



VITENSKAPELIG  
HØYSKOLE  
Norwegian School of  
Theology, Religion and Society

# Spirit baptism in the Pentecostal movement

And the inauguration of the Kingdom of God

**Aleksander Skoe Gulvik**

Supervisor: Marion Grau

Professor in systematic theology, missiology and ecumenics

MF Norwegian School of Theology, Religion and Society,

AVH5010: Thesis for Master in Theology (60 ECTS), 2023

Word count: 30 023





## Abstract

This thesis has endeavoured to help bring some new perspectives on the classical Pentecostal teaching on baptism on the Holy Spirit and have a look at recent Pentecostal scholarship on the subject. The teaching that was so prominent in the early days of the movement, has later faded more away, and renewed interest may help to bring it back to the forefront. The research questions are about Spirit baptism, what it is, how it has been developed and how it is understood. Are the Pentecostals right in confirming a subsequent baptism for empowerment for service and witness, or is it merely initiatory into the faith? Could a potential reworking of the theological framework give credibility to the idea that it is a broad biblical metaphor, connecting various theological themes such as ecclesiology, eschatology and the Kingdom of God together? And if this is so, may it revitalize its importance and relevance for Pentecostals today?

This is a literary research, consulting works of important scholars in the field to gain an overview of different perspectives and debates on the subject in question, and to give valuable insights into the research questions given. Hermeneutical considerations will be done, considering the interpretation from mainly a Pentecostal perspective.

Our literary research concluded in there being various perspectives on Spirit baptism, even within the Pentecostal movement, although the classical teaching of a subsequent baptism for service and witness still is present, and several scholars agree with its connection to communal church life and eschatology. Frank Macchia provides a thoroughly framework for viewing Spirit baptism as constitutional for the Church, as well as the means by which the Kingdom is inaugurated, without neglecting its function as empowerment for individual believers.

# Table of contents

- 1 Introduction..... 1
  - 1.1 Goal of the Thesis..... 1
  - 1.2 Research Questions..... 3
  - 1.3 Theory and methods..... 5
  - 1.4 Definitions..... 9
    - 1.4.1 The Holy Spirit..... 9
    - 1.4.2 Spirit Baptism..... 10
    - 1.4.3 Ecclesiology, Eschatology, Soteriology and the Kingdom..... 11
- 2 Background..... 14
  - 2.1 Pentecostalism..... 14
  - 2.2 Baptism in the Holy Spirit..... 17
    - 2.2.1 Development of the doctrine of Spirit baptism..... 22
    - 2.2.2 The New Testament..... 28
    - 2.2.3 Spirit Baptism in Early Christianity..... 34
    - 2.2.4 The Dunn Debate..... 36
    - 2.2.5 Glossolalia..... 42
- 3 Spirit Baptism, Eschatology and the Kingdom of God..... 47
  - 3.1 The Kingdom..... 48
  - 3.2 Ecclesiology..... 54
  - 3.3 Eschatology..... 60
- 4 Conclusion..... 72
- 5 Bibliography..... 77

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 *Goal of the thesis*

The goal of this thesis is to help bring some potential newfound perspectives on the classic Pentecostal teaching of a subsequent baptism in the Holy Spirit. If these new considerations can help proliferate the teaching that was so prevalent in the early days of the movement and show its relevance to contemporary Pentecostal churches, then there might be a more widespread charismatic empowerment of individual believers, and by appreciating its potential importance it may lead to more charismatically empowered churches flowing with the gifts of the Spirit. First and foremost, a more thoroughly presentation of its history, its significance and the development will be in order to understand the recent developments in Pentecostal scholarship on the teaching. After this, the recent works of Frank D. Macchia will in particular be considered as he has brought forth many new perspectives on Spirit baptism, reworking it into a theological framework that relates it to both the charismatic empowerment of the individual, as well as to the Church, eschatology and the Kingdom of God.

Historically, there has been framed some critical approaches to the Pentecostal movement for being somewhat anti-intellectual, or having a lack of scholarly and academic research or work done on its behalf. Although this has changed in recent decades, its main theological teaching that was so prominent in its beginning, namely Spirit baptism, has somewhat faded both in the Pentecostal scholarship as well as in its emphasis in the churches, in favour of eschatology, sacrificed at the altar of ecumenical concerns or because of the theological diversity of the movement. There seems to be a need for a revitalization for such an important teaching that the early Pentecostals were so fervent about, providing it with newfound frameworks like in the context of ecclesiology and the eschatological reality of the arrival of the Kingdom. This need is present both in the academic realm, as well as for churches and individuals that need the fresh life of the Spirit for renewal, growth and to be a valuable part of the proclamation and advancement of the Kingdom of God. Like Frank D. Macchia asserts, that before his book on Spirit baptism, there has not been a real constructive effort by a Pentecostal systematic theologian to elaborate on the doctrine in nearly three decades. Considering how

important it has been to the beginning of this movement that has grown into a significant force of global Christianity, we may well gain much on reflecting more on it. Thanks to Macchia, and others, has the considerations on the doctrine resurfaced in Pentecostal academic journals and scholarship in recent times.<sup>1</sup>

With the main subject being Spirit baptism in the Pentecostal movement and the inauguration of the Kingdom of God, there will be a thoroughly historical summary of the development of the Pentecostal movement itself first, since it is within this movement that the particular teaching on baptism in the Holy Spirit has reached prominence and attention in modern times. Pentecostalism is a diverse movement, with great variety and diversity, but keeping this in mind, there will be a consideration of the main branches and major aspects of it. Then the development of the doctrine of Spirit baptism itself, through various movements, will be considered along with a survey of its presence in the New Testament and early Christianity. When the background is firmly laid, there will be a thoughtful consideration of the ‘Dunn Debate’, a debate that sparked much of later academical, Pentecostal work on the subject where intellectual responses were required after James D. Dunn’s meticulously exegetical work on the Scriptural basis for Spirit baptism challenged the classical Pentecostal doctrine of a subsequent encounter of the Spirit for charismatic empowerment. Since this debate has been of such major influence and importance, this thesis would definitively be lacking if it were not to dwell into the various aspects of it. Since it is not directly part of the subject in question, any lengthy discussion about speaking in tongues will be avoided, although some mention must be done since it was considered by many early Pentecostals to be the initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit that verified the experience. Macchia mentions *xenolalia* (speaking in unknown, foreign languages) as seen by early Pentecostals as an evangelistic tool, although when this view faded away, the doctrine of tongues lost much of its global and ecumenical significant, and therefore also any great relevance in this thesis.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Steven M. Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism: Classical and Emergent* (Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2016), 12–22; Lee Roy Martin, *Pentecostal Hermeneutics: A Reader* (Leiden: BRILL, 2013), 194.

2 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 152; William P. Atkinson, *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts and the Dunn Debate* (Cambridge: The Lutherworth Press, 2012), 6; Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology* (Michigan: Zondervan, 2009), 35.

Frank D. Macchia's theological framework of Spirit baptism will also then be explained in depth and viewed in relation to other scholars and theological assessments. Since it is the main interest of the thesis, it will be given due prominence. To understand Macchia's theology, there is a need for a somewhat complex elaboration on how he views Spirit baptism itself, as well as how he connects it with the fellowship of the Church (the *koinonia*) and the eschatological reality of the Kingdom of God.

The geographical and cultural area in question will be that of the Western world. The main voices will be of well-known theologians and scholars from this area, although some important figures like Simon Chan (Singaporean Chinese theologian) will be mentioned, just because their influence and prominence in modern Pentecostal scholarship in the West makes them so relevant. This is because the context would be too broad by including other parts of the world that often has a greatly different perspective and world views, and this area is also geographically and culturally closest to us. To gain an overview over Pentecostal thought from all over the world would be a massive project that would far extend beyond the limit of this work. The background of the teachings and the various movements that precluded it, is from the Western world as well, and the movement itself began in the U.S. While it would be interesting and important to consider the Norwegian part of the movement, as was originally intended, following T.B. Barratt, Byposten and other sources, it would have been an entirely different type of work, and the contributions and reflections of modern Pentecostal scholarship in the Western world would have been left unattended. There has thus been a necessary delimitation here, to more fully engage with the leading Pentecostal scholarship in the Western world and its stage of progress and current understanding.

## **1.2 Research questions**

While Spirit baptism has been an important theme in the Pentecostal movement from its beginning, there is seemingly lacking a definitive and comprehensive theological framework for understanding its role in these modern days and addressing the increasingly lack of emphasis in recent scholarships and preaching. While my research shows that it has been vastly important for the earlier figures of the Pentecostal movement, its future is more

uncertain as Pentecostalism has moved to an increasingly diverse set of teachings and to more structural and ecumenical aspirations. While Charismatic and Pentecostal churches are rapidly growing all around the world, one could still ask if the core teaching of the movement has somewhat been set aside and that this in turns could mean that the free flow of spiritual gifts in both the individual and communal life is limited, resulting in that believers are not fully endowed with the charismatic and spiritual power that is available to them. According to Simon Chan, ‘Among second-generation Pentecostals, Spirit baptism is received first as a doctrine before it is actualized in personal experience. But when the doctrine is poorly explained, the intended experience does not necessarily follow.’ A renewed outworking of the doctrine would in this manner be highly important for the practical life of Pentecostals and highlighting central themes of their faith. Simon Chan also states that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is a reality far greater than the classical Pentecostal conceptualization of it. These possible broader contours will be considered in length.<sup>3</sup>

To understand the baptism in the Holy Spirit in a context that relates it to several other theological areas, we will consider its implications on the communal church life (ecclesiology) and the coming Kingdom of God (eschatology), as well as how it relates to the initiatory salvation experience and the the teaching about a subsequent charismatic empowerment for service and witness. This is to see if a grander view of the doctrine is both possible and accurate. It will be important to gain a clear understanding of whether the teaching refer to the salvation experience itself or of the charismatic empowerment for service and witness, precisely because much of its potential value in pragmatic terms will rest on this, and thus much of the purpose of the thesis. If it is only a way of speaking about salvation, then there may be less to gain from comprehensive academic work on the subject, besides mere theological reflection. If the Pentecostals are correct in emphasizing its empowerment for service and life, then there is much to gain for both believers and churches alike to renew the interest in a potential force of significance for the vitality of both the church and its members. It will thus be of great value, since none will seek what they already have. If there can be made a case for a broader understanding of the metaphor, then this could be important in order to emphasize that it transcends the mere individual focus it often gets and thus

3 Simon Chan, *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 10-



connects it with both communal life, as well as the participation in the Kingdom of God. Such findings could provide valuable in order to understand an important experience for Pentecostals in a broader perspective.

Some research questions will thus be;

- 1) What is really the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and how has it historically been developed until it became a Pentecostal doctrine?
- 2) Is the baptism in the Holy Spirit mainly soteriological as an initiation into the faith, or is it rather the charismatic endowment of power for witness and service? Even more, is it a biblical metaphor encompassing much more?
- 3) How does Spirit baptism relate to ecclesiology, eschatology and the Kingdom of God in the theology of Pentecostal scholar Frank D. Macchia? Can these connections serve a grander purpose?
- 4) How can the teachings of Spirit baptism be reworked into a new theological framework to revitalize its relevance and importance?

### *1.3 Theory and methods*

My own preliminary position as the author of this work, is that of having an education in theology with a personal background in the Pentecostal movement. This has both certain advantages and certain disadvantages. The advantages are a first-hand knowledge of the active life in a Pentecostal church (in a Norwegian setting), an inside perspective and a somewhat considerate depth of knowledge of its teachings and history. This means that the language and meaning that is inherent in the teaching of Spirit baptism will be seen in a preliminary understanding that can be expressed in this work. The challenge is to remain impartial and strive for an open-minded objectivity, listening to critical voices and also those that reject the Scriptural basis of the teachings, rather than to use biased sources to defend an already existing teaching without acknowledging any objections or different views and perspectives. The task will be to listen to both sides of the argument and view it from different perspectives.

About theoretical frameworks employed in the work, it would be natural to use critical realism as a theoretical framework of understanding, implying that reality is seen as existing independently of the knowledge about it, although it is interpreted in a social-cultural framework and by human beings with their personal associations and their world of ideas. While we cannot have absolutely certain knowledge that is infallible, according to Ram Roy Bhaskar, we can have different perspectives and descriptions of the same reality. In this case, this will mean that it is difficult to make the absolute statement that Spirit baptism is, beyond any doubt, an existing reality, while still recognize that it is being experienced and described in similar terms by many, many people. Just as David Perry writes (as stated in chapter 2.2.2), even if it could be maintained that the Spirit baptism cannot be fully defended from Scripture, it still cannot deny the experience of millions of Pentecostals over the world.<sup>4</sup>

As part of a literary research, some considerations about using hermeneutics would be relevant in order to gain some understanding about how we gain knowledge from textual material, as well as how Pentecostal hermeneutics are often done in order to understand their statements and sentiments. To understand their considerations of Spirit baptism, it will be most helpful to understand their hermeneutical background. Anthony C. Thiselton is a renowned theologian who had hermeneutical theory and biblical interpretation as some of his main theological concerns. He writes that hermeneutics is about how we read, understand and make use of texts, and then especially those from another time or context of life than our own. In biblical studies it is quite often used, as passages appear in a foreign context, and to understand the intended meaning the use of hermeneutics can be applied. Although most of the biblical references in this thesis will be provided in the context of various theologians and authors and their remarks in recent works, some understanding of the common use of hermeneutics in biblical studies would be deemed appropriate to understand the texts in question. Not only is it about the actual process of interpretation, but also about what we are actually doing when we read, understand and apply texts, Thiselton states.<sup>5</sup>

---

4 T.G. Jakobsen, *Vitenskapsfilosofi Og Kritisk Realisme: Et Ikke Antroposentrisk Alternativ*, 1. utgave (Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2021), 189–96; David Perry, *Spirit Baptism: The Pentecostal Experience in Theological Focus* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 19–24.

5 Anthony C. Thiselton, *Hermeneutics* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009), 1–5.

Lee Roy Martin, professor and Editor of the Journal of Pentecostal Theology (Brill), has edited and written an introduction for a book about Pentecostal hermeneutics consisting mostly of published articles on the Journal of Pentecostal Theology. His hermeneutical knowledge in the Pentecostal tradition will be excellent background for understanding more of contemporary Pentecostal scholarship and the subjects of the thesis. He makes a connection with how Pentecostal hermeneutics were in a kind of paradigm shift, just as the disciples after the Day of Pentecost. The disciples at Pentecost had a certain worldview, assumptions and preliminary understanding when reading Scripture, like their background in 1<sup>st</sup> century Judaism and the influences of Greek philosophy present in both their surroundings as well as through the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scripture into the Septuagint. These hermeneutical lenses changed on the Day of Pentecost, Martin writes, with new contextual factors: Jesus Himself and His life, teachings, death and resurrection, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the missional urgency and the eschatological nature of Jesus' Kingdom. In the same way, Martin argues that the first Pentecostals likewise had inherited a set of interpretative presumptions; the conservative hermeneutics of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The baptism in the Holy Spirit altered their worldview, according to Martin, and shaped a new hermeneutical framework, that of the 'Five-fold Gospel'. Their reading of Scripture would thus be read in the understanding of Jesus as Saviour, Sanctifier, Spirit Baptizer, Healer and Coming King. This became a new 'theological grid' for understanding, alongside understanding the Bible as a single, unified narrative – a narrative that they were partakers of, and not just readers of. The experience of the Holy Spirit also gave them an experiential approach to understanding the Scripture, rather than the fundamentalist approach of rationalism, relying mostly on the facets of human reason alone. Religious experience became more valuable for understanding and thus helped recreate the lense from which Scripture and the faith was understood. God's presence was considered the legitimation of the community as the people of God, and often the interpretation of Scripture happened in the community with preaching and appropriate responses. In the modern world of Pentecostalism, Martin acknowledges a triadic pattern of Pentecostal interpretation; the Scripture, the Holy Spirit and the community of faith. We shall consider all three in the forthcoming thesis and shall endeavour to understand the baptism of the Holy Spirit both through Scripture, its historical context, the Five-fold Gospel, the Spirit (the pneumatological framework), as well as in relation to the community (church, *koinonia*,

ecclesiology) and the eschatological Kingdom of God in order to give sufficient answers to our research questions.<sup>6</sup>

Lisa Given makes the mention that when using books as research literature, one must remember that books are usually not peer reviewed like research articles are, and that it sometimes includes the author's thoughts on an issue that is not based on research findings. This will be kept in mind when consulting books on the subject.<sup>7</sup>

The sources chosen and given emphasis in this thesis are a result of the background research, noting foremost the most significant and relevant theologians and scholars as well as their works on the Pentecostal movement and the doctrine of baptism in the Holy Spirit. There are quite a few major figures in contemporary Pentecostal academics that are constantly recurring when reading the various books and articles on the subjects of Spirit baptism, ecclesiology, eschatology and those that are renowned names in the academical world of Pentecostals. These are, among others, Amos Yong (and of particular relevance his book '*The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh*'), Simon Chan (and his '*Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition*' that tackles many ecclesiological concerns), Steven Land (and in particular '*Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*'), Andy Lord and Harold D. Hunter (and especially his book on Spirit baptism, '*Spirit Baptism: A Pentecostal Alternative*'). This thesis would not have been completely justified by leaving out these prominent scholars, and the debates concerning various contemporary perspectives on Spirit baptism, ecclesiology, eschatology and the Kingdom of God are being lead by these.

In addition to these authors and books, sources that have been important in the later decades in the debate about Spirit baptism has been included, like James G. Dunn and Roger Stronstad. Steven Studebaker mentions Stronstad (alongside Macchia) as among the most established and respected Pentecostal theologians today and are thus important figures to include. When considering ecclesiology, names like Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen has to be included due to his relevance in theological work about ecclesiology. Terje Hegertun has also been included due to his relevant work on 'the Spirit driven Church' in recent years, and also being

<sup>6</sup> Martin, *Pentecostal Hermeneutics*, 1–9.

<sup>7</sup> Lisa Given, *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (California: SAGE Publications Inc., 2008), 784.

an important figure in Pentecostal theology from Norway. There has been a focus on works that are both available and relevant as well as adding important perspectives, knowledge and information about the main theme in question. There are of course many kinds of works and authors that could have been used in this regard, although many of them do not have a truly comprehensive take on Spirit baptism or have not sufficiently engaged in the debate. Others are of different geographical or cultural origins and therefore not included in a work that by the temperament of its inherent design, is somewhat limited.<sup>8</sup>

The translation of the Bible used is the The New Revised Standard Version (although several translations have been consulted in the process), due to its acclamation by many academics and church leaders and being somewhat literal, although still containing much of the original meaning.<sup>9</sup>

## 1.4 Definitions

What exactly is the baptism in the Holy Spirit? To understand that we must first understand what we mean by the Holy Spirit. It is, after all, the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

### 1.4.1 The Holy Spirit

The Hebrew Old Testament term for Spirit, *ruach* (Gen 1:2, Exod 31:3, Isa 11:2), carries a similar meaning to the New Testament's *pneuma* (Matt 1:18-20; 3:11, 4:1), according to Global Dictionary of Theology; breath, air, wind or soul. It is also from where we get the word *pneumatology*. The dictionary also lists wind, fire, dove and paraclete as biblical metaphors used for the Holy Spirit. It continues to list three major uses of the word *ruach*;

- 1) Wind or a breath of air
- 2) The principle of life, the force that vivifies human beings
- 3) The life of God, both at a physical and spiritual level

---

<sup>8</sup> Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 6.

<sup>9</sup> Edward D. Andrews, *FROM SPOKEN WORDS TO SACRED TEXTS: Introduction-Intermediate to New Testament Textual Studies* (Christian Publishing House, 2020), 606.

Harold Hunter states that we do not really know the original meaning, but that the matter of discussion is on the priority of wind or breath. Frank Macchia firmly asserts that the Holy Spirit is a person, not a fragmented set of works or experiences. He is in good tradition on that notion, and suffice to say here would be that the Spirit will be considered in this thesis as part of the triune God, having a distinct identity just like the Father and the Son, still being fully God, like Studebaker and the traditional Western traditions confirm. With a distinct identity, He also has a unique agency and activity, and this kind of agency will be seen especially in our elaboration of Macchia's theological framework on Spirit baptism.<sup>10</sup>

### 1.4.2 Spirit Baptism

Spirit baptism will be more difficult to give a preliminary and firm definition of, since it is exactly the outworking of different perspectives and views of it that will be the subject of the thesis. There will be various names used for Spirit baptism; the baptism in the Holy Spirit (John 1:33), the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the infilling of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:4), all will refer to the same. The outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2) will be our main reference point, as well as the prophecy given by John the Baptist that Jesus will baptize in the Spirit (Mark 1:8, John 1:33, Matt 3:11, Luke 3:15). Frank Macchia writes about Spirit baptism as essentially an experience of self-transcendence motivated by the love of God, in Lukan terms: a charismatic experience of clothing with power. Macchia therefore does not deny the individual experience of Spirit empowerment, but he broadens the contours to view Spirit baptism as a fluid metaphor with varied imagery that suggest broader pneumatological boundaries than mere Spirit empowerment, as something that actually has to do with all aspects of life in the Spirit – including the new creation. It becomes for Macchia an organizing principle of Pentecostal theology. The highest definition possible as Macchia sees it, is Spirit baptism as an eschatological gift that functions as an outpouring of divine love.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Steven M. Studebaker, *From Pentecost to the Triune God: A Pentecostal Trinitarian Theology* (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2012), 6–7; Harold D. Hunter, *Spirit Baptism: A Pentecostal Alternative* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2009), 39.

<sup>11</sup> Studebaker, *From Pentecost to the Triune God*, 7; Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 13–18.

Atkinson uses the following classical Pentecostal definition of the baptism in the Holy Spirit in his book about the Dunn debate; '*A charismatic empowering for Christian service distinct from and thus, potentially, chronologically subsequent to initial regenerating faith in Christ*', and this definition will be used when referring to classical Pentecostal teaching on the issue. It should be apparent from the context when we consider Spirit baptism in broader terms or in other contexts. To gain answers to our research questions, and the subject of the thesis, there will be a thoroughly consideration of Spirit baptism's nature, history and functions.<sup>12</sup>

### **1.4.3 Ecclesiology, Eschatology, Soteriology and the Kingdom**

Ecclesiology is about the doctrine of the Church, how we theologically reflect upon the nature and function of the church. The term ecclesiology is derived from the Greek word ἐκκλησία (ekklesia) that means, in a literal sense, a calling together of a gathering, or an assembly. In Christianity, is also is about gathering, but not in the same way as in the ancient world, although it could sometimes function in a political and cultural context (being human institutions also), but it is much more, and nothing like it exists, according to Macchia. It is a place for divine-human encounter, a place where God has constituted a communion of love. In this thesis, we will consider ecclesiology as a church in the traditional sense, being an assembly of believers, although Macchia's theology of a communal fellowship constituted by the baptism in the Holy Spirit will be considered in detail.<sup>13</sup>

Eschatology is defined by Peter Althouse as the area of Christian dogmatics that investigates the culmination of divine activity in what has traditionally been called the last things; things pertaining to death, judgement, heaven and hell, end of world history, the coming Kingdom of God and the future cosmos. It is not just about the salvation of the individual soul, but the social and cosmic dimensions of the new creation. The reason this definition is chosen for this thesis, is because of the theological significance it gives, while being relevant to our consideration of Spirit baptism in relation to the Kingdom of God in Macchia's framework.

---

<sup>12</sup> Atkinson, *Baptism in the Spirit*, 3.

<sup>13</sup> Frank D. Macchia, *The Spirit-Baptized Church: A Dogmatic Inquiry* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020), 1–5.

Just as Macchia related Spirit baptism to more than the individual person, his eschatological connections work very well with a definition that also includes the social and cosmic dimensions of ‘*The Last Things*’. Reflections on eschatological concerns will also, just as the definition implies, result in an overlap with considerations of the Kingdom of God.<sup>14</sup>

Soteriology is the theological study of how salvation is accomplished. In Protestant theology, from where the Pentecostal movement also began, the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ are considered the means of salvation. Salvation itself, according to The Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms, is the action of God to reconcile, redeem and renew the created order in Jesus Christ and is given freely by grace and faith in the finished work of Jesus Christ. Amos Yong argues for a multidimensionality of salvation, being personal, familial, ecclesial, material, social, cosmic and eschatological. This goes way beyond the scope of this thesis, even if we shall look at some of these areas in light of Spirit baptism. The use of the term soteriological will in this thesis first and foremost refer to the salvation of the individual person by faith, lest the context dictates otherwise, since this is the underlying theological thought that most often seems to be meant in those passages where the term is addressed.<sup>15</sup>

The Kingdom of God has been a dominant Protestant and Pietistic theme, according to Macchia. Jürgen Moltmann associates the Kingdom of God with the eschaton, and it is also usually a central issue in exploration of eschatology, as mentioned. It is the ‘ultimately liberating, all-redeeming and therefore eschatological kingship of God over His creation’. It also differs from creation at the beginning since God in all His glory will dwell in creation and be all in all. This he calls the eschaton. It is not here already, yet it influences creation by its nearness. The Kingdom for Macchia is a pneumatological ‘concept’, inaugurated and

---

14 Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *An Introduction to Ecclesiology: Historical, Global, and Interreligious Perspectives* (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2021), 9; Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell, *Perspectives in Pentecostal Eschatologies: World Without End* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Company Limited, 2012), 1.

15 Donald K. McKim, *The Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms, Second Edition: Revised and Expanded*, Second Edition (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 279; Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005), 91–97.



fulfilled as Spirit baptism. It is a reign of divine love. Macchia extends the motif of the Kingdom with the concept of Spirit baptism as an incorporative participation in, and union with, God and His life-transforming presence. It becomes a point of integration between sanctification and eschatology. As soteriological concepts, Spirit baptism becomes for Macchia a connection between the Kingdom of God and participation in God.

We shall in this thesis we make use of Moltmann's understanding of the Kingdom of God as the eschatological reality where God dwells in creation and has absolute Lordship and by this consider it in the Macchia's framework of Spirit baptism. It will be likened to the *eschaton*, a term that is used for the future reality where the Kingdom of God is fully realized. The reason for using the definition by Moltmann, even though he is not really mentioned much in this work, is that his definition has a solid theological basis in the work of Macchia and articulates well what seems to be agreed by most other works that have been consulted for the thesis.<sup>16</sup>

Having provided the introduction with some elaboration on the goal of the thesis, the research questions employed, the theoretical and methodical considerations, an overview of the sources, authors and work that will be used, as well as some explaining of the key concepts of the thesis, we shall now turn to the history and background for the Pentecostal movement. This will be followed by the teaching of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and its development and usage in the New Testament and early Christianity. After this we will explore the Dunn debate that sparked a lot of Pentecostal scholarship and apologetics for the doctrine of Spirit baptism, as well as a short glimpse of what speaking in tongues has to do with it all (*glossolalia*). This will be a necessary preliminary chapter to understand the reflections and connections made in Chapter 3, where the task is to view the relation of the Spirit baptism to, first and foremost the Kingdom of God, but also to ecclesiology and eschatology more generally. The works of Frank Macchia will be particularly considered in the discourse on the relations of these various theological areas.

---

16 T. David Beck, *The Holy Spirit and the Renewal of All Things: Pneumatology in Paul and Jurgen Moltmann* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Company Limited, 2010), 132–138.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Pentecostalism

Pentecostalism, as an extensive umbrella term of different denominations and movements of Pentecostal and Charismatic churches, is the most rapidly growing movement in Christianity today, with estimates of over 500 million people over the world, according to Allan Anderson. This represents approximately a fourth of the total numbers of all Christians. The term Pentecostalism is itself difficult to pinpoint exactly, as there are so many variations of charismatic, neo-charismatic and Pentecostal churches out there. While there are many common features, there are also differences between them. Because there are so many different variations, Anderson considers it difficult to find some core commonalities they might be defined to. Steven M. Studebaker informs us that the modern Pentecostal movement has three main historical forms that now exist side by side. These are Classic Pentecostalism, the Charismatic movement and the Third Wave or Neocharismatic movement. The diversity itself is perhaps one of the marks of Pentecostalism today. The theological concepts of 'subsequent baptism in the Spirit' and 'initial evidence' are at least something, stemming from the origin on Azusa Street in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, being the main doctrine for US Pentecostalism. 'Initial evidence' is the belief that there are tongues and utterances of the Spirit that follows a baptism in the Spirit, granting the experience a credence of being valid. Anderson maintains, however, that it is much too narrow to define Pentecostals as having this initial evidence, as that excludes the great manifold of believers who has a different experience of the Spirit, although Studebaker views the distinguishing belief of Classic Pentecostalism as the baptism in the Holy Spirit, happening after salvation as an experience for empowered ministry and evidenced by speaking in tongues. For the purpose of this thesis, I will consider Pentecostalism to include this great variety of denominations and theological doctrines, but will focus upon the classic Pentecostal movement with its teaching on a subsequent baptism in the Holy Spirit.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1–10; Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 1.

The Pentecostal movement can be said to really begin in Azusa Street, Los Angeles, in 1906. It is here the Holiness preacher William J. Seymour began preaching about the experience of speaking in tongues and the baptism of the Spirit. He had this teaching from Charles Parham and his Bible school in Houston, Texas. People began receiving healing, miracles and the baptism of the Spirit after about a month, and this led to a worldwide influence and visitation from people all over the world.<sup>18</sup>

Charles Parham began his ministry in 1893 as a pastor in a Methodist Episcopal Church, according to R. G. Robins, before leaving Methodism in favor of being a Holiness evangelist. He had, apparently, accepted the teaching of fire baptism from B. H. Irwing by the late 1890s and forged forces with Sandford in the summer of 1900 for a revival in Topeka. Glossolalia had been witnessed as early as 1897 at Sandford's place in Shiloh, where also signs and wonders were purportedly happening in great measure. After this, Parham visited Dowie's church in Chicago where the foundation of Zion City had begun.<sup>19</sup>

In Topeka, Parham then started his own Bible school, called Bethel Bible School, where he along with 40 others were seeking a deeper experience. Parham is said to have instructed his students to search through the Book of Acts in pursuit of the signs of baptism with the Holy Spirit. The initial evidence of the baptism, speaking in tongues, were then concluded upon. On New Year's Day in 1901 it all started, when a student called Agnes Ozman began to speak in tongues, allegedly in Chinese. This is the date that most historians consider the beginning of the movement. Many of the other students experienced the same within the next days. Parham then created a theological framework for these events where glossolalia played a major role. One of them was xenolalia, the ability to speak an unknown foreign language with the purpose of world-wide evangelization. Glossolalia was also considered the sign that came with the Spirit baptism and verified the experience, as well as the mark of the true Church and the seal as the Bride of Christ. The latter concept of a seal was later mostly set aside, and the idea of xenolalia for evangelization as well. As for the initial evidence, it however did survive

---

18 Adam Stewart, *Handbook of Pentecostal Christianity* (Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 2012), 22.

19 R. G. Robins, *Pentecostalism in America* (California: Praeger, 2010), 22.

and became a central teaching for mainstream Pentecostals, although debated by many later, as it was somewhat excluding of those professing Spirit baptisms without this gift.<sup>20</sup>

In the coming years, Parham and his followers would share these teachings, under the name of Apostolic Faith, throughout Kansas, Missouri, Texas and Arkansas without much success, before it began to really take hold in healing campaigns in the late 1903/early 1904. At this time the Apostolic Faith Missions began to grow, with a base in Houston, Texas. Nevertheless it was mostly overlooked by the Holiness movement in general. In the summer of 1905, the Apostolic Faith continued with mass meetings, street preaching, evangelism and ministry amongst the less fortunate. They also connected with the African American community, and especially with a Holiness preacher called Lucy Farrow who would work together with Parham. She left her small congregation to a Holiness preacher called William Seymour, in order to campaign with Parham in Kansas. Seymour would later turn out to be one of the most important figures of the emerging Pentecostal movement.<sup>21</sup>

William Seymour was born in Louisiana in 1870 and moved to Indianapolis where he would become part of the Holiness movement in the church Evening Light Saints. He arrived in Houston in 1903, where he was seen and appreciated by Farrow in such a degree that he would be given this task of supervising her congregation in her absence. Farrow herself received the Pentecost before returning in the fall and shared it with Seymour. He enrolled in Parham's new Bible school in Brunner, Texas, where he had to sit on the outside of the classroom door due to racial segregation laws in place. Seymour embraced the Pentecostal teaching and shared pulpits and street corners with Parham in the beginning of 1906.<sup>22</sup>

When Seymour got an invitation to pastor the Holiness Church Association of Southern California, things were really about to hit the fan. He travelled to Los Angeles on February 22, 1906, before finishing Parham's Bible school. His teachings on tongues were not very much appreciated, however, and already in early March he was let go of his mission. After a worshipper in Farrow's congregation soon after received the baptism of the Holy Spirit and

---

<sup>20</sup> Robins, 23–24.

<sup>21</sup> Robins, 24

<sup>22</sup> Robins, 25–26.

began to speak in tongues, Seymour and others received the same. Crowds began to arrive at Seymour's cottage where he conducted meetings before making them search for a more suitable location. This location they found in the now infamous 312 Azusa Street, in Los Angeles. This was formerly a African Methodist Episcopal Church and became the Apostolic Faith Mission. An extraordinarily revival began with ecstatic frenzies, outbursts of glossolalia and racial diversities. It hit the secular press already days later and was mocked in Los Angeles Daily Times on April 18. Rapidly it grew to a global scale, and people from all across the nation and the world came visiting. Up to 1500 people were present during the heights that would follow in the next three years. Every day, for the whole day, people were gathered at the peak of the revival and partakers took the experience with them, creating missions all over the world. This revival went down in history as the birthplace of the Pentecostal movement.<sup>23</sup>

Parham, on the other hand, went to Chicago and the remainings of Zion and Dowie's work that was ruined by scandal, bankruptcy and illness and joined up with hundreds of his followers. Many of these would later become important figures in the emerging Pentecostal movement. The Apostolic Faith Movement now claimed up to 10 000 followers, and Parham travelled to Los Angeles in October for the Asuza Street Revival. He did, however, end up in a backlash with Seymour, as he considered the revival to be filled by fanaticism and religious anarchy and claimed reforms to be made with the removal of many of Seymour's main associates. This was the beginning of Parham's decline within the movement as Seymour in return proclaimed the Holy Spirit to be the only leader of the mission. The revival in Azusa Street lasted from 1906 till 1908, with a re-emergence in 1911, before it was over, although the movement it had spawned would continue in great strength.<sup>24</sup>

## ***2.2 Baptism in the Holy Spirit***

The main theological theme in the Pentecostal movement, is the baptism in the Holy Spirit, according to Frank D. Macchia in his research paper that he participated with at the McMaster

---

<sup>23</sup> Robins, 26–27.

<sup>24</sup> Robins, 27–28.

Divinity College 2007 Pentecostal Forum: "Defining Issues in Pentecostalism: Classical and Emergent." The speaking in tongues and endowment of other spiritual gifts as part of this experience were of main concern on this forum. A Pentecostal theologian prior to the 1970s was almost certain to be writing about Spirit baptism, he states, even if this may no longer be the case. The British theologian Allan Anderson is backing up on the fact that the fundamental teaching in Pentecostal theology has been the concern with the experience of baptism in the Holy Spirit, although Macchia confirms that among contemporary scholars of Pentecostal theology this is no longer so, due to the theological diversity, among other factors, that has pertained the movement.<sup>25</sup>

While Spirit baptism has historically been the central teaching in Pentecostal and charismatic churches, it is rather peculiar that in other denominations and churches, it is barely mentioned at all. Macchia finds this puzzling, as all of the four Gospels introduces the ministry of Jesus Christ with the metaphor of Spirit baptism. This is not just meant to be within the meaning of the Christian baptism as most churches would imply, but rather something that ushers in the Kingdom of God, Macchia states. Even in ecumenical considerations have the teachings of Spirit baptism been found lacking, even when the centrality of it is so present in a movement that is among the Christian traditions in the world with the most adherents. Macchia considers this as partly because of the lack of Pentecostal participation at the ecumenical table and proposes a new emphasis of its role in the inauguration of the Kingdom of God, an emphasis that will be viewed more thoroughly later in the thesis.<sup>26</sup>

George Montague attests in the book '*Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence From the First Eight Centuries*', that the noun baptism does not directly appear in this phrase in the New Testament, but that the verb 'baptize' does – eight times. Four of them are given by John the Baptist as a foretelling of the One who is to come, the One that will baptize in the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:8, Matt 3:11, Luke 3:16, John 1:33). It is actually written about in the beginning of each of the four Gospels, although it appears in distinct forms. He

---

<sup>25</sup> Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 13–14.

<sup>26</sup> Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 61–63.

will baptize 'in the Holy Spirit' according to Mark and John, while Matthew and Luke (representing the Q tradition) add that he will baptize in 'Holy Spirit *and fire*'.<sup>27</sup>

There are also some different verbs in the book of Acts that is deemed to be referring to Spirit baptism, namely that the Holy Spirit 'came down', 'descended on', 'fell on', was 'poured out' and that the believers were 'filled with' or 'received' the Holy Spirit. In Pauline writings (1 Cor 12:13, Eph 4:5) and Johannine texts (John 14-15) are also passages being related to Spirit baptism. Anthony Palma gives some notions in this regard, namely that The Holy Spirit works internally in a believing person to bring forth the new birth and does not depart from the believer to return at a time of outpouring or infilling. These are only metaphors in relation to an overwhelming experience of the already indwelling Spirit, a kind of release, he asserts.<sup>28</sup>

Matthew and Luke use the metaphor *fire* in regards to judgement in the subsequent verses, and Montague confirms that this association was commonly used by the prophets, as well as the Qumran community that John the Baptist seemed to have known. In Jeremia and Isaiah, we also have the prophetic conjecture of spirit and judgement. The Holy Spirit that John the Baptist is announcing here is seen by most commentators, Montague claims, as the Spirit of purification and judgement prophesized by Isaiah 4:4, as well as in the Qumran literature.<sup>29</sup>

There has been a continuous debate, according to Roger Stronstad in the book '*Defining Issues in Pentecostalism: Classical and Emergent*', about whether John the Baptist prophesized about two different baptisms (one in Spirit and another in fire) or if the two components were part of the same baptism. He continues to review John's explanation with his harvesting metaphor about the gathering of wheat and the burning of chaff, and he concludes that there are two different baptisms: the one in Spirit for the believers as a blessing and the one in fire for the impenitent referring to judgement. Although this could be so, he continues to see a

---

27 Kilian McDonnell and George Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries* (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 3.

28 Goran Medved, "The Doctrine of Baptism in the Spirit in the Charismatic Movement," January 1, 2015, 173, [https://www.academia.edu/69414165/The\\_Doctrine\\_of\\_Baptism\\_in\\_the\\_Spirit\\_in\\_the\\_Charismatic\\_Movement](https://www.academia.edu/69414165/The_Doctrine_of_Baptism_in_the_Spirit_in_the_Charismatic_Movement); Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 77.

29 McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 4.

difference between Jesus' actual ministry and the prophecy given by John the Baptist. Jesus's ministry was about good news, divine favor and gracious words (Luke 4:18-21) rather than the fulfillment of the judgemental prophecy of John, he writes. It was thus not exactly the way John had expected. Jesus would still baptize in fire, bringing judgement, but that would be in the distant future, and He would baptize in Spirit, but that would be after His resurrection and ascension – on the day of Pentecost. He does not consider this to be a denial of John's prophecy, however, only that it would happen at a later time than Jesus' earthly ministry. Frank Macchia agrees with Stronstad's understanding of two distinct baptisms, one in a way of fulfillment for the repentant believers, one in the fire of judgement for the unrepentant.<sup>30</sup>

Macchia agrees with the impression that John the Baptist did not only prophesize judgement with his reference to Spirit baptism, although judgement is of major importance, but also of purgation and restoration. He affirms to what Montague has portrayed about judgement, and its background in Isaiah, and also to the concept of purification that Montague also addresses, just as the apocalyptic vision we see in the Gospels. It is interesting how Macchia underlines what Stronstad is considering, namely that John the Baptist's prophecy would happen in ways that he himself had not thought of. In addition, Machia writes, in Luke we see that the Spirit baptism prophesied, not only would cleanse, but also brings God's holy presence with the presence of the Kingdom and indwelling believers, as well as giving power to the believers for charismatic witness. He further contends that Luke does not include the baptism of fire, perhaps as he cites Dunn, because the sacrifice of Jesus was itself the baptism of judgement taken for others. Luke would still maintain that the baptism of fire awaited in the future, with the Day of the Lord. Spirit baptism would then be both now, and not yet, just as the fulfillment of the Kingdom of God would be.<sup>31</sup>

Since the prophecy that John the Baptist gives, is stating that Jesus will actively baptize, it cannot simply be about the event when Jesus is baptized in the river of Jordan. Montague pledges that we must rather look to Jesus' charismatic and public ministry to find evidence for the baptism of the Holy Spirit and according to Mark, in terms of the *exousia* (power, authority) that He asserts. Thus Mark's understanding about Jesus as the baptizer in the Holy

---

30 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 112–13; Macchia, *The Spirit-Baptized Church*, 13–14.

31 Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 98–101.



Spirit seems to be a charismatic ministry of healing and his contentions with Satan in all his different forms. In addition, at the end of Mark's Gospel, Jesus' baptism in the Holy Spirit also becomes the anointment to become the suffering Servant who gives up his life for the remissions of sins. Montague summarizes his reading of Mark with that Mark intends to account for both dimensions of the Spirit-filled life: the ministry of power, as well as the ministry of fidelity towards death. This is significant for our understanding of the possibility of viewing the Baptism in the Holy Spirit in contemporary Pentecostalism as the charismatic renewal into ministry, that we will later dwell into, as Jesus always will be the prime example of a Christian life. Perhaps is the other dimension; the giving up of one's life through the power of the Spirit an overseen or under communicated aspect of this Spirit-fulfillment in the life of the believer.<sup>32</sup>

Preliminary in this chapter, we considered how recent Pentecostal scholarship have tended to depart from Spirit baptism as its main theological loci, towards other theological themes. The reason of the diversity of the movement was given as an example, and other reasons could be the exegetical difficulties with justification from Scriptures, that the teaching might be considered somewhat elitist and exclusive to those outside of the movement and that the uniqueness of the Pentecostal movement in ecumenical matters would be sought in a worldview or epistemology rather than in a single core teaching. One of the prevailing themes have been a shift towards eschatology. This makes for a great opportunity of seeing contemporary concerns in relation to the historical core teachings, by giving Spirit baptism a eschatological framework, much based on the work of Frank Macchia, and will be dealt with thoroughly later in this thesis. Also, the increasingly structural and institutional character of the Pentecostal movement could be, according to David Perry, another reason for this shift, wherein a concern of order over the freedom of charismatic experiences emerges. Even so, it is not really about whether or not Spirit baptism is the real center of Pentecostalism that is the question, Perry further maintains. It is important and worthy of consideration in any case. Also there has been, as mentioned, recent contributions to Pentecostal scholarship that highlights the importance of Spirit baptism while providing a greater context to it, like that of Macchia, where he seeks to understand Spirit baptism with eschatological, soteriological and

---

<sup>32</sup> McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 3–14.

ecclesiological concerns to provide greater ecumenical value. Other theologians, like Simon Chan, have also brought emphasizes on Spirit baptism and glossolalia in Pentecostalism to the forefront, while addressing its place within the more comprehensive tradition of Christian spirituality.<sup>33</sup>

Macchia agrees with Simon Chan that while there is no universal agreement about the details of the particular Pentecostal beliefs, a spiritual experience of an intense and overwhelming kind that is focused upon Jesus Christ, an experience often named 'baptism in the Holy Spirit', is repeatedly prominent in their discussions and writings. Seeing how this teaching developed into the Pentecostal doctrine that carried much of these emphasizes, we shall now turn.<sup>34</sup>

### 2.2.1 Development of the doctrine of Spirit baptism

The baptism in the Holy Spirit as a subsequent experience after the conversion, as a central doctrine of the Pentecostal movement that came forth in the beginning of last century, was highly influenced by prior movements such as early Methodism, and even before that in Protestantism. James Dunn writes that in radical and pietistic Protestantism, there was a tradition that held salvation as something experienced in two stages; the first conversion experience and then later a second experience of the Holy Spirit. For many Puritans, this was an experience of assurance of salvation. John Wesley later taught a doctrine of a 'second blessing' (also called 'Christian Perfection' and 'Perfect Love'), which meant an experience after conversion that was called sanctification. Wesley in his desire to live a holy life, had the conviction that there was a second work of grace after the conversion. This experience would make possible for the believer to live free of the sinful bondage and to transform the Christian life in sanctification. This doctrine was further developed by the emerging Holiness movement before it reached its 'fulfillment' as 'the baptism in the Holy Spirit' in the Pentecostal movement.<sup>35</sup>

---

33 Perry, *Spirit Baptism*, 24–27.

34 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 21.

35 James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*, Ex-seminary Library edition (Kentucky: Westminster John 22

Without the Methodist movement in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the Holiness movement in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there would not have been a 20<sup>th</sup> century Pentecostalism, Steven G. Land asserts. He further states that the importance of the Wesleyan origins cannot be overstated. He cites Donald Wheelock in that both Wesleyan and non-Wesleyan Pentecostals agree that personal holiness precedes Spirit baptism and that together with African American spirituality, it gave rise to this movement of participation in the Spirit.<sup>36</sup>

According to Lewis Brogdon, Wesley considers that it is possible to have an encounter with God that leads to a deliverance from sin, restoration to the image of God and thus results in loving God more completely. This is called the second blessing, second in that it is affirmed at a later time than salvation, which is the first blessing.<sup>37</sup>

In the Holiness movement, Phoebe Palmer, a significant name in the movement, saw sanctification as an instant experience available for all Christians. Later, in 1857-1858, much of the Holiness movement began to expect a worldwide revival with a 'second blessing'-sanctification before the return of Jesus. Also, at this time, the notion of perfection began to give way to ideas about the 'power of Pentecost', and Phoebe Palmer began to see holiness as the baptism in Holy Spirit which was later continued by the early Pentecostals. The Holiness movement itself highlighted the personal encounter and moral perfection of the individual. It arised in a reaction to the contemporary liberalism and formalism that was present in Protestantism at the time. John Fletcher in turn brought together Wesley's Christian perfection teachings with the revivalist's notion of a crisis experience to an understanding of sanctification as a 'second blessing', or a 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' that would happen after conversion and initiation into the Christian faith.<sup>38</sup>

Merrill F. Unger states that in the holiness movement, the notion of 'the baptism of the Holy Spirit', became widely used for the second blessing experience and became quite the familiar concept for those under the influence of the Holiness movement. W. E. Boardman, a known

---

Knox Pres, 1970), 1; Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 26.

36 Steven Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom* (Tennessee: CPT Press, 2010), 39–42.

37 Stewart, *Handbook of Pentecostal Christianity*, 21.

38 Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 26–27; Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 14.

pioneer of the Holiness movement, wrote that there is a second experience besides the first, that happens at a later time, sometimes years later, calling it a 'second conversion'. The first experience he deemed justification by salvation, and the second was a sanctification where the sinner was made holy in heart and life.<sup>39</sup>

John Fletcher had, as mentioned, included a baptism in the power of the Holy Spirit, a baptism of burning love, in the doctrine of perfection. Brogdon states that by 1870 there was an increasingly Pentecostal language when it was to describe the sanctification experience. This second blessing doctrine was in many ways laying the groundwork for the later doctrine of baptism in the Spirit that Parham maintained.<sup>40</sup>

In addition to these influences, we have the Reformed revivals by Jonathan Edwards, Charles Finney and Asa Mahan that had their own influence on the Pentecostalism that was to emerge and then the Keswick Convention from 1875 who advocated 'the new birth' and 'the fullness of the Spirit'. This fullness of the Spirit was not the same as would later be known in Pentecostalism, although it had a great impact, but were seen in the manner of 'holiness'. The Baptism in the Holy Spirit, however, was increasingly becoming the phrase for 'the second blessing' and soon it was seen more as power for service than it was for holiness, something that we shall see also pertains to the Pentecostal understanding. Reuben A. Torrey was one of the main figures behind this change and in North American revivalism this became of major influence.

Anderson summarizes that we end the 19<sup>th</sup> century with three dispositions;

- 1) The Methodist's second blessing as sanctification
- 2) Keswick's Baptism of the Spirit as an empowerment for service
- 3) The third blessing that included the second blessing regarding sanctification, but added a third blessing of the baptism with fire that was for power to serve

This third position is what the early Pentecostals later would adhere to, speaking of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit and the initial evidence of tongues, although they removed it from

---

39 Merrill Unger, *The Baptism and Gifts of the Holy Spirit* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), 10.

40 Stewart, *Handbook of Pentecostal Christianity*, 21.

the view of Fletcher, that sanctification was needed, claiming evidence from John the Baptist's prophecy that Jesus would baptize in the Spirit, as well as the experiences in Acts 1:8 and 2:4-5.<sup>41</sup>

James Dunn writes that towards the end of the 19th century, the teaching of baptism in the Holy Spirit gradually changed from sanctification and holiness, with a baptism of fire cleansing from sin, to that of power for service. It was under these circumstances that Pentecostalism began.<sup>42</sup>

A Pentecostal historian named Charles Conn, maintains that the Pentecostal movement was an extension of the Holiness revival and says that those who received the Spirit baptism in the early years were those in the Holiness revival or those holding Holiness views.<sup>43</sup>

Unger states that in the Pre-Pentecostal history, R. A. Torrey may be one of the most influential non-Pentecostal leader. He was the one who provided a more thoroughly doctrinal background that was deemed more respectable. None is quoted more often, according to Unger, than Torrey of those establishing the central tenet of the baptism of the Spirit in the Pentecostal movement. The idea that the baptism of the Spirit happens distinctively, subsequently and additionally to the regenerating work, is his most quoted statement. He sets forth the doctrine that a man may be regenerated by the Holy Spirit while still not baptized in the Spirit, and that every true believer has the Holy Spirit, although not everyone has the baptism of the Spirit – though they may come to have it.<sup>44</sup>

Macchia brings the significance of the Methodists teachings about sanctification to the table when he considers that the power of Pentecost is sanctifying and not to be separated from the Pentecostal blessing. Just as the prophet in Scripture was separated from sin and consecrated, so would Christians that share the prophetic calling also be. William Seymour would also bring together sanctification and Spirit baptism by considering it a gift of power upon the

---

41 Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 28–29; Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 14.

42 Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 2.

43 Unger, *The Baptism and Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, 10.

44 Unger, 10–11.

sanctified, cleansed life. Spirit baptism would thus empower, as well as renew, and bring forth the sanctified life to an outward expression. The Pentecostal thought about the divine outpouring is thus linked with the Wesleyan teaching about sanctification as a transformation by the love of God. His main emphasis here, is thus seeing Spirit baptism as a charismatic empowerment that is not divided from the regeneration and sanctification of Christian initiation, a concept that also Amos Yong makes use of, as we shall see later in the thesis.<sup>45</sup>

Macchia makes the point that although Spirit baptism was of major importance of the early Pentecostals, there are a few developments that give rise to some complications of the doctrine held. One of them is that while many early Pentecostals made a sharp distinction of Spirit baptism to sanctification in response to the Holiness Movement, they often spoke about Spirit baptism as a sanctifying experience of the love of God when they were not debating polemics. Another was the debate about whether the Holiness sanctification was still needed. Thirdly we have the now-called Oneness Pentecostalism that considered Spirit baptism as the final moment of the conversion/salvation experience and lastly the notion of speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of Spirit baptism. In the beginning, after Parham's teachings, many considered xenolalia (speaking in an unknown foreign language) the means of world evangelization, but this idea soon faded away. Other Pentecostals often disagreed on whether tongues were a necessary evidence of Spirit baptism, even within the US Pentecostalism where such a teaching had the strongest support. Today there is still dispute about the connection of Spirit baptism and speaking in tongues, Macchia writes.<sup>46</sup>

So, we can see that there is a somewhat diverse set of ideas and teachings about Spirit baptism in Pentecostalism and it has been interpreted in different ways. Macchia asks the question of what purpose it serves to speak about Spirit baptism as the central loci of Pentecostal doctrine, when there is no clear understanding of what it is all about. This diversity is a major reason for Spirit baptism no longer having this great residue of importance by Pentecostal profiles today, Macchia claims. He further states that before his work on the subject, there has not been a constructive effort for making a cohesive doctrine of Spirit baptism by a Pentecostal systematic theologian in nearly three decades. He continues to affirm that Spirit baptism has

---

45 Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 79–83.

46 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 14–16.

lost its prominent place among many Pentecostal scholars in the West and that they have detached themselves from the importance the teaching has had in the movement both historically and globally.<sup>47</sup>

Macchia, however, maintains that even if there is a great variety of distinctive teachings among Pentecostals, the favored doctrine is nevertheless the baptism in the Holy Spirit, both from the literature of the early years, as well as seen amongst the majority of Pentecostals today as profoundly charismatic. This despite various viewpoints about the specifics, although commonly focused upon the person of Christ as the victor of all that opposes in the world.<sup>48</sup>

There are also other central Pentecostal teachings of great importance in the movement in addition to Spirit baptism, like divine healing, tongues and the eschatological reality of the second coming of Christ, but we will not dwell into these issues as separate theological locies in this thesis, although we will consider eschatology (and briefly tongues) in relation to Spirit baptism. Walter J. Hollenweger also brings up the debate on whether a doctrine as a central pillar of Pentecostalism is problematic because of its diversity and lack of unison acknowledgement, and how it is more an experience that unifies the Pentecostals. Macchia acknowledges this diversity, but maintains that there is a coherent, doctrinal vision among Pentecostals and states that Spirit baptism is not only a doctrine, but also a metaphor that functions symbolically in ways other than doctrine. Even though there is not a uniform agreement about the beliefs, Macchia observes that in the discussions and writings of Pentecostals, a certain kind of intense, direct and overwhelming spiritual experience called 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' still reoccur over and over again. Typically, Spirit baptism is seen as an empowering experience that is connected to the witness to Jesus Christ and participation in spiritual gifts, and Macchia sees an overwhelming notion of the experience and teaching of Spirit baptism in the literature produced throughout the history of Pentecostalism, making it that which is most principally Pentecostal and even being their crown jewel.<sup>49</sup>

---

47 Studebaker, 16–20.

48 Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 36.

49 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 16–21.

Since we in the introductory chapter have endeavoured to examine the Scriptural basis for the teaching, a more in-depth attention must now be given to the biblical witness of the New Testament. By reviewing the different passages in the New Testament, the commentaries from different scholars on how to understand them will somewhat address the Dunn debate about their meanings and as such be foreshadowing our inquiry into the debate in chapter 2.2.4.

### **2.2.2 The New Testament**

Frank Macchia mentions two things that strike him when reading the New Testament's use of the verb 'baptize' in relation to the Spirit. One of these is that he considers the role of Spirit baptizer as the most distinctive belief about Jesus among the writers of the books and epistles in the New Testament. In all of the four Gospels, Jesus is announced as the Spirit Baptizer in the very beginning. This is especially interesting since this role of imparting the Spirit is new and unique to the New Testament, without any former importance in the Messianic expectations of the Old Testament or in the Jewish expectations of the coming Messiah. Macchia argues that the later high Christological claims of His deity would have been an effect of the accounts of Jesus breathing or pouring forth the Spirit for new life. If this is so, then it assuredly places Spirit baptism at the very core of the understanding of Jesus that is given in the New Testament. Furthermore, Macchia reads the multidimensionality of the pneumatological metaphors regarding this as finding its fulfillment in the eschatological reality of the inauguration of the Kingdom of God, something that will be considered in detail in Chapter 3.<sup>50</sup>

Harold Hunter writes that the little theological work produced by the Pentecostals until the 1980s, focused almost entirely on the Lukan elucidation of the book of Acts, with only a minor interest in Pauline and Johannine literature. The lack of scholarly research seems to be a result of the practical orientation along with a strong emphasis on eschatological matters that pertained the movement in most of its history. As the Lukan writings in the book of Acts were considered sufficient basis for its teachings on Spirit baptism and tongues, a further and

---

<sup>50</sup> Studebaker, 23–24.



deeper consideration of Paul's pneumatology was deemed unnecessary, although the Pauline writings on tongues accompanied the already existing practices on these matters and gave them verification. Hunter deems this to be a case of incomplete research.<sup>51</sup>

Roger Stronsted argues that Luke's theological emphasis on the Holy Spirit is independent and different from Paul's, something those influenced by Reformed hermeneutics and theology did not consider. Luke is concerned with the vocational and charismatic activity of the Holy Spirit, both in regards to Jesus in the Gospel, as well as for the disciples in Acts. He continues to inform that in Luke-Acts all those who received the Holy Spirit were already saved. This is paralleled with the teachings of the subsequent second blessing. Repentance and forgiveness of sins are thus the essential spiritual prerequisites for being baptized in the Holy Spirit, he writes. So rather than being a salvation experience, it must be the charismatic experience that the disciples received on Pentecost. Many scholars within the Evangelical tradition dismiss this, he asserts. He begins with the story of Zacharias and Elizabeth in the Gospel of Luke, where they were reported as righteous in the sight of God, before they both were filled with the Holy Spirit on different occasions, before continuing with the story of Simeon that also was righteous and experienced the Holy Spirit in the Temple. All these cases were about prophetic ministry rather than salvation.<sup>52</sup>

In the Book of Acts he continues to report about this pattern, both on the disciples on the day of Pentecost, as well as the experience of Cornelius and his household. Later in the Book of Acts, you have the Samaritans where the believers there had not yet had the Holy Spirit fallen upon them. After Peter and John prayed for them, they did in fact receive the Holy Spirit. The final example is Paul's meeting with the disciples at Ephesus where they encountered the Holy Spirit and began speaking in tongues and prophesying. In all these encounters, there was a time between their initial salvation and their experience of the Holy Spirit.<sup>53</sup>

Although these are all interesting encounters, the prime encounter for Spirit baptism is of course the experience of the disciples on Pentecost. In Acts 2:4 it is stated that the disciples

---

51 D. Hunter, *Spirit Baptism*, 38.

52 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 104–107.

53 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 107–108.

'were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave utterance'. This is told by Luke himself in Acts 2:14-21 that it is the fulfillment of the eschatological prophecy in Joel 2:28-32.<sup>54</sup>

The encounter with Cornelius has many resemblances to the event at Pentecost, Stronstad contends. There was speaking in tongues with the exaltation of God and the message that it was the same gift that was given at Pentecost (Acts 11:15-17), meaning the same gift that was given as the fulfillment of the prophecy. Stronstad reads a pattern here, that the baptism of the Holy Spirit, is signified by speaking in tongues. The same pattern that was held as one of the main teachings among the early Pentecostals.<sup>55</sup>

John connects Jesus' role as Spirit baptizer to His divinity, according to Macchia, as John 20:22 states that Jesus breathes the Spirit forth, just as God did in Gen 2:7. The very life of God sent forth to redeem and sanctify, as in Him was life (John 1:4) and He as the Logos is said to be God in John 1:1. In Acts 1, Jesus refers to Himself as the Spirit baptizer, and it is understood that He would send the Spirit after He had ascended to the Father (Acts 2:33). Paul only mentions Spirit baptism once (in 1 Cor 12:13), although Macchia writes that he assumes the significance of Jesus in the role of the Spirit, and through faith in Him, throughout his writings. Macchia considers Spirit baptism at the core of the Christian understanding of Jesus in the New Testament, especially since His role is unique to the New Testament and has no references from the Old Testament or the Jewish anticipation of the Messiah. Furthermore, he remarks how the metaphor of Spirit baptism is deployed in the New Testament as quite similar to how it functions among Pentecostals globally, with a certain fluidity and multidimensionality. It is all brought together with the New Testament teachings about eschatology and the inauguration of the Kingdom of God through the Spirit, he writes. Jesus as the Spirit baptizer functions in the context of John the Baptist's teaching of the Kingdom of God in Matt 3, for example. Jesus' own baptism with the Spirit descending is endowed with the description of the openings of the heavens, a typical sign of an apocalyptic revelation. These visions of Spirit baptism point towards the final judgement and final

---

54 Studebaker, 108.

55 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 116–117.

sanctification of the whole creation, according to Macchia, a concept that will be more expounded in chapter 3.<sup>56</sup>

In John 3:5, we also have the connection between Jesus as the Spirit baptizer with the entering of the Kingdom of God. In Acts 1, this same connection is made between Jesus' role and the teachings about the Kingdom. In Acts 2:17 it is said that the Spirit is to be poured out upon all, after it is given to the disciples in Jerusalem. Macchia reads this as an eschatological fulfillment. That the ultimate goal of Spirit baptism is the new humanity and the new creation, Macchia also finds evidence for in Paul's writings about the baptism in the Spirit into one body in 1 Cor 12:13, with the fellowship of all believers in the Spirit's '*koinonia*'. So, we see, the eschatological focus of the Pentecostals may not be a 'competing' teaching to Spirit baptism as their central loci, but rather a context in which it could be understood.<sup>57</sup>

Steven M. Studebaker denies the idea that many Christians adhere to, namely that the Holy Spirit received on Pentecost was primarily about salvation, with a clear negative. There has been important debates about this following James Dunn's work on the subject, that will be expounded in chapter 2.2.4. It cannot be so, he asserts, as Luke writes clearly about the right standing of the disciples in his Gospel already years before the event. He writes about Levi receiving forgiveness of sins (Luke 5:27-32), forgiven disciples of John the Baptist to become his own (Luke 5:1-11) and the great deeds performed by Jesus' followers (Luke 9:6, 10). In Luke 10:16 we read that whoever received the disciples, received him, and in Luke 10:20 it is written that their names were recorded in Heaven. They also participated in the new covenant meal of the last supper. It cannot, therefore, be about salvation, but rather about vocation. The disciples were already saved and the outpouring of the Spirit was about the prophecy in Acts 2:17-18. He further asserts that this experience is not an anomaly, but a pattern repeatedly seen in Luke-Acts.<sup>58</sup>

---

56 Studebaker, 21–24.

57 Studebaker, 24–25; Christopher Adam Stephenson, "Pentecostal Theology According to the Theologians: An Introduction to the Theological Methods of Pentecostal Systematic Theologians" (Wisconsin, Marquette University, 2009), 120–28.

58 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 108.

Stronstad and Menzies conclude their exegesis with the notion that Spirit baptism is soteriological in Paul's pneumatology. According to Stronstad, Paul's theology of Spirit baptism is initiatory and embodies the believer unto Christ and the Church. Harold Hunter, the Pentecostal scholar, agrees with this, that in Paul's understanding it is central to salvation, unlike the charismatic emphasis in Luke. Macchia notes that a Pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism should include both the soteriological aspect of Paul as well as the charismatic aspect of Luke. One enters Spirit-baptized existence at initiation, although the experiences of Spirit baptism is to be ongoing, according to Macchia. The experience of Spirit baptism is to bring conscious participation in the Kingdom, growing in sanctifying grace, as well as charismatic openness to bless others and glorify God – something that begins in Christian initiation, but ultimately is realized eschatological. While Stronstad and Menzies separates Luke's and Paul's theology of Spirit baptism, they fail to integrate the two, Macchia asserts, although Menzies does state that these two views complement each other.<sup>59</sup>

Macchia continues to dwell into the question about Spirit baptism in Luke; if it is only charismatic or prophetic, or something more. The Korean theologian Youngmo Cho maintains that Luke does not portray Spirit baptism as inauguration of the Kingdom of God, but rather gives the power to proclaim the Kingdom. Here it is empowerment of witness that is of main concern, while Cho considers Paul to connect the Spirit as the source of the Kingdom. Macchia on the other hand, seeks to listen to the multiple voices in the New Testament like how Matthew relates them directly with John's proclamation and the prediction of the arrival of Jesus as the Spirit Baptizer, as well as how Jesus talks about works of the Spirit in connection with the presence of the Kingdom. Macchia thus arrives at the conclusion that the metaphor of Spirit baptism can be used both for the arrival of the Kingdom, as well as for the empowerment of witness of this Kingdom. He emphasizes the importance of both the soteriological and charismatic functions of it and ultimately concludes that Spirit baptism is a baptism into the love of God that sanctifies, renews and empowers until all of creation is turned into the dwelling place of God.<sup>60</sup>

---

59 Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 57, 153.

60 Macchia, 57–60.

Roger Stronstad, on the other hand, criticizes Macchia for bringing everything together as part of Spirit baptism. If it is everything, he writes, like initiation, sanctification and Christian witness, then it is really nothing. He calls it a confusion of categories and a 'feel good' approach. Instead, he wants to assert that it is rather a 'crisis experience' for believers that already have a right standing with God. As such, it is not about both initiation, sanctification and empowered witness, and there must then be an interval of time between when this right standing occurs, as salvation, and when believers are baptized in the Holy Spirit. He especially rules out the initiational or soteriological aspect that Macchia integrates from the Pauline writings. Stronstad still considers Paul to be complementary to Luke in that Paul is using more metaphors and is writing in the context of 'task theology' (to address certain issues in Corinth). Stronstad contends that the emphasis on service within the church is compatible with Luke's notion of Spirit baptism as an empowerment for witness and service. Identifying as an apostle, he is surely aware of the Spirit's activity, and shows great signs of it in his evangelistic endeavours.<sup>61</sup>

Evidently, in the beginning of Acts, Luke obviously portrays the baptism in the Holy Spirit as something that gives power to witness and not only how the Spirit brings someone into faith and seals that with baptism, Macchia states, although we have seen that there are some different stances taken amongst different scholars. Macchia further addresses the Pentecostals as doing well in making the empowerment for prophetic witness a central part of their Spirit baptism. The Lukan Spirit in Spirit baptism is the Spirit of witness. This is important in the sense that many lukewarm Christians would be encouraged to be baptized in the Spirit in dynamic praise and for charismatic power for service. To be a living witness to Jesus, this would be an essential flaming up of the indwelling Spirit and something to bring fresh life to lifeless churches.<sup>62</sup>

As we have seen, there are plenty of biblical references to Spirit baptism. Many of these are in Luke-Acts, but also Paul addresses it in his writings. There are, however, some differences in how these passages are interpreted, although a certain consensus among the works consulted is that Luke is primarily focused on the charismatic aspect, while Paul is focused on the

---

61 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 119–135.

62 Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 75–78.

soteriological aspect. Keeping in mind that Dunn would consider both to be about salvation. Macchia on the other hand emphasizes how Jesus is portrayed as the Spirit baptizer and views this as a central New Testament focus.

### 2.2.3 Spirit Baptism in Early Christianity

As we have seen, the doctrine of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit emerged in modern Pentecostal movement through various proponents in the Methodist, Holiness and Revival-movements preceding it. But what about its existence in the early church? Did it just arise out of nothing or did it have a prior tradition in the church?

Anderson maintains that the early church was a community of the Holy Spirit that in many ways would resemble Pentecostal and Charismatic churches today in their expressions. Many of the charisms of the Spirit was freely flowing, like prophecy, healing and speaking in tongues. The book of Acts, as well as 1 Corinthians, mentions many occasions of these. This practice, however, seems to have had an early decline. Some signs of this is the Montanist movement that believed they had brought back the gifts of the Spirit in the church. Tertullian, the early giant of a theologian in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD, writes that such occurrences as prophecies, visions, ecstasy, interpretation of tongues, healing, revelation and exorcism were gifts that were available to the believers.<sup>63</sup>

J. B. Galloway writes in '*A Study of Holiness from the Early Church Fathers*' that the early Christian writers proclaim that it was common in the second century to pray that believers were filled with the Spirit. He further writes that Tertullian stated that it was practice to anoint the baptized believer with oil before praying to be filled with the Holy Spirit. While water symbolized cleansing from sin, the anointing with oil signified the baptism of the Spirit.<sup>64</sup>

There were other early Christian writers that briefly touched upon the subject of charisms. One of these was the bishop Ignatius of Antioch (d.107) about a special gift he had and the ability to understand heavenly things. Clement of Rome writes about an outpouring of the

---

<sup>63</sup> Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 19–20.

<sup>64</sup> J.B. Galloway, *Study of Holiness from the Early Church Fathers* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2014), 34.

Spirit and Justin Martyr about people among them possessing gifts of the Spirit (mentioning exorcism). Bishop Irenaeus of Gaul (c.130-202) tells about several charisms, and early writings like Didache, Shepherd of Hermas, Acts of the Apostles portray similar events. There seemed to be no lack of appreciation and acceptance for the spiritual gifts from the Church Fathers. What was deemed negatively as heretical sects, such as the activities of the Montanist movement, would however put a strain on the later centuries of charismatic expressions in the Western church.<sup>65</sup>

Aside from liturgical documents about the laying on of hands (and thus filling the believer with the Spirit and His graces), there are also theologians in the East like John of Damascus (675-749). He explains that since humans consist of soul and body, there is also a two-fold purification, a two-fold baptism of water and Spirit. In the Eastern church, the charismatic gifts were continued to be practiced. Symeon the New Theologian (949-1022) did actually write about a 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' by recounting ecstatic experiences and speaking in tongues. Some years later, Gregory Palamas (1296-1359) wrote about receiving spiritual gifts by the laying on of hands and experiencing God through the Spirit. Furthermore, Theophan the Recluse, a monastic teacher in the Orthodox Church, said that to be filled with the Spirit is a collaboration with, and allowance of, the Holy Spirit to manifest Himself by perceptively touching the heart. He also says that while He is in all of us, He is not being active in all.<sup>66</sup>

While there are mentions and affirmed practices in early Christianity of Spirit baptism and the charisms, it does not seem to have had the exact same significance in the writings available from this time to the emphasizes made by the early Pentecostals. It does, however, seem to have been a known phenomenon in the life of believers in the Church following New Testament times, with expressions resembling charismatic churches in later times.

While we have taken a glimpse on how the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit have developed into its Pentecostal crescendo, as well as its mentions and practices in the New Testament and early church, we need to consider a pivotal event for recent Pentecostal scholarship on the issue, namely the Dunn debate. Important parts of this debate has already

---

<sup>65</sup> Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 20–21.

<sup>66</sup> Anderson, 21–22; D. Hunter, *Spirit Baptism*, 143–49.

been considered in various theologians interpretations of Lukan and Pauline writings in the New Testament. It does, however, deserve a chapter of its own, since this debate gave rise to a lot of Pentecostal apologetics and scholarly works to defend their teaching about a subsequent baptism in the Spirit that was different from only an initiatory experience. It thus set the stage of much contemporary scholarship on the subject.

#### 2.2.4 The Dunn Debate

James D. G. Dunn is Emeritus Lightfoot Professor of Divinity at the University of Durham and a much renowned and influential New Testament theologian. With his book '*Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*', based on his doctoral research, he sparked what is called the first wave of Pentecostal scholarship on Luke-Acts. He argues that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was part of, and the main element, of the believer's conversion-initiation event in becoming a Christian and that the traditional Pentecostal understanding is not compatible with Scripture. He then advocates for its soteriological essence and denies the charismatic empowerment for witness as a subsequent experience. This gave rise to a lot of apologetic Pentecostal and scholarly work, where this thesis was to be responded to and the traditional understanding defended.<sup>67</sup>

Dunn questions if the New Testament is telling the same story about the baptism in the Holy Spirit as the Pentecostals do and whether it is something essentially different than becoming a Christian. While he does respect Pentecostalism as a movement, he delivers some heavy critique on its teaching about Spirit baptism. With his lexical and syntactical exegesis, he unravels his understanding of many of the passages and texts pertaining to the doctrine of Spirit baptism. While Pentecostals would often understand Jesus' experience at Jordan as a subsequent baptism in the Holy Spirit, Dunn rather considers it as a pivotal moment of salvation history, the beginning of the Messianic era. While it could be seen as a powerful anointing, its primary cause is to be initiatory, according to Dunn. Based on this, Dunn considers it paradigmatic for the conversion-initiation experience, as he maintains is the correct understanding of Spirit baptism, rather than a subsequent experience for believers. He

---

<sup>67</sup> Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 152; Atkinson, *Baptism in the Spirit*, 6.



has the same sentiments about Pentecost itself, namely that it was first and foremost initiatory in the sense that it sparked the age of the Spirit and the birth of the Church. It was the beginning of the new age and a new covenant for his disciples. He thus considers Pentecost as a paradigm of actually becoming a Christian, not of a second blessing.<sup>68</sup>

Roger Stronstad meanwhile declares that Luke is found to have a charismatic rather than a soteriological theology of the Holy Spirit. Riku Tuppurainen claims Stronstad's declaration as a profoundly theological conclusion derived from Lukan biblical theology and something that has provoked one of the defining debates in Pentecostal theology (part of the Dunn debate).<sup>69</sup>

While Dunn uses the whole of the New Testament as a basis for his research on the subject, it has been mainly the Luke-Acts consideration that has been of pivotal importance among the Pentecostal respondents. After accounting for his exegesis on Pentecost, Dunn further addresses the Samaritans in Acts 8:4-25. Since those who believed here did not receive the Spirit at the moment of conversion, Dunn deems that it means that Luke wants to show that their original response was not a real conversion and that Luke highlights the difference between true and false conversion. Not until they received the Spirit, did they become true believers. Another important passage for Pentecostalism is Paul's conversion, where he was filled with the Spirit only after three days from his conversion on the road to Damascus. Here Dunn argues that Luke is not displaying a subsequent second blessing for Paul, but rather a conversion lasting three days.<sup>70</sup>

After this, Dunn goes on to the conversion of Cornelius, another account that many Pentecostals consider being evidence for that salvation happens at an earlier moment than the Spirit baptism. Dunn understands this encounter to be another salvation experience where Cornelius received the Spirit just when Peter spoke about faith and forgiveness and thus confirms to his view that the baptism in the Spirit IS God's act of forgiveness and salvation. Then we have the Ephesians that had not yet received the Spirit when Paul met them, a

---

68 Atkinson, *Baptism in the Spirit*, 6–11.

69 Riku P. Tuppurainen, *Reading St. Luke's Text and Theology: Pentecostal Voices: Essays in Honor of Professor Roger Stronstad* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2019), 104.

70 Atkinson, *Baptism in the Spirit*, 5-13.

peculiar situation. Dunn rejects the understandings that a) They were believers already, or b) A believer can be without the Spirit or c) There was a timelapse between them receiving baptism and them receiving the Spirit. Rather, he concludes, these were not yet Christians and did not really know either the Spirit or Jesus and were only baptized with the baptism of John. Dunn therefore sees only one baptism in this encounter, that of the Spirit that made them Christians.<sup>71</sup>

Based on this, there is no surprise that Dunn's conclusion is as following: the reading of Luke does not support the Pentecostal teachings about subsequent baptism in the Holy Spirit. It is rather soteriological in essence and brings the individual into the new covenant. Even the experiences of Jesus represent Christian conversion as an archetype and a change of paradigms. This is consistent with the rest of the New Testament and the Pauline writings, he asserts.<sup>72</sup>

In November 2009, a session of the Society of Biblical Literature conference in New Orleans was all about Dunn's book and the debate. That itself shows how relevant it has been for the debate on Spirit baptism, still sparking debates even four decades after its original publishing. Roger Stronstad, a major contributor to the debate and also to this conference, offers two claims about Dunn's work. Firstly, it hasn't really had any effect on Pentecostalism and its teachings, secondly it has helped Pentecostals creating a more reflective approach to the baptism in the Holy Spirit in the works of Luke. While the first statement may be true for most Pentecostals, Atkinson does mention Max Turner as one of the important figures that has been convinced by Dunn's work. The second statement is certainly correct. As have been mentioned previously in this thesis, Pentecostalism has been criticized for not engaging in much academic and scholarly expositions of their faith and beliefs in their early years and have been considered to be anti-intellectual by some, based on their focus on pragmatic and experimental lives. This began to change in the later decades of the last century with Roger Stronstad as one of the pioneers. He is an Associate Professor in Bible and Theology at Summit Pacific College in British Columbia and especially his work '*The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*' gives a good deal of response to Dunn's propositions. Here he gets

---

71 Atkinson, 13–14.

72 Atkinson, 14–15.

afront with what he deems a 'silencing' of Luke's pneumatology by many contemporary interpreters. Three important facets of Luke's works have not been rightfully considered, according to Stronstad. One was the idea that Luke had a consistent pneumatology about 'being filled with the Spirit', both in Acts as well in the Gospel, that he was both an accomplished theologian as well as a historian, and that he was an independent theologian that should not be read as either Paul or John.<sup>73</sup>

William and Robert P. Menzies agree on the last point, namely that one should not deny the uniqueness of Luke's pneumatology, although they seemingly diverge somewhat from the traditional Pentecostal teaching about a subsequent baptism in the Holy Spirit by advocating two baptisms in the Spirit instead; one soteriological based on Pauline writings and one for charismatic empowerment based on Luke. According to David Perry, the work of William and Robert Menzies has nevertheless been important for Pentecostals. Furthermore, Perry states that there has been a somewhat lack of progress in the debate over these 40 years and Stronstad writes that the debate remains unsolved. Dunn on his side expresses some disappointment in that more faults in his thesis have not been highlighted. This might be due to different fundamental assumptions about epistemology and hermeneutics according to Perry.<sup>74</sup>

David Perry contends that even if Dunn would be right to claim that the Pentecostal experience should not be called 'baptism in the Spirit' in a biblical sense, based on the language employed in the New Testament with the connection between Luke's notions of the 'gift of the Spirit' at Pentecost and the Pentecostal doctrine, it still cannot deny the experience of millions of Pentecostals over the world. Also, while Dunn's critique has a rational basis by his interpretation of Scripture, Pentecostals employ the manner differently, in that they often move from experience to doctrine to theology, and that doctrines are of little use if not resonating or reflecting real personal experiences. These differences in epistemology, Perry claims, are making the debate unresolved. To exegete out of experience can be seen as a somewhat dangerous practice from a sceptics' view, but William W. Menzies in turn responds to this that it is dangerous to form theology and hermeneutics from non-experience rather. In

---

<sup>73</sup> Atkinson, 18–25.

<sup>74</sup> Perry, *Spirit Baptism*, 14–17.

our theoretical introduction, some thoughts on Pentecostal hermeneutics also portrayed some of this. These reflecting conclusions by Perry and Menzies show why it is important to investigate the hermeneutical lenses Scripture is understood through in order to see the perspectives of the debates more clearly.<sup>75</sup>

Amos Yong, on the other hand, calls for what he names 'a dynamic pneumatological soteriology', where there are three moments to be emphasized when it comes to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The first is the soteriological aspect, the first receiving of the Holy Spirit. Then we have the ongoing experience of being filled by the Spirit (sanctification) and then there is the eschatological future day when the experience of the full baptism and union with God is to happen. He thus sees this as a part of the dynamic process of salvation, in that the believers have been saved, are being saved and will be saved. This dynamic process brings light to the whole debate about whether Spirit baptism is understood as a conversion-initiation experience or a second or even third work of grace, according to Yong. While he considers it to include the initiatory conversion-experience, he also continues to embrace and even expects the classical Pentecostal understanding of a second (or third) work of grace that endows the believer with charismatic and vocational power to service and witness. With that in mind, Yong does not consider these two to exclude each other. He does, however, regard the Spirit baptism in its initiatory aspect as an ongoing Wesleyan understanding, as a process, and also the empowerment for service to be of multiple possible happenings rather than a single event. Yong then does not relate the Spirit baptism to neither the classical Pentecostal view of charismatic empowerment as a single event, nor to the mere event of initiatory conversion, but rather to an ongoing dynamic process where the full salvific work of Christ is being at work in the believer through the Spirit, from beginning to end.<sup>76</sup>

Goran Medved makes some mentions on two types of traditions in Protestant Charismatic theologies when it comes to understanding Spirit baptism, namely sacramental and non-sacramental. The sacramental view teaches that The Holy Spirit is received at initiation. When a believer, at a later time, experiences baptism in the Spirit, it is thus a sacramental grace that

---

<sup>75</sup> Perry, 19–24; Tuppurainen, *Reading St. Luke's Text and Theology*, 96.

<sup>76</sup> Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005), 101–105, 118–120.

is experienced, called 'the release of the Spirit'. This would also be the main understanding of many charismatic leaders today. This means that it is not the Spirit that is falling anew on the believers, but rather the already indwelling Spirit received at salvation, that is brought to a realization. Both in Anglican, Lutheran, as well as Presbyterian churches that affirm to the sacramental tradition, this teaching is found, Medved expounds.<sup>77</sup>

In Reformed, Baptist, Methodist and other churches we can find the non-sacramental tradition. Here it is not connected with sacraments, although they accept that believers can experience the indwelling Spirit. The concept of Spirit baptism they relegate to the day of Pentecost, however, as a one-time event, although some would see it as the final stage of initiation. In addition to these, we have the Catholic Charismatics that seek to bring together the Pentecostal experience with their Catholic tradition, in the sacraments of baptism and confirmation. In baptism, they teach, we receive a sanctifying grace and the life of God, while in confirmation we receive the graces of the Holy Spirit just as the Apostles on the day of Pentecost. This is seemingly similar to the Protestant teachings of regeneration of the Spirit and receiving the Spirit, as well as a subsequent baptism of the Spirit.<sup>78</sup>

Medved mentions the independent charismatic churches as well, that although does not have a coherent and unified view, still can be considered to mostly have left the classic Pentecostal view of second blessing, initial evidence and the measurements for Spirit baptism. While not dogmatic on their stances, they try to avoid the separation of Christians among those who have experienced this and those who have not, with rather mentioning it as such concepts as 'a new fullness of the Holy Spirit', 'being filled with the Spirit' and so on. The idea is still that it empowers believers and provide growth in their spiritual life and is something that is to be wanted.<sup>79</sup>

While maintaining God's transcendence and God's 'otherness' (Wholly Other in Barth's words), Macchia speaks of the baptism in the Holy Spirit as the means of God becoming

---

77 Medved, "The Doctrine of Baptism in the Spirit in the Charismatic Movement," 177.

78 Medved, "The Doctrine of Baptism in the Spirit in the Charismatic Movement," 177–178.

79 Medved, "The Doctrine of Baptism in the Spirit in the Charismatic Movement," 179–180.

immanent in creation, and thus the means by which the creation becomes God's ultimate dwelling place.<sup>80</sup>

It is here given an overview of the debate that sparked much Pentecostal scholarship on the issue as well as bringing together different traditional views on the subject. It is valuable to keep in mind the different perspectives on Spirit baptism that exist when debating the subject, knowing that there are well founded reasons given for various contradicting views. Throughout the thesis, we have mentioned the teaching about speaking in tongues, and its employment as an initial evidence, several times. Before we really consider Macchia's theological framework in depth, a brief survey of how he views glossolalia is in order to grasp the full scope of his reworking of the metaphor of Spirit baptism.

### 2.2.5 Glossolalia

After our background research on the development of the Pentecostal movement, it is clear that speaking in tongues as an 'initial evidence' of baptism in the Holy Spirit has been a distinctive teaching in Pentecostal circles. Parham termed it 'the Bible evidence' and believed it to be *the evidence* of baptism in the Holy Spirit, and also Seymour initially accepted the teaching, although he later came to the conclusion that other factors than only the speaking in tongues had to be evaluated. If the fruits of the Spirit were completely absent, it would be difficult to maintain the legitimacy of the experience in his view. Gary B. McGee claims that early Pentecostals would follow Parham's lead on the issue, teaching that the evidence must be the speaking in tongues. Even from as early as 1906, there was no real consensus on the subject among Pentecostals, according to McGee.<sup>81</sup>

Glossolalia was, however, not just simply a sign to verify an experience for many early Pentecostals. It was a way of carrying out mission and fulfilling the great commission, Chan maintains. This quickly waned, since it became evident that it would not work like hoped. Chan suggests that in Luke's pneumatology, it shows (at most) as some kind of inspired

---

<sup>80</sup> Stephenson, "Pentecostal Theology According to the Theologians," 130–131.

<sup>81</sup> Gary B. McGee, *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008), 88–89, 96–112.

speech, but that there is no sufficient reasons for employing it as initial evidence, and asks if not prophetic speak would serve better as evidence instead. He does find a symbolic conception of tongues appropriate on the other hand, symbolizing a spiritual reality and that Luke intends it for empowering the believers to preach, rather than it being the preaching itself.<sup>82</sup>

In Macchia's work on glossolalia, the theological themes of Paul Tillich, as well as references to him, are present. Glossolalia here becomes a way the intensity of the presence of the Holy Spirit is experienced. It is both a symbol where the Spirit participates and a way it is conveyed. As the Pentecost is a theophany, glossolalia also functions for the Pentecostals as a theophany, a 'kairos' event (an opportune moment). The emphasis here would be on the sacramental quality of the glossolalia, rather than the evidential quality as an empirical evidence for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. It is a theophanic encounter with God that is spontaneous, free and wondrous. Macchia still contends for a logical connection between glossolalia and the Spirit baptism. It is not a just another sign among many others, but it portrays the inability of any human speech to really communicate the human encounter with the divine. Macchia maintains that the closer one draws to the divine presence, any attempt at rationally communicate the experience ends it, as to reflect and rationally communicate an experience is to distance oneself from it already. Tongues on the other hand expresses it without ending it, and the experience and the expression becomes one.<sup>83</sup>

Daniel Castelo states that Macchia's emphasis on theophany is important for several reasons. One of these is that instead of seeing it as a phenomenon of human religiosity, it features as a form of divine self-disclosure. It is focused upon God and the understanding that 'God is here' in the context of worship. It also places Pentecost within the dynamics of God's activity as appearing and revealing Himself in some way throughout Scripture. Pentecost in this way referred back to previous theophanic encounters and also pointed forward towards the parousia (The Second Coming), marking Pentecost as an eschatological event. The idea of Pentecost and the baptism in the Holy Spirit as an eschatological event and connected with the inauguration of the Kingdom, is the central theme in this thesis. We see already how Macchia

---

82 Chan, *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition*, 42–44.

83 Stephenson, "Pentecostal Theology According to the Theologians," 133–34.

incorporates various theological themes, including glossolalia, into his pneumatological framework. Glossolalia, as Macchia considers it, thus is a spoken mystery that conveys some of the paradoxes of the Kingdom as present, but not yet, near but still out of reach, as revealed but still veiled. A paradox that will be more expounded in Chapter 3.1 on the Kingdom of God.<sup>84</sup>

There's also the relation between structure and ecstasy that Tillich preserves, and that Macchia seems to agree with. Paul's doctrine of the Spirit, as found in 1 Corinthians, expresses this concern that there is a unity between ecstasy and structure. Ecstasy does not diminish the structure. The ecstatic dimension of experiencing the spiritual presence should as thus be subject to *agape* (love) and *gnosis* (knowledge/understanding). While Paul encourages the charismatas of the Spirit, they should not lead to chaos. This consideration is often dismayed by various denominations, Tillich asserts, in either the way the Roman Catholic Church replaces charismata with office or the way Protestants often replace ecstasy with doctrine and moral structure. Rather there should be a structure in which ecstasy can flow instead of seeing it as chaotic and something to be dismissed. Stephenson writes that Macchia maintains his whole reflection about glossolalia within the frame that ecstasy and structure remain united. While glossolalia is a free and ecstatic expression, it is also a structured expression because of its sacramental quality. While concerned with the freedom of the Spirit, glossolalia also maintains the symbols of speech as a sacramental legitimacy of the experience. As thus it is both ecstatic and structured.<sup>85</sup>

Macchia considers the necessary relationship between glossolalia and Spirit baptism in a way that glossolalia is a symbol of the divine presence through theophany, rather than a sign that points away from itself to signify a more substantial reality (that of Spirit baptism having taken place), something that has been a traditional Pentecostal narrative on the teaching of initial evidence.<sup>86</sup>

---

84 Castelo Daniel, *Pentecostalism as a Christian Mystical Tradition* (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2017), 152–53.

85 Stephenson, 131–135.

86 Stephenson, 135.



‘Initial evidence’ is the term used by Pentecostals to describe tongues as the first observable sign of Spirit baptism. The views have varied historically on this, but historians such as Gary McGee considers this doctrine the chief doctrinal distinctive of classic Pentecostalism, although a systematic theologian such as Macchia insists that this distinctiveness cannot be reduced to tongues. In the US especially there has been a definitive teaching that one cannot claim to the baptism without tongues as evidence, while there have been others who are of the opinion that tongues might not immediately follow the Spirit baptism. Joseph Roswell Flower, an early Assemblies of God leader, considered that it should happen at some time after the baptism, although the experience itself did not need it to be considered legitimate. It is mostly among the white Pentecostal churches in the US that the initial evidence is at the forefront, according to Macchia, while it elsewhere varies. In Europe it is less common. Mainstream charismatics usually do not keep such a doctrine, Macchia cites Henry Lederle, although there are some exceptions.<sup>87</sup>

In chapter 2, there has been some much needed elaborations on the Pentecostal movement, the development of the doctrine of Spirit baptism, relevant passages from the New Testament, the practice of Spirit baptism and charism in early Christianity, as well as an overview of the Dunn debate and a brief consideration of glossolalia. We have seen how the Pentecostal movement has risen from the dusts of Azusa Street to a worldwide phenomenon and how the teaching of baptism in the Holy Spirit has gone through several doctrinal stages, from pietistic Protestantism, through Methodism, revival movements and the Holiness movement until it was seized as a subsequent encounter with the Holy Spirit for charismatic witness and power in the Pentecostal distinctive. We have had a glance of relevant New Testament passages considering Spirit baptism and its relation to the Kingdom of God, as well as a very brief overview of its history in earlier traditions of Christianity. We have seen that all of the Gospels introduce Jesus as Spirit baptizer and that the context of Spirit baptism of both John the Baptist and Jesus, is the Kingdom. The event of Pentecost in Acts 2 have been surveyed, as well as several other events in the New Testament where Spirit baptism is addressed. The Dunn Debate, that has been so important for more contemporary works on Spirit baptism and providing us with well-defined answers to the Pentecostal understanding, has been considered

<sup>87</sup> Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 36; Tony Richie, *Essentials of Pentecostal Theology* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2020), 197–98.

at length with a considerate debate on whether Spirit baptism is to be understood primarily initiatory, as charismatic empowerment or both. Ending the chapter, we have taken a quick look at glossolalia and how Macchia relates this to his theology, using the theological themes of Tillich.

By doing this, we should have answered our first research question, namely what the baptism in the Holy Spirit is all about (and how it has developed as a distinct teaching), and partly whether it is soteriological, charismatic or a broader and more fluid metaphor.

This all gives us the necessary understanding to address our goal of bringing some new perspectives on the teaching of Spirit baptism and continue on to our last two research question by bringing it together with ecclesiology, eschatology and the Kingdom of God, together with Frank D. Macchia. While Macchia's work will be the most important, it will be viewed in relation to scholars such as George Eldon Ladd, James Dunn, Amos Yong, Steven G. Land, Andy Lord and others. With seminal works by renowned names such as these, having our point of departure in Macchia's work, a more comprehensive understanding of the potential relation between these various theological areas incorporated in a broader theological framework should be possible.

### 3 Spirit Baptism, Eschatology and the Kingdom

In his book *'Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology'*, Frank Macchia portrays his theological framework on Spirit Baptism in light of ecclesiology, eschatology and most importantly, the Kingdom of God. To understand the whole image Macchia conveys with using Spirit baptism as the central tenet, we will look more closely into how Macchia develops his concept by first investigating the central theological areas that make up his pneumatological framework. Each of these presents valuable aspects of his theology and to understand his aim and fluidly use of the metaphor Spirit baptism, we need to carefully endeavour into each of them before we connect them together with Macchia's framework. Other scholars that offer either differing or complementary views to Macchia, will be consulted to give his framework the right context in contemporary Pentecostal scholarship. This will also help us to gain a clearer overview of the theological areas in question, giving them a broader contour with different perspectives, as well as some potentially critical objections. While the main task here is to endeavour to portray Macchia's reworking of the pneumatological framework of Spirit baptism, with the purpose of bringing some new insights and perspectives to the table, it is important to see that he does not work in an academical vacuum, but relates with other contemporary scholars that both challenge and sustains his theology with acclamation.

The goal of this chapter will be to bring it all together, both the overview of the background we have gained in chapter 2, as well as the presentation of the main theological themes Macchia draws upon and how they relate to the metaphor of Spirit baptism.

According to Christopher Stephenson in his paper *'Pentecostal Theology According to the Theologians: An Introduction to the Theological Methods of Pentecostal Systematic Theologians'*, Macchia sets the baptism in the Holy Spirit in an eschatological framework that inaugurates the Kingdom and as such, transcends the Church. The baptism gives birth to the Church and therefore constitutes and transcends it. The Church's unity is as thus not based on episcopacy, but the baptism. He further writes that Spirit baptism is an eschatological gift bound fundamentally to the Gospel of the Kingdom and accessible by one faith shared among the entire people of God. The one catholic church's universality comes from the Spirit's

universal presence. By this, it is not only Pentecostalism's main doctrine, but also foundational for the early church and its confession of Jesus. The understanding of Jesus as the Spirit-baptizer is a vital part of the Gospel, he states. Stephenson demonstrates that Macchia sets forth his theology with the background of the Kingdom of God and pneumatology. He uses it as a point of concern to encourage social engagement, to frame justification's cosmic dimensions and to provide the background for the Spirit baptism. He then uses pneumatology for a consideration of glossolalia beyond the boundaries of initial evidence as have been seen already, justification beyond the forensic account and considering ecclesiology and soteriology in relation to Spirit baptism.<sup>88</sup>

### **3.1 The Kingdom**

Firstly, to understand why Spirit baptism could be connected to the inauguration of the Kingdom, we need to look at how Macchia interprets the New Testament witness of the Kingdom in pneumatological terms. In 19<sup>th</sup> century liberal Protestant theology, the Kingdom was considered an ethical and communal reality while a new consideration of the Kingdom as an apocalyptic and other-worldly kind of realm emerged in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Macchia argues that both these sides are very much one-sided in opposite degrees and thus distorted. Rather, we must understand it pneumatological in the way, just as Gregory of Nyssa stated, that the Spirit is the Kingdom and Jesus Christ is the King.

Before we dwell into these theological concepts, we must have a look at the history of the concept of the Kingdom of God and how it has been understood since Old Testament times. We must also consider the event at Pentecost for the constitution of the church and the relation of the church to the Kingdom of God. According to Norman R. Perrin, the root of the symbol is in Ancient Near Eastern myth, where the kingship of God is seen as common to all the peoples of that time and place. This was brought together with another tradition in Israel, namely the Salvation History, and in turn this meant the combination of the saving acts of God as well as God as a powerful re-creator, and thus it formed a *myth* where Israel saw themselves as the people of God. When we are talking about 'myth' here, we refer to myth as

---

<sup>88</sup> Stephenson, "Pentecostal Theology According to the Theologians," 142–143.

a ‘complex of stories, some factual and some fantasy, that are regarded as demonstrations of the inner meaning of the universe and of human life’, a definition given by Alan Watts.<sup>89</sup>

The symbolic language of the Kingdom grew more metaphorical during the Roman rule, according to Perrin. When considered a symbol, Philip Wheelwright has a twofold terminology in understanding symbols in general; 1) Steno-symbol that has a one-to-one relationship to that which it represents (like the mathematical symbol for pi) and 2) Tensive symbols that have a set of meanings that cannot be fully expressed by a single referent. If we consider the Kingdom of God as a steno-symbol, it would have to be an event such as a dramatic intervention by God in history, and thus exhausted its significance afterwards. Norman Perrin, in his *‘Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom’*, understands the Kingdom not as a concept, but a symbol which evokes a myth. In Ancient Judaism he considers the Kingdom as being a fundamentally tensive symbol giving this statement on the matters; ‘as a symbol it can represent or evoke a whole range of or series of conceptions, but it only becomes a conception or idea if it constantly represents or evokes that one conception or idea’, and furthermore rejects the labelling of the Kingdom as a mere concept or steno-symbol.<sup>90</sup>

Dale Patrick, professor of religion at Drake University, considers Jesus to employ the expression of the Kingdom of God (Βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ) as a way to comprehend a complex of ideas, associations and metaphors, and that the listeners must make a number of connections to understand what He means and reconceptualize this with a new understanding if necessary.<sup>91</sup>

In the Old Testament, we do not have the exact term ‘Kingdom of God’, although it is an idea that is found frequently among the prophets. According to George Eldon Ladd these have two emphasizes; one is that God is spoken about as King over both Israel (Exod. 15:18; Num. 23:21, Deut. 33:5; Isa. 43:15) and the earth (2 Kings 19:15; Isa. 6:5; Jer. 46:18; Ps 29:10; 9:1-4). While God is King, it is also spoken about when He will manifest His kingship in a future

---

89 Wendell Willis, *Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2020), 59–60.

90 Willis, 59–61.

91 Willis, 70.

time (Isa 24:23; 33:22; 52:7; Zeph. 3:15; Zech. 14:9ff). One of these prophetic hopes would be about a Kingdom on earth by a descendant of David, a hope that the Jews lost after the return from exile. It was replaced by a hope of a transcendent Kingdom beyond history by the Son of Man, the expected Messiah. Although there is a diverse and manifold amount of descriptions about the Kingdom in the Old Testament, it would always imply an act of God in history, where the redemptive purposes were realized. This would be both considered a near happening where God would save and judge Israel, as well as an eschatological hope in the future, Ladd asserts.<sup>92</sup>

The fundamental meaning of Kingdom (in Greek *basileia* and in Hebrew *malkût*) is debated among scholars, according to Ladd. There are those who consider the idea that *basileia* is the *eschaton*, the eschatological fulfillment, while the Hebrew word has the idea of reign, rule or dominion. In late Judaism, the Kingdom of God meant God's rule or sovereignty, something Ladd also advocates as a good understanding of its portrayal in the Gospels and hints to the RSV translation of the word to 'kingship' or 'kingly power'. Macchia agrees with this, in that the Kingdom in the Old Testament is there when God is present to exercise divine redemption. While there is an idea of a present reality here, there is also a future realization. In the Old Testament, as well as in rabbinic Judaism, God's Kingdom can have more than one meaning, as we have briefly mentioned. God is King, yet also to become King in the future. This already and not yet-concept is something we also will see while working out a theological framework for Spirit baptism in eschatological terms and for the inauguration of the Kingdom. Still, Ladd concludes, the kingdom of God is not very present in Jewish literature before the days of Jesus. A lot of Jesus' teachings and parables about the Kingdom therefore do not have many parallels in the literature of the world of Jesus and must be considered something new.<sup>93</sup>

As a summary, Ladd affirms that 'basileia' (Kingdom) is complex with several facets and not merely a single concept, just as Norman Perrin does with his symbolic understanding. The root meaning of the word is the reign, or rule, of God. While it can mean the eschatological

---

92 George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, Revised Edition (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1993), 58–59.

93 Ladd, 60–61; Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 92.

happening when God acts in kingly power to destroy His enemies and save His people, it would also be the future realm of salvation where God's people live as subjects and beneficiaries of His reign. In addition, we have the present reality of the Kingdom just as Jesus portrays in His own presence, proclamation and mission.<sup>94</sup>

Frank Macchia is following up the citation of Gregory of Nyssa, that Christ is the King and Spirit is the Kingdom, with the notion that Spirit baptism is the means by which creation is brought under the reign of life, transformed by the Kingdom. Through the indwelling Spirit, the reign of the Father, the risen Christ and the reign of divine life is brought to all of creation. While we have previously ventured into the debate about the soteriological and charismatic aspects of Spirit baptism, as well as its development and current understanding in Pentecostal and charismatic contexts, it does not according to Macchia exhaust its meaning by being limited to such perspectives and understandings. Rather it is given eschatological expansiveness and transcendence by the connection to the inauguration of the Kingdom of God that both John the Baptist (Matt 3:1-12) and Jesus Himself (Acts 1:2-8) contextually provide. We see here that Macchia gives our second research question a potential answer, that Spirit baptism can be seen as a metaphor that is broader than either initiatory or charismatic empowerment. The announcement by John the Baptist about the arrival of Jesus as the Spirit Baptizer is here set in the context of His role in bringing forth the Kingdom of God. Jesus also has this context for His teachings about the baptism in the Spirit, and it is written just before we are told about the events at Pentecost in the Book of Acts. Macchia certainly sees a continuity of the metaphor of Spirit baptism throughout the New Testament in its connection to the eschatological fulfillment of the Kingdom of God, even if he admits Dunn somewhat right in asserting its fluidity.<sup>95</sup>

After this, Macchia brings forth a compelling theological insight by stating that the Kingdom of God provides a meaningful theological framework for Spirit baptism precisely because the substance of the Kingdom is pneumatological in Scripture. In Rom 14:17 we can read the following: 'For the kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy

---

94 Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 68.

95 Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 89–91.

in the Holy Spirit.’ If this is so, it makes sense that when there is an ‘outpouring’ or special presence of the Spirit, then the Kingdom is also present.<sup>96</sup>

Righteousness has a particular significance for Macchia when it relates to the Kingdom, namely in terms of justification. He calls it ‘the element of the Christian life most in need of a Trinitarian reinterpretation in the light of the connection between Spirit baptism and the Kingdom of God.’ He continues to see justification, overlapping with sanctification, as metaphors of the renewal of creation into God’s dwelling place. Justification for Macchia is to be ‘righteoused’ by God, and that Spirit baptism as the fulfillment of the Kingdom of God thus provide a greater theological framework for the understanding of justification by faith. More so than the forensic justification that often is read from Pauline texts in a Lutheran manner. The righteousness of justification can then be seen as an eschatological gift of new creation through the Spirit of God. He draws inspiration from these conclusions from works by D. Lyle Dabney, Ernst Käsemann and Douglas Harink, as well as Jürgen Moltmann. As earlier mentioned, Macchia speaks of the Kingdom of God in the Old Testament as where God is redemptively present. When he considers the reality of the Kingdom of God as inaugurated by the Spirit baptizer, then the righteousness that is part of the justification can be seen as a Hebraic concept like liberation and redemption that reorders life towards justice and mercy. Macchia, together with Brevard Childs, thus see a continuance between the righteousness in the Old Testament with acts of liberating redemption (a right ordering of life by the power of God) with the New Testament’s justification as the righteousness of God’s final act of redemption towards the new creation. The reason we bring this into the picture, is because Macchia seems to understand the righteousness in justification as something that has to do with the eschatological redemption of the new creation, and thus helping inaugurating the Kingdom. By this he relates it to both Spirit baptism and the Kingdom.<sup>97</sup>

The framework Macchia supposes in justification as the ‘righteousing’ of the Kingdom of God inaugurated as Spirit baptism, is brought forward in three dimensions: 1) The Spirit in the life of Jesus (conception, baptismal anointing and resurrection), 2) Jesus as the devotional man of the Spirit, with the love in the Spirit as an open and redemptive bond between the

---

96 Macchia, 91.

97 Macchia, 129–133.



Father and the Son, resulting in liberating acts of deliverance that transform lives and 3) That the inauguration of the righteousness of the kingdom of God is about the participation available to creation by the Spirit of Christ, in the favor of the Father, through liberating signs of renewal – something that also brings an empowerment for life lived in daily trust in God. His main point here is that it is Jesus as the man of the Spirit that brings about justification. He was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification (Rom 4:25). He was justified in the Spirit (1 Tim 3:15) and anointed by the Spirit he inaugurates the righteousness of the Kingdom of God as liberation to the world, a liberation that will eventually make all things new. The outpouring of the Spirit by Spirit baptism, Macchia considers to be the answers to the groaning creation that longs for the Kingdom. In the gift of the Spirit, the righteousness of the Kingdom is received. That Luther proclaims justification by faith in Christ, is nothing new, but Macchia cites Luther in that, not only is justification a Christological reality, it is a pneumatological reality as well. Luther does actually state that the reception of the Spirit and faith reckoned as righteousness will be the same thing. The Spirit is an important agency in the inauguration and reception of kingdom righteousness. In summary, Macchia claims that justified existence is pneumatic existence, Spirit-baptized existence. It allows us to participate in the life and reign of God.<sup>98</sup>

It is important to mention here that Pentecostal theology usually follows the Evangelical concepts of defining salvation in a christocentric and objective way. This means that justification is provided by the cross of Christ and by His atoning work. Macchia, no doubt, agrees with that. We also have, however, in the words of Larry Hart, a subjective pole. This is the Spirit of Christ, and is working out the transformation of the moral and spiritual condition of believers. The application of the salvific work of Christ is done by The Holy Spirit, Hart asserts. It is the Spirit who communicates and makes the christocentric work a subjective reality in our lives. In that way it allows us (in Macchia's words) to partake of the life and reign of God in a Spirit-baptized existence.<sup>99</sup>

Macchia also shares the idea that the Kingdom is both 'now' as well as 'not yet'. Just as the Kingdom of God represents the sovereign rule of God initiated by the redemptive work of

---

98 Macchia, 134–38.

99 Studebaker, *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism*, 51–55.

Christ, it is not fulfilled before His return in power to make all things new. The concept of already, but not-yet, Macchia also finds in parables of the Kingdom in Matt 13, where it states that the Kingdom is like a seed that is yet to grow into a tree. While Studebaker acclaims Macchia's avoidance of a realized eschatology, he is more sceptical about Macchia's pneumatological understanding of the Kingdom, something he estimates as being better understood in primarily christological terms.<sup>100</sup>

### 3.2 Ecclesiology

Without developing the ecclesiological concerns too deeply or broadly in this thesis, some mention of the Church in relation to Pentecost, Spirit baptism and the Kingdom of God is in order. While there is much that could have been written on the subject, a thoroughly done analysis would be outside the scope of the research questions of this thesis. Nevertheless, the importance of ecclesiology in terms of the potential communal place for the outworking of the spiritual lives of Pentecostals could probably not be overstated when we consider Chan's words that The Pentecostal Christian needs the community to make sense of his or her own spiritual experience. He strongly advocates a move from the individualistic approach where the fellowship is seen as a place to cater to 'my needs', an approach that is far too prevalent by Chan's observation. It should instead be a more communal understanding of the Christian life. Chan notes that when understood within its own communal-liturgical context, the central experience of Pentecostalism is much better made sense of.<sup>101</sup>

However, to understand these relations, some foreknowledge of what the Church actually is can be helpful. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen writes that theological doctrine of the church was not really a fully developed theological theme until the time of the Reformation, even if many church-related matters were of concern earlier. We find, however, many metaphors and symbols in the New Testament regarding the Church, many that have deep roots in The Old Testament, according to Kärkkäinen. Of particular mentions are *the people of God* (1 Pet 2:9, Rev 5:9-10), *the body of Christ* (Eph 1:22-23, 1 Cor 12:27, Col 1:18) and *the temple of the*

---

<sup>100</sup>Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 96–97.

<sup>101</sup>Chan, *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition*, 13.

*Spirit* (Eph 2:19-22, 1 Pet 2:5). Here we have a clear Trinitarian pattern that virtually all churches are in agreement upon as the basis and nature of the Church, Kärkkäinen states. Just as each person is made in the image of God, so is the Church. The Church as a communion, the *koinonia*, thus reflects the communion that is inherent in the Trinity, even if in a very incomplete manner. The Church also serves as a sign of the coming reign of God and should not be confused with really being this reign. A difference between the Church and the Kingdom of God is in order. In terms of the Church's relation to eschatology and the Kingdom, Macchia mentions the Spirit's unique attachment to the crucified and risen Christ, that is the Spirit baptizer and the inaugurator of the Kingdom. The Church must live in a way that lifts up Christ, and not itself, as it is Christ that ushers in the Kingdom of God in the world. The Church, being a natural result of the outpouring of the Spirit, cannot be wholly identified with the Kingdom. Neither are they, however, two completely distinct realms. The Church is a dwelling place of the Spirit and the Kingdom of Christ, and is consecrated and empowered to witness this reality to the world. The Spirit and the Kingdom are, however, prior to the Church, and guides it on its eschatologically oriented journey as a people, although the Church is the central locus for, and natural result of, the life of the Spirit, or the life of the Kingdom. Spirit baptism is again what binds the Church to Jesus and the Kingdom, in Macchia's theology.<sup>102</sup>

Amos Yong agrees with Kärkkäinen on this trinitarian pattern with '*the People of God*', '*the body of Christ*' and '*the temple of the Spirit*' and suggests that this be seen in relation to the pneumatological ecclesiology of 'the Church as a charismatic fellowship of the Spirit'. He also highlights that there are difficulties with asserting a certain Pentecostal ecclesiology because of its diversity. When we talk about Pentecostal ecclesiology, we must bear in mind that this designation is not a clear and concise description of a uniform movement, but as we have mentioned in the preliminary chapters, there are a range of movements and churches called Pentecostal or Charismatic, of varying degrees, with a span of forms and practices. An in-depth consideration of the ecclesiological structures and doctrines would, however, fall

---

<sup>102</sup>Kärkkäinen, *An Introduction to Ecclesiology*, 1; Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 189–98.

outside of the purpose of this thesis, so we will only briefly mention it as the state of the matter.<sup>103</sup>

The core of the Church is the Spirit, Macchia maintains, and that is a mystery. He refuses any rational descriptions of the Church, claiming that it will only lead to weak and inadequate descriptions of its soul and destiny and refers to the lack of systematic statements on the Church in the New Testament. Since the Church has Spirit baptism at its core, and is a mystery in itself, he advocates for the trinitarian models of the New Testament, in agreement with Yong and Kärkkäinen, namely the people of God, the body of Christ and the temple of the Spirit. It is the communion of the people of God that are baptized into the body of Christ, as well as coming into being as the presence of God fills the believers and make them a temple for the Spirit. It is in this latter model that Macchia in particular finds connection with Spirit baptism as it emplys the concept of believers filled with the Holy Spirit, becoming a holy temple with Christ as its foundation (1 Cor 3:11).<sup>104</sup>

Kärkkäinen furthermore criticizes the Pentecostal movement for their lack of ecclesiological theology, something Yong agrees is the case. Until recently, he writes, most Pentecostals have contributed to the topic mainly with some key biblical perspectives from the New Testament, primarily from the book of Acts without addressing these concerns in depth in theological and doctrinal presentations. To this day, many even wonder if there is such a thing as a Pentecostal ecclesiology, he asserts. This is a work in the making, according to Kärkkäinen, that advocates the Fivefold Gospel as a fruitful foundation. Yong notes that the Fivefold Gospel is not something that provides a normative ecclesiological template, but rather suggest a plurality of Pentecostal ecclesiologies rather than a single, authoritative one, just as the Fivefold Gospel suggests the variety of ways that encounters with Jesus was experienced, not to mention the multiplicity of tongues on Pentecost. Interestingly for this thesis in particular, is Kärkkäinen's address of Spirit baptism as a deeply communal experience that is an integral part of Pentecostal church life and ecclesiology, as well as the connection between the

---

103Paul Avis, *The Oxford Handbook of Ecclesiology*, 1st ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 336–342.

104Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 199–204.

outpouring of the Spirit, eschatology and mission to the world that pertained to the early Pentecostals.<sup>105</sup>

Simon Chan advocates in the same manner for an ecclesial pneumatology rather than an individual, meaning that the primary work of the Spirit is about the Church rather than the individual. When he considers the Spirit on Jesus' baptism, he regards it as representative of the Spirit being over the Church, being Jesus' body on earth, rather than a model for individual believers. First and foremost, Chan sees Spirit baptism as an event of the Church. That does not mean it does not happen personally, but that when it does, it makes one more conscious and responsible for ecclesial concerns. Spirit baptism thus has as its prime function to actualize the communal life, the fellowship in Christ. This has been left out of many Pentecostal discussions of the matter, he states, and makes the notion that no real communion with God is possible without being baptized into the body of Christ. Amos Yong mentions how there also are ecclesiological views that move from the fourfold/fivefold Gospel to the notion that the Spirit empowers believers into the calling of Christ by birthing them into the Kingdom and baptizing them in the Spirit to partake in the calling of Jesus with charismatic gifts and vocations, to further the vocation of Jesus. According to Tuppurainen, Luke's ecclesiology arises out of his pneumatology and eschatology, the themes that becomes the separation marks of the Christian community to that of the Jewish. The fellowship that is described in Luke-Acts has a close connection between the concepts of Israel and the Gentiles, kingdom and power, as well as the eschatological hope and pneumatological mission, according to Tuppurainen.<sup>106</sup>

This seems to be in agreement with Macchia, in that he considers Spirit baptism to be descriptive of the very nature of the Church as it is continually incorporating people and being more deeply incorporated itself. His central thesis is that 'Spirit baptism gave rise to the global church and remains the very substance of the church's life in the Spirit, including its charismatic life and mission.' He sees Spirit baptism to have its beginning in a believer's initiation into Christ and His body, the Church, and later experientially realized. It is

---

<sup>105</sup>Kärkkäinen, *An Introduction to Ecclesiology*, 85–89; Avis, *The Oxford Handbook of Ecclesiology*, 344–46.

<sup>106</sup>Chan, *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition*, 99; Avis, *The Oxford Handbook of Ecclesiology*, 346–47; Tuppurainen, *Reading St. Luke's Text and Theology*, 106.

initiatory, but with an eschatological understanding as an ‘already and not-yet’-reality. This aligns well with the previous debate expounded in this thesis about whether Spirit baptism is mainly soteriological, charismatic empowerment or both. In his book, Macchia advocates for the baptism in the Holy Spirit to be considered as the core idea of our understanding of the Church, where it is both birthed and is flourishing. Like Simon Chan, Macchia also talks about *Spirit-baptized communion* and has a clear ecclesiological understanding of Spirit baptism. Just as Chan, he likewise advocates for its function to actualize communal life. Macchia considers Spirit baptism at its core to actually be the foundational reality of the Church and its practices, although it is individually received. While they both have an ecclesial pneumatology at the core, they differ significantly on what function the Church serves. While Macchia highlights its role on the foundational aspects of the Church, it is clear that he considers the baptism of the Holy Spirit to belong first and foremost to the Kingdom of God, as something that both fulfills and transcends the Church. So while the communion and vocation of the Church is part of the role Spirit baptism plays, its fulfillment is in the final new creation of God’s reign, of His Kingdom. Chan, on the other hand seems to consider the ontology of Church as an end to itself, not a means to another end like the Kingdom. According to Andy Lord, he views the Church as a *koinonia* created *before* the foundation of the world, alas being the body of Christ to the world. The eschatological hope then seems to be the uniting of all in Christ, rather than the expressed realization of the Kingdom of God as something that transcends the Church.<sup>107</sup>

Frank Macchia claims that there are different views of Spirit baptism for different ecclesiologies and these views have often been used to serve one’s own ecclesiology. What he calls ‘Word ecclesiologies’ (meaning the Church as those who are faithful to the word of the Gospel), would be inclined to view Spirit baptism as regeneration by faith in Christ through the word of the Gospel. Sacramental ecclesiologies (the Church as a sacrament that mediates grace to the world) would liken Spirit baptism to water baptism or as an initiation into faith, while Holiness and Pentecostal groups (with the Church as a people called for empowered service to the world) would see it as something that revives and renews the people of God for its task. He maintains, however, that these overlap each other. He writes that he would like to

---

<sup>107</sup>Macchia, *The Spirit-Baptized Church*, 12–15; Andy Lord, *Network Church: A Pentecostal Ecclesiology Shaped by Mission* (Leiden: BRILL, 2012), 73–74; Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 155.

see Spirit baptism related to a newer understanding of the Church as *koinonia*, or communion in the life of the trinity of God, and that Spirit baptism should first and foremost be related to the Kingdom of God rather than the Church, reflecting the prophetic preaching of John the Baptist. Spirit baptism as the ministry of the Messiah in bringing in the Kingdom of God, is primary to the relation of the life of the church.<sup>108</sup>

Leon Harris rightly writes that Macchia's ecclesiology is trinitarian, and that is because the fellowship (*koinonia*) that is present both in the local community, as well as between the different communities, are brought about through Spirit baptism. The Spirit brings the reflection of the inherent communion and love in the trinity to church. Since God exists in communion, the Spirit baptism that constitutes the Church also has its foundation in the life of God. The nature of the church as a communion is also a result of Spirit baptism, according to Macchia. Spirit baptism has a relational structure that has communion as its essence. As we have mentioned earlier, the trinitarian structure is evident in most ecclesiologies (perhaps except the Free church tradition), and Macchia is therefore well able to engage in ecumenical dialogue with this consideration while at the same time influencing Pentecostal theology to include the Spirit in its relation to the Father and the Son, Harris contends. This further means that this fellowship is relational to the world, as Macchia states; 'Spirit baptism implies a triune life that is motivated by love, not only as an internal dynamic but externally toward the other. Spirit baptism seeks the other for the other's sake, for liberation and communion.' Koinonia is thus at the very substance of Spirit baptism, Harris writes, and when these two are brought together they form the ecclesiological framework of Macchia's theology. Spirit baptism in turn forms the link between the Church and the Kingdom.<sup>109</sup>

Although Macchia proclaims that Spirit baptism has a profound meaning for the constitution and fellowship of the Church, this is not, in his opinion, sufficient to grasp the breadth of the metaphor in how he considers it employed throughout the New Testament. If it were fundamentally an ecclesial dynamic, one would understand John the Baptist's use of the

---

108Michael Welker, *The Work of the Spirit: Pneumatology and Pentecostalism* (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2006), 123.

109I. Leon Harris, *The Holy Spirit as Communion: Colin Gunton's Pneumatology of Communion and Frank Macchia's Pneumatology of Koinonia* (Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2017), 130-133.

metaphor to only that which happened at Pentecost. Macchia suggests that, instead, it must be first seen as relating to the Kingdom of God, just as John's preaching was about repentance, for the Kingdom of heaven was near (Matt 3:1-2), and just as the Kingdom was the context of Acts 1. Spirit baptism points to redemption through Christ in a mainly pneumatological and eschatological manner, according to Macchia.<sup>110</sup>

Overall, the Church can hardly be overestimated by Macchia's consideration in relation to a theology of Spirit baptism and the mission of God in the world. He considers with historian Rodney Stark, that the communal life in early Christianity was one of the chief reasons for the rapid advancement in the early days, simply because they did not merely proclaim the Gospel, they participated and embodied it in communal life and witness.<sup>111</sup>

Having seen the importance of the fellowship in the Spirit, the *koinonia*, in Macchia's work, while still functioning as a means to a greater end, we shall now turn to the eschatological aspect of his view on Spirit baptism. It is obvious that the eschatological realization holds great importance for Macchia, and this will relate to and partly overlap with our preliminary connections to the Kingdom.

### **3.3 Eschatology**

By placing Spirit baptism in relation to the Kingdom of God in Macchia's theology, there is a clear concept of inaugurated eschatology involved and that Spirit baptism is both in the here and now, as well as an anticipation of what is to be when Christ will fill all things as Eph 4:10 states. Furthermore, when it gets to the eschatological concerns, Macchia mentions several biblical passages to serve such a framework for Spirit Baptism. One is the aforementioned Matthew 3:11-17, where John the Baptist prophesies about the 'baptizing in Spirit' that is to be done by the Messiah as a final act of salvation. John the Baptist's baptism is merely preparatory, while the eschatological 'apocalyptic transcendence' is the Messiah's doing. Macchia further connects this with Jesus' own baptism where the opening of the heaven

---

<sup>110</sup>Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 63, 85-86.

<sup>111</sup>Macchia, 156-157.



happened, a typical sign for apocalyptic revelation. When the dove descends, we are again reminded of the Genesis' account of the Spirit hovering the waters at the beginning of creation and the new creation happening after the flood. It seems to make much sense then that this pattern reoccurs as a signal of the new age and new creation that is to be fulfilled through the Messiah. Thus, Macchia concludes, John's vision of Spirit Baptism, as well as the Jordan experience, reveals the eschatological significance of Spirit Baptism as a final judgement and final sanctification of the entire creation. While it is to be fulfilled in the final act of Christ's return, the happenings on Pentecost with the appearing of tongues, fire and sound of a wind are thus pointers to the appearing of the Lord in the great Day of the Lord with 'blood and fire and billows of smoke' along with cosmic signs. This all connects with the inauguration of the Kingdom of God and the Church participating in and bearing witness to the final sanctification of creation in the baptism of the Holy Spirit.<sup>112</sup>

Riku Tuppurainen acknowledges the eschatological themes Macchia has described and adds that they bring together the metaphors in the Old Testament of judgement and power, deliverance and vindication that point towards the fulfillment of God's purpose on earth, as well as the final liberation of Israel with the inclusion of the Gentiles in the Kingdom. The talk of the Kingdom in Luke cannot be separated from Israel and its eschatological realization, Tuppurainen maintains. He conceives this understanding on the claim of N. T. Wright and Jacob Dervell, in that the church in Luke-Acts were not meant to be a new form of community, but a reformed Israel, a primarily Jewish entity, although the inclusion of Gentiles and the pneumatological experiences were signs of the end of the age. This means that the Church and its mission is clearly part of an eschatological context, where Jesus as the Davidic King is drawing the nations under His reign. For Roger Stronstad, the Church follows the pattern of Jesus, in both its charismatic empowerment by the anointing of the Spirit, as well as the prophetic function as pointing towards that which is to come. While using different words, Stronstad also talks about the inauguration of the last days connected to an outpouring of the Spirit of prophecy. The prophetic experience of the power of the Spirit in the Church, represents the future experience of the Kingdom.<sup>113</sup>

---

112Macchia, 84–86.

113Tuppurainen, *Reading St. Luke's Text and Theology*, 106–107.

Steven G. Land likewise gives the testimony that the ultimate context and horizon of the Pentecostal movement is eschatological, with the presence of God, who as the Spirit, is the agent of the arrival of the Kingdom of God. While Christ is the King or Regent, the Holy Spirit is the active reigning presence. He continues to agree that while the Kingdom is already present, it is not yet consummated. He argues that this tension between the already and the not yet is vital for understanding the shape and power of this spirituality. In Spirit they already are part of the Kingdom and at the same time they live in the not-yet of the world and awaiting the full arrival of it. Also, the Kingdom is manifested in the world in words and deeds by a Spirit-filled witness of the full Gospel of Jesus as Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer, Baptizer in the Holy Spirit and coming King. The Pentecost constituted the Church as an eschatological community of universal mission, Land states, in the power and demonstration of the Spirit. We can thus see how the eschatological aspect has been so important to the Pentecostals and why it has been so much of its driving force and also how it relates to the central doctrine of Spirit baptism for charismatic empowerment to service and witness. This was also new for the Pentecostal movement, according to Land, and the many gifts of the Spirit were mostly seen as rare and without eschatological significance in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Holiness movement, although that is not to say that eschatology, as a whole, played no role.<sup>114</sup>

When it comes to the already, but not-yet concept, Land develops a twofold understanding. He talks first about how the power of the Kingdom is at work through the Holy Spirit, although the joy this brings is at the same time brought together with a sorrow of the present fallen world and the people in it, as well as a longing for the 'not yet'. There is thus a pessimism of nature with the groaning and sighing in the Spirit, as well as an optimism of grace. Still, to believe that the Kingdom is present, is also to live out the power of the Spirit in worship, witness and service. The Spirit is thus already active in the believers and giving gifts to the body, yet the believers are not completely as they shall be in what he calls the consummation of the age. The impact of the Fall is also still there. Even so, one can know the fullness of salvation as regeneration, sanctification and Spirit baptism. The aspect of fusion, of the believers fused to Christ, may favour the 'already' side more than the 'not yet'.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup>Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 12, 43-52, 89-92.

<sup>115</sup>Land, 92-97.

The other side that tends towards the 'not yet' are composed by polarities of sharp separation and mutual exclusivity. Here we have God and Satan, light and darkness, saint and sinner, Church and the world. To be of the world would be an opposite to the fusion, or to put it in biblical terms 'Friendship with the world is enmity with God'. To receive the Spirit of God, one must reject the spirit of the world. Where this side was overly emphasized, worldly involvements would often be somewhat abandoned. The tension must therefore be held in balance, and there can be no escape into the 'not-yet'. There also cannot be 'an already' with setting up the Kingdom here and now, without the radical in-breaking of God. Living in the Spirit, Land writes, meant living in this double aspect: in the world, but not of it, saved but not resurrected, and already filled, but with the longing for the day God would be all in all. Pentecostalism was thus teleologically related to the kingdom of God in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. It is the power of the Spirit that strengthens, sustains and directs through trials and temptations of life towards the goal of the Kingdom of God.<sup>116</sup>

As an eschatological metaphor, Spirit Baptism is fluidly applied throughout the New Testament and illustrates the many ways we can partake of the rich blessings of Christ through the Spirit. Although the Spirit has many functions in the Church, Macchia sees a central aspect of the Spirit in the realization of the Kingdom of God in power. Tuppurainen also affirms the Church to be constituted by Spirit baptism and that Spirit baptism is reaching towards a goal that is other than the Church. The pneumatological dimension of Luke's ecclesiology is in bringing the promise of the Kingdom to us in the here and now and therefore largely missional.<sup>117</sup>

As we have mentioned, Macchia has worked out a theological framework for Spirit baptism that encompasses several theological concepts and extends it beyond a mere subjective experience. He connects the metaphor of Spirit baptism with the eschatological hope and the inauguration of the Kingdom of God. Eschatologically, Macchia sees the pouring of water in John as well as Joel's and Luke's description of the arrival of the Spirit in terms of the great outpouring (Joel 2:28; Acts 2:17). He continues to see the metaphor as carrying significance of divine presence, cleansing and prophetic witness. Macchia considers the new role as Spirit

---

<sup>116</sup>Land, 97–98, 114, 125, 134.

<sup>117</sup>Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 86–87.

Baptizer given to the Messiah in the New Testament to be a revolutionary revision of the Jewish expectations, since the connection between the Messiah and the outpouring of the Spirit before the great Day of the Lord is not clearly given in the Old Testament. Here we are given a new understanding of the Christ as both the Messiah, as well as the Lord who inaugurates the kingdom by the Spirit and shares in its reign. The historical roots of such an understanding in the Old Testament, can, as we have introduced earlier in this chapter, be related to the idea of the Kingdom of God arriving when creation is restored to the divine lordship of God, as a source of freedom and redemption.<sup>118</sup>

This does not mean, however, that Macchia denies the classical Pentecostal doctrine on empowerment for witness and service. He rather contends that the broad framework he employs helps us appreciate the richness of this and that empowerment for service is part of the inauguration of the Kingdom of God in power. It transforms lives and empowers them for service. When this is not seen in relation to the Kingdom, then it loses its direction, purpose and guidance, Macchia argues. Just as sanctification serves a purpose, so does gift of the Spirit and the charismatic empowerment. The complexity of the Kingdom means that the empowerment for witness likewise must have many dimensions to it. These are both individual and communal. The eschatological participation in the Kingdom of God involves both initiation by faith and the baptism in the Holy Spirit for power in witness. An experience of power for witness is thus very much important for Macchia's framework on Spirit baptism as inaugurating the Kingdom of God. Also, the visible signs of God's favor that anticipated the new creation was very much present among the early Pentecostals with signs and wonders. Signs were at the very substance of Jesus' mission to inaugurate the Kingdom of God, Macchia affirms, and essential to the inauguration of the Kingdom of God through Him (Mark 1:15ff).<sup>119</sup>

In Matt 12:28, we have the words of Jesus stating 'But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you.'. This makes sense in terms of the Old Testament tendencies to view the Kingdom as where God is redemptively present as sovereign. This also makes the connection Macchia proposes, namely that the Kingdom of

---

<sup>118</sup>Macchia, 93–94.

<sup>119</sup>Macchia, 144–153.

God is made present by the Spirit of God. This redemptive presence is also present in Luke 4:18, where the Spirit of God is said to be upon Jesus, in order to redeem and restore. Even so, there is not a discontinuity in this passage from a creation graced by God, to His redemptive presence, according to Macchia. There is rather a transformation of what is already existing. A transformation that does not abandon it, but renews it. In other words, the Kingdom is present already in parts of creation that are graced by God, but it comes in fresh power through the Spirit and the outpouring of the Spirit. If a pneumatological theology of creation highlights the Spirit sweeping over the waters in Genesis, then a pneumatological ecclesiology will point towards how the Spirit is to be poured out on all flesh so that creation may be the dwelling place of God, Amos Yong maintains, in accordance with Macchia. Ultimately it will then reach the vision of a Spirit-baptized creation as the temple of the Holy Spirit.<sup>120</sup>

Gregory J. Liston is, on the other side, somewhat careful with having an overemphasis on what he calls ‘Spirit eschatology’, an eschatology where the Spirit is focused on at the expense of Christ, or the ‘Logos eschatology’ as he calls it. These two must, according to him, be complemented and seen as mutually reinforcing. Through the Spirit, the work of Christ can be applied to our current situation, and through the Spirit, the coming kingdom of Jesus can be actualized. This pneumatological aspect is vital, not only to eschatology, but altogether to the reality of what is achieved in Christ; both the Cross and the resurrection happened *through* the Spirit, Liston states. He goes into a somewhat lengthy consideration of time, with a focus on two parallel timelines (‘redeemed’/new and ‘fallen’/old time) in the framework of eternity. He maintains that time and eternity is situated in Christ, but enabled through the Spirit. This resembles much of what is already been written about the ‘already and not-yet’-concept.

Suffice to say here, is that Liston sees the focus on the Spirit at the expense of the Son as something that changes the understanding of this new and old time running in parallels. The result is that the distinctiveness and separateness of Christ is undermined and gives the present experience of reality in fallen time too much focus. With a Spirit eschatology that complements rather than replaces a Logos eschatology, the redeemed and fallen time co-exists and the reality in Christ and of the Kingdom may be actualized in the present moment by the

---

<sup>120</sup>Macchia, 94–96; Avis, *The Oxford Handbook of Ecclesiology*, 352.

Spirit, just as Jesus states in Luke 17:21, that the Kingdom is invisibly present. Liston makes the claim that Logos eschatologies like those of Barth and Thomas F. Torrance, undervalue the actualization of the Kingdom through the Spirit in the present moment. With this he concludes with what this thesis is mostly about, namely a theological framework where eschatology and Spirit baptism is brought together. The eschatological reality and Spirit baptism is, when the Logos eschatology and Spirit eschatology is complemented by each other, mutually reinforcing and two sides of the same coin. While Spirit baptism leads the community towards the coming eschatological reality of the Kingdom, this already existing reality is what enables Spirit baptism in the first place.<sup>121</sup>

Amos Yong contributes to the same apprehension. The eschatological outpouring of the Spirit means that the anticipated future is both experienced in parts now while also being waited for. Salvation is by this understanding both historical and tended towards the future with the new creation. The ‘not-yet’ of the eschatological salvation Yong sees as including the saving work of the Spirit in personal, familial, social and cosmic dimensions.<sup>122</sup>

Macchia is of the same opinion, stating that Spirit baptism *is* eschatological in nature. It is an event that brings us into a fullness that is not yet. As have been mentioned several times in this thesis, the New Testament passages about Spirit baptism often has the coming Kingdom as its context and horizon (Matt 3:2, Acts 1:1-8, 2:17-18). The ultimate point is eventually the full realization of the Kingdom and new creation by the final resurrection in the end days. The event of Spirit baptism brings the more encompassing reality of life in and with God. Amos Yong agrees with this, noting that according to Acts 2:17, the outpouring of the Spirit that was promised ‘makes present’ the last days. Those that Jesus were to proclaim and inaugurate through the Spirit (Luke 4:19). Macchia states that it is not just within the sacramental, charismatic and missional life of the Church that Spirit baptism occurs, Spirit baptism is the transcendental reality bringing these practices to life; just as it constituted the Church at Pentecost.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup>Gregory J. Liston, *Kingdom Come: An Eschatological Third Article Ecclesiology* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2022), 44–50.

<sup>122</sup>Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh*, 96.

Macchia continues to mention several other occurrences in the New Testament that reveals an eschatological aspect of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Macchia reads an eschatological meaning in that the disciples according to Luke 24:49 were to wait in Jerusalem for the power of the Spirit, since it is the key location of salvation in the end of times. There is also the already mentioned passage in Acts 2:17-18, where Peter's quote of Joel 2 has an eschatological connection. Wolfgang Vondey also mentions the Pentecostal apocalyptic vision to be more precisely defined as an affective transformation that is conforming the Church and the individual to 'the pathos of God instilled by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit through experiences of the charismatic gifts creating and shaping eschatological practices'. In other words, it is eschatological because they are reconstructions of time and space by the Holy Spirit in the image of the eschaton, just as they are apocalyptic since they are driven by a passion for the world that is confronted with and ultimately consumed by the Kingdom of God. Vondey do differ from Macchia in that he does not make all these 'eschatological practices' (such as salvation, sanctification, Spirit baptism and divine healing) part of Spirit baptism, but rather consider them several pneumatological actions that God makes use of to enable the world to participate in God's Kingdom. He does, however, note charismatic manifestations as constant reminders of the eschaton and the endowment of the Spirit as necessary for the motivation and empowerment of mission for the Church.<sup>124</sup>

Larry R. McQueen also regards the present experiences of Spirit baptism (as well as salvation, sanctification and healing) as anticipations of life with God in the new creation. He considers several dimensions of Jesus as the Spirit Baptizer in eschatological matters. First that Jesus pours out the eschatological Spirit to give spiritual discernment, and secondly that He sends the Spirit so that the Church can engage in faithful witness to the world. Thirdly he mentions that this witness is to be embodied by the Church. The Spirit also enables the Church's witness through prophecy and as the advisor. Even more so, the Church's participation in the communal holiness safeguards the integrity of faithful witness. Here we have the familiar Pentecostal notion that we have thoroughly mentioned in earlier chapters, that Spirit baptism

---

<sup>123</sup>Macchia, *The Spirit-Baptized Church*, 164; Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh*, 90–91.

<sup>124</sup>Macchia, *The Spirit-Baptized Church*, 14; Wolfgang Vondey, *Pentecostal Theology: Living the Full Gospel* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017), 148–150.

empowers for witness. We can also see resemblances from Macchia's ecclesiology as constituted by Spirit baptism, in that McQueen consider witness embodied by the Church and enabled by the Spirit, as well as how this communal aspect connects with the witness of the Pentecostals to the world and ultimately serves an eschatological function.<sup>125</sup>

In response to his reviewers, Frank Macchia gives a summary of what his most basic theological incentives are in his work about Spirit baptism. This is to define it fundamentally as a self-impartment of the Triune God. He acknowledges Constance Price as being correct in her observation that his basic intention is an expansion of the understanding of Spirit baptism as a trinitarian act, understood eschatologically as the outpouring of divine love. He further adds that in the event of Jesus, He received the Spirit from His Father and poured it forth to give birth to the Church and fulfill the Kingdom and reign of God in history. In addition to this, Macchia writes that he seeks to view Christology through this framework as Spirit baptizer, as well as imparter and giver of the Spirit. It is the self-impartment of God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, as well as the fellowship that arises in this context with its eschatologically goal through the outpouring of the Spirit, that Macchia uses Spirit baptism as a framework to understand. He further affirms his second theological move to be that of ecclesiology, namely that Spirit baptism constitutes the Church. When viewing Spirit baptism as only regenerative, sacramental or charismatic, it becomes subordinate to a special function of the Church, rather than the constitution of it that makes all this possible. In the koinonia of the Father, Son and Spirit, the Spirit baptism is the constitutional factor, as well as something that transcends the Church in relation to the Kingdom and the coming, new creation. Thirdly, Macchia writes that he embraces the experiential aspects with participation in the love and life of God through numerous practices and experiences.<sup>126</sup>

There are those that consider Macchia's expansion of the Spirit baptism-metaphor as somewhat of a stretch. Andy Lord argues that John the Baptist's prophecy might not be enough biblical basis for Macchia's interpretation and that Spirit baptism as a major biblical

---

<sup>125</sup>Larry R. McQueen, *Towards a Pentecostal Eschatology: Discerning the Way Forward* (Dorchester: BRILL, 2019), 247–248.

<sup>126</sup>Frank D. Macchia, "Spirit Baptism: A Response to My Reviewers," *Canadian Journal of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christianity* 1, 2010, 176–183.



metaphor of the coming Kingdom, with its cosmic transformation, is reading too much into it. He does, however, acknowledge the potential of Macchia's approach has for bringing the Pentecostal development over the last century together, with its distinctive teachings, and incorporating the eschatological significance of Spirit baptism with bringing signs of the coming Kingdom to the Church. Lord still seems to consider it better to connect Spirit baptism with the formation of the Church and Christian identity like James Dunn and Gordon Fee do, rather than considering it to actually be about the coming Kingdom itself.<sup>127</sup>

Anthony Thiselton also mentions how critics may question the inclusivity and weight Macchia places on Spirit baptism. If it is so inclusive that it almost includes everything, then it risks becoming nothing in particular, with no clear borders. This is the same critique that Stronstad delivered. If it is everything, then it is really nothing, or a confusion of categories as Stronstad wrote. And why would not Paul, John and the others emphasize it more in their writings if it was so important? Most of the allusions given by them could appear to give less focus on it than Macchia does.<sup>128</sup>

Macchia answers to this, that it is not his goal to bring all views about Spirit baptism into a single idea or definition, but rather that his exegetical endeavours of the New Testament gave him the understanding that Spirit baptism is used as a term for the inauguration and fulfillment of the Kingdom of God in history, and thus gives it a broader eschatological implication. He writes that it is the result of the narrative foundation of the New Testament, namely the Gospels and Acts, that all underscore the idea of Jesus as the Spirit baptizer and thus providing Spirit baptism as a 'root metaphor' for the eschatological impartation of the Spirit. So, we see, that while there are several other comprehensive Pentecostal works that align well with Macchia and in many ways compliment and verify his theological framework, there are also prominent scholars that disagree with him, also within the Pentecostal movement, and consider him to have taken the whole metaphor too far.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup>Lord, *Network Church*, 78.

<sup>128</sup>Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Holy Spirit: In Biblical Teaching, Through the Centuries, and Today* (Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2013), 460.

<sup>129</sup>Macchia, "Spirit Baptism: A Response to My Reviewers," 179–180.

In preliminary chapters we have looked at the important work of James Dunn in response to the Pentecostal movement's doctrine of Spirit baptism and how he considered the baptism of the Holy Spirit to be initiatory and embodied in the conversion-experience of the believer. In other words, he refuses the classical Pentecostal doctrine of subsequent charismatic empowerment. He would thus appear to be a great opponent to Macchia's reworking of the framework that Spirit baptism is understood within. Although they would obviously disagree on the function and nature of the baptism in the Holy Spirit in terms of charismatic empowerment or initiation, they seem to have, interestingly enough, a few similar understandings when it comes to the communal aspect and the eschatological consideration with the Kingdom of God. As we have seen, Macchia connects Spirit baptism clearly with both the Church (as its constitutional element) as well as the already-and-not-yet Kingdom. Dr. Ashley Neil Smith, in his survey of Dunn's work and theology, writes that Dunn's clear understanding of the Pauline writings infer that Spirit baptism enables the individual to be a member of the Body of Christ. Furthermore, Smith writes that Dunn considers Spirit baptism to be necessary to enter the Kingdom. According to Dunn in his 'Baptism in the Holy Spirit', the baptism in the Spirit was not something distinct from, and subsequent to, entry into the Kingdom. It was the only means by which one could enter at all. He further writes that the Spirit baptism alone initiates the Kingdom and initiates into the Kingdom, just as Macchia states that it inaugurates the Kingdom. While Macchia and Dunn may diverge about how this relates (Dunn f.ex. argues for the decisive moment of Jesus' own baptism as a pivotal moment that brought in the End, with the new age and the Kingdom, although not being the baptism in Spirit and fire), both does relate it to ecclesiology and the Kingdom of God. Macchia does however have a much broader framework into which he incorporates Spirit baptism, and he does not consider Spirit baptism to simply be the conversion experience in the Christian life, the similarities are nevertheless strikingly interesting.<sup>130</sup>

There are, as we have seen, many differing views on Spirit baptism that diverge from Macchia's broad interpretation. Andy Lord provides three main categories of interpretation of Spirit baptism, namely Pentecostal, Evangelical and Catholic. While mainstream Evangelical and Catholic understandings clearly differ from Macchia, contemporary Pentecostal

---

<sup>130</sup>Dr Ashley Neil Smith, *The Pentecostal Reformation* (North Carolina: Lulu Press, 2013), 22–34; Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 14–26.

scholarship both agrees and diverges from his framework. Pentecostals have historically had a focus on personal experience, initial evidence such as tongues and mission. There has been a broader consideration on how it relates to the ecclesiological community by the challenges of Fredrick Bruner in 1970, according to Lord, and more recently the wider, more metaphorical understanding, such as Robert Menzies' and Frank Macchia's studies, where the background is set in the eschatological Kingdom. A holistic, eschatological interpretation is something also Lord finds unavoidable, referring to Acts 2 and the early Pentecostal connection of Spirit baptism and eschatology. Lord also mentions the Church as a sacrament that is constantly being recreated by God through charismatic pneumatology. The Eucharist has been central to many ecclesiologies (such as Zizioulas' theology that it constitutes the Church), and while Lord mentions how it is impossible to exclude the Eucharist from the life of the Church (based on Acts), he argues that it is rather a sacramental ordinance that is shaped by Spirit baptism. These ecclesiological notions do not seem to differ so much from Macchia's theology of Spirit baptism as constitutive of the Church, although articulated differently. It seems that Macchia is ploughing new terrain in his theological frameworks for Spirit baptism, while still building on previous scholarship and interacting with contemporary Pentecostal scholars, although there also are competing perspectives and some critical voices that Macchia is making Spirit baptism out to be more than it is made out to be in Scripture.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup>Lord, *Network Church*, 145–149.

## 4 Conclusion

In the introduction of the thesis, the purpose of bringing some potential new perspectives on the classical Pentecostal teaching on the baptism in the Holy Spirit was stated. Some new perspectives have definitively been provided. The title of the thesis revealed that we were in particular looking for the connection between Spirit baptism and the inauguration of the Kingdom of God. There were four research questions that all shall have been thoroughly contemplated throughout the thesis. In terms of the subject and title of this work, we have employed Frank D. Macchia's pneumatological framework on Spirit baptism and considered this in relation to other scholars, both without and within the Pentecostal movement.

The first research question was about the teaching of the baptism in the Holy Spirit itself and how it has developed in recent history. Through various movements such as Methodism and the Holiness movement, and certain personal influences, the baptism in the Holy Spirit have taken form as the Pentecostal distinctive, as a subsequent experience with the Holy Spirit, after initiation, that gives charismatic empowerment for witness and service. Speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of this experience was a common teaching among the early Pentecostals, although disputed. We have seen that the teaching on subsequent, charismatic baptism, has been confronted with other views, most importantly that of James Dunn, who argues that it is about the initiation conversion-experience, rather than for vocational empowerment. His exegetical work on the subject sparked much interest and many debates. This brings us to our second research question, where we have provided views of both cases and how they defend it, and then endeavoured to show how it also can be seen as a broader metaphor. We can conclude that there are exegetical interpretations that make a well-founded case for a soteriological understanding, something that is shown to be especially prevalent in the Pauline writings and particularly attributed to James Dunn, while teachings on charismatic empowerment also is thoroughly defended in Pentecostal scholarship, with Lukan writings especially to be an important foundation for it. Roger Stronstad is perhaps the most important scholar that defends this teaching. It has historically been understood in Pentecostalism as a subsequent baptism as empowerment for witness and service, and it is this teaching that Dunn challenges and claims lack scriptural basis. Several scholars argue for considering both

aspects, and that neither exclude the other, but rather that the soteriological aspect of Paul complements the charismatic aspect of Luke. In the works of Frank D. Macchia in particular, the metaphor of Spirit baptism has been broadened to include much more, and has become the foundation for both the Church, pneumatological activities, eschatology and the inauguration of the Kingdom of God. While Spirit baptism links it all together, it is not a single concept or definition for Macchia, but a metaphor that connects the various theological loci. The Church is constituted by Spirit baptism, and Spirit baptism brings the presence of the Kingdom near, but they are not one and the same. The Kingdom is about the new reality that is inaugurated by Jesus as the Spirit baptizer, and the Church is a means to that end.

In Chapter 3, we have seen more how Spirit baptism relates to ecclesiology, eschatology and the Kingdom of God in the works of Macchia, and can clearly state that he claims these connections serve a grander purpose than what has usually been meant by Spirit baptism in classical Pentecostal circles. It is evident that he considers Spirit baptism to be a fluidly and multidimensional metaphor that encompasses several very important theological themes and brings them together under it. He gives much emphasis to the fact that all of the Gospels introduce Jesus as the Spirit baptizer and that the context in both the prophecy of John the Baptist and the teachings of Jesus Himself, is the Kingdom of God. Macchia mentions several biblical passages to serve the framework for Spirit Baptism as eschatological. One is Matthew 3:11-17, where John the Baptist prophesies about the ‘baptizing in Spirit’ that is to be done by the Messiah as a final act of salvation. John the Baptist’s baptism is thus merely preparatory, while the eschatological ‘apocalyptic transcendence’ is the Messiah’s doing.

The communal life of the Church, the *koinonia*, has a vital importance for Macchia in the relation to Spirit baptism and the Kingdom of God, being constituted by Spirit baptism, although not to be a means to itself, but rather as a means to something greater, namely the pneumatological Kingdom of God. This view differs from scholars such as Simon Chan, who consider the Church as the body of Christ on earth, and thus not being teleologically directed towards something beyond itself. Macchia does however acknowledge ecclesiological models such as the body of Christ, and people of God and the temple of the Holy Spirit, but he brings them in subjection to Spirit baptism as the constitutive and nourishing force. He has a more pneumatological understanding of the Church, than Chan, who seems to view it more in

christological terms. The Church as a communion, the *koinonia*, thus reflects the communion that is inherent in the Trinity, even if in a very incomplete manner. The Church also serves as a sign of the coming reign of God and should not be confused with really being this reign. A difference between the Church and the Kingdom of God is in order.

The baptism in the Holy Spirit is fundamentally a self-impartation of the Triune God for Macchia, a trinitarian act, understood eschatologically as the outpouring of divine love and God becoming immanent in creation by Spirit baptism. The Spirit baptism is for Macchia also present both here and now, as well as anticipating the new creation and the coming Kingdom of God where God will reign supreme. This dialectic between already, and not-yet is featured in many Pentecostal works on both Spirit baptism, eschatology and the Kingdom of God, as we have shown in Chapter 3.

Frank Macchia makes a case for Spirit baptism being the means by which creation is brought under the reign of life, transformed by the Kingdom. Through the indwelling Spirit, the reign of the Father, the risen Christ and the reign of divine life is brought to all of creation. According to Macchia, only viewing Spirit baptism as initiatory or charismatic, or even both, does not give due importance and contours to the employment of the metaphor in the New Testament. It is in connection to the inauguration of the Kingdom of God that it is given eschatological expansiveness and transcendence. Macchia makes mention of the biblical concept in Rom 14:17, namely that the Kingdom is pneumatological. When there is an outpouring of the Spirit, then the Kingdom is becoming present.

The Kingdom of God is understood in relation to its Old Testament usage, where the Kingship of God is emphasized. It is the redemptive purposes that reveals the reign of God, that gives rise to the Kingdom metaphor that is used by Macchia and New Testament scholars. There are those who liken the New Testament term 'basileia' with the eschatological fulfillment, and considers the Hebrew word in the Old Testament more to be about God's rule or sovereignty. The words kingship and kingly power is essential here. In Macchias work, the pneumatological inauguration of the Kingdom of God consists in God being present through Spirit baptism to exercise divine redemption in the here and now, as well as an anticipation of a future reality where the Kingdom will be fully realized.

Those that are critical to Macchia's framework, is mostly criticizing that he brings too much into the metaphor and that this broad understanding of it as a biblical metaphor encompasses much more than it has solid biblical evidence for. If it is everything, then it is really nothing, and with no clear borders, there is not really a distinct teaching we are talking about anymore. And if it would be so important and fluidly used, critics ask why the writers of the New Testament do not give it more importance. These objections definitively have some credibility, and one can surely ask if not Macchia is trying to bring too much into it all. These objections also come from within the Pentecostal movement, although there also are many that see great potential in the theology he is proposing. In addition, we have the theological voices from outside of Pentecostalism that not merely would disagree with Macchias pneumatological framework, but by the Pentecostal teaching on Spirit baptism entirely. As always, there are many different perspectives.

While there are some objections on Macchia's use of the metaphor, if it really can be said to inaugurate the Kingdom of God, with Jesus as the Spirit baptizer, then such a framework truly can give it relevance and importance in Pentecostalism today. He does bring in biblical contexts of the Kingdom of God in relation to Spirit baptism, and by reworking the teaching into a new and broader framework, Macchia connects competing theological concerns in the Pentecostal movement. The baptism in the Holy Spirit and eschatology have been two theological concerns that have been important all throughout the movements history, and bringing them together seems to provide interesting grounds of reflection and perhaps a greater reason for believers of participating in both the Church and the Kingdom. That Pentecostalism ultimately has an eschatological horizon, seems to be agreed upon by many prominent scholars in the movement, as well as having firm historical prominence. Macchia does advocate some very interesting connections between the two.

If the framework by Macchia can portray the teaching to have more relevance to both churches and believers alike, then it possibly could revitalize its importance in the movement. As stated earlier, the diversity of teachings that has pertained the movement in recent times, not to mention the diversity of the movement itself, may be one of the reasons why the teaching baptism in the Holy Spirit has been less focused upon recently. To bring some of these diversities together may in this regard be a potential way to revoke the emphasis and

importance it previously had. It will, however, need to stand to scrutiny by other Pentecostal scholars, and in collaboration with these be developed into a fruitful foundation for understanding the Spirit and the pneumatological agency in the movement. By all the Pentecostal works consulted for this thesis, there seems to be a certain interest in Macchia's theological efforts, and his work in Spirit baptism has increasingly been cited.

So, can a theological reworking of the pneumatological framework of Spirit baptism provide the teaching with new vigour and relevance? As Simon Chan stated: 'Among second-generation Pentecostals, Spirit baptism is received first as a doctrine before it is actualized in personal experience. But when the doctrine is poorly explained, the intended experience does not necessarily follow.' As Macchia is ploughing new grounds with this work bringing a somewhat faded teaching back to prominence, then the actualization of the teaching, giving it an even more substantial foundation, could potentially bring more people into experiencing it, and by that, bringing more of the Kingdom into the world.



## 5 Bibliography

- Althouse, Peter, and Robby Waddell. *Perspectives in Pentecostal Eschatologies: World Without End*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Company Limited, 2012.
- Anderson, Allan. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Andrews, Edward D. *FROM SPOKEN WORDS TO SACRED TEXTS: Introduction-Intermediate to New Testament Textual Studies*. Ohio: Christian Publishing House, 2020.
- Atkinson, William P. *Baptism in the Spirit: Luke-Acts and the Dunn Debate*. Cambridge: The Lutherworth Press, 2012.
- Avis, Paul. *The Oxford Handbook of Ecclesiology*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Beck, T. David. *The Holy Spirit and the Renewal of All Things: Pneumatology in Paul and Jurgen Moltmann*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Company Limited, 2010.
- Chan, Simon. *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2011.
- D. Hunter, Harold. *Spirit Baptism: A Pentecostal Alternative*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2009.
- Daniel, Castelo. *Pentecostalism as a Christian Mystical Tradition*. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2017.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. Ex-Seminary Library edition. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Pres, 1970.
- Dyrness, William A., Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, Juan Francisco Martinez, and Simon Chan. *Global Dictionary of Theology: A Resource for the Worldwide Church*. Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2008.
- Galloway, J.B. *Study of Holiness from the Early Church Fathers*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2014.
- Given, Lisa. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. California: SAGE Publications Inc., 2008.
- Harris, I. Leon. *The Holy Spirit as Communion: Colin Gunton's Pneumatology of Communion and Frank Macchia's Pneumatology of Koinonia*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2017.
- Hegertun, Terje. *The Spirit Driven Church: Signs of God's Graceful Presence*. Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2017.
- Jakobsen, T.G. *Vitenskapsfilosofi Og Kritisk Realisme: Et Ikke Antroposentrisk Alternativ*. 1. utgave. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2021.
- Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *An Introduction to Ecclesiology: Historical, Global, and Interreligious Perspectives*. Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2021.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Revised Edition. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1993.
- Land, Steven. *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*. Tennessee: CPT Press, 2010.

- Liston, Gregory J. *Kingdom Come: An Eschatological Third Article Ecclesiology*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2022.
- Lord, Andy. *Network Church: A Pentecostal Ecclesiology Shaped by Mission*. Leiden: BRILL, 2012.
- Macchia, Frank D. *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*. Michigan: Zondervan, 2009.
- . “Spirit Baptism: A Response to My Reviewers,” *Canadian Journal of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christianity* 1, 2010, 178–83.
- . *The Spirit-Baptized Church: A Dogmatic Inquiry*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.
- Martin, Lee Roy. *Pentecostal Hermeneutics: A Reader*. Leiden: BRILL, 2013.
- McDonnell, Kilian, and George Montague. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994.
- McGee, Gary B. *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008.
- McKim, Donald K. *The Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms, Second Edition: Revised and Expanded*. Second Edition. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.
- McQueen, Larry R. *Towards a Pentecostal Eschatology: Discerning the Way Forward*. Dorchester: BRILL, 2019.
- Medved, Goran. “The Doctrine of Baptism in the Spirit in the Charismatic Movement,” *January* 1, 2015. [https://www.academia.edu/69414165/The\\_Doctrine\\_of\\_Baptism\\_in\\_the\\_Spirit\\_in\\_the\\_Charismatic\\_Movement](https://www.academia.edu/69414165/The_Doctrine_of_Baptism_in_the_Spirit_in_the_Charismatic_Movement).
- Perry, David. *Spirit Baptism: The Pentecostal Experience in Theological Focus*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Richie, Tony. *Essentials of Pentecostal Theology*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2020.
- Robins, R. G. *Pentecostalism in America*. California: Praeger, 2010.
- Smith, Dr Ashley Neil. *The Pentecostal Reformation*. North Carolina: Lulu Press, 2013.
- Stephenson, Christopher Adam. “Pentecostal Theology According to the Theologians: An Introduction to the Theological Methods of Pentecostal Systematic Theologians.” Marquette University, 2009.
- Stewart, Adam. *Handbook of Pentecostal Christianity*. Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 2012.
- Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke: Trajectories from the Old Testament to Luke-Acts*. 2nd edition. Michigan: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Studebaker, Steven M. *Defining Issues in Pentecostalism: Classical and Emergent*. Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2016.
- . *From Pentecost to the Triune God: A Pentecostal Trinitarian Theology*. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2012.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *Hermeneutics*. Michigan: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . *The Holy Spirit: In Biblical Teaching, Through the Centuries, and Today*. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2013.
- Tuppurainen, Riku P. *Reading St. Luke’s Text and Theology: Pentecostal Voices: Essays in Honor of Professor Roger Stronstad*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2019.

- Unger, Merrill. *The Baptism and Gifts of the Holy Spirit*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.
- Vonhey, Wolfgang. *Pentecostal Theology: Living the Full Gospel*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017.
- Welker, Michael. *The Work of the Spirit: Pneumatology and Pentecostalism*. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2006.
- Willis, Wendell. *Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation*. Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2020.
- Yong, Amos. *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology*. Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005.