther (1992: 178), Wagner explains the impression that miracles are more efficient than the gospel message to incite a reaction of faith within the human mind, as Christianity was being offered to unbelievers in both word and deed, it was the action that far surpassed the word in evangelistic efficacy. The Third Wave is promoting a dissimilar approach, raising the supernatural experience without the establishment of a proclamation to repentance.
divinity’s presence. Conteh-Morgan (2004: 147) explains the weakness: in pursuit of phenomena, the advocates of the Charismatic movements have an ‘identity weakness’, which is the major cause for a psychological substitute, or an intimate personal relationship with their leader: intra psychic detachment and identity predicament.

5. Justification by sanctification?

Every vital and dynamic religious movement is continually endangered by extremes and imbalances on the part of its advocates. The Charismatic movement is indisputably not exempt from these hazards (Hedlund 2010: 38-41). One danger that besets this movement is legalism, the vain expedient that one can make oneself worthy or morally acceptable to God (Knight 2010: 91-101). Bruner (1970: 95) observes: “In the majority Charismatic view, as the converted sinner increases in sanctification he progressively qualifies for the special baptism”. For Bruner (1970: 111), ‘Faith itself is often understood as a spiritual work of a superhuman effort rather than the despair of all effort’. It is not a “mere trusting” but an “absolute surrender.” The steps to salvation are removing all known sin, and then the purification of the heart by faith and finally the Pentecostal baptism of the Spirit. Some Charismatics instruct that one must first make sure that we are “right with God” before we apply for the anointing of God. In a manner reminiscent of semi-Pelagianism, the Charismatics sometimes suggest that justification is produced “by the cooperation of divine and human activities” (Damboriena 1969:90). On the credit side one can perhaps say that Charismatics have rediscovered another dimension of faith as obedience. Yet I would insist that the obedience of faith is not what justifies us but is a consequence of the inward awakening produced by the Spirit. Nonetheless we need to remember that Christians are not to remain passive, but must actively seek the fulfilment of the promise of God in their lives.

6. Anointing with the Spirit vs baptism of the Spirit

Anointing with the Spirit is meant to be a special outpouring of the Spirit. It demonstrates various manifestations of the Spirit in the unexplainable power and form beyond human reason
to accomplish God’s mission. However it is to be differentiated from the baptism of the Spirit which took place when the believers profess their faith in God and the Anointed One.

Reformed Christianity contends with Charismatic movements that our task is not to find God through experiences of the heart at all times, yet confess that God has already been found through faith in Jesus the Anointed One worked in us by the Spirit of God. A weakness of the Charismatic movement is that it rigorously concentrated on spiritual *charisma*, indicating that these are supernatural exclusive to Christianity (Bradshaw 2010: 212). Something is amiss in the theology of the Swedish Charismatic leader Hollenweger (1971: 43) who declared:

“We have in our assemblies many more people, perhaps even members, who only have the forgiveness of sins but are not born again and have not received the Spirit.”

However the Reformed believes in the forgiveness of sins, which follows on the new birth through the indwelling of God the Holy Spirit. New experiences of the Spirit will surely follow his work of conversion, but the Reformed maintain the biblical fact that the converted person has already received the Spirit through the faith He worked in us.

7. **Transcendent indolence**

Spiritual indolence is expressed in the form of anti-intellectualism. It cannot have a balance between the word of God and the anointing with Spirit. Anti-intellectualism characterizes not only Charismatic movements, but the wider movement of conservative evangelicalism (Wells 1993: 72). While the spiritual gifts through the anointing with the Spirit of church leaders are not identical, one should ask the advice of particularly prudent and sensible teachers of the church (Mayes 2011: 63). A disdain for theology is manifest in many charismatic assemblies, including the electronic church. Some Charismatics complain that their pastors neglect theological study and sermon preparation. Although Charismatic movements have given birth to many flourishing Bible colleges, it has produced little lasting theological and biblical scholarship, though this may
be changing. Many Charismatics appeal to 1 John 2:27; “You have no need that any one should teach you,” since the anointing teaches one about everything. Yet the New Testament makes clear that the church needs teachers as well as evangelists and prophets. Teaching and study are gifts of the Spirit to love God with all your minds (Mt 22: 37) just as much as tongues and miracles. If theology is “the sanctification of the mind” then one does not have entire sanctification unless one has engaged in theological reflection. Both Catholicism and Reformation have honoured the doctors of the church, and without such teachers the church would be severed from its spiritual and theological moorings.

8. Anti-afflictions theology

The most frequent criticism of the Charismatic movement by the religious establishment is that it substitutes a theology of glory for a theology of the cross. Sometimes Charismatics appear to be overly familiar with God, thus creating the impression that they live no longer by faith but by direct sight with an instant understanding of God’s will. Du Plessis (1974: 93) admonished his fellow Charismatics that we are in a dangerous heresy when we speak of “shaking, trembling, falling, dancing, clapping, shouting, and such actions as manifestations of the Holy Spirit. These are purely human reactions to the power of the Holy Spirit and frequently hinder more than help to bring forth genuine manifestations”. Many in the charismatic movement seek the rapture of Pentecost without first submitting to the cross of Calvary. Holiness becomes a “cherished delight” rather than a cross to be borne (Synan 1975: 10). On the other side of the ledger, one must not downplay or deny a place in the church to the experience of Pentecost, which can enliven and embolden one in the practice of one’s faith. One should note that Paul sought to redirect, not to suppress, the zeal of the Corinthians. He did not denigrate tongues but endeavoured to regulate and allocate it its proper place.

388 Among Scholars of noteworthy repute who are related with Pentecostalism are Gordon Fee of Regent College, J. Rodman Williams of Regent University, Larry D. Hart of Oral Roberts University, and Walter J. Hollenweger, formerly of the University of Birmingham, England.
389 These texts describe an attitude to be cautious with the circumstances of Gnostic heresy in the early church. It does not imply that one should not be taught by the leader of the church.
9. Sectarianism

The Charismatic movements have revitalized Christian spirituality in a model of triumphant Christian identity, a vigorous belief, highlighting godly authority to conquer difficulty in one’s life (Kärkkäinen 2004: 150). However, the Charismatics have been positioned with hardly any alternatives: either to discharge oneself of other persons implicated for the need of faith, to refuse experiences that seems to break one’s faith, or to abandon one’s faith (Kärkkäinen 2004: 151). Sectarianism is another pitfall in the Charismatic Movements (Knight 2010: 80-2), though this temptation is found in all branches of Christendom, including Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy. Religious, cultural and social isolation were components of the Charismatic experiences from its initiation (Burns 2008: 103-4). The Charismatics almost constantly considered themselves dissimilar from the world (Hunt 2006: 209), and that sense of disconnection formed their worldview (Billingsley 2008:147). The work of the Spirit is to affect the Anointed One’s redemptive work to God’s people. Beck (2007: 27) says Christian reflection have understood the Spirit’s focal task as bringing about the eschatological imperative of God, which attains beyond individuals or even the church and extends to all creation. However, many charismatics have a tendency to be separated from the mainline churches and societies while they are endeavouring to be freed from disunity with them (Kay 2009: 291-2). They taught that while all believers constitute the church, only the Spirit-baptized are the Bride of Christ. At the marriage supper of the Lamb the role of the other believers is to serve the Bride (Nichol 1987: 80). The Church of God of Prophecy has claimed to be “the one, true ‘Church of God’” (Synan 1971: 163). William M. Branham, who was associated with Oneness Pentecostalism, insisted that believers baptized with the trinitarian formula be re-baptized in the name of Jesus the Anointed One. Every denomination must struggle to curb and suppress its schismatic side and try to be a church rather than a sect (Bloesch 2000: 203).

Knight (2010: 81) says in this regard the Charismatics are inclined to be more open to ecumenical initiatives than many conservative Presbyterians and Lutherans. At the same time, a sectarian propensity has often been manifest in the Charismatic movement in its history.
The doctrine of the Trinity is not always confessed or rightly understood among the Charismatics. Too often Christ is separated from the Spirit, and the baptism of the Spirit into the body of the Anointed One is portrayed as qualitatively different from the baptism of Christ with the Spirit. In its weakness the Charismatic movement tends to be the opposite to those of the dogmatic belief (Kay 2009: 227), against which it is frequently in response, in that it is occasionally in danger not of linking the Spirit and the Son inadequately, but of separating them from one another, a tendency to depersonalize the Spirit (Gunton 2003a: 107). Occasionally the Charismatics speak of two faiths, a “faith toward the Anointed One for salvation” and “a faith toward the Spirit for power and sanctification” (Bloesch 2000: 203). However, the Reformed consistently advocate the same nature of the triune God (Allen 2010: 54). Referring to the Holy Spirit, the reformed believe He is God Himself the eternal Spirit which proceeding from the Father and the Son, and of one substance with them both (Guretzki 2009: 136). Küng (1978: 83) claims that the Spirit is neither “some magical, mysteriously supernatural aura of a dynamistic kind” nor “a magical being of an animistic kind.” He is “God himself in his especially personal and self-giving aspect: as a power which gives itself to man, as a power which creates life, but who cannot be controlled by man, (Evans 1996: 54).” The Charismatics too readily gravitate toward either an almost polytheistic tritheism in which the Father, Son and Spirit have independent personalities or unitarian monotheism that celebrates the unity of God but does not allow for different modes of being within God himself. This problem does not pertain to Charismatics only, for the doctrine of the Trinity is being debated anew within Christendom.

391 Some say that the Holy Spirit is only with the person who has given his or her heart to Christ. The Spirit allegedly does not yet abide in that person. The Spirit is frequently likened to electricity or a magnetic force (Bloesch 2000: 203-4).
11. Secularism

Religious, cultural and social isolation were components of the Charismatic experiences from its initiation (Burns 2008: 103-4). The Charismatics almost constantly considered themselves dissimilar from the world (Hunt 2006: 209), and that sense of disconnection formed their worldview (Billingsley 2008:147). The work of the Spirit is to affect the Anointed One’s redemptive work to God’s people. Beck (2007:27) says Christian reflection have understood the Spirit’s focal task as bringing about the eschatological imperative of God, which attains beyond individuals or even the church and extends to all creation. However, many charismatics have tendency to be separated from the mainline churches and societies while they are endeavouring to be freed from disunity with them (Kay 2009: 291-2).\(^{393}\) Lambert (2003: 233-295) criticizes that followers have been duped into accepting as true and advantageous the oppressive predomination forced upon them through systematic instruction by manipulating charismatic leaders (Knight 2010: 82-6). Multitudes of truthful and credulous believers are unconsciously wounded by ‘Charismatic captivation,’ trapped in the undetectable snare of controlling mistreatment (Moore 2003: 185), squalid profitable misuse (Liardon 2005: 96) and mental dependence on abusive leaders for their private interest and expansion of their private kingdoms. Many thoughtful Charismatics are embarrassed when people of affluence and power boast of how their faith helped them to gain their enviable status in society.

As reported in the second chapter the anointing with the Spirit is bestowed to serve the people of the Anointed One and make them ready to prepare for the coming dreadful and terrible day of the Yahweh of eschatological judgment in which all the nations will be judged. It is already manifested in present days, yet is advancing towards the eschatological future events. The Charismatic movement is too soon by celebrating power as a Christian virtue, and it misses the New Testament emphasis on the weakness of the cross. It was even a spook of a will to power that grows out of faith, but this is always power for service, not for dominion over others.

\(^{393}\) A foremost group of the charismatic movement has encompassed the social beliefs of wellbeing, prosperity and success and perceives faith as a means for obtaining the possessions of this world (Bloesch 2000: 203).
12. Anointing and its danger

Through the impact of the cultures in which the church is situated an essential part of the communication is the anointing of the sick, particularly the connection between the therapeutic skills to the remedial methods of Christianity, and the increasing syncretism of Christian rituals with the rites of other religious traditions in the daily experience of numerous societies (Larson-Miller 2005: 10). All of these concerns are significant only because of the tension that is retained in the continuing rituals of anointing the sick with oil as an aspect of the therapeutic ministry of the church. That tension is assigned to the extent of historical Christian belief about the usage and considerations of anointing with oil alongside doctrinal, spiritual and pastoral perspectives of Christians in the twenty-first century (Larson-Miller 2005: 11). The tension tradition and future anticipation communicated in the present that provide visual signs in the contexts of the word about continuing belief in the healing occurrence and action of the Anointed One.

However, one of the Spiritual abuses, the misuse of spiritual authority and charisma to maltreat believers in the Christian Church is a hazardous and intricate matter (Orlowski 2010: 34; Mt 7: 22-3). Brown (2003: 76) urges the ones who experienced anointing with the Spirit, but fail to use it properly, to revert to their original anointing. The anointing with oil is today widely used among Charismatic Movements to represent the Spirit who endows people with graces, authority, and power, and through that ‘sacrament’ sets them apart for God’s service or ministry. The extensive use of anointing with oil has generated much controversy and debate in the Ghanaian media because of the abuses that have characterized its uses among some Charismatic Pentecostal churches and leaders. The popularity of the anointing services generates a huge market in the sale of olive oil and white handkerchiefs that are used in the victorious dancing times that conclude the anointing services.\(^{394}\)

\(^{394}\) According to Orlowski (2010: 32-5) in one church, prayer cards that are consecrated and sold by the prophet are widely used. This prayer card, when applied to afflicted parts of the body, is supposed to bring healing. These substances, ‘spiritual sand’, ‘spiritual soap’ when consecrated by the prophet, can then be combined with holy water to form a paste that is to be applied to diseased parts of the body to effect healing. It is not just the extensive use of
The groups who pay excessive attention to the anointing with oil as being efficient in itself are in danger of disregarding private intimacy with the Spirit and the requirement to be nourished with God’s word. Rites have an inclination to be recurring so as to attain selected purposes (Morrill 2007: 1-2).\footnote{Morrill (2007: 2) remarks that the repetitiveness of religious rites gives vast eminence to formula, and gradually to the idea develops that the formula become effectual in themselves, and gives a manipulative nature to rites.} The therapeutic outcomes of rituals in African religions are not in uncertainty. But the hazard of such rituals is that they lead ‘obsessive-compulsive behaviour’ that confines the followers to be ensnared by the prototype of rituals (Maxwell 1998: 350). The customs of dispensing substances that are inescapable ‘extensions of faith’ are comparatively prevalent among African Indigenous Churches.\footnote{Anointing rituals have affected Africa because it shapes into the traditional view of religion as a cause of power and that religious group members should be effectual in delivering such energy for resolving life’s incapacitating troubles. However, anointing will itself be converted into a weakening factor if it is not practiced with uprightness and theological reliability (Larson-Miller 2005: 11-5).}

All manifestations of the Spirit, \textit{charismata}, through the anointing with the Spirit must be supportive and submitted to Scripture. \textit{Sola Scriptura} has been reflected in the Reformed thought since the reformation era. Acts confirms that the mentioned gifts are subjected to the Scripture and cooperative to it.

From a Reformed perspective theological criticism indicated three requirements are indicated for Christian liturgies and about anointing with oil for therapeutic purposes and the empowerment for the mission: Scriptural proclamation as foundational, communal substance as essential, and faith as fundamental to the rituals (Morrill 2007: 1-5).

Although the Charismatics have many critiques, some positive contributions by them will be traced in the next section.
B. Contributions

1. Revitalized manifestations

The charismata of the Spirit testify to the expansion of God’s economy of abundant generosity into the whole world (Bowlin 2011: 341). Many Charismatic services do manifest the overwhelming presence of God in a sense of rediscovering the experience in a positive way of Christian life (Munyenenyembe 2011: 120). Too often the mainline Protestant worship service is too enclosed in ritualized forms that hinder expressions of faith and unpredicted manifestations of the Spirit. There are many Charismatic worship services in which reverence and joy are held together. Some mainline denominations are often associated with the proverb that things should be done courteously and in order, but this can be an excuse blocking the free movement of the Spirit in worship meetings. The word of God is not only to be heard but also to be seen (cf. Acts 2: 22; 4: 20; Rm 15: 19), but real seeing is with the eyes of faith.

Reformed tradition should not treat the Charismatic movement as an adversary but as a challenge to retrieve the fullness of the gospel. While there need be guarding against certain imbalances in this movement, the charismatic awakening should be appreciated for the following. The Spirit declares in and through Scripture to generate the body of the Anointed One. Consequently, the proclamation of the gospel is motivated by the Spirit, who participates in the divine community through the declaration of the word (Grenz 2003: 265). The Spirit speaks through the word and the body of the Anointed One unites in worship to God who speaks through Scripture the Spirit speaks to the world through the body of the Anointed One.

The Charismatic movements demonstrate the benefits of the Spirit beyond conversion. The

---

397 Charismatic Pentecostalism may contain more fire than light, but the communities of God’s mainline churches need fire as well as light, the Holy Spirit as well as the Word of God. In this discussion the mainline churches must confess that the Spirit of God is speaking to them through this movement, and for this we can only be grateful (Bowlin 2011: 339).
believers in mainline churches too frequently depend upon baptism or affirmation to assure them of the blessings of the Spirit, without realizing that the manifestations of the Spirit through the anointing by the same Spirit should be a lasting reality in the life of the Christian (Dyrness & Kärkkäinen 2008: 259).

The Charismatic movements have rediscovered the crucial function of the charismatic gifts for personal edification, communal worship and the ministry of evangelism (McGrath 2011: 345-6). The spiritual *charismata* are supposed to operate as tools for ministry rather than rational evidences of having the Spirit.\(^{398}\) The Charismatic movements awakened the alertness of the revitalizing or empowering work of the Spirit.\(^{399}\) But the Spirit not only regenerates and illumines but also energizes and thereby equips the Christian for a missionary profession (Keating 2002: 79).\(^{400}\) Nonetheless miraculous signs must never become an end in themselves and must never be regarded as evidence of godliness or authentic faith (cf. Dt 13: 1-5).\(^{401}\) The Charismatic movements emphasise that the marks of the church consist of mission and fellowship, *koinonia*, as well as Word and sacraments. A church that may have accurate preaching but lacks the companionship of love is likely to have only the structure and not the content of Christian faith (Hocken 2009: 123).\(^{402}\) One reason why Charismatic movements have

---

\(^{398}\) In this respect, it is recommendable to search for the *charismata* of the Spirit particularly the higher gifts that build up the church (1 Cor 14: 1-5).

\(^{399}\) In the Reformed tradition the prominence has often been on the Spirit’s enlightening work, principally in reference to understanding the Bible. The regenerating and sanctifying work of the Spirit has also received suitable thoughtfulness.

\(^{400}\) Keating (2002: 78-81) says Charismatic movements have succeeded in recovering the function of signs and wonders in the evangelistic ministry of the church. People are convinced not only by hearing the word but also seeing the power of the word in action, which led the people to faith (Acts 14: 3; Rm 15: 18-19; Hb 2: 4).

\(^{401}\) The Anointed One, Jesus himself was not enthusiastic about the quest for signs (Mt 12: 38-39; Lk 1: 29; Jn 4: 48). None of the believers can earn their salvation or make themselves worthy of God’s grace. But they can demonstrate and manifest God’s grace in their daily lives, and if they do so they will be rewarded, not because they have achieved a higher level of holiness but because they have been more open to the moving of the Spirit or have been benefited by means of the unconditional grace of God. Even then they can take no credit, since their sincerity is permanently tied to God’s graceful election. They do good works because they have been dedicated by God to a life of service. If they stop to do good works they will be judged for having quenched and grieved the Spirit who lives within them and strives to perfect their union with the Anointed One.

\(^{402}\) Hocken (2009: 123) views the local congregation of the Charismatic movements is more often than not a family
experienced such a stunning expansion is that people are drawn to the fellowship of love that is manifest along with many of its adherents. The Reformation rediscovered this biblical notion but was unable to keep away from a hierarchical church in which all major responsibilities are assumed by the pastor. We must also be watchful to the danger of “paraclericalism” that results in the laity usurping the prerogatives of the pastoral office (Maurer 2010: 55-7).

Charismatic movements have forcefully rediscovered the ethical dualism of the New Testament; the conflict between the Anointed One, Jesus and the adversaries of God and humanity, the devil or Satan. But when this dualism becomes a metaphysical duality between the material and spiritual worlds, it is an intrusion of Gnosticism in charismatic theology. The Charismatic movements reaffirm the evangelical notion that the most significant fact in the Christian life is crossing the divide that separates the state of sin and lostness from the state of grace and redemption (Hocken 2009: 119). But although the decision of faith is something established and completed it is at the same time something to be renewed in daily experience. We have been saved, but we are also still being saved, and we will be saved when the Anointed One comes again in his glory.

2. Missio Spiritus in contextualization

The Reformation era was conceivably more aware of their contextual circumstances than most (Bagchi & Steinmetz 2004: 3-4). The Reformed tradition, following Calvin, recognizes self-knowledge to be a noteworthy theological notion, and it appears meaningful to reverberate on how reminiscence and indignity as essentials of self-knowledge are connected to the contemporary state (Lapsley 2007: 151). Since the Reformation epoch, the Charismatic movement has spread dramatically around the world over the last century and is marked by its that cares for the physical and material as well as the spiritual needs of its members.

403 Hocken (2009: 118) says they are prone to err in claiming too much for the Spirit-filled Christian, in identifying the charismata of the Spirit with the eschatological completeness of the Spirit.
404 Cox (1996: 85-9) notes the Charismatic movement is distinguished by malleability to diverse traditions. It is a belief created to journey into the dissimilar settings. However regardless of this examination little has been studied
adaptability to a wide range of cultures. The contextualization of the Christian faith has always been primary to the existence of Christianity (Tennent 2009: 25). While it is undeniable that the Reformed tradition has played a great role to communicate with dissimilar cultural communities through contextualization of the gospel throughout the history of the Church, the Charismatic movements have accelerated its contextualization more rapidly than previously. Grenz (2005: 91) affirms that the Spirit illumines Scripture to the community to live as examples of the Scriptural account in present circumstances.

Contextualization is an important factor to comprehend the gospel (Ojo 1988: 190).\textsuperscript{405} The theology of contextualization is the embodiment of the theology about the Anointed One and the indwelling of the Spirit in the believers (Bergmann 2003: 17). The out-pouring, anointing, and irresistible force of the Spirit make it possible for contextualization to happen. God called them to impart that anointing to the Gentiles, on whom God bestow his Spirit through the Anointed One and the witness of his Jewish apostles (Teplincky 2008: 97). The Anointed One can be observed as the contextualizing Spirit. The experience of the Spirit implicates the unique Charismatic movement’s contribution to the contextualization argument, and it challenges Charismatics to a bigger participation in this argument (Turner 2010: 512).

The anointed community equipped by the anointing with the Spirit continues the invigorating mission of the anointed One to witness to the marginalized and the poor (Went 2004: 63). The task of contextualization involves spanning the gap between church and culture. Various methods and models for this task have been proposed. From the brief review above, it is clear that Charismatic movements can particularly contribute to the contextualization debate through its understanding in three areas: the work of the Spirit, eschatology, and experience. The \textit{missio Spiritus} deserves further attention as this is usually neglected in discussions on contextualization, to evaluate this progression of adaptation. A lot of missiological research was done on contextualization which embraces the development of adaptability, but little of this has been applied to the peculiar charismatic experience and none has been done on the argument.

\textsuperscript{405} Imasogie (1993: 22-24) remarks that contextualization of Christianity is the very course of understanding its reality and relating it to practical life issues and pious prototypes within a communal settings.
and because this also seems the key to broadening the Charismatic appreciation of contextualization. Contextualization within the Charismatic movements often happens without being planned, simply as an experience of the Spirit that interacts with the life experience of those who participate in the eschatological Kingdom.

The early Charismatic eschatology was guided to an awareness of the return of Christ by which the body of the Anointed One was being refurbished through an outpouring of the Spirit, experienced by the Charismatic movement, preceding Christ’s return (Faupel 1996: 36-41). The believers have been enforced outwards into the world by the anointing of the Spirit so that people might accept the Anointed One and to accelerate the end to draw closer (Faupel 1996: 219-22). More lately the eschatological exigency has faded in places where the Charismatic movement has transferred from the underprivileged to the middle and upper classes, but is still distinctive of the movement (Macchia 1998: 8-29). As the Spirit forces believers to preach the gospel, so the experienced substances, the manifestations of the *charismata* through the anointing of the Spirit become contextualized. This contextualization has partly materialized in the emphasis on personal experience of God the Spirit. This contextualization is occasionally distinguished from the conventional reformed doctrines.

The ‘speaking in tongues’ was recognized as the main portal to contextualization, that which enables witness around the world (Macchia 1998: 17). It is a medium for personal worship to God and, through interpretation, a means by which God speaks to individual situations. A tie between tongues and the crying out of creation is described in Romans 8.⁴⁰⁶ The Spirit reminds us that the commission of contextualization should never be confined to the “expert.” Contextualization would occur only when ordinary (Wilkinson 2012: 9),⁴⁰⁷ Spirit-inspired believers are enabled to wrestle together with the problems before God. Insight and supervision

---

⁴⁰⁶ A Charismatic recognize that they can sense the hurt in culture that is sensed within God’s Spirit, and feel the yearning to conquer the evils and experience intimacy with the Anointed One in their speaking tongues. Contextualization originated in the realities and emotions of life in the crucified Christ (The Encyclopedia of Christianity 2008: 806)

⁴⁰⁷ A Charismatic has developed contextualization through the distribution of the gospel by ordinary people, frequently with less theological preparation.
are obtained by the Spirit to enable contextualization to take place. However, experiences of the *charismata* and empowerment by the Spirit are still at the centre of the Charismatic movement. However, the hazard with this ‘inconsistent’ contextualization is that even though it can contribute to a theology of flexibility to the unconverted, it can also guide to socio-cultural misconstruction and inattentiveness (Anderson 2000: 193-210). Bergunder (2008: 249) calls to a question one can examine of some ambiguity among Charismatics on how to connect hermeneutically with the issue of contextualization in missiological perspective. Some critical anthropological studies present the Charismatic movement as a contextual phenomenon and barely alien to existing mainline religious communities (Bergunder 2008: 248).

An experience of the Spirit both upholds the body of the Anointed One and also forces them out in commission: an energetic that implicates the more common force of the Spirit in creation. Therefore, the Spirit is concerned in both supporting cultures of societies and the believers in the Anointed One. The experience of the work of the Spirit in nature will consequently inspire contextualization that is the omitted linkage in numerous movements to the Lord’s commission.

Taylor’s (1972: 21) acknowledgement helps to understand a separation in the contemporary idea of an objective, theoretical God and a God recognized exclusively by means of experiences. This division is comparable to the contextualization arguments between the body of the Anointed One and social culture, revelation and experience. Taylor (1972: 23) says that this partition can be resolved when the Spirit becomes essential to their thoughts. He starts by examining their experience, not of life in common, but of periods when they experience the ‘supernatural,’ something beyond themselves (Taylor 1972: 8-17). These experiences embrace a perception of communion between Creator and creature through the *charismata* of the Spirit, the mediator. The Spirit relates them with God and enables communication in both perspectives (Munyenyembe 2011:62-72). He guides the hearts of people to the Anointed One. It is also the Spirit that enlightens peoples’ hearts to other people, enabling them to see them as they are wonderfully created, equivalent as they are, and this shapes the foundation of the contextual mission of God’s Kingdom.
3. Missional benefits of charismata

The experience of the charismatic is likely to edify the Reformed to preserve scope in their theology and their anticipation of diverse experiences of the anointing with the Spirit (Ojo 2008: 167-179). From within the Charismatic movements there appear three distinctive spiritual charismata received through anointing by the Spirit that are related to insightful wisdom, foretelling, and tongues (Lord 2001: 211). Yong (2010: 123-64) indicates that the charismata of the Charismatic movements propose fresh resources for reminding about how Christian communities can connect and transform the economic, political, and social, and framework of the world. These demand to be required in petitions along with the coherent perceptions of the bodies of the Anointed One and social culture, and will be fundamental to contemporary contextualization (Harvey 1995: 73-62). The gift of wisdom (1 Cor 12: 8) assists the believers achieve God’s perception on the subjects they struggle with, assigning cogent insights from a divine supply to join to their rational perception (Stibbe 1997: 19). Stibbe advocates that the gift of wisdom also provides a clue into God’s hidden, redemptive intention in history, and it is essential to obtain such an prediction if a contextualization is to comply with God’s will.

Prophecy is manifested with the inspiration of the Spirit in the bodies of the Anointed One, but associates them with particular socio-cultural circumstances. As Penny (1997: 76) notes ‘mission’ is the major theme in Luke’s theology of the prophecy in the Spirit. The body of the Anointed One as a prophetic institute should reveal the Anointed One within a contemporary culture, and precise prophetic inspiration guides the believersto participate in the role of carriers of the truth in the world by means of the charismata of the Spirit.

---

408 McGee (1994: 275-8) notes that prophetic charismata are concerned with the troubles of the underprivileged and with inequality in a world maltreated by personal and communal injustices.
C. Suggestions and perspectives

1. Theology of “by the Spirit through the word”

The Spirit is both the one who enunciates the testimony to Scripture through his anointing and the one whose very manifestation provides affirmative testimony to oneself through his inhabitation. The eschatological Spirit transforms people to become listeners to Scripture, and reveals how the message of Scripture continues to speak in the present age (Allen 2009: 65). The Charismatics should be convinced to revise their beliefs according to Scriptures. If spirituality is correlated to the knowledge of God through his Spirit, then the experience of genuine spirituality must be joined to what is meant by the truth of the Spirit (Carson 1994: 394). Miller’s (2002: 162) examination of the link between the Spirit and the word of God according to Zwingli helps to understand the charismatic movements. Zwingli distinguished between the “external word”, the Scripture, listened to through the Spirit, and the “internal word”, the word of God accurately listened to. The Scripture restrains inconsistent interpretation; Spirit and Scripture are never opposite. This inside word conveys a self-recognition and individual assurance. Miller (2002: 163) advocates conformity to Scripture as an indicator to evaluate the factual charismata of the Spirit.

All believers in the Anointed One, Jesus, have the Spirit (Rm 8: 9) and are “spiritual” (1 Cr 2: 14). However we are to live by the Spirit (Gl 5: 16) and self-consciously put to death the deeds of sinful nature and yield the fruit of the Spirit. The Scriptural texts are itself an invitation to the reader to accept and reside in the Scriptural account by and through the Spirit.409 The Scriptural manuscripts are works of faith written by believers filled with the Spirit (Eph 5: 18-20). The quest is not only experiential understanding of “what the Scripture declares,” but, more notably, the essential and redemptive conversion of mind and existence so as to be changed to be a more

409 The movements of the apostles in the early church have been recurrently denoted the constant works of the Spirit in the revitalizing of the Church and enable its advocates to join God’s intervenes into the world through the charismata of the Spirit by the Church.
truthful community (Yong 2002: 32-57). The core of the Scriptural witness is at the same time its recurrence, performed in various places and times subsequent to the experiences of the early Christian church. The revelation of God is the private, mutual, communal and national experiences of God through the word by the Spirit. Consequently the Spirit is poured out in and in line with Scripture upon those that have been called so that they might pay on-going attention to the Scripture. The marvellous works, signs, wonders and miracles of the apostles of the Early Churches cannot be understood apart from Scripture. Arguably, while both the word of God and the Spirit’s manifestation are correlated and interpreted by one another in the discernible context, both the extreme errors of either experiential-oriented hermeneutics or authorial declarations about the written texts can be avoided.

There is an eschatological aspect to spirituality, as the bride, the body of the Anointed One, joins the Spirit in crying, “Come, Lord Jesus!” (Rv 22). These aspects can be added to any facet of spirituality controlled by the word of God, rectifying the believers and their experiences by Scripture, so that they may join the richness of the inheritance of the Anointed One, Jesus. Only then shall they draw near to spirituality in all dimensions of their lives, every aspect of human activities, individual and communal, under the authority of the word of God, with the awareness that the reformed and the Charismatics are to reside in the word by the Spirit in the presence of God, by his grace and for his glory. They shall magnify and testify to God in all their expressions through the experience of the Spirit and a solid assurance of their redemption, with various truthful demonstrations of spirituality.

2. Theology of equilibrium

In the present era God may utilize rational and instinctive ways to establish His kingdom on earth. In the era of the apostles both methods occur as the intentional and inspired manner. The canon of Scripture is complete. Modern ways to deliver the message of God are imperfect, but they are comparable to the means used by the apostles. In accepting modern spiritual charismata,

---

\[410\] See Acts 2: 14-42; 11-26; 4, 29-31; 5: 20; 6.
Scriptural evidences are acquired from what occurred in apostolic days. Modern charismata are both rational and perceptive. The prospect of both types of charismata can be inferred from the analogous distribution of different types of charismata in the era of the apostles. Moreover the Anointed One, the Spirit and God are the source of all charismata (Eph 4: 7, 11; cf. 1 Cor 12: 11).

Spiritual charismata of all types ought to be honoured and to be received (1 Cor 12: 14-26). Those gifts are pursued with love (1 Cor 13) to build up the Church (1 Cor 14). Simultaneously they are to be tested against Christological criteria, and recognized through the ethical life of the recipients (1Th 5: 21-22). Modern manifestations are at all times fallible not because of the Giver, but because of the weakness and wickedness of the instrumental recipient. All intuitive and discursive charismata are to be examined and evaluated on the basis of Scripture, to which nothing is to be added (Dt 4: 2; Rv 22: 18-19).

There is no authoritative apostolic analogue for modern circumstantial settings. The apostles and everyone else mentioned in the Scripture had to face confrontations in their unique socio-cultural settings that had to be related to common Scriptural beliefs. But the relevancies that the apostles applied were inspired and comprised of the divine Scriptural norm. Apostolic authorized intuition about circumstances is exquisitely trustworthy (Acts 27: 9-26) and enduringly informative to circumstantial settings (2 Tm 3: 1-5). In this aspect, it is categorized as divine revelation, while present socio-cultural settings are part of the created area to which the authoritative divine intuition is to be revealed. The relation between our contemporary instructional essence and modern socio-cultural settings is not equal or unbiased. Rather, the contemporary instruction idea is authoritative insofar as it is in line with Scripture. The present incidental realities are not ecclesiastically dependable at all, no matter how notable it might be. Incidental realities through both rational and predictive information may warn the people in the modern era. Nevertheless the deficiency of equilibrium between instructional essence and incidental realities signify that instructional essence, based on the Scripture, must function with authority and must prevail as the infallible divine purpose of God for his kingdom.
These are lessons both for the Reformed and for Charismatics. Some Charismatics need to become more aware of the fallible, mixed character of intuitive charismata. They need to be informed about the valuable discursive charismata. On the other hand, the Reformed are required to accept the important intuitive charismata. Their theological foundation is that intuitive gifts ceased with the completion of the Scripture canon. What they have essentially described is merely that inspired intuitive gifts ceased with the completion of the canon.411

Theology should reflect the way that God decides to emerge in the present. However, the theology that bears fruit must also be accountable to the tradition of the other Christian body from which it came as well as to the way God has been described in general religious reflections (Sontag 1987: 201). To be “charismatic” basically conforms to the reaction to the presence of the Spirit, but also to accept and to endeavour to articulate the Spirit’s messages in the present time.

Therefore to be truly charismatic, a theology should take its indication as much from an experience of the Spirit as from the Scripture or from an understanding of the life of the Anointed One, Jesus. It should not disregard Scripture or uncompromised doctrines through the Christian history or the Anointed One, Jesus. To shape an appropriate charismatic theology requires the experience of the presence and the movement of the Spirit and thoughtful enthusiasm to formulate their constructive mysterious occurrences. A charismatic theology must be inspired by the initiatives of the Spirit. Otherwise theology is doomed to misunderstand God’s unalterable purpose in the Scripture and to be sterilized in its impact. Charismatic movements should be approached with an appropriate theological methodology.

411 Gaffin (1992: 2-7) watchfully unlock a door to modern intuitive charisma. What is observed as prophecy is in fact a natural application of Scripture by the missio Spiritus, somewhat unexpected insight that biblical ideas have a bearing on a particular circumstances or problems. Gaffin remarks what has been classified as instructive substance derived through intuitive process.
3. Methodological perspectives

Most Christian theologies have adopted the paradigm of western philosophy so as to shape its methodological doctrines. It does not, however, indicate that the Charismatic theology will only be acknowledged if it has the same rational structure as western thought. If the Charismatic theology somehow eludes, or asserts to be beyond the analysis or grasp of proper reason it does not unavoidably instigate an irrational and absurd theology. When emotion, with all its unsteady vagaries and immoderations, evades a decisive assessment of theology it is inevitably dislocated. In search for the charismatic anointing with the Spirit, it is essential that the function of both emotion and inspiration and their correlation to rational conception and theological structure.

At its foundation, the movement and source of the formation of the Charismatic theology is the indwelling and movement of the divine Spirit. However, to its evaluation, and the constructive endeavour erected upon it, reason can still be an essential element to formulate the Charismatic movements. In fact, reason is an instrumental *charisma* bestowed by God since the creation of the world to any religious tradition without exception, including the Charismatics. The Charismatic theology would, however, have to reconsider the initiation with the premise that the *charismata* of the Spirit and his movements afford a more unswerving access to God’s marvellous purpose than when it utilizes rationality as an indicator for their theological navigation.

The *charismata* of the Spirit are multiform and are not uniformly distributed. Hence no theology can be universal that is, equally legitimate for all. Nor can it apply the same power in every epoch and with every people. Even if the Spirit is at all times with us, we are not constantly aware of Him in analogous manners. The performance of ceremonies is not proscribed, nor is the observance of sacraments of no benefit. However, the manifestation and power of God cannot be materialized to move in or through people unless the Spirit employs them, and this no one can
compel.\textsuperscript{412}

However, God the Spirit, who communicates with humans by means of mysterious charismatic gifts, is also God who may decide to work against the organizations and the expectations implicit in the natural created order. Human reason would compel God to follow his laws of nature, as philosophers have observed (Sontag 1987: 202). But God’s presence may sometimes be experienced to be perplexing and unimaginable\textsuperscript{413}, and sometimes even unnoticed (Mt 1: 23). It is not eccentric, since theology basically observes religious experience and codifies its peculiar expressions in a systematic structure. Its assignment is to describe such experiences in an intellectual frame.

Forcing an exclusively rationalistic foundation for epistemology might eliminate the decisive characteristics of the Charismatic theology. This is a principal issue we encounter nowadays, since rationalism has affected the mainstream of our inherited theologies in the process of their formation. False experiences are to be exposed. There must be distinguished between “inspiration” as an authentic sentiment of the divine presence and “enthusiasm” as its counterfeit. The challenge is to distinguish “cultic sect” from “religion” in order to label one forged and the other true. No discernment of criteria or rational reconstruction can expect to define what a “charismatic” theology is unless it acknowledges the legitimacy of ecstatic experience. Neither sentiment nor ecstatic experience can be alienated from our definition of “knowledge”.

An empiricism impose not eradicate emotion, but that will depend upon how it characterize the

\textsuperscript{412} The charismatic theology is more adjusted to movement, contingency, and to the resolutions of will that cannot be present in advance. Emotion is present, and we sometime ignore it at the possibility of excluding the dynamics of the Spirit. To be emotionally motivated is likewise no guarantee of the presence of the Spirit. In all aspects, the function of reason is not excluded. It is enhanced either by this psychological phenomenon or spiritual inspiration, since it is reason’s assignment to utilize the established criteria to discern the genuine and authentic presence of God in any spiritual movement. Merely to move in emotional sentiment is in itself no guarantee of Divine origin. The Evil force motivates and operates people too. However, the manifestations of the Spirit is never without its disturbing side effects in the process of creating deliverance, all of which makes it complicated for us to distinguish God’s genuine movements with conviction.

\textsuperscript{413} See Mt 17: 1-13; Mk 9: 2-8; Lk 9: 28-36.
“experience” it apply as its criterion. Charismatic theology challenges us philosophically, since we might reassess our theological postulations and philosophical hypothesis prior to the productive theological mission can initiate without deformation. However, we necessitate a faith in God’s upcoming actions if we are to confirm this, since his power is the divine love and compassion. It frequently manifests in our contemporary natural order with somewhat contradictory characters.
Conclusive remarks

This research studied the ethos and characteristics of anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movements, and supplied it with a reformed assessment. The anointing of the Spirit is seen by both the Reformed traditions and the Charismatic movements as the tremendous presence of power of the living God. They have debated the comprehensive soteriological function of the Spirit and it relation to the anointing with the Spirit.

The Charismatic movements arose from discontent with dominant rational aspect of the Calvinistic tradition, its doctrinal bias, and a lack of emotional experience in their Christian life. The anointing with the Spirit was the commencement of the mission of God’s chosen people in the Charismatic movements. These movements are characterized by explosive manifestations of the Spirit. Although the outpouring of the Spirit was pledged by God the Father, there are numerous unresolved concerns since the means of these movements are imperfect human beings. These difficulties are closely connected to the anointing with the Spirit.

This research illustrates some contributions of the Charismatic movement that entails the revitalized crucial function of the charismata with manifestations of the Spirit for individual edification, energetic communal worship, influential evangelism and particularly contextualization in its communication with other societies and communities in evangelism in the missio Spiritus, in eschatology, and in experience. But to discern, assess and evaluate the Charismatic movement’s the anointing with the Spirit, the following critiques should be noted. As a whole the Charismatic movements places their emphasis on an untrue foundation, by principally focussing on sensational and insecure experiences. This incorrect substance misled them hermeneutically to underestimate Scripture. Then this undervaluation of Scripture led them to erroneous theological consequences.

A quest for prudent hermeneutical proof
Hermeneutics is crucial to comprehend the Charismatic movements. The Charismatics tend to situate their beliefs and experiences on inaccurate principles of hermeneutics, in which the text is misused to be interpreted out of context and of the synthetic acknowledgement of the Scripture. The Charismatic’s miscalculation in their hermeneutics obscures them to interpret the texts of the Scripture by emphasizing their experienced stresses only in the realms of the revealed and accomplished work of the Anointed One, predominantly on the doctrine of justification, while ignoring the progressive consummation of the Anointed One’s work in relation to the doctrine of the sanctification. It does not implicate that the glorious redemptive missio Christi on the cross is deficient for human beings and the universe. The authentic boundary of Christ’s accomplishment on the cross should embrace both the present and the future, since it is to be delivered and completed persistently until the second coming of the Anointed One.

The misinterpretation of the term ‘justification’ as the state of ‘divinely sanctified’ as the ‘concept of deification’ of the believer in the Charismatic movement generate, a theory of ‘new species’ that never existed previously and much more ‘superior being’ than to the first man Adam, simultaneously they ruminate them as ‘divinely transformed gods’ who claim not to be sick nor hungry, and nor poor. Consequently the Charismatic movements determinedly launch their theologies in the present contemporary perspectives, not in eschatological perspectives, while the anointing with the Spirit is poured upon the believers under the settings of imminent eschatological perceptions.

Justification has a legitimate character: to be justified is to be acquitted but also is a depiction of the covenant relation ‘to cause to be in the veracious relation with God’. It is not a deification that the Charismatic promote. Thus the Charismatic theology on the doctrine of deification of the believer should be applied only to the coming Kingdom and the inhabiting of God’s Spirit in the believer.

Hence in the Charismatic movements, the misapprehension of the doctrine of justification and sanctification in their miscalculated hermeneutical views led them to be slipped into a secular
hazardous pitfall, by replacing their dynamic charismatic forces which were bestowed for the eschatological mandate to worldly prosperous pursuit in the present ages.

Scripture does not spur believers to pursue any miraculous exhibitions of the Spirit. The Reformed tradition are certain of three characteristics of the miracles in Scripture assist us to realize why God has miraculously worked; miracles executed the new epochs to disclose God Himself; miracles authenticated the messengers of revelation, and miracles requested attention to affirm the delivered oracles.

A quest for eschatological mandate

The Charismatic should recognize the redemptive manifestations of the Spirit has habitually been observed as eschatological (Act 2: 15-21). The outpouring of the Spirit has been imparted on the believers as a certainty in the eschatological epoch. It is to prepare them as the bride of the Anointed One, in whom it should be testified and applied to the extent of the establishment of God’s kingdom and equips them to escape the upcoming dreadful judgment day of the Lord which will effect on a universal realms. This is repeatedly acknowledged as the resolution of the missio Spiritus. To confront with this eschatological day of judgement, one is desperately obligated to remain with justification and sanctification. Since the one who endowed by the anointing with the Spirit should be upheld with eschatological mandate, one should never exist only for the present perishable world or preach a disposable prosperity gospel.

A quest for sanctification

The anointing with the Spirit is related to soteriological tenacity, repentance is preconditioned to experience the charismata of the Spirit (Acts 2: 38). The requisition of anointing with the Spirit is to transport the chosen one to sanctification as a bride in eschatological perspective. Unlike the conventional view of the Charismatic movements, it is not only a means to achieve the missio Spiritus, but also a purpose as an inhabiting shelter of the God the Spirit in the believers. For that
reasons, sanctification should be the centred-virtue in the performances and ministries of the charismata of the Spirit in the Charismatic movements.

Sanctification should not to be positioned under the perspective of justification, nor is justification to be absorbed into sanctification, rather should it be emphasized alongside with justification. It is noteworthy that ‘complete sanctification’ does not designate ‘innocent perfection’ but a perfection of unconditional love for others, including the non-believers and enemy and that desire to be a person who is proficient to live beyond indomitable offense (Mt 5: 38-48).

The Charismatics believe that the anointing with the Spirit is the presence of God. Then a question arises. If it is the presence of God, should it be witnessed and manifested through their sanctified commitment in individual and communal societies. However, the sanctifying characteristics, which come through God’s presence, are hardly demonstrated in the life of the Charismatic believers, unless it is essentially being forced through a sensational experience by the Spirit. One’s belief of the extent of justification affects one’s personal life and society with sanctification.

Authentic love is the authentication of sanctification, completed through the Spirit. Scriptural perfection, unlikely the belief of the Charismatic is to be uncontaminated and enhanced adoration conquering over the hatreds, is completed in all the words and deeds in love. Sanctification denotes a relentless affiliation with God, in which their virtuous behaviours stimulate and challenge the untamed community.

Sanctification cannot be achieved by the anointing of the Spirit in the perspective of the Charismatic movement, since it aims toward the believers to be blameless, imitating the Anointed One. God resides at them through the sanctifying Spirit. That the insecure preposition of the Charismatic movements which depends on their subjective, experiential, phenomenal, human-centred, and materialistic experiences causes a deficiency responsibility for the
contemporary society, although the *missio Spiritus* should be demonstrated in a sanctified life.

Hence the modern Charismatic movement owes the Reformed tradition, in which the progressive characteristic of the sanctifying *mission Spiritus* is intensely related to the doctrine of justification and sanctification. The Reformed traditions have correctly challenged Charismatics to acknowledge that charismatic forces and sanctification of the saint are not inevitably interrelated. Reception of *charismata* of the Spirit indicates no security of spiritual maturity. Nonetheless the Charismatics have not copiously recognized this certainty, a significant inheritance of the Reformed tradition.

**A quest for circumspection**

Their transcendent lassitude is one of the most hazard features of the Charismatic movement. It resulted in their anti-intellectualism or anti-rationalism. It unceasingly let them fail to hold a well-adjusted locus between the word of God and the anointing with Spirit. Their atmosphere easily lured them into the deceit of their instincts and a whispering voice in their ears. They are led to believe that they are so consecrated, sanctified, and prepared that they are unfailingly able to listen to the voice of the Anointed One apart from Scripture. It eventually leads them to the arrogant condemnation of others. Their leader who has enthralled them with his erroneous and immoral motivation relentlessly misuses their *charismata* to dominate, control them, and dictates to his followers. The conceited belief of the Charismatic movements effects their religious, cultural and communal seclusion. The Charismatics almost persistently see themselves as disparate from the other Christian assemblies and eventually formulates their concrete isolated worldview.

Since the misconducted schemes of the Charismatic movements, the circumscription of the operations of the Spirit has also developed as a major issue. It caused spiritual turmoil and chaos in the Christian churches. Subsequent to it the pages of Church history are interspersed with insulated and restricted outpourings of the Spirit. The main stream of the Christian Church did
not seek such manifestations, but there are clear evidence and confirmation that there has been astonishing demonstrations of charismata of the Spirit throughout the history of the Church.

Thus no contemporary incidences, no matter how bewildering or spectacular, can necessarily be ruled out as unscriptural. All must be verified with the norm of Scripture and discerned with guidance of the Spirit. It may perhaps be a counterfeit phenomenon (2 Th 2: 9-11). The Charismatic soteriology is pneumatological. Consequently the pneumatological soteriology of the missio Spiritus is predicted to subsequent and integrated to the word and missio Christi in the economy of the Trinity.

A quest for an unprejudiced modus

No one will deny that the Christian churches are the instruments of the worldwide missio of the Anointed One. However the quest for an unprejudiced modus cannot be undertaken by the ordained ministry, but by the whole body of believers. The Reformed traditions are obliged to cultivate a delicate alertness of the demonstrations of anointing of with Spirit both in the churches and in the world.

One cannot dictate beforehand that either discursive charismata or intuitive charismata must be dominant, which has to be the prominent distinctive of each Christian community. For the Lord “gives them charismata, to each one, just as he determines,” not as we determine (1 Cor 12: 11). The Anointed One resolves to rule and guide his Church by means of the complete Scriptures through the anointing with the Spirit. He enriches no supplementary authoritative oracles. Hence the offices are subjected to the authority derived from Scripture (Eph 4: 11).

The working of the Spirit through the charismata throughout the history of the Christian church has to be taken into account. The charismata of the Spirit are vital components of Christianity. They are an energetic transforming faculty that equip the churches as witnesses for God’s
In the quest of the charismatic anointing with the Spirit, an unprejudiced perspective is imperative to discern and correlate the function of the *charismata* of the Spirit with reasoning, emotion inspiration and intelligence, to form an authentic theological structure. Reason can still be an important component to reshape the Charismatic movements. In fact, reason is an analytical *charisma* bestowed by God since the creation of the world, to detect forged *charismata*. Charismatic theology should be examined rationally as a barometer for their theological expedition to discern and elevate the *charismata* of the Spirit and movements of the Spirit could be more effectively approached to detect God’s decisive purpose.

The Spirit has operated both in a discursive and an intuitive modus throughout the history of the Church. The Reformed have rarely been able to acknowledge both *modi* in a balanced manner, since they had to struggle with abnormalities of the Charismatic phenomena. The Reformed tradition is typically allied to cessationist theology. They frequently retain the completeness and sufficiency of Scripture. They use the discursive modus to discover solutions from Scripture. Nonetheless the extraordinary *missio Spiritus* of an intuitive modus has been manifested throughout the history of the church since the apostolic era. Numerous extraordinary occasions occurred in Reformed churches in spite of the Reformed view.

**Entreaty to be loyal to Scripture**

The Charismatics have indeed fallen into a predicament through their instinctive modus due to the deficiency of their way of using Scripture. The Reformed think they should eliminate the intuitive modus and rely on the adequacy and exclusivity of Scriptural authority.

The pneumatology of the Reformed and the Charismatics should be loyal to Scripture as the sole trustworthy measure to discern the spirits in the world. If spirituality is interconnected to the knowledge of God through his Spirit, then the experience of spirituality must be combined to
what is meant by the truth of the Spirit. The ethos of Scripture eliminates the categories of inconsistent interpretation; The Spirit of God and his word are never contradictory.

**Entreaty to discern the Evil one**

Reformed churches and Charismatic should reflect and revise together, and discern who their definite adversary is. When they are both enticed away by the pathos of the modern mendacious theology and transcendental philosophy they will not articulate the word of the Anointed One through the Spirit. They have to stand together, to encourage one another, against the voice of the evil spirit(s) to invalidate and annihilate their stronghold and to pursue the righteousness of the Anointed One to inherit the kingdom of the God.
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This research has attempted to discover the ethos and characteristics of the anointing with the Spirit of the Charismatic movements with the reformed assessment. It has been studied how the exegetical interpretation and Scriptural theology of the anointing with the Spirit relate to the systematic reformed theology.

This study has indicated the key notion of this research, “the anointing with the Spirit” in Ancient Near Eastern Literature and in Scripture. The biblical foundation of the Reformed tradition on the notion of this research has been investigated and Christian reflection on the anointing with the Spirit has historically been investigated. The church’s dogmata of the anointing with the Spirit examined throughout the history of the church as well as whether the anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movement was implicated in the Reformed tradition. Whether the Reformed tradition disallowed all supernatural phenomena has also been examined, and what their concept is of the anointing with the Spirit.

The debates between charismatic and reformed perspectives on the theological characteristics of the anointing with the Spirit have been compared. Essential to the argument is the nature and characteristics of the Charismatic movement in relation to the anointing with the Spirit, in which
the unique experiences of the Spirit and their response to the world is demonstrated.

The explored issues are systematically recapitulated and evaluated to be resolved. Four systematic spheres are examined with different hermeneutical approaches: the biblical and theological pneumatology; soteriology, in which the anointing with the Spirit is to be applied; promulgated eschatology that entails the characteristics of the missio Spiritus and the extent of the establishment of God’s kingdom in connection with the anointing with the Spirit, and finally mandated ecclesiology that requires responsibilities and commitments of those who are endowed with the charismata of the Spirit in the sphere of all contemporary areas.

The anointing with the Spirit is related to soteriological aspect, authentic repentance is preconditioned to be gifted the charismata of the Spirit (Acts 2:38-40). Unlikely the pneumatological concept of the Charismatic movements, it is not only a means to achieve the God’s redemptive task, but also a resolution to prepare a residence for the God the Spirit in the hearts of the believers. Consequently sanctification should be the centred-ethos in the manifestation and application of the charismata of the Spirit in the Charismatic movements. The Charismatic believe that the anointing with the Spirit is the presence of God. However, the sanctifying characteristics, which come through God’s presence, are scarcely demonstrated in the life of the Charismatic believers.

In the eschatological perspective, this research unveils the anointing with Spirit, poured upon the body of the Anointed One, is for eschatological completion, confirming the godly guarantee of his physical presence of the Anointed One by indwelling of his Spirit in and among their eschatological sanctuary. Simultaneously the anointing with the Spirit is perceived as a reality to encounter the upcoming dreadful judgment day of the Lord which will occur to the world. Justification and sanctification are essential requirements to face those days. Then the anointing with the Spirit in the Charismatic movement is by no means operated only for the present prosperity gospel. Eschatological imminence should be the foundational theology for both the Reformed and the Charismatic traditions.
In assessment and evaluation of the Charismatic movements, this research analyses the cohorts of the Charismatic have ostensibly collapsed into a predicament over the intuitive characteristics due to the deficiency of its confirmation with the authority of Scripture in the process of charismatic manifestations of the Spirit. Some Charismatics blunder into a deception since they incline to shape their ethos on emotional and sensational experience, rather than to formulate these experiences in response to the authentic truth of Scripture.

In this regards, this research indicates the Charismatics is to revise their *dogmata* according to Scripture. If spirituality is correlated to the knowledge of God through his Spirit, then the experience of genuine spirituality must be joined to what is meant by the truth of the Spirit. Nevertheless in search for the charismatic anointing with the Spirit, this study does not disregard the essential function of both inspirational intuition and rational conception to form their theology and beliefs on Scriptural foundation. The Reformed contends that they should eliminate the insecure and instinctive category of procedures and solemnly rely on the adequacy and exclusivity of Scriptural authority. The Charismatics believe that such knowledge is not seriously dissimilar to the imperfect nature of contemporary causes. However, both perspectives require some consideration. The instruction of the essence either repeats Scripture either Scriptural or is invalid.

Finally this investigation illustrates some contributions of the Charismatic movement that entails the revitalized crucial function of *the charismata* with manifestations of the Spirit for individual edification, energetic communal worship, and influential evangelism and particularly the contextualization in communication with other society and community in evangelism in the areas of the *missio Spiritus*, eschatology, and experience.
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