

4-2015

They Shall Recover: Towards a Pneumatological and Eschatological Understanding of the Atonement in Pentecostal Healing

Daniel J. Simmons

Southeastern University - Lakeland

Follow this and additional works at: <http://firescholars.seu.edu/honors>

 Part of the [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Systematic/Doctrinal Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Simmons, Daniel J., "They Shall Recover: Towards a Pneumatological and Eschatological Understanding of the Atonement in Pentecostal Healing" (2015). *Selected Honors Theses*. Paper 20.

THEY SHALL RECOVER: TOWARDS A PNEUMATOLOGICAL AND
ESCHATOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE ATONEMENT IN PENTECOSTAL
HEALING

IN COMPLETION OF FULFILLING THE
REQUIREMENT FOR AN HONORS
UNDERGRADUATE THESIS

HONORS DEPARTMENT
COLLEGE OF CHRISTIAN MINISTRIES AND RELIGION

BY

DANIEL JAMES SIMMONS

SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY

LAKELAND, FLORIDA

4 APRIL 2015

Abstract

This thesis identifies the ideologies of the Christian church surrounding divine healing with an emphasis upon the Pentecostal outbreak of the Azusa Street Revival. This study explores the “Atonement model” of divine healing, and assesses its strength in adequately capturing Pentecostal thought regarding divine healing. From this understanding, the study examines pneumatology and eschatology within the purview of divine healing in order to criticize the validity of the Atonement model.

Introduction

When children like eight-month-old Brandon Schiabe become ill and die prematurely, it is nothing short of a tragedy; however, it is unusual when parents like Herbert and Catherine Shaible are held responsible for their son's death. Herbert and Catherine belong to a fundamentalist Christian church that believes in God's power to heal its physical ill followers; instead of Brandon receiving the medical attention that he needed, the parents agreed for the church's prayer of recovery to be his sole aid. Unfortunately, Brandon did not recover—nor did his older brother that died from a preventable bacterial infection four years earlier. Authorities have since convicted Herbert and Catherine Shaible for involuntary manslaughter and child neglect. Meanwhile, this tragic case has brought divine healing to attention of the main stream media to assess its validity.

When I examine the misfortunes of young Brandon Schaible and my late father and step-father's fatal encounters with cancer, I cannot keep from challenging the ideology concerning God's divine healing power within the Pentecostal Christian tradition in which I identify myself. My father, a Vietnam veteran, contracted lung cancer from smoking for almost forty years. I was a teenager when he passed away, and I rarely challenge the events of his death and the lack of receiving God's healing due to his age and the natural cause-and-effect surrounding his disease. However, the shocking end to my mother's remarriage was riddled with unanswerable conclusions. Why would a man so young contract a cancer that is usually found in men almost twenty years older than he? Surely he was a good man who served God and honored his country; why would God not honor his pleas for healing, especially since almost every Pentecostal believer in North Alabama prayed for his healing? Is God's healing power only observed within ancient manuscripts and scriptures? If God's healing power really does exist within modernity,

do we see it? If the Atonement of Christ provided the means of my salvation, can I be sure of my salvation if I am not healed? What happens to faithful Christians that are not healed? Is Pentecostal healing too theologically simple to answer these questions?

After discussing these puzzling questions with my academic advisor and recognizing potential answers within Pentecostal theological academics, I decided to attenuate research towards divine healing within the Christian church in hopes to better understand the mystery of divine healing. Essentially, I will be discovering the history of divine healing in hopes that reexamining it in other theological lenses, such as pneumatology and eschatology, will improve its logic and follow a better biblical hermeneutic. From there, Pentecostal healing will be assessed in the same theological spectrum.

After beginning my research, I have come to the conclusion that studying divine healing is important in order to prevent tragedies similar to Brandon Schiable's misfortunes. Further still, it is imperative to gain understanding from the effect that calamities, illness and death have upon the disciplines of theology, philosophy, anthropology, and upon the entire academy.

Pentecostalism's theodicy is regularly challenged and even ridiculed, so an exploration of other theological pursuits in light of Pentecostal healing will not only benefit Pentecostal academics but may also help dispel rumors and myths for those outside of the tradition to grasp a better appreciation for the Pentecostal theology of divine healing.

In order to accomplish this goal, I have analyzed the history of divine healing throughout church history, primarily focusing upon the years immediately preceding and following Pentecostalism, in order to assess past methods and understandings of divine healing and analyze them to the prevalent theories and understandings of modern divine healing. In addition, I will be examining the applications and understandings of divine healing that emerge within the historical

review of divine healing for potential improvement and conformation to a much more logical and biblical approach to divine healing within the context of other Pentecostal ideologies, specifically Pentecostal pneumatology and eschatology. Some questions to be addressed within this thesis are as follows:

- Could views of divine healing directly before and during Pentecostalism be responsible for the major attitudes toward divine healing for what people experience today?
- Is a Christological divine healing model a satisfying theology of divine healing? What are its weaknesses?
- Should eschatological and pneumatological views replace Christological models for divine healing? Could they be combined instead?

Literature Review and Methodology

As the following literature review will suggest, the methodology of this study did not include the pursuit of conducting any research on the basis of individual experience or survey. The nature of the study did not warrant it; observing individual claims of Pentecostal healing was not the pursuit of the study. Since the study was acutely directed at arriving at a theological conclusions of healing, Pentecostal literature was the best method at attaining these results. After consulting these resources, the conclusions reached reflected the intended goals of the study.

The scope of identifying the practice of divine healing was limited to the writings that have emerged from Pentecostal and Neo-Pentecostal academic writing. Not only does scarce research exist outside of the Pentecostal tradition, but the smaller quantity of research held outside of the Pentecostal academy is not as thorough, objective, or as historically sound as the reports native to Pentecostal sources. In order to ensure the study was conducted on the best material available, only academic Pentecostal publications, primarily from monographs or dissertations, was compiled to draw conclusions for the study (except for identifying the popularity of positions held by some in Pentecostal ministry).

However, the brevity of this thesis did not allow the research to extend to Pentecostal scholarship outside of the United States. The Pentecostal contextualizations of other cultures pertained to people of other cultures inside America. In addition, the writing of academic material by non-American authors included in the study was written on American Pentecostalism.

Ronald Kydd's *Healing through the Centuries* was particularly beneficial to the study for several reasons. Kydd was able to uncover a vast amount of information on divine healing that spanned an even greater time period. His inclusions on divine healing practice within the

Apostolic era to the outbreak of Pentecostalism was exemplary and necessary to provide context for the entire study. His inclusion into providing the examples of Pentecostal ministers were crucial in ensuring the accuracy and cohesion of divine healing throughout Pentecostal ministry.

Kim Alexander's PhD dissertation on Pentecostal divine healing was pertinent for setting the larger framework for this study. *Pentecostal Healing: Models in Theology and Practice* gave incredible detail to theology of healing preceding and following Azusa. Similarly, Robert Goff's *Fields White unto Harvest* formulated the importance of Pentecostal ministers responsible for shaping many attitudes and theologies of Azusa. *The Everlasting Gospel: the Significance of Eschatology in Pentecostal Thought* was essential for further establishing the roles of Pentecostal leaders, as well as defining the history and theological attributes of Pentecostal eschatology.

The impact of F.F. Bosworth's *Christ the Healer* has not subsided since its first publication in 1924.¹ Bosworth captured the essence of divine healing of both early Pentecostalism and the post-Azusa Pentecostal schisms splintering themselves for organization. Bosworth's standardization of divine healing is validated in not only its influence on the healing revivals following World War Two, but also on the ideologies of modern Pentecostalism globally.

In assessing the pneumatology of Pentecostal healing, it is pertinent to understand Pentecostal hermeneutic and the biblical narrative itself. Ken Archer's *Pentecostal Hermeneutic for the 21st Century* defines the pneumatological role of the Spirit within the biblical narrative and John Christopher Thomas' *Devil, Disease, and Deliverance* explicitly depicts the reality of Pentecostal practice of divine healing in response to biblical narrative. More specifically, Matthias Wenk's *Community-Forming Power: the Socio-Ethical role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*

¹ The copy that I consulted during the research of this study was one that I acquired at a Pentecostal Bible school in 2010, almost 100 years after its publication.

and Martin Mittelsadt's *The Spirit and Suffering in Luke-Acts: Implications for a Pentecostal Pneumatology* further describe the pneumatology of a paramount section of biblical narrative—Luke-Acts.

Keith Warrington's expositions in both *Pentecostal Perspectives* and *Pentecostal Theology* were monumental in observing the pneumatological happenings within Pentecostal divine healing. Both sources add tremendous weight to the inclusion of Spirit in various facets, principally in biblical narrative and in the experience of "the Gifts of the Spirit." Erling Jorstad adds credibility to Warrington's writing. Jorstad draws attention to the Pentecostal reliance upon the gifts of the Spirit within *The Holy Spirit in Today's Church*.

In supposition, David Reed's PhD dissertation, *In Jesus' Name*, signified the Christological nature of Pentecostal theology, including divine healing, and the need for pneumatological recognition of divine healing. Reed provided the example of Oneness Pentecostal history and belief to relay the risk of abandoning Trinitarianism, a caution that should be heeded within Pentecostal healing. Veli-Matti Karkkainen's *Pneumatology* was monumental in establishing the priority of pneumatology in Pentecostalism. His research also established its superiority over complex, systematic theology as a whole.

Fredrick Bruner discusses the soteriology of the Holy Spirit in *Theology of the Holy Spirit*. This piece was important for making a relationship with soteriology and pneumatology, which is critical in confirming pneumatology and divine healing, providing that divine healing has many soteriological implications. Bruner argues that pneumatology is mistakenly only addressed as an agent of distributing divine healing and not of salvific healing, as well.

Perspectives in Pentecostal Eschatology contributed mightily to understanding eschatology and affirming its appositeness to this study of divine healing. William Raccah's

“Early Jewish Eschatology” brilliantly captured the context of Pentecostal eschatology and its Judaic roots. “Eschatology in Context” by Peter Althouse established the eschatological nuances in the Full Gospel (including healing). Together, these provide the eschatological frameworks in which the eschatological research in this study is conducted from.

William K. Kay’s inclusions shaped the eschatological representation of divine healing in this study in two very distinct and equally important approaches. First, Kay included C.L. Parker’s critique on the atonement in “Healing” found in *Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies* removed the soteriological element from healing and was significant in legitimizing the opportunity for the broadening of divine healing, both in cases of disability and in liberation. Second, *Pentecostalism* greatly described the tension of the “here but not yet” found within Pentecostal eschatology and the geographical relevance to Pentecostal “Latter Rain.”

Assessing the future of the Pentecostal movement was important in understanding both modern Pentecostal eschatology and future Pentecostalism. Larry McQueen’s *Towards a Pentecostal Eschatology* reveals a separation from Classical Pentecostal eschatology and the eschatology of modern Pentecostals, and this is needed to capture the totality of eschatology in Pentecostalism. Harvey Cox’s *Fire from Heaven* also addressed the differences in modern Pentecostal eschatology and Classical Pentecostal eschatology, except that Cox contends that a greater measure of eschatology contributes to modern Pentecostalism’s attempts for social change and liberation.

Interaction with disability and eschatology needed to be addressed in this study. Disability complicates theodicy, particularly with Pentecostalism and its expression of administering divine healing to all people. Therefore, the writings of scholars with experiences of disability within the Pentecostal tradition are important for reconciling the two facets within

Pentecostal healing. Amos Yong, both in *The Theology of Down Syndrome* and *The Bible, Disability, and the Church*, challenges modern soteriological perceptions of disability and then moves toward an appropriate eschatological response. Steven Fettke makes a similar move in this arena but expends more effort in describing the “now” of the eschaton as opposed to its broader contribution to eschatology. Nancy Eisland’s *Disabled God* more thoroughly provided the necessity of disability and its Christological response to the eschaton.²

For similar reasons, contextualized liberation within eschatology needed to be addressed. Samuel Solivan’s *The Spirit, Pathos, and Liberation* and Eldin Villafane’s *The Liberating Spirit* continue the implications for Pentecostal eschatology and the suffering of Hispanic-American Pentecostals. Like Solivan, Zachary Tackett’s “As a Prophetic Voice” describes the liberatory narrative of the Exodus shifts the eschatological expectation to an African-American Pentecostal context of social justice.

² Although not Pentecostal, her work closely reflects the work of Pentecostal academics.

Chapter One: The History of Divine Healing and the Atonement

To discuss the progression of divine healing in Pentecostalism, it is first pertinent to address that divine healing is found in church history in eras that precede the short lifespan of Pentecostalism. Historians are unable to uncover any credible documentation of divine healing practiced in the Christian church outside of biblical narratives until the second century. Ronald Kydd writes that in Irenaeus' of Lyons writing in *Against Heresies*, a rebuttal of Gnosticism and proclamation of classical theism, Irenaeus rebukes two Christian teachers for their deficiency to heal the sick, blind, lame, deaf, injured, or help those who were demon possessed.³ Hippolytus, the author attributed to writing *The Apostolic Tradition*, includes instruction for laity with gifts for administering healing, which Kydd writes is significant because it assumes that divine healing was still occurring in early Christianity.⁴ Furthermore, it is documented that the influential theologian Origen observed that many Christians "perform many cures."⁵

It is significant to note that the instances of divine healing which were recorded exclusively give credit to God's power, demonstrated by the miracles happening in the name of Jesus Christ. Justin Martyr, a famous apologist who contended for Christianity's proofs through Hellenistic philosophy, documented in numerous works that many miracles were done by saints through the name of Jesus, some that even included driving out those that were demon possessed.⁶ Similarly, Origen documented that "the gift of healing extended even to Greeks and

³ Ronald A. N. Kydd. "The Early Years: A Church Triumphant," in *Healing Through the Centuries: Models for Understanding* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), 27-28.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁶ Morton Kelsey, "The Facts about Healing," in *Healing and Christianity: A Classic Study* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1995), 118-119.

barbarians who came to believe in Jesus Christ, and these people sometimes performed amazing cures by invoking the name of Jesus.”⁷

Another key element needed for understanding divine healing in the early church was how divine healing was applied and appropriated:

...[W]e find practices very similar to those recorded of Jesus and the apostles. Prayer along with laying hands on the sick is specifically mentioned; undoubtedly oil was used. Sometimes prayer alone was effective; or again, the result was obtained just by calling on the name of the Lord or even mentioning some fact about Jesus’ life.⁸

However, liturgical support of divine healing in Christianity began to change in the Middle Ages. A minute faction of the eastern churches prioritized pneumatology in their practice of Christianity, thus allotting divine healing to accumulate through the *charismata* within their monasteries and churches.⁹ However, the entire Western Church officially denied gifts of healing and even called some use of the gifts such as glossolalia, interpretation, and miracles, evidences of demonic possession.¹⁰ Despite experiences of the mystics that participated in these practices found in some of these eastern churches, it should be understood that they were exceptions—supernatural phenomena inside Christianity should not be seen as common during the Middle Ages.¹¹

Although divine healing was not recognized by the Western church, the church was not opposed to natural healings or physicians. In fact, Christianity supported natural healing by originating healing centers. By the fourth century, Christians preferred to seek medical help

⁷ Ibid., 120.

⁸ Ibid., 121.

⁹ Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 21.

¹⁰ Ibid., 22.

¹¹ Ibid., 23.

when confronted with illness.¹² For example, Basil the Great built many hospitals for the sick when confronted with the needs of the poor that surrounded him. He set up a system for the wealthy societies of Caesarea in order that they could contribute to building hospitals in Rome, Antioch, and even Bethlehem.¹³

The practices of divine healing remained, with some exception, during the Protestant Reformation. Martin Luther contended that Christians no longer needed miracles; notwithstanding, the modern divine healing was associated with the Anabaptists, a Christian movement in which Luther recognized as having many irreconcilable faults.¹⁴ Similar to the Anabaptists, the Quakers' "Inner Light" theological focus included opportunities for an elevated pneumatology that included many miraculous signs and healings.¹⁵ Many of the eccentric observances typical of modern Pentecostalism are similar to the practices of these early Quakers and Anabaptists.¹⁶

The historicity of Pentecostalism, not just divine healing, needs to be understood in the spawn of the Holiness Movement through the instructions and the teachings of John Wesley's Methodism. Prudencio Damboriena writes that Wesley's ideas of "religion of experience," the role of the Holy Spirit in a believer's life, and the possibility of achieving personal holiness helped fuel the birth of the Pentecostal movement.¹⁷ Kim Alexander confirms that the role of

¹² Kydd, "The Early Years: A Church Triumphant," 76.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 77.

¹⁴ Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 23.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 23-24.

¹⁶ Prudencio Damboriena, S.J. "Background of the Holiness and Pentecostal Movement," in *Tongues of Fire: Pentecostalism in Contemporary Christianity*, (Cleveland, OH: Corpus Books, 1969), 11.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 12.

experience in Wesley's theology was an important theological establishment for future Pentecostals and their understanding of divine healing.¹⁸

Now to address divine healing in its primary historical framework, most historians recognize leaders such as William Seymore and Charles Parham to be responsible for the healing movement. However, more recent scholarship is affirming that there were pioneers preceding both Parham and Seymore that significantly progressed the healing movement, particularly Charles Cullis. Kim Alexander writes that in the late 1860s, Dr. Charles Cullis began to provide both homeopathic treatment and spiritual care after receiving an experience of "Entire Sanctification."¹⁹ Cullis' work is particularly important for three reasons: he was the first American to implement divine healing, he provided spiritual healing within the biblical account of James 5:13-14, and he convinced many in the Holiness movement that both healing and salvation were provided in the Atonement of Christ.²⁰

Albert Benjamin Simpson, more commonly known as A.B. Simpson, is a recognized influence on the Pentecostal movement and healing movement in several important ways. For example, many of the leaders of the Pentecostal movement both attended his school and read many of his writings.²¹ His influence upon the early leaders of Pentecostalism was so great that it is possible that Aimee Semple McPherson constructed her "Foursquare Gospel" after Simpson's "Four-fold Gospel."²² Faupel writes that Simpson was Frank Sanford's biggest

¹⁸ Kimberly Ervin Alexander. "The Nineteenth Century Divine Healing Movement," in *Pentecostal Healing: Models in Theology and Practice*, (Blandford, UK: Deo Publishing), 28.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 16.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 16,17.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 19.

²² *Ibid.*, 19.

influence, a leader whose main contribution to Pentecostalism was in influencing Charles Parham.²³

John Alexander Dowie's convictions of divine healing were not passed down to many early Pentecostals, but his influence upon early Pentecostalism cannot be overlooked. Dowie is credited for founding both the (supposed) utopian healing society Zion City, Illinois and the Christian Apostolic Church.²⁴ Alexander documents Dowie's dualistic theological understanding of Christianity by describing his "Two Chain" theology.²⁵ "One emanated from Christ, bringing 'salvation, healing, life and ultimately heaven', while the other originated in Satan, resulting in 'sin, disease, death and hell.'"²⁶ Alexander then includes the importance of Dowie's "Two Chain" theology by logically placing the origin of all sickness from the Devil that resulted in Dowie preaching that the church was ineffective because of an incorrect understanding of sickness as God's judgment.²⁷ Dowie's healing theology differs from the soteriological nature that was common to the understandings of divine healing of others.²⁸

Alexander's writings about the Dowie's soteriology is not without conflict. Faupel writes that, "Dowie's understanding of divine healing is grounded in the atoning work of Christ. Like salvation, healing obtained through faith in this work of Christ. Just as Christ breaks the power of sin, so he breaks the power of disease."²⁹ Alexander's conflicting assessment of Dowie appears

²³ D. William Faupel, "Birth Pangs: The Pentecostal Message Foreshadowed," in *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*, (Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 142.

²⁴ D. William Faupel, "John Alexander Dowie," in *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought* (Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 116.

²⁵ Alexander, "The Nineteenth Century Divine Healing Movement," 58.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 58-59.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 59.

²⁸ Alexander, "The Nineteenth Century Divine Healing Movement," 63.

²⁹ Faupel, "John Alexander Dowie," 123.

to be inconsequential to the progression of Pentecostalism because Faupel argues that the Pentecostals that Dowie influenced did not accept many of his views upon divine healing.³⁰ This is an important observation because Dowie's adherents "...were among the most influential in giving theological shape to the Pentecostal revival."³¹

Other than William J. Seymour, there are no other figures as significant to the construction of North American Pentecostalism than Charles Fox Parham. However, his role in founding the movement is often overlooked and was not recognized until 1959.³² Parham's emphases upon divine healing were exuberantly important to shaping Pentecostal divine healing. Parham believed that sickness was not physical in nature, but spiritual; he saw that God's deliverance from sin to believers equaled a deliverance from sickness, as well.³³ "Parham believed that taking medicine was wrong. His own extensive encounter with disease confirmed that belief... only when he [Parham] trusted God enough to throw his medicine away had any real change been effected."³⁴ Parham's healing home founded in Topeka, Kansas in 1898 incorporated faith into the way it ministered healing to the ill. "Although Parham clearly expected all disease to be cured by faith, he recognized that healing required the building of faith within the individual patient. The home's an environment which, along with his teaching, encouraged recipients of the healing ministry to exercise faith and claim their answer."³⁵ Dowie passed on doctrines and practices to Parham which consequently influenced Pentecostalism and divine healing indirectly. For example, "Dowie's ministry undoubtedly influenced Charles

³⁰ Ibid., 63.

³¹ Ibid., 135.

³² Ibid., 184-185.

³³ James R. Goff, Jr. *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism*, (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988), 43.

³⁴ Ibid., 43.

³⁵ Ibid., 45.

Parham... In all respects, Parham's Topeka experiment was a much smaller example of what Dowie had already established in Chicago."³⁶ Faupel confirms that Parham's healing home, Beth-el, was modeled after both Cullis's healing home in Boston and Dowie's in Chicago.³⁷

Parham was also deeply influenced by Frank Sanford. When Sanford arrived in Topeka in June 1900, Parham was impressed by Sanford's preaching. Parham left his family and healing home temporarily and attended Sanford's bible school, Shiloh.³⁸ After spending time at Shiloh, Parham returned to Topeka to find that the two interim holiness ministers were not willing to relinquish the healing home back to Parham; Parham did not try very hard to recover it from them.³⁹ As a result of this fallout with Beth-el, Parham disassociated himself with the healing home and then opened up a Bible school on the outskirts of Topeka that was not only modeled after Sanford's Shiloh, but also preached the "religious doctrines" received from Sanford himself.⁴⁰ From this we can infer that the doctrine of divine healing found in the Atonement of Christ was passed onto Parham's students through his experiences, further strengthened by Simpson's "Four-fold Gospel" that included Jesus Christ as Healer.

In spite of the many failures of his former evangelistic and educational endeavors, moves and relocations, Parham once again moved his family and *Apostolic Faith* printing to Orchard, Texas in late 1905 to establish an evangelistic presence and Bible school in Houston, Texas.⁴¹ This Bible school was directly important to Pentecostalism and the doctrine of divine healing because of the enrollment of a particular minister who would later be recognized as the leader of the entire Pentecostal movement—William J. Seymour. Even though Parham "was sensitive to

³⁶ Ibid., 51.

³⁷ Faupel, "John Alexander Dowie," 162.

³⁸ Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest*, 59.

³⁹ Ibid., 60.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 60-61.

⁴¹ Ibid., 104-105.

the local Jim Crow statutes and yet sympathetic to the spread of Pentecostal doctrine among blacks, admitted Seymour to the Bible school but provided separate seating.⁴² Although the teaching was made in an unideal setting of sitting in a different room with an open door, Goff writes that Seymour did, in fact, “absorb Apostolic Faith theology,”⁴³ which included Parham’s teachings on divine healing.⁴⁴

After attending Parham’s Bible school for five weeks, Seymour received an offer to pastor a small holiness congregation in Los Angeles; convinced by the leading of the Holy Spirit, Seymour accepted with Parham’s permission.⁴⁵ Seymour’s relationship with the holiness congregation was quickly severed after they refused to accept Seymour’s Apostolic Faith preaching; however, Seymour and the small few of his converts began to hold Bible studies in a friends’ home at 214 North Bonnie Brae Street.⁴⁶

Then, on April 9th 1906, Jennie Moore began to speak in other tongues, an act reciprocated in Acts 2, during one of Seymour’s sermons on Acts 2:4. This active outpouring of the Holy Spirit signified to those present that “the Pentecostal revival had arrived in California.”⁴⁷ Over the next three days, crowds of both blacks and whites flocked to the street and house on Bonnie Brae. In fact, the crowds were so large that it is reported that the porch collapsed under the weight of the people.⁴⁸ Due to the astronomical growth of the revival, Seymour and his band of revivalists began looking for other areas in Los Angeles to house the

⁴² Ibid., 107.

⁴³ Ibid., 107.

⁴⁴ Seymour’s theology was not built entirely from Parham’s teachings. See Gaston Espinosa’s *William J. Seymour and the Origins of Global Pentecostalism: A Biography and Documentary History*.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 111.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 112.

⁴⁷ Larry E. Martin, *The Life and Ministry of William J. Seymour: and a History of the Azusa Street Revival* (Joplin, MO: Christian Life Books, 1999), 146.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 147-148.

movement. Renting the building for just eight dollars a day, Seymour began holding services at the revival area that had previously been an African Methodist Episcopal Church at 312 Azusa Street, near downtown Los Angeles.⁴⁹

This location was prominent for not only sharing the Apostolic Faith doctrine of evidential tongue speaking as the sign of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but it was also important for sharing its doctrine of God's healing for sickness provided for in Christ's atonement. Not only did Seymour and others preach its doctrine, but they also made room in the mission for those who were seeking to be healed. "As many as 100 at a time would be in the upper room seeking the Holy Spirit baptism or divine healing...One report said that, 'People were healed there every day.'"⁵⁰ In addition, Seymour's actions outside the mission demonstrated that he experienced Christ's healing power when ministering to the sick:

Seymour came to the home and approached the suffering child's bed. He opened a bottle of anointing oil, anointed the girl's head and said, 'Little girl, do you believe that God can heal you?' Seymour did not get 'excited,' he prayed 'calmly' and believed God for healing. Instantly, the girl turned over in the bed and fell into a 'peaceful sleep.' She slept through the entire night, healed by God's mighty power.⁵¹

The tenets of Apostolic Faith provided by Seymour himself evidenced an undeniable connection with divine healing as part of its core principles. For example, one of the main duties of a preacher in the Apostolic tradition is to visit the sick.⁵² In a doctrinal overview, Seymour writes to: "Seeking healing. We must believe, with great joy, that God is able to heal: 'I am the Lord that healeth thee' (Exodus 15:26)... Behold I am the Lord, the God of all flesh; is there

⁴⁹ Ibid., 155-158.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 190.

⁵¹ Ibid., 192-193.

⁵² William Joseph Seymour, *The Doctrines and Discipline of the Azusa Street Apostolic Faith Mission of Los Angeles (The Complete Azusa Street Library)*, (Joplin, MO: Christian Life Books, 2000), 105.

anything too hard for me?’ (Jer. 32:27; Luke 24:52,53).”⁵³ Although the Apostolic doctrines do not explicitly state healing’s soteriological connections, we can infer that it did not deviate from Parham’s understanding because if Seymour had, he probably would have explicitly mentioned so in the same manner that Seymour modified Parham’s annihilation of the wicked: “We [Seymour’s Apostolic following] don’t believe in the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked. That is the reason why we could not stand for [Parham’s understanding of] tongues being the evidence of the baptism in the Holy Ghost and fire.”⁵⁴ However, Faupel writes that Christ’s atonement assuaged more soteriological concerns in Seymour’s theology than Parham’s, in the sense that Spirit-baptism, justification, sanctification, healing, and racial tensions were to be redeemed through “The Precious Atonement” of Christ.⁵⁵

William Seymour’s contribution to global Pentecostalism should not be overlooked as inconsequential. Although Seymour ignited the North American Pentecostal flame, important cities such as New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Washington DC, Chicago, Zion City, St. Paul, Atlanta, Birmingham, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Portland, Seattle, San Francisco, and Oakland had been permeated with Pentecostal theology and had been established as Pentecostal centers by 1908.⁵⁶ Although Azusa Street was the most influential Pentecostal presence in the nation during the span of about three years in the early stages of the Pentecostal revival in America,⁵⁷ Azusa Street’s impact on American Pentecostalism is still recognized currently. Azusa Street birthed American Classical Pentecostalism and that at least twenty-six Pentecostal denominations trace their origins to the Azusa, including the Assemblies of God and the Church

⁵³ Ibid., 43.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 87.

⁵⁵ Faupel, *Everlasting Gospel*, 211.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 226.

⁵⁷ Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 43.

of God in Christ.⁵⁸ Anderson writes extensively on Seymour's influence on Classical Pentecostalism and future Pentecostalism by expressing that:

Although Parham was indeed influential in the early formation of Pentecostalism, Seymour and Azusa Street eclipsed him in significance and play a major role in the ways most Pentecostals and Charismatics define themselves...Although events have moved a long way from the heady days, this formative period of North American Pentecostalism should be seen as its fundamental essence and not merely as its infancy. This means that if the movement is to continue to be strong in the twenty-first century, it must consider its Azusa Street prototype to be the source of inspiration for theological and spiritual renewal.⁵⁹

In a more global context, Italy, Brazil, England, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, France, and Switzerland had been affected by the experiences of the Pentecostal revival at Azusa Street.⁶⁰

With the Apostolic Faith message reaching many areas of North America and the world at large, it should be no surprise that classical Pentecostal theology mirrors an ideology of divine healing that is soteriological in nature. Several writings in Pentecostal theology not only establish an Christological model for divine healing, but also provide supportive explanations of Biblical texts and theologies on the nature of both God and humankind. For example, F.F. Bosworth's 1924 Pentecostal classic *Christ the Healer* was widely distributed and revered in classical Pentecostalism. *Christ the Healer* is devoted to the premise of Christ's healing power through Jesus' atonement and implements ample support in other theological and anthropological matters needed to comply with an Christological model for healing.

For Bosworth, sickness is commensurate with sin, thus atonement redeems both sickness and sin: "our attitude toward sickness should be the same as our attitude toward sin. Our purpose

⁵⁸ Ibid., 42.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 44-45.

⁶⁰ Faupel, *Everlasting Gospel*, 219-221.

to have our body healed should be as definite as our purpose to have our soul healed.”⁶¹ In Bosworth’s understanding of divine healing, God’s nature mirrors that of a healer as well. One of Israel’s “Redemptive Names of God” in the Old Testament is Jehovah Rapha—“I am the Lord that Healeth Thee; God’s healing is a “privilege purchased by the atonement.”⁶² God’s sovereignty is displayed through Christ’s healing example upon the earth for all of humanity.⁶³ In addition, God’s holistic concern for humanity is indicated through healing’s evangelistic nature. Bosworth writes of his experience at a revival in Ottawa, Canada in which, “[d]uring the seven weeks of the meeting, six thousand came for healing, and about twelve thousand for salvation. I doubt if there would have been more than one thousand for salvation had it not been for the miracles of healing...”⁶⁴

Foundations of Pentecostal Theology also establishes support for sickness to originate with sin and healing resulting from Christ’s atonement. Similar to Bosworth, Duffield and Van Cleave highlight the relevance of God’s will as an appropriate consequence to the parallel between sickness and sin: “[I]f sickness is of the Devil, certainly God does not will it upon any of his blood-bought children.”⁶⁵ However, sickness also has a purpose for discipline and correction.⁶⁶ One of the primary advances that Duffield and Van Cleave make is that although they recognize healing instances in Old Testament texts and God’s healing nature in the

⁶¹ F. F. Bosworth, *Christ the Healer*, Revised ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Chosen Books, 2008), 18.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 33.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 56, 49.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 83.

⁶⁵ Guy P. Duffield and Nathaniel M. Van Cleave, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (Los Angeles, CA: Creation House, 2008), 374.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 371.

“Redemptive Names of Jehovah,” healing in the Old Testament is portrayed in a framework of atonement for specific sins committed by Israel.⁶⁷

Stanley Horton’s *Systematic Theology* presents divine healing as an integral part to salvation as well. Divine healing’s case for existence within orthodox theology resides in biblical evidence and record, the atonement of Christ, biblical principles of salvation and humankind’s sinful nature, and divine healing is an outpouring of a restoration of the fallen world.⁶⁸ Jesus’ attitude towards healing is demonstrative of God’s will and attitude towards healing—healing in the New Testament cannot be recognized purely through Greco-Roman influence of the New Testament but by the “divine preparation” of healing in the Old Testament.⁶⁹ Thus, healing is undoubtedly provided for in the atonement of Christ as part of the “whole gospel” because a removal of divine healing from the atonement that would create a Hellenistic dualism of soul and body, evident in many of the beliefs of influential cessationist Reformed theologians like Augustine.⁷⁰ Purdy affirms this duality, but contends for unity, as well: “[B]iblical holism consists of a recognition of the human person as a total person, with all parts integrated and operating properly for the benefit of the whole.”⁷¹ Salvation that separates physical and spiritual dimensions is not warranted by the “reconciliation of restoration and healing.”⁷² As a result, Purdy concludes that divine healing is “not a minor doctrine, but rather an integral part of the message of the entire Bible.”⁷³

⁶⁷ Ibid., 375-377, 389.

⁶⁸ Vernon L. Purdy, “Divine Healing” in *Systematic Theology: Revised Edition*, Stanley Horton, ed. (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1994), 489-490.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 496-500.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 500-502.

⁷¹ Ibid., 506.

⁷² Ibid., 503-505.

⁷³ Ibid., 522.

Although Pentecostal scholarship assimilates divine healing into soteriology, it is admissible to recognize Pentecostal leaders responsible for many Pentecostal movements whose influence in Pentecostalism cannot be overlooked. Although E.W. Kenyon preaches that both healing and sickness are spiritual and non-physical in nature, he affirms that sin and sickness were placed upon Christ so that what “Satan wrought on man (sic)” could not belong to humankind.⁷⁴ T.L. Osborn reveals an overt connection to atonement and divine healing by writing that just as Christ cannot be separated as Healer and Savior, “so we cannot separate divine healing from salvation.”⁷⁵ Pavel Hejzlar affirms that Kenneth Hagin’s interpretation of Gal. 3:13 holds that sickness is included in the curse of the law which Christ redeemed humankind from and that the life “benefits” believers lay claim from the provision made available in “the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.”⁷⁶ Although Oral Roberts’ soteriology will be discussed later, his position on healing is nonetheless soteriological in nature: “[t]he healing virtue of Jesus is God’s antidote against disease...”⁷⁷

Conclusion

Contrary to many misconceptions and critiques of Pentecostal theology, the theology and application of divine healing did not originate within the seemingly young movement of Pentecostalism. Divine healing hails from a rich legacy of church history that long precedes Pentecostalism—critically assessing divine healing should not be done hastily or without proper

⁷⁴ E. W. Kenyon, “Healing in Redemption,” in *Jesus the Healer*. (Lynwood, WA: Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society, 1997), 30-32.

⁷⁵ T. L. Osborn, “The Condition,” in *Healing from Christ*, (Tulsa, OK: Osborn Foundation Publication, 1955), 23.

⁷⁶ Pavel Hejzlar, *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis Macnutt in Dialogue*, (Leiden, Holland: Brill Publishers, 2010), 75-77.

⁷⁷ Oral Roberts, “The Seven Rules of Faith that Bring You What You Want,” in *If You Need Healing Do These Things*, (Garden City, NY: Country Life Press, 1950), 77.

recognition of the entirety of Christian heritage. In addition, it is significant to note that even the resurgence that divine healing has played in modern Christianity predates the outbreak of the Pentecostal revival by a significant period of history. However, administering divine healing in many facets was regularly associated as a paramount practice within Pentecostalism and the Pentecostal revival was responsible for launching divine healing into global recognition.

There is insufficient proof to identify the ideas surrounding divine healing for our early Christian audience. Therefore, assumptions that early Christianity either did or did not support a Christological understanding of divine healing cannot be made. However, we can recognize that an atonement model for divine healing emerged before the Azusa Street Revival, indicating that the praxis of divine healing did not originate with the revival but was only responsible for spreading it to a global audience. Since Azusa, practices of divine healing may have changed throughout American Pentecostal revivals, but the source of this healing has predominantly been the Atonement of Christ. There is little refutation that Pentecostal healing is derived from any other means, at least from any noteworthy sample.

Chapter Two: The Pneumatology of Divine Healing

Even those with little interaction with Pentecostalism are familiar with its vibrant spirituality and worship. Peter Neumann describes that “Pentecostals expect and emphasize encounters with the Holy Spirit that radically transform their broader Christian experience and spirituality.”⁷⁸ The Holy Spirit is even contributed for providing its nascence. Allan Anderson records that the Azusa Street Revival was viewed as having been led by the Holy Ghost, containing many manifestations of the Spirit and God’s power, ushering in the revival promised in the “last days.”⁷⁹ Despite Pentecostalism’s prime pneumatology, Donald Dayton describes that divine healing and the present power of God is more characteristic to Pentecostalism than even Spirit baptism.⁸⁰ Since the pneumatic nature and insistence on divine healing are so prevalent to Pentecostal practice, it would be unusual if the two foci were not heavily dependent upon each other, even with the rich Pentecostal tradition attributing divine healing to the soteriological event of the atonement of Christ. Thus, this chapter will be examining how pneumatology and divine healing interact with one another within the purview of Pentecostal understanding and praxis.

To recognize biblical constructions of healing without recognizing Pentecostal hermeneutic would overlook too many important foci surrounding the way in which Pentecostals perceived the Holy Spirit and engaged with Him through scripture. Kenneth Archer’s Pentecostal pneumatological hermeneutic reveals as much about the communal nature of Pentecostalism as a whole as it does about the theological constructs within itself. The Pentecostal community

⁷⁸ Peter D. Neumann, “Spirituality,” in *Handbook of Pentecostal Christianity*, (DeKalb, IN: Northern Illinois University Press, 2012), 196-197.

⁷⁹ Allan Anderson, *Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 187.

⁸⁰ Donald Dayton, “The Rise of the Divine Healing Movement,” in *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), 115.

recognizes that the Spirit's role in biblical hermeneutics is a continuation of Jesus' physical ministry and the interaction with Trinity.⁸¹ Moreover, the Pentecostal community depends upon the Holy Spirit to empower them to follow Christ's appointed mission through personal interaction within the community and through the Holy Spirit's guiding direction of scripture necessary for holy living.⁸² Accordingly, the Pentecostal community equates the Holy Spirit's guidance to bring about a summation of the entirety of God, and in the practice of administering divine healing in communal worship, a purely "Atonement model" of healing would deprive the pneumatological essence of Pentecostal experience and administration of the mission of Jesus, including healing.

There are some conflicts with the "Atonement model"—only attributing divine healing to the workings of the Atonement of Christ— and the pneumatological implications that James 5.14 constitutes as proper means to distribute divine healing. Although John Christopher Thomas admits the weakness of the claim, his research shows ample reason to recognize "the prayer of faith" from the elders as a request for the gifts of healing, a gift of the Spirit, to heal the sick.⁸³ In addition, he contends that the oil used did not have apparent medicinal qualities to it, but instead was of divine origin; Old Testament narratives (particularly Zechariah 4) connect the relationship of the oil to the presence of the Holy Spirit.⁸⁴ However, it is important to recognize that the James 5.14-16 pericope includes the admonition to be done "in the name of the Lord," the oil's eschatological significance that signified the accession of the Messiah, and the call for

⁸¹ Kenneth J. Archer, "A Contemporary Pentecostal Hermeneutical Strategy," in *Pentecostal Hermeneutic for the 21st Century: Spirit Scripture and Community*, (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 182.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 182-183.

⁸³ John Christopher Thomas, "James 5.14-16," in *Devil, Disease, and Deliverance: Origins of Illness in New Testament Thought*, (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010), 9-11.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 14-16.

confession of sin.⁸⁵ Therefore, a pneumatological reflection on healing in James 5.14-16 should not be done without prior consideration of the Christological nature of the pericope.

Keith Warrington affirms the Pentecostal correlation to the oil in James 5.14-16 with the Spirit, but he does add that it is often removed from its Old Testament origins that represent kingly anointing, prosperity (both economically and eternally), and a measure of God's strength.⁸⁶ In addition, the works of the gift of faith and prayer indicate the Spirit's avocation to divine healing in the pericope. The gift of faith is a supernatural gift that acts in accordance with the Spirit to confirm that the prayer of faith complies with the will of the Lord, thus becoming successful.⁸⁷ "The gifts of healing are most appropriately offered in conjunction with the gift of faith, the former depending on the latter for success."⁸⁸

Warrington adds a biblical insight to healing that recognizes the significance of the role of the Holy Spirit in Jesus' ministry that could potentially supplement Christological healing. In John 14.15-18, it is unlikely that a "greater measure" of miracles equates to a progression in the frequency and quality of miracles performed by believers' ministry; Pentecostals must recognize that it is more accurate to restructure a pneumatological healing ministry as opposed to a healing ministry that adheres to the narrative example documenting Jesus' ministry.⁸⁹ Instead, "authoritative power" will be evinced through the Church at a global scale in the age of the Holy Spirit.⁹⁰ It is quite significant that Warrington's insight would not necessarily renounce the Atonement model for healing since the passage implies the promise of power into action, not an

⁸⁵ Ibid., 16-25.

⁸⁶ Keith Warrington, *Pentecostal Perspectives*, (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press, 1998), 158-160.

⁸⁷ Warrington, *Perspectives*, 164-166.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 170.

⁸⁹ Keith Warrington, "Healing, Exorcism, and Suffering," in *Pentecostal Theology: A Theology of Encounter*, (New York: T & T Clark Publishing, 2008), 283.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 284.

immediate channel and appropriation for a practical application and manner for distributing healing.

Luke-Acts proclaims a dynamic theological statement as it relates Jesus' relationship to the Holy Spirit through the commission of Jesus' ministry. After Jesus receives the promise of the Holy Spirit (Luke 3.22), the Spirit is identified as the catalyst force that drives Jesus into the desert, which both establishes Jesus' identity as God and Jesus' future dependence upon the Holy Spirit for successful ministry.⁹¹ In fact, the references that Luke 3.15-16, 3.22, 4.1, and 4.14 authoritatively dictate that the active power of Jesus ministry was through the leading of the Holy Spirit in His life.⁹²

Luke-Acts is also an ever-present source that credits the Holy Spirit for many feats accomplished within Jesus' ministry. Although it will be discussed later in the next chapter, soteriology incorporates themes of restoration of all of humanity, not just those exclusive to spirituality. For example, Matthias Wenk writes that Luke-Acts displaces the Judaic soteriology by incorporating the community's responsibility for the welfare of their own society; the fulfillment of the eschaton was understood to accompany a renewed social order.⁹³ "The significance for Lukan pneumatology is found in the Spirit's role as the agent by which liberation and vindication are accomplished."⁹⁴ In assessing the pneumatological attributions to liberating the poor, it is essential to observe the identity of the poor that Jesus was bringing

⁹¹ Martin William Mittelsadt, *The Spirit and Suffering in Luke-Acts: Implications for a Pentecostal Pneumatology*, (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services, 2002), 82-83.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 83-84.

⁹³ Matthias Wenk, *Community Forming Power: the Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*, (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 209-210.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 210.

deliverance to: those under “satanic oppression,” economic oppression, and ethnical and gender minorities estranged from contemporary society.⁹⁵

To ensure an appropriate respect for Pentecostal experience within the scope of this study and assessment of Pentecostal divine healing, it is germane to include the experiences of Pentecostals whose healing ministries influenced the foundations and praxis of divine healing throughout Pentecostal history. William Branham, a poverty stricken healing minister hailing from rural Kentucky, received a divine call to the healing ministry in 1946.⁹⁶ Although controversy and seemingly unsettling practices have colored and added difficulty to defining public opinion of Branham’s ministry, his strong influence cannot be diminished due to the sheer number of those who have copied him (even currently).⁹⁷ Branham relied upon the Holy Spirit for a “gift of discernment” that could “discern diseases, and thoughts of men’s (sic) hearts, and other hidden things that only God could know and then reveal to me.”⁹⁸ Branham would then reveal secretive information about those seeking healing in order to encourage their faith. Although Branham reportedly relied upon the presence of an angel who would help him identify diseases of those that were sick⁹⁹, his model of healing undeniably includes an (interesting) pneumatological asseveration.

Kathryn Kuhlman’s healing ministry impact on Pentecostalism is difficult to pinpoint just because it is so vast; for that very reason, her immense presence and acclaim in Pentecostal communities indicate that Pentecostals are not opposed to pneumatic dependence in divine healing and could even suggest that many have adopted her approach to healing and

⁹⁵ Ibid., 211-214.

⁹⁶ Kydd, *Healing Throughout the Centuries*, 171.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 171-180.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 177-178.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 178-179.

implemented her practices in healing the sick. Kuhlman began preaching healing in ministry in the mid-1930s and ultimately became one of the most dominant religious personalities of the 1960s and 1970s.¹⁰⁰ Kuhlman trusted that the Holy Spirit could be depended upon for performing healing power since the ministry of Jesus had been carried on by the Spirit since Pentecost.¹⁰¹ Similarly to Branham, Kuhlman relied heavily upon the anointing of the Holy Spirit for divine revelation about the sick in order for healing to manifest. Often she announced specific healings to the audience and requested for the healing recipients to confirm their healings by reporting to the platform and testifying to the healings.¹⁰²

Kuhlman's pneumatological approach to delivering healing to mass audiences closely mirrors her counterparts' healing ministries, particularly upon the necessity for faith given by the Holy Spirit,¹⁰³ but her theology of healing differs in several ways. First, despite the Spirit's dominant expression in healing, Kuhlman affirmed "that healing is in the atonement."¹⁰⁴ Second, she acknowledges God's sovereignty in the healing, signifying a distinctly stronger theodicy than their contemporary healing ministries: "'Why are not all healed?' the only honest answer I can give is: I do not know...For only God knows, and who can fathom the mind of God?"¹⁰⁵

When approaching the subject of Oneness Pentecostalism, I am hesitant to express brash criticism due to Trinitarian Pentecostalism and Oneness Pentecostalism's shared interests, similar origins, and ecumenical value.¹⁰⁶ However, its Sabellianistic influences were sufficient for the Assemblies of God to condemn the movement as heretical after the proposition of the

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 183-1844.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 190.

¹⁰² Ibid., 185-186.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 191.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 194.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 191-192.

¹⁰⁶ David A. Reed, *"In Jesus' Name": the History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals*, (Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2008), 338.

New Issue.¹⁰⁷ I make this Oneness and Trinitarian Pentecostal comparison with caution, but the Atonement model runs a similar Trinitarian risk in the fashion that Oneness Pentecostalism's pneumatology is subordinate to the Name of Jesus. Acts 2.38, the apex pericope for establishing Oneness soteriology, denotes Jesus as "Dispenser of the Spirit" and "Giver of His Name" as a pneumatological response to all of Christian living, such as prayer and persecution.¹⁰⁸ This leads to implementing Christocentric dominance in Acts 2.38 in Spirit rebirth, experiential nature of faith, the repentance that unites believers unto God, and the reception of the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁹ Reed's exposition on Oneness prioritization of Acts 2.38 has revealed a concern following the Atonement model's relationship to the Spirit. In the manner that Oneness prioritization of Jesus' name overrides roles specifically given for the Spirit, the Atonement must give prudence to the Spirit's distinctive roles in healing both explained previously and later within the study.

Another Trinitarian concern exists when the Holy Spirit's role in Pentecostal soteriology is overlooked. Assuming an entirely Atonement model would encounter conflict with Trinitarian relationships, principally if pneumatology within soteriology were removed outside the Pentecostal framework for divine healing. Therefore, if this pneumatological divine healing is to be recognized as an extension of soteriology in a greater breadth of understanding, the Spirit's responsibilities within appropriating and affirming salvation must be discussed. The Spirit undoubtedly works within the Trinitarian relationship, which is not contested, but the Spirit is integral in completing the work of salvation by delivering the Gospel message and providing an

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 349.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 335.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 336.

avenue for human prayer so that “[humans] might both have and know of having this salvation.”¹¹⁰

One of the most substantial weaknesses to the Atonement model that suggests a need for modification is that the Atonement model fails to acknowledge the Pentecostal predilection of conducting divine healing through the “gift of healing,” an endowment allotted by the Holy Spirit. The gifts which Warrington described earlier in this chapter illustrate this very point. Further still, Veli-Matti Karkkainen’s *Pneumatology* records that Pentecostalism values expressive, charismatic spirituality as opposed to “discursive theology;” Pentecostalism experiences empowerment for witness and service through the emphasis on the supernatural happenings in their lives, all of which are contributed by the Spirit.¹¹¹ Erling Jorstad contends of Pentecostal reliance upon the Spirit to provide healing through the manifestation of the “gift of healing”:

Consider, for example, a person who is sick. The Spirit gives, or has given, ‘gifts of healing’ to a member of the congregation. This person goes to the sick member and manifests the gift which the Spirit has entrusted to him—and the sick person receives healing.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Fredrick Dale Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: the Pentecostal Experience in the New Testament Witness*, (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985), 268-269.

¹¹¹ Veli-Matti Karkkainen, *Pneumatology: the Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 89-94.

¹¹² Erling Jorstad, *The Holy Spirit in Today's Church: A Handbook of the New Pentecostalism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973), 122-23.

Conclusion

Pentecostal theology is without a doubt Christological in nature, but its vibrant worship and reliance upon the Holy Spirit indicate that it has many predominant pneumatological elements. Divine healing should be considered in the same manner. Pentecostal reliance upon the gifts of the Spirit working among communities, in manifestation of both healing power and insight into achieving holy living, reveals that Pentecostal practice includes more than a Christological nature to divine healing found in the Atonement.

However, it would be an injustice to dispose of the one for the other. The examples of Pentecostal ministers incorporating the Holy Spirit into their practices while continuing to further the Pentecostal tradition of appropriating healing to the victory of the Atonement reveal that the two can exist harmoniously together. In fact, the Trinitarian rejection of Oneness Pentecostalism suggests that incorporating the two together makes a better theological system for Pentecostalism as whole, including the totality of divine healing and the manner in which it is practiced by Pentecostals.

Chapter Three: The Eschatological Broadening of Divine Healing

Pentecostal eschatology, like Judaic eschatology, points forward in time to the coming of the Messiah to bring healing, liberation, and judgment of those who did not worship the monotheistic God or were chosen by Him. Judaism affirms that there will, indeed, be a messiah leading a messianic kingdom symbolic of the Davidic monarchy of early Judaism, containing “political prestige and economic prosperity.”¹¹³ However, there is within Judaism some refutation of the Davidic relationship due to David’s failed morality throughout the history of the kingship and by the rejection of the term “messiah” in the Maccabean documents.¹¹⁴

Moreover, Raccah writes that there has been a shift in the Messiah’s identity; he was previously a “political ruler and liberator who will merely free the Jews from the oppressive rule of others” and is now considered a monarch responsible for the spiritual renewal for all of humanity.¹¹⁵ Judaic eschatology is largely built upon the suppositions of immortality, and from which, the rewarding nature of heaven and resurrection greatly conflict the tormenting nature of hell.¹¹⁶ Most importantly, these eschatological themes run secondary to the following: the extension of the Messiah’s rule of goodness to all humanity, the restoration of Israel to its former glory, and the culmination of the eschaton by God’s action independent of human action.¹¹⁷

¹¹³William Raccah, “Early Jewish Eschatology,” in *Perspectives on Pentecostal Eschatology: World Without End*, ed. Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell, (Cambridge, U.K.: James Clarke and Co., 2012), 29-30.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 30-32.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 36.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 39-48.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 39.

Just as these themes are embraced within the essence of Pentecostalism, Jesus as Soon Coming King was a primary essence of the four and five-fold Gospel.¹¹⁸ Althouse affirms that eschatology is integrated into the other streams of the full gospel.¹¹⁹ More specifically, the “biblical evidence” of glossolalia ultimately signified the coming of the Lord, physical healing foretasted of the kingdom to come, and soteriology, particularly justification, is incomplete without eschatological motifs.¹²⁰ In defining Pentecostal eschatology, there have been three significant eschatological positions throughout Pentecostal history. The holiness movement influenced Pentecostals first viewed eschatology in the framework of the Latter Rain until around the 1940s when the movement adopted dispensational millennialism as it became more evangelical, and is now currently moving toward an eschatology that recognizes the imminent fulfillment of the eschaton.¹²¹

The eschatology of the “Latter Rain” recognized the eminence of Christ’s return to the earth to establish order and justice. William Kay documents that the Latter Rain imagery was even taken from the landscape of Israel:

Within the land of Israel, rain falls at the time of planting and softens the ground and then again just before the harvest and fattens up the olives, grapes and corn. As far as Pentecostals were concerned the former rain was poured out when the church was planted at the beginning of the dispensation and the latter rain is poured out at the end of the season just before the harvest. The image of harvest, like other images in the Bible, can also speak of the end of the cycle, of the end of the agricultural year and of judgment. The various images of the bridegroom returning, of the sickle being thrust into the harvest, of the Lord of the harvest returning for the fruits of his labor, were ways of saying basically the same thing and were celebrated.¹²²

¹¹⁸ Peter Althouse, “Pentecostal Eschatology in Context: the Eschatological Orientation of the Full Gospel,” in *Perspectives on Pentecostal Eschatology: World Without End*, ed. Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell, (Cambridge, UK: James Clarke and Co., 2012), 205.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 206.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 211-230.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 210-211.

¹²² William K. Kay, “Theology 2,” in *Pentecostalism*, (London, UK: SCM Press, 2009), 248.

These restorationist themes within the Latter Rain resulted in prompting Pentecostals and its future welfare into four theological thrusts. The Latter Rain established that Pentecostals must be engaged with mission, sanctified by the filling of the Spirit, able to recognize the loss/restoration pattern within biblical narratives, and expect to see the Spirit work to restore humanity at the global scale.¹²³

Pentecostal eschatology was largely premillennial. “Most Pentecostals when tracing their roots readily acknowledge that they are indebted to Darby’s dispensationalism”; however, Faupel writes that as Pentecostalism eschatology was largely influenced by its holiness roots.¹²⁴ After the monstrosities of the Civil War, American Protestants began shifting from a postmillennial view to premillennial view—Pentecostal eschatology also shifted towards this worldview.¹²⁵ After Spirit Baptism initiated the dispensation of the Spirit and soon return of Jesus, Christian Perfectionism and its postmillennial implications soon took a second place in prominence within Pentecostal thought.¹²⁶

When considering the disillusionment among modern Pentecostals stemming from the dispensational premillennialism that it inherited, it is difficult to pinpoint exactly an accepted eschatology for the future Pentecostal movement. However, Pentecostal scholarship affirms that continuing to “read the text [of Revelation] in the present tense preserves the pathos of immediacy so valued in Pentecostal spirituality and reflects the way we interpret other portions of scripture.”¹²⁷ McQueen necessitates the Pentecostal movement’s dire need to recognize the

¹²³ Ibid., 249-250.

¹²⁴ Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel: the Formation of Eschatology in Pentecostal Thought*, 103.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 91-114.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 114.

¹²⁷ Larry R. McQueen, *Toward a Pentecostal Eschatology: Discerning the Way Forward*, (Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2012), 286.

Beast of the Apocalypse by stating Revelation should not be interpreted like a historical checklist with contemporary signs filling in the spaces. Instead, the narrative symbolically informs and spiritually quickens Pentecostals to recognize the Beast as power hungry, oppressive, Christ insulting attitudes opposing the church within society and even our own hearts.¹²⁸

To continue the inclusion of Pentecostal ministry within our study, Kydd exemplarily describes the eschatological soteriology of Oral Roberts' healing ministry, one of the most prominent healing ministries of all Pentecostal history (popularity being the standard). Oral Roberts was born in 1918 and was miraculously healed of tuberculosis and stuttering twenty-three years later in 1935.¹²⁹ This experience spawned Roberts' healing ministry in 1947 that ultimately became so successful that Kydd records that one of his healing lines once brought 9,300 people under Roberts' hands for healing prayer in a single evening.¹³⁰ Although there are many similarities shared between Roberts and many of the healing evangelists of his time in the late 40s and early 50s, there is one soteriological understanding that differs from the others. Kydd documents that Roberts believes that healing power is found in the atonement of Christ, made available by the faith of believers, and was the first to institute a "point of contact" for appropriating this faith in the believers' hearts.¹³¹ On the contrary, Kydd polarizes Roberts' soteriology into two separate facets, one of them pertaining to the certainty of healing contained within the atonement, while the other greatly conflicted the certainty of divine healing.¹³²

This other pole represented the sovereignty of God and the challenges of not being able to account for the vast amount of those of whom were not healing during the course of Roberts'

¹²⁸ Ibid., 287-291.

¹²⁹ Ronald Kydd, "Oral Roberts: Quintessential Pentecostal" in *Healing through the Centuries: models for Understanding*, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), 202.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 202.

¹³¹ Ibid., 204-206.

¹³² Ibid., 207.

ministry, including when God says “no” to divine healing in the instances of when the denial of healing by principle of faith “gives way to a greater miracle and serve[s] a larger purpose.”¹³³ In struggling with the antagonistic natures of both of these theological compartments, Kydd writes that Roberts “acknowledged the sovereignty but preached the certainty.”¹³⁴ Kydd makes his most striking contribution to this study is by claiming the positions of adamant certainty to divine healing, such as those held by Kenneth Hagin(s) and Wigglesworth, are widely disregarded by not only Roberts, but by the majority of Pentecostals, as well.¹³⁵

The research of this study has shown several soteriological concerns regarding the Atonement model, and many of them cannot be addressed without the comprisal of eschatology within its salvific construct. C.L. Parker, an English Assemblies of God lecturer from 1930-1960, voices the strongest critique when disagreeing with the Atonement model, primarily as he identifies the differing natures of sickness and sin and the Atonement’s ability to primarily reconcile humanity unto God.¹³⁶ “Sickness has no moral or sin-like characteristics and so does not require expiatory aspects. Reconciliation with God, however, is the source of a great range of blessings, and these include physical benefits...To treat the removal of sickness in the same way as the removal of sin [is a mistake].”¹³⁷ Although the objection could be made that sickness is a consequence to sin, sickness should properly be understood as inherently void of morality. Upon doing so, healing can more broadly encapsulate themes such as restorative themes within eschatology, disability, liberation, and exponentially more components that equating sin and sickness within the Atonement model cannot.

¹³³ Ibid., 207-208.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 208.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 209-211.

¹³⁶ William K. Kay, “Healing” in *Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies: a Reader*, ed. William K. Kay and Anne E. Dyer, (St. Albans Place, London: SCM Press, 2004), 50.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 50.

This point is most valid when juxtaposing disability and eschatology. At what level will God's redemptive power cease, and more simply, what exactly will God deliver the disabled from? In *The Theology of Down syndrome*, Amos Yong explains this tension by recording his family's experience with his brother, Mark, who has been diagnosed with Down syndrome. He exposes the lack of affluent definitions of "healing" for the disabled and challenges the answers given for the disabled within these precarious eschatological frameworks, particularly as it ignores the value of the disabled in the "here" of the eschaton:

Mom recalled once when Mark came alongside her during an ICF worship service [church service] to lift up his mother's hand. At first, she was embarrassed since she thought that she would lift up her hands at her own instigation. However, after the service, another woman came and told Mom that she wished she was as free as Mark to worship God. Mom can tell of other occasions during worship when God has used Mark's example to liberate others from their anxieties, fears, and despair. In each of these ways and more, Mom believes Mark's life has been a conduit for the grace of God to be manifest to others. What else is this than the saving work of God expressed in the life of an individual who is otherwise dismissed and marginalized according to the norms of this world? When I asked Mark what it meant to him that Jesus was his savior, he answered, "He is my best friend."¹³⁸

After experiencing misunderstanding and ultimately mistreatment from the Pentecostal community when dealing with his handicapped son, Steven Fettke pushes for a renewed perspective of the disabled that resembles those of Yong. Primarily, Western society contends that only those with right minds are considered to be made in the image of God and a pneumatology of this suit prioritizes those with the "best gifts" and consequently overlooks the disabled to the point that it altogether denies the ministry the disabled can offer the church.¹³⁹ To

¹³⁸ Amos Yong, *Theology and Down syndrome: Reimagining Disability in Late Modernity*, (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 161.

¹³⁹ Steven Fettke, "The Spirit of God Hovered Over the Waters: Creation, the local Church, and the Mentally and Physically Challenged, A Call to Spirit-led Ministry," presented at the Society for Pentecostal Studies at Duke University, March 13-15, 2008, 1-4.

continue this issue of healing for the disabled, God’s healing power also manifests in restoring the broken perceptions of the church towards disability.¹⁴⁰

“Eschatological images without people with disabilities effectively translate in our churches—harbringers of the coming reign of God—without such people, either.”¹⁴¹ Pauline perceptions of the eschaton embody perfection at all levels, including that disability will be absent in the eschaton, but such a position robs the personalities and identities of the disabled.”¹⁴² Jesus’ ministry ushering in the eschaton should depict the Church’s expectation of the finality of the eschaton. Jesus welcomed those outcast by their disability, thus signifying that healing for the disabled is needed for the healthy among modern society in the present.¹⁴³ The wounds of the crucifixion permanently residing in Jesus’ resurrected body affirms that God will be careful not to remove the identities given by disability.¹⁴⁴

Nancy Eisland, a non-Pentecostal scholar, expands upon the importance of contextualizing Christology into a disabled setting to set the course of the Church’s understanding of God’s interactions with the disabled, for “the Incarnation is the ultimate contextual revelation.”¹⁴⁵ Although Eisland’s and Yong’s disabled Christology is quite similar, Eisland’s Christology differs as she discloses Jesus’ impaired hands to impart the reality of disability to humanity and its place among divinity.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, the pierced sides of Jesus reflect innocent suffering and “hidden” disabilities and together with Jesus’ wounded hands, they

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 6-7.

¹⁴¹ Amos Yong, *The Bible, Disability, and the Church: a New Vision of the People of God*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2011), 121.

¹⁴² Ibid., 119-121.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 125-126.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, 129.

¹⁴⁵ Nancy Eisland, *The Disabled God: Toward a Liberatory Theology of Disability*, (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1994), 98-99.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 101.

model unanimity of wholeness and disability in God.¹⁴⁷ In doing so, Christ's physicality is not divorced from His divinity, but rather embodies the essence of marginalization and this understanding of God creates "a renewal of hope for people with disabilities and others who care."¹⁴⁸

Pentecostal history proudly embodies one that welcomed and based its success on marginalization. It could potentially be theorized that a past laced with so much suffering could later necessitate its current predisposition towards certain "errors", such as the practice by some exuberantly emphasizing wealth and health and diminishing the necessity of suffering and showing indifference towards disability. However, Pentecostalism rightly recognizes the vast, all-encompassing nature of salvation and consequently reciprocates it to the totality of all humankind, notwithstanding ethics and a renewed vision of social justice. For example, many Assemblies of God missionaries devoted to improving the lives of Native Americans do not proclaim the Pentecostal message of healing as purely healing of the body, but as power to overcome alcoholism and correcting acerbity from failed promises delivered by the European-Americans and the national government.¹⁴⁹ Doing so helped correct the AG's "racist and paternalistic" style of missionary evangelization.¹⁵⁰

Murray Dempster has observed the necessity of social ethics in Pentecostalism and its vitality to the grand Pentecostal mission. "I aim to demonstrate that belief in the triumphant return of Jesus Christ, when it is grounded in Jesus' own mission, ministry, and message about

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 101.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 101-102.

¹⁴⁹ Angela Torrenco, "Jesus as the Great Physician: Pentecostal Native North Americans within the Assemblies of God and New Understandings of Pentecostal Healing," in *Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Healing*, ed. Candy Gunther Brown, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 113-114.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 114.

the kingdom of God, actually entails an eschatological warrant and a moral mandate of the church's engagement with society."¹⁵¹ Despite the uncertainty of social activism within early Pentecostalism, ministers within the movement were not interrupted in developing social programs during evangelism and the current astronomical rate of Pentecostal growth has uncovered church authorities to global suffering; such integration of alleviating human need "and social change have been part of the untold story that has fostered Pentecostal growth around the world."¹⁵² Dempster provides the rationale of eschatological happenings existing currently within modern frameworks from the text of Matt.11.12/ Luke 16.16 as it presents the kingdom of God breaking into the present moment:

Jesus said, as the kingdom was pressing into this age, people could press against it and already experience the transforming power of God's messianic salvation. It was like new wine placed into old wineskins; it begins to bleed through the leather and just a bead of the new wine of the age to come is powerful enough to unstop a deaf ear, or to loose a dumb tongue, to restore sight, to cure a leper, or to gladden the heart of the poor. It is God's Day of Salvation.¹⁵³

As the influx of the eschatological age of the "now and not yet" impacts the present age, the Pentecostal narratives push toward liberation for the marginalized. Dempster is careful to state that Jesus' ethical system was not finalized because what was established was bound to the contexts of responding to religious or situational challenge;¹⁵⁴ however, Jesus emphatically established moral bonds of love extending from the believing community to enemies.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ Murray Dempster, "Eschatology, Spirit Baptism, and Inclusiveness: an Exploration into the Hallmarks of a Pentecostal Social Ethic," in *Perspectives on Pentecostal Eschatology: World Without End*, ed. Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell, (Cambridge, UK: James Clarke and Co., 2012), 155-156.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 157-159.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 164-65.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 169.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 171.

More specifically, Jesus' example of concerning himself with the needs of the poor and "least of these" is an inescapable challenge to church mission and social ethic.¹⁵⁶ For example, He sought out to bring healing to ailments that alienated members from their own societies and broke rabbinic traditions in order to seek the justice of women.¹⁵⁷ As a whole, the social ethic that Dempster derives from the Pentecost/kingdom paradigm from Luke-Acts prompts the church to engage in social service to individuals and institutions of society, all while actively voicing a "moral witness" that incorporates the needs of all humankind.¹⁵⁸

Johann Blumhardt's social ethic monumentally impacted the ideologies of Barth, Tillich, Bonhoeffer, Emil Brunner, and a host of leading Pentecostal scholars, and his ethical bent in pietistic theology has a distinctly eschatological focus. Although Blumhardt was not necessarily American, Frank Macchia's interaction with Blumhardt is highly influential to Pentecostal academics. In fact, it mirrors the eschatological "inbreaking" descriptive of Dempster earlier. Even though pietism was eschatologically awaiting the "revolution with the spirit of the Antichrist," Blumhardt's eschatology differed entirely with his tradition as he saw hope for the future as it was renewed through the work of the Spirit: "the Lord is not a destroyer but one who blesses and renews."¹⁵⁹ From this perspective of holistic renewal, Blumhardt brings forth a personal role in its participation. He disagreed heavily on "history as something foreordained and fixed" and this eschatological framework granted much more human involvement with the plan of redemption for the Kingdom of God. He interpreted the future of Matt. 24 to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD, as well as scoffing any attempts of predicting future events in

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 180.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 176-185.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 187-188.

¹⁵⁹ Frank D. Macchia, *Spirituality and Social Liberation: the Message of the Blumhardts in the Light of Wuerttemberg Pietism*, (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1993), 84-88.

Revelation primarily to instate that the fulfillment of the outpouring of the Spirit happened before the Parousia, not after.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, this spirituality was built of seeming dichotomies, such as being “active and passive, patient and impatient, initiated by God’s grace and cultivated by works”—ultimately dealing with these tensions by “hurrying and waiting,” described by Blumhardt himself.¹⁶¹

This signification of the “future-to-be” is indeed present in many Pentecostal writings, including Horton’s *Systematic Theology*. Purdy affirms that Jesus’ suffering accounts for the healing of God’s people, but a link is presented with the Atonement and eschatology as Purdy writes that evidences of divine healing are present testimonies to His power, just as instances void of healing are assurances that one day all will be completely restored.¹⁶² In fact, the terms used to describe this phenomenon of present eschatological happenings almost identically match the supposition of the others discussing this same event: “Divine healing is actually an inbreaking of the power of the coming ages.”¹⁶³ Purdy further elaborates that:

At the same time, divine healing is temporary in this age, serving notice of the impending judgement of God on the kingdoms of this world as well as the establishment in the world of God’s righteous rule. That is, healing is a very tangible expression of God’s enduring love for his creation. The healings that Christ performed in the power of the Spirit were signs that the kingdom of God was near. The healing of the sick was understood by Christ and the gospel writers to be an expression of God’s future victory, to be consummated when Jesus comes back to earth again. It was the ‘already’ of God’s kingdom verifying the promised ‘not yet’ ... Thus the healings we experience today are just a first installment of the future redemption of our bodies.¹⁶⁴

Experientialism is integral to formulating Pentecostal belief and praxis and Harvey Cox writes that its prioritization over tradition and scripture is mirrored in dynamic worship,

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 89.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 90.

¹⁶² Purdy, “Divine Healing” in *Systematic Theology: a Pentecostal Perspective*, 508.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 509.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 509.

glossolalia, and “stressing the more joyful dimension of their meeting with the Spirit.”¹⁶⁵ However, pain is often disregarded within this experience for new Pentecostals, even though this was a major purport of experience with the Spirit within Classical Pentecostalism—this experience with this Spirit “who has a purpose not just for them but for the whole world.”¹⁶⁶ Early Pentecostalism recognized its position within the “already and not-yet and witnesses to the first fruits of the kingdom” and believed in the life-altering experience awakened and initiated by the Spirit in which they experienced.¹⁶⁷ However, there is perceived danger in Pentecostals bracing the literal message of the imminent return of Christ due to its neglect of valuing long term global solutions, like the environmental crisis.¹⁶⁸ Although in conflict with McQueen’s predictions of the future of the movement, Cox perceives the younger generation of Pentecostals to have embodied their ancestors’ model of mission by rejecting to the appeal of ministering to the rich institutions in order to recognize “that Jesus promised His kingdom to the poor and to those who suffer for righteousness sake.”¹⁶⁹

“God’s response to our plight is not a quick-fix solution through some supernatural corrective. Rather, it is a long-term engagement with us in community and mutual caring.”¹⁷⁰ Pentecostal soteriology is holistic in nature and its hermeneutics derived from the narratives from all of scripture (not just Luke-Acts). It is important to recognize the eschatological natures in other narratives that lend themselves to developing Pentecostal thought, particularly as it

¹⁶⁵ Harvey Cox, *Fire from Heaven: the Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century*, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1995), 312-315.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 315-316.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 317.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 317-318.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 318-319.

¹⁷⁰ Samuel Solivan, *The Spirit, Pathos, and Liberation: Toward an Hispanic Pentecostal Theology*, (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 76.

constructs contextualized Pentecostal theologies. For example, the Exodus narrative reveals God to be a loving creator, moved by compassion to relieve affliction and exuding loving qualities of compassion and sympathy; the Hebraic God does not even remotely resemble the divine characteristics of Greek stoicism or Aristotelian philosophy.¹⁷¹ As the narrative progresses, God is not merely wishing to alleviate pain and suffering or passively waiting for an opportunity for change. Instead, God is deeply moved by compassion and aids their individualistic and contextualized needs, empowers Moses as “an agent of liberation,” and chooses to move a marginalized society from Egyptian oppression in bondage to peaceful freedom in Canaan.¹⁷²

Zachary Tackett reports differences within Pentecostalism as it responds to the liberation emphases within the Exodus narrative. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s liberating preaching from this narrative was drawn from African American slave eschatology that long awaited liberation from oppression in exchange for freedom.¹⁷³ This varies significantly from the white community’s interpretation as it borrowed heavily from the holiness expressions of evangelicalism in the nineteenth century that recognized the liberation of the Exodus as a personal “spiritual journal” resembling the transformation of conversion.¹⁷⁴ Yet, it is pertinent that both whites and blacks recognized the liberation importance of the narrative, “including social implications of this liberation.”¹⁷⁵

Before Eldin Villafane composes an American-Hispanic social ethic, he necessitates its purpose by strikingly noting that the average net worth of Anglo households was eight times

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 75.

¹⁷² Ibid., 76.

¹⁷³ Zachary Tackett, "As a Prophetic Voice: Liberationism as a Matrix for Interpreting American Pentecostal Thought and Praxis." *JEPTA: Journal of The European Pentecostal Theological Association* 33, no. 1 (March 2013), 50. Accessed March 19, 2015.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 50.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 50.

higher than Hispanic households in 1984.¹⁷⁶ Villafane looks to the eschatological nature of the New Testament and its necessary ecclesiological response to address this social concern. “The message of the New Testament is that God’s rule is already present in Jesus the Messiah, although it awaits final consummation in the not yet of the future.”¹⁷⁷ From here, Villafane connects the activity of Jesus’ ministry to the Spirit and the early Pentecostal mandate of continuing Jesus’ ministry and mission through the authority of the Holy Spirit that “struggle[d] with the forces of sin and death, with the demonic powers-that-be, whether individually or institutionally manifested...”¹⁷⁸ Thus, Villafane charges the church to discern the presence of the Spirit among the world, not just the church, as it sees justice amidst God’s creation in modernity as proof of God’s reign on the Earth in which He moves the future to contain that “all things are made new.”¹⁷⁹

Conclusion

As eschatology permeated Pentecostalism at such a deep, intricate level, its interaction with divine healing cannot be overlooked. The Latter Rain anxiously awaited by Classical Pentecostals ushered in physical healing to levels unfathomable to the world and church cultures preceding it; the restoration of God resided both in the end of time and many Pentecostals had to the opportunity to experience it in the present. Interestingly enough, the premillennial slant to Pentecostal eschatology resembles a complexity; was God breaking into the present in order to gradually restore the world or would a remnant be the only glimpse of holiness that the impending evil world would witness? Although the two ideologies contradict, at least when

¹⁷⁶ Eldin Villafane, *The Liberating Spirit: Toward an Hispanic American Pentecostal Social Ethic*, (Grand Rapids, MI: University Press of America, 1993), 27.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 184.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 185-187.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 191.

considering premillennialism outside of Pentecostalism, Pentecostal “inbreaking” of the eschaton offered a dramatic response to the deterioration of the world and society, which included God’s miraculous healing power.

The tension of the “here and not yet” is responsible for making Pentecostal healing particularly difficult to understand, but to overlook this tension without thorough investigation would result in a lack of resolution to many questions asked by Pentecostals and non-Pentecostals. For example, God’s healing power existed within Pentecostalism because God’s time was drawing near—the outpouring of the Spirit signaled the soon coming end to all things. Although this immediate response is not currently felt as strongly as many early Pentecostals had, the following thought must be taken to fruition. Even though God’s healing power is indeed present and increases exponentially with time, God’s sovereignty, coupled with the remainder of the time left before the culmination of the eschaton, presents a theodicy cooperative with both the salvific nature of Pentecostalism and the brutal reality of sickness that humanity currently encounters.

Although this question finds settlement in some specific areas, other explanations need to be provided to clarify other difficulties in Pentecostal healing. Does the rejection of soteriology from divine healing present an answer to social issues or does it erode the entirety of understanding all Pentecostal healing? The answer is neither—the example of Pentecostal ministry and God’s sovereignty both affirm that salvation, like healing, is eschatological in nature—they can potentially be one in the same. However, healing from sickness does indeed embody the broad Pentecostal understanding of salvation. Being sick does not result from personal sin and should be perceived differently from sin in the appropriation of the Atonement.

The extensity of Pentecostal healing expands even more! As the marginalized suffer, Pentecostals seek and contribute to further the present restoration of all things, including social justice and disability. Pentecostalism should engage disability without discarding disability as simply an ailment that is dealt with and cared for in the eschaton; it denies the disabled voice needed in Pentecostalism to continue present restoration and reveals the need for social “healing” among the healthy. As this attitude approaches ethics and liberation, the same eschatological fervency fuels (or should, at least) the inclusion of the marginalized in order to demand all of Pentecostalism to be actively engaged in restoring all of humanity both unto Christ and unto equality for all.

Conclusion

After completing this study, a dichotomy is ultimately presented that Pentecostals must choose between. Although the history of divine healing does not necessitate a particular ideology for the beliefs of those experiencing divine healing throughout history, Pentecostalism certainly recognizes the Atonement of Christ as the appropriation of divine healing. As a Pentecostal experiencing life almost 100 years after Azusa, a rich history would be challenged and conclusively disregarded.

However, this study has revealed complications with the Atonement being purely responsible for divine healing. The agency of the Holy Spirit is diminished, if not discounted, from the phenomenon of Pentecostal healing in spite of the obvious Pentecostal dependence upon pneumatology. Further still, a purely Christological healing could risk a denial of Trinitarianism at the meta-theological level. In addition, the Atonement model presents a rigid soteriology that leaves complications, such as disability and social justice, at the fringe of consciousness—what happens with these challenges?

The answer lies within an integration of both; the Atonement and its challenges should not be polarized in which one must be embraced and the other shunned. Instead of adhering to the Atonement without objection, a proper approach takes after the example of the Pentecostal ministers listed in this study. Those that included the work of the Spirit and the eschatological sovereignty of God within their healing ministries never forsook the Atonement within their attributions of divine healing. Their experiences were free to continually test their perceptions of God's healing power without a complete rejection of the Atonement—the Atonement just needed to be reconsidered in the light of other divine expressions.

The reduction of pneumatology in order to succor a hyper-Christology, especially inside a Spirit-emphasized spirituality like Pentecostalism, indicates the easy ability to forsake Trinitarian integration into theological foci. The best method for reconciling this Trinitarian concern is to recognize these pneumatological components in order to elevate them to their rightful place in divine healing. For example, the Spirit was as present within the formation of the world as he was in Christ's body during the very stripes taken on His back in Isa. 53. This theological lens creates clarity for Pentecostal thought and supports a healthy Trinitarian understanding.

As the defining traits of divine healing are augmented and expanded by eschatological inclusion, a theology of divine healing could never stand on its own if it were to be removed. Furthermore, Pentecostal thought and the growth of the movement itself would not stand without these eschatological motifs! The "here and not yet" not only provides a wealth of answers regarding a Pentecostal theodicy and response to God's sovereignty, but it also recognizes the Father's role in delivering divine healing to the world. God's sovereignty reveals not the image of a patient bureaucrat or "unmoved mover," but instead a loving Father so anxiously excited for justice and restoration that He overrides the fulfillment waiting at the end of time because the progression of time cannot handle the sheer power of God's redemptive plan and the mandate for His children to follow.

This mandate for healing includes the disabled and oppressed; if anything, it magnifies them to the center stage of this restoration. Jesus Christ, the clearest presentation of God and the optimal resemblance of humanity, was persecuted and maimed—disabled if you will—and lived a life of helping those of whom were disabled themselves. He plead for the religious leaders to follow His example of caring for Jacob's children but only received responses of rejection and

scorn. Everyone had an obligation for bringing God's coming kingdom into the settings in which they found themselves in. Although rebranded and refashioned into a later Pentecostal generation, eschatological fervency is necessary to propagate divine healing to a global scale.

Due to the brevity of this study, there are areas of divine healing that could, unfortunately, not be addressed. Further research of this study would greatly benefit from the inclusion of Pentecostal scholarship from other cultures. The rapid growth of Pentecostalism indicates a need for contextualizing divine healing in different societies and each contextualization will present its own challenges and strengths. The role of faith in divine healing is another area of study that would greatly further this study. It seems to be another variable to be explored in constructing a holistic perception of healing and theodicy. However, the results of the study are sound and such inclusions would only add strength to the conclusions made of recognizing the pneumatological and eschatological understandings within the divine healing power of God provided by the Atonement of Christ.

References

- Alexander, Kim Ervin. "The Nineteenth Century Divine Healing Movement." In *Pentecostal Healing: Models in Theology and Practice*. Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2006.
- Althouse, Peter. "Pentecostal Eschatology in Context: the Eschatological Orientation of the Full Gospel." In *Perspectives on Pentecostal Eschatology: World Without End*, ed. Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell. Cambridge, UK: James Clarke and Co., 2012.
- Anderson, Allan. "Historical and Theological Background." In *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Archer, Kenneth J. *Pentecostal Hermeneutic for the 21st Century: Spirit Scripture and Community*. New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Bosworth, F. F. *Christ the Healer*. Revised ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Chosen Books, 2008.
- Bruner, Fredrick Dale. *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: the Pentecostal Experience in the New Testament Witness*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.
- Cox, Harvey. *Fire from Heaven: the Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1995.
- Dayton, Donald. "The Rise of the Divine Healing Movement." In *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.
- Dempster, Murray. "Eschatology, Spirit Baptism, and Inclusiveness: an Exploration into the Hallmarks of a Pentecostal Social Ethic." In *Perspectives on Pentecostal Eschatology: World Without End*, ed. Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell. Cambridge, UK: James Clarke and Co., 2012.
- Duffield, Guy P., and Nathaniel M. Van Cleave. *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology*. Los Angeles, CA: Creation House, 2008.
- Eisland, Nancy. *The Disabled God: Toward a Liberatory Theology of Disability*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1994.
- Faupel, D. William. "John Alexander Dowie." In *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*. Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Faupel, D. William. "Birth Pangs: The Pentecostal Message Foreshadowed." In *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*. Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Steven Fettke, "The Spirit of God Hovered Over the Waters: Creation, the local Church, and the Mentally and Physically Challenged, A Call to Spirit-led Ministry." Presented at the Society for Pentecostal Studies at Duke University, March 13-15, 2008.

Goff, James R., Jr. *Fields White Unto Harvest: Charles F. Parham and the Missionary Origins of Pentecostalism*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1988.

Hejzlar, Pavel. *Two Paradigms for Divine Healing: Fred F. Bosworth, Kenneth E. Hagin, Agnes Sanford, and Francis Macnutt in Dialogue*. Leiden, Holland: Brill Publishers, 2010.

Jorstad, Erling. *The Holy Spirit in Today's Church: A Handbook of the New Pentecostalism*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973.

Karkkainen, Veli-Matti. *Pneumatology: the Holy Spirit in Ecumenical, International, and Contextual Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002.

Kay, William K. "Theology 2." In *Pentecostalism*. London, UK: SCM Press, 2009.

---"Healing." In *Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies: a Reader*, ed. William K. Kay and Anne E. Dyer. St. Albans Place, London: SCM Press, 2004.

Kelsey, Morton. "The Facts about Healing." In *Healing and Christianity: A Classic Study*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1995.

Kenyon, E. W. "Healing in Redemption." In *Jesus the Healer*. Lynwood, WA: Kenyon Gospel Publishing Society, 1997.

Kydd, Ronald A. N. "The Early Years: A Church Triumphant." In *Healing Through the Centuries: Models for Understanding*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998.

Kydd, Ronald "Oral Roberts: Quintessential Pentecostal" in *Healing through the Centuries: models for Understanding*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998.

Macchia, Frank D. *Spirituality and Social Liberation: the Message of the Blumhardts in the Light of Wuerttemberg Pietism*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1993.

Martin, Larry E. *The Life and Ministry of William J. Seymour: and a History of the Azusa Street Revival*. Joplin, MO: Christian Life Books, 1999.

McQueen, Larry R. *Toward a Pentecostal Eschatology: Discerning the Way Forward*, Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2012.

Mittelsadt, Martin William. *The Spirit and Suffering in Luke-Acts: Implications for a Pentecostal Pneumatology*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services, 2002.

- Neumann, Peter D. "Spirituality." In *Handbook of Pentecostal Christianity*. Dekalb, IN: Northern Illinois University Press, 2012.
- Osborn, T. L. "The Condition." In *Healing from Christ*. Tulsa, OK: Osborn Foundation Publication, 1955.
- Prudencio Damboriena, S.J. "Background of the Holiness and Pentecostal Movement." In *Tongues of Fire: Pentecostalism in Contemporary Christianity*. Cleveland, OH: Corpus Books, 1969.
- Purdy, Vernon L. "Divine Healing." In *Systematic Theology: Revised Edition*. Stanley Horton, ed. Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1994.
- Racah, William. "Early Jewish Eschatology." In *Perspectives on Pentecostal Eschatology: World Without End*, ed. Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell. Cambridge, U.K.: James Clarke and Co., 2012.
- Reed, David A. "*In Jesus' Name*": *the History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals*. Blandford Forum, UK: Deo Publishing, 2008.
- Roberts, Oral. "The Seven Rules of Faith that Bring You What You Want." In *If You Need Healing Do These Things*. Garden City, NY: Country Life Press, 1950.
- Seymour, William Joseph. *The Doctrines and Discipline of the Azusa Street Apostolic Faith Mission of Los Angeles (The Complete Azusa Street Library)*. Joplin, MO: Christian Life Books, 2000.
- Solivan, Samuel. *The Spirit, Pathos, and Liberation: Toward an Hispanic Pentecostal Theology*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Tackett, Zachary. "As a Prophetic Voice: Liberationism as a Matrix for Interpreting American Pentecostal Thought and Praxis." *JEPTA: Journal of The European Pentecostal Theological Association* 33, no. 1 (March 2013). Accessed March 19, 2015.
- Thomas, John Christopher. "James 5.14-16." In *Devil, Disease, and Deliverance: Origins of Illness in New Testament Thought*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010.
- Torrenco, Angela. "Jesus as the Great Physician: Pentecostal Native North Americans within the Assemblies of God and New Understandings of Pentecostal Healing." In *Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Healing*, ed. Candy Gunther Brown. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Villafane, Eldin. *The Liberating Spirit: Toward an Hispanic American Pentecostal Social Ethic*. Grand Rapids, MI: University Press of America, 1993.
- Warrington, Keith. "*Healing, Exorcism, and Suffering*." In *Pentecostal Theology: A Theology of Encounter*. New York: T & T Clark Publishing, 2008.

--- *Pentecostal Perspectives*. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press, 1998.

Wenk, Matthias. *Community-Forming Power: the Socio-Ethical role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Yong, Amos. *The Bible, Disability, and the Church: a New Vision of the People of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2011.

Yong, Amos. *Theology and Down syndrome: Reimagining Disability in Late Modernity*. Waco, TX, USA: Baylor University Press, 2007.