1. Introduction

1.1 A Bewildering Question: What Makes Teaching a Charism?

The driving motive behind this paper is a question I have pondered for the past two years as to whether teaching, as a spiritual charism in the local church, differs in any way from teaching as either an innate aptitude or acquired skill. This has been a question of personal inventory regarding my own development both spiritually and ministerially, as it seems that life has revealed myself foremost as a teacher in spiritual gifting and to spiritual oversight in calling. Every few years it seems that through the process of ministerial experience and development, I have learned a few new things about ministry, which for the most part has naturally been in the areas of leadership, teaching or shepherding. Regarding my involvement in various teaching ministries, I have sought to integrate in ministry whatever new concept I have acquired in the areas of curriculum design and development, learning taxonomies, learning outcomes and competencies, and teaching and communicative methodologies.

I have never doubted the Spirit’s preeminent role towards spiritual edification. Nonetheless, the process of personal development, coupled with observation on how teaching and training is carried out in both local church ministry and in the secular workforce, has caused me to question the nature of the teaching charism from the perspective of a Pentecostal ministry and church setting. More specifically, and I should say more honestly, I have sometimes frankly wondered: If a person has a relatively genuine concern for people and can effectively teach through acquired competency of skill and methodologies common in secular as well as in spiritual educational settings, why is there need for a teaching charism?
1.2 How Does Teaching as a Charism Differ from Acquired Teaching Competencies?

To state the question more precisely, I have wondered for some time now: How does the teaching charism differ (or does it differ in any way) from the possession of acquired skills or innate aptitudes pertaining to education whether in secular or spiritual settings, that are utilized in congregational ministry and theological education? Moving towards a viable answer to this question defines the scope of the paper. What I have provided here then is a brief effort designed to facilitate a process towards articulating what may be specifically distinct about the teaching charism, when ministered through and by the Pentecostal concept of spirit-baptism, especially when a person may already be effectively cognizant and trained in contemporary, teaching and learning methodologies. More importantly though, the ultimate objective of this inquiry is to better understand how people in a teaching ministry in the local church as well as in theological education can better insure that they are ministering under the anointing of the Spirit, rather than by natural teaching methodologies alone.

2. Pneumatic Experience as a Corrective to the “Schooling Instructional Model”

2.1 The Secularizing Nature of the “Schooling Instructional Model”

Through researching the concerns of this paper, I have discovered that the questions I have raised concerning the teaching charism are indicative of similar concerns raised within both Evangelical and Pentecostal contemporary settings. For the past two or three decades, some Christian educators have raised concern that Christian education ministries are often too strongly patterned after the twentieth century “schooling-instructional model” derived from the western secular classroom setting, coupled with its inevitable prioritizing upon cognitive learning, for facilitating religious education in the local church. ¹ Regarding the Asian setting in general and the Singapore setting in particular, Allan Harkness postulates that government efforts to facilitate

community cohesiveness in spite of religious/cultural pluralism, coupled with the “universalizing of Western postmodernism,” should challenge local churches to insure that their educational ministries more reflect New Testament concepts of “edification” rather than the “secular school classroom.” Critically warning against this tendency to shape educational ministries upon the “school-instructional model,” Harkness raises the observation that New Testament edification comes “not primarily through the acquisition of knowledge, but rather as the various gifts bestowed by the Holy Spirit on the members of the community are exercised for the common good.”

I suggest that this indictment towards local churches of unwittingly structuring ministry too closely upon the secular “school-instructional model” confirms Wonsuk Ma’s observation that the “inherent spiritual/pneumatic concerns” of most “average Asians,” whose worldviews commonly possess a “keen awareness of the spirit world,” demands renewed desire by Pentecostal leaders and ministers towards “taking God’s expectant intervention” to human settings. With reference to contemporary dialogue in Pentecostal education circles regarding the correct balance of formal instruction and “the moving of the Holy Spirit in a Pentecostal classroom,” Everett McKinney cautions that educators determine “the spiritual vitality and ministries of the church by the way we shape and model Pentecostal ministry” in the classroom setting. Del Tarr has similarly warned against the “domestication of the Holy Spirit” within Pentecostal Christian education, wherein educators cannot facilitate the “disturbing influences” of the Holy Spirit in both churches and classroom settings, because of their own “simple neglect” to seek the “appearance of the charismata.”


2.2 The Value of John Westerhoff’s “Socialization” Model for Articulating Pentecostal Teaching Methodologies

Cheryl Bridges Johns has worked out a critical evaluation of the “schooling-instruction paradigm,” which she says is in conflict with the Pentecostal educative goal of “experiential-relational knowledge.” A digression to a similar injunction by Evangelical educators reinforces Johns’ critique. Jackie Smallbones and Lawrence Richards have both observed, for instance, that when the “schooling instructional” model is made the major framework for Christian education, believers are taught a non-biblical understanding of faith, because the concept of Christian knowledge becomes disproportionately perceived as something “to be learned at the intellectual level.”

From reference to Richard’s analysis of the “schooling instructional model,” Smallbones argues that since a true knowledge of God is foremost a matter of experiential relationship with God through Christ, Christian education must insure that teaching methodologies center foremost not on cognitive instruction but on facilitating a “personal and very intimate...father/child relationship with God.” Both Smallbones and Richards contend that John Westerhoff’s “socialization” model of education through the context of personal relationships provides a more holistic focusing of instruction upon a proper biblical educative goal of deepening one’s relationship with God, with the further objective of affecting every other human relationship. Such an objective must involve a teaching methodology that reaches and can “touch the whole personality.” This critique by Smallbones and Richards towards the

“schooling instructional model” clarifies how a truly biblical/Pentecostal educational approach must involve efforts to insure that instructional methodologies facilitate even in formal educational settings, a first person consciousness of the very “immanence of a transcendent God” via the teaching/learning process.\(^{11}\)

Johns’ call for a shifting away from “schooling instructional model” coincides with her suggestion that a Pentecostal concept of teaching can be better facilitated through its placement within John Westerhoff’s idea of catechesis.\(^{12}\) Westerhoff defines catechesis as “the means by which the community becomes aware of God’s revelation, comes to faith and acquires knowledge...for faithful mission and ministry through every aspect of its corporate life.”\(^{13}\) In contrast to the “schooling instructional” paradigm, Johns argues that Westerhoff’s model reinforces a truly Pentecostal model of catechesis, which she suggests can be well defined as “the means whereby the Pentecostal community becomes aware of God’s revelation and responds to this revelation in faithful obedience.”\(^{14}\) Such a defining of catechesis would involve “the oral nature of a Pentecostal hermeneutic and the dynamics of Pentecostal liturgy” and the “dynamic and active role of the Holy Spirit” which, given the essential role of the charismata within Pentecostal spirituality, necessitates “the full involvement of all members of the community of faith” in a given instructional setting.\(^{15}\) Johns’ call for a shifting away from the “schooling instructional model” in favor of Westerhoff’s “Christian socialization” model, therefore, reinforces the Pentecostal distinctiveness as a faith centered on experiential encounter with God. This shift of thinking also implies that the role of a teacher or of the teaching charism from a Pentecostal perspective ought to prioritize above all else in the educative or instructional setting, the facilitating of “God’s actions and presence in the teaching-learning process.”\(^ {16}\)

abandonment of the “school-instructional” model however, but only that it should be “supplemented with the socialization model.”

---

12 C. Johns, Pentecostal Formation, p. 121.
14 C. Johns, Pentecostal Formation, p. 121.
15 C. Johns, Pentecostal Formation, p. 121.
16 C. Johns, Pentecostal Formation, p. 124.
3. How the Hebraic Concept of Yāda’ Clarifies the Pneumatic Character of the Teaching Charism

3.1 Value of Thomas Groome’s Examination of the Hebraic Concept of Yāda’ for Representing the Essential Methodology and Goal of Christian Education

The concept of “teaching” as a New Testament ministry encompasses a very broad role within early church thinking, by virtue of its charismatic dimension in early church thought and practice, along with its dual anchoring in both the Old Testament Hebrew and Greco-Roman perspectives. The Old Testament counterpart to the New Testament concept of διδάσκω can primarily be conveyed through the Hebrew terms yāda’ (“to cause to know,” “teach”) and yārāh (“to teach,” “instruct”), which foremost conveys instruction on how to live one’s life within the will of God rather than communication of knowledge or skills.17 A survey of discussions into the nature of Christian education reveals a broad interest among Catholic, Protestant mainline and Pentecostal educational thinkers towards Thomas Groome’s suggestion that Christian education should reflect a strong anchoring in the Hebraic concept of yāda’ as both the essential methodology and goal for Christian education.18

According to Groome, the term yāda’ demonstrates that in the Hebrew worldview, the acquisition of knowledge was achieved through an experiential encounter with a given subject. This is confirmed by how the term is used in the Genesis account to describe sexual union, wherein Adam acquired a “knowledge” of Eve (Gen 4:1, 25; Num 31:18; Judges 21:12).19 In Hebrew thinking, “knowledge is thought of not in terms of a possession of information alone, but in terms of its ‘actualization.”’20

---

Groome argues that yāda’ implies that biblical learning is achieved “more by the heart than by the mind, and the knowing arises not by standing back from in order to look at, but by active and intentional engagement in lived experience.” Acquiring a knowledge of God requires then an experiential encounter with the will and person of God.

The experiential dynamic of teaching according to Hebrew thought is further revealed through the manner or method that instruction generally took place among the Hebrew people. Since the concept of education was primarily considered the “passing down of a given way of life, the predominate environment conducive to this kind of teaching was within the home via its natural context of familial relationships (Deut 4:9; 6:7, 20-25; Exod 12:26-27; Prov 6:20-23; 13:1).

The Hebrew approach to learning, through an experiential dynamic of teaching via the medium of a relational setting, can be observed as the predominant concept of teaching within the life and ministries of Jesus and the early church. Groome argues that the New Testament counterpart to the term yāda’ is the verb יָדַע (“to know”), which is confirmed by how the term defines the nature of sexual union as resulting in the experiential knowledge of the man and woman (i.e., Matt 1:25; Luke 1:34, “How can this be since I do not know man?”). Paul uses the term in 1 Corinthians 8:1-2 to convey how a true knowledge of God involves a personal experience of God’s agape, which naturally results in a pattern of continued behavioral change towards others and in one’s sense of mission in the world. Groome notes that ultimately the Hebraic yāda’ concept is best transitioned into New Testament thought via the triadic association in Johannine literature between the concepts of knowing, loving and obeying (i.e., John 8:31-32; 10:14-15, 27; 13:34; 15:12; 1 John 2:3; 4:8, 11).

From this Johannine perspective of yāda’, Groome therefore concludes that “in the biblical sense, then, to know God is a dynamic, experiential, relational activity involving the whole person and finding expression in a lived response of loving obedience to God’s will.” The extrapolation of the Hebraic yāda’ concept, via the Johannine knowing,
loving and obeying triad, carries decisive implications towards a Pentecostal approach and perspective of the teaching charism. John’s portrayal of the Paraclete (John 14:20-21, 25-26; 16:12-15) has also been foundational to Pentecostal epistemology. 26 According to Groome, such an experiential understanding of Christian faith implies that “Christian religious education should be grounded” in a “relational,” “experiential,” and “reflective way of knowing,” and of pedagogical learning about the person and will of God. 27

3.2 How the Yāda’ Concept Implies a Pentecostal Educative Praxis of Action-Reflection in the Spirit?

The writings of Jackie David Johns and Cheryl Bridges Johns provide credible Pentecostal argument on how Groome’s examination of the Hebraic concept of yāda’ seems to well define and parallel the Pentecostal epistemology of pneumatic experience via Spirit-baptism as an essential paradigm to cultivating a knowledge of God and one’s mission in the world. 28 Two implications they derive from the yāda’ concept for Pentecostal education are most pertinent to the current discussion. First to note is their association of yāda’ to the Pentecostal epistemological framework, which suggests that “God is known through relational encounter which finds its ultimate expression in the experience of being filled with the Holy Spirit.” 29 They qualify this observation by stressing that the “Spirit-filled believer has a predisposition to see the transcendent God at work in, with, through, above, and beyond all events,” and worship serves as the primary medium through which

Pentecostals make an “appropriate response to perceived manifestations of the Divine presence.”

The second implication derived from their thinking pertaining to our discussion is that the yāda’ concept reveals how also inherent within the Pentecostal epistemological framework is a missiological purpose that perpetually invites the Pentecostal worshipper towards “a life of responsible action (orthopraxy).” From this observation, Johns and Johns suggest that the Pentecostal epistemological framework converges to some extent with the concept of praxis, conveying the idea of “reflection-action,” which suggests that orthodoxy (right belief) should naturally result in orthopraxy (right action) within the missiological context of human need and relationships. Steven Land similarly refers to Pentecostal experience and liturgical practice as an “action-reflection in the Spirit” (i.e., praxis “in the Spirit”). Byron Klaus captures this same characteristic of Pentecostal experience: “Pentecostals affirm a dynamic of the Holy Spirit which gives rise to dynamic witness,” for “to encounter God [as in Pentecostal worship] is to sense the mission of Christ.”

The carryover of the Hebrew concept of teaching can be further seen in how both Jesus and early church leadership primarily relied upon or utilized relational and ministry experiences as primary modes of teaching and spiritual instruction. It can be argued for instance, that Jesus’ primary means of teaching was by the actual engaging of his disciples in his own mission, by virtue of their relational attachment to him as his disciples. The experience of joining Jesus in his actual ministry and life

30 J. D. Johns, “Yielding to the Spirit,” p. 74; Groome, *Christian Religious Education*, pp. 143-44 makes reference to how the Hebraic yāda’ concept is best transitioned into New Testament thought via the triadic association in Johannine literature between the concepts of knowing, loving, and obeying (i.e., John 8:31-32; 10:14-15, 27; 13:34; 15:12; 1 John 2:3; 4:8, 11). From this the Johannine perspective of yāda’, Groome concludes that “in the biblical sense, then, to know God is a dynamic, experiential, relational activity involving the whole person and finding expression in a lived response of loving obedience to God’s will.”


experiences provided in essence the disciples’ instruction by Jesus (i.e., Mark 8-10), and this arrangement thus provided for the disciples “a kind of mobile ‘seminary.’” Similar to Jesus’ method of teaching, Paul in his self-described role as a “teacher” often defined his teaching methodologies according to his relational association with his subordinates. During times wherein Paul’s disciples shared in “his total life” within the context of “active service or mission,” the goal of teaching was not the acquisition of spiritual knowledge in itself, but simply the involvement of one’s self in mission and ministry.

4. Pauline Suggestions towards Defining Teaching as a Charism

4.1 Understanding the Teaching Charism from an Incarnational View of the Charismata

The experiential dynamic of teaching is further clarified by how New Testament literature defines teaching as a charismatic role (Eph 4:8 uses δωραταμα, “gift,” from Ps 68:19, LXX) or charism (1 Cor 12:7) within early church life and ministry. The implication is that the capacity to teach was like other ministries within the church, considered to be a work of the Holy Spirit working through the teacher. Before further examining this charismatic dimension of the teaching charism, I find it needful to first digress in order to briefly establish a few helpful perimeters regarding the nature of the charismata (Rom 1:11; 1 Cor 1:7; 12:4, 9, 30-31).

---

36 For example, Paul describes the initial growth of Philippian believers under him not according to categories of “study” but according to the idea of “partnership” (Phil 1:5; 4:3); Banks, Reenvisioning Theological Education, pp. 119-24.
38 It should be kept in mind that the term “spiritual gifts” is directly translated only from pneumatika in 1 Cor 12:1 (or then, “spiritual things”), with the plural term charismata coming from Rom 11:29; 12:6; 1 Cor 12:9, 30-31); Russell P. Spittler, “Spiritual Gifts,” International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, rev. ed., ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), vol. 5, pp. 2843-45 (603).
The key issue concerns the debated question as to what degree the charismata are natural or supernatural capacities. David Lim has conceptualized a helpful model for approaching this question, through which he suggests that “the gifts are incarnational,” referring to how “God touches all our abilities and potential with supernatural power.” Thus, “our character, life, faith...problems and successes in life” altogether effects the expression of a given charism through the human agency. Lim notes a similar manner of conceptualizing the gifts from Rodman Williams, who says “the presence of the charismata ‘enhances natural capacities and function.’” From this perspective, Lim suggests placing the charismata on a continuum ranging from the “natural” to the “supernatural.” Further clarity to the incarnational nature of the charismata can be found in J. Robert Clinton and Richard Clinton’s concept of a “giftedness set,” referring to a threefold interplay involving “natural abilities, acquired skills, and spiritual gifts.” They define the latter as “a God-given unique capacity imparted to each believer for the purpose of releasing a Holy Spirit empowered ministry via that believer.”

Distinctions between what is “natural” and what is “supernatural” of the charismata should not perhaps be tightly held, as such distinctions do not seem to exist within New Testament thought, for in the final analysis the charismata are precisely “operations of the Spirit” released through human agencies. Charismata are “free gifts,” whose source is the Spirit. Dunn thus defines a charism as a “concrete materialization of

41 Lim, Spiritual Gifts, p. 48.
42 J. Robert Clinton and Richard W. Clinton, Developing Leadership Giftedness: What Leaders Need to Know about Spiritual Gifts (Altadena, CA: Barnabas, 1993), p. 40. I appreciate the discussion of Clinton & Clinton on this subject for while stating they represent the Evangelical perspective on the charismata, they place no restrictions on the number of possible charisms existing today, while also maintaining an incarnational paradigm similar to that of Lim, Spiritual Gifts, pp. 92-103.
God’s grace.” Gordon Fee similarly notes that in 1 Corinthians 12:7, what is given to each believer is a “manifestation of the Spirit...each gift is a ‘manifestation,’ a disclosure of the Spirit’s activity” in the midst of the believing community. Siegfried Schatzmann concludes, after examining at length the debate between natural versus supernatural dynamic of the charismata, that in Pauline thought, “every charisma could only be supernatural because it was God-given and Spirit-bestowed,” and thus given by God to be exercised in “unconditional dependence on and in openness to God.” Schatzmann acknowledges on the other hand, which I want to affirm, that we should not limit God’s capacity to supernaturally endow natural talents surrendered to God (i.e., Rom 12:1-2).

4.2 The Prophetic Dimension and Purpose of the Teaching Charism

I will now demonstrate several strands of data from the Pauline discussion on the charismata, in order to suggest how the teaching charisma should be manifest via the Pentecostal distinctive of Spirit-baptism. This discussion warrants first, however, a brief examination of Robert Menzies’ modified version of the older Pentecostal “gateway” position, which regarded Spirit-baptism as the point of initiation into the charismata. Given the present reality of experiential familiarity with the charismata within the Charismatic movement outside the confession of classical Pentecostalism, Menzies proposes that Spirit-baptism should be considered as the “gateway” not to the charismata altogether, but to the more prophetical charismata, which he identifies as the πνευματικον (1 Cor 12:1; 14:1). Menzies identifies the πνευματικον as the more Spirit-inspired speech gifts (i.e., message of wisdom or knowledge, prophecy, discerning of spirits, tongues and interpretation of tongues), and thus a

44 Dunn, The Theology of Paul the Apostle, p. 553.
47 Schatzmann, A Pauline Theology of Charismata, pp. 76-77.
“sub-category” of the charismata. While Menzies’ modified “gateway” position is helpful in demonstrating the value of Spirit-baptism upon ministry through the charismata, I am concerned if this proposal restricts or limits (within human understanding) how God may choose to manifest the Spirit of prophesy via human agencies, for as Jesus said, “The wind blows where it wills” (John 3:8). As Gordon Fee observes, for instance, “exhortation” (Rom 12:8), teaching (1 Cor 14:6) and singing (Eph 5:19; cf. 1 Cor 14:26; Col 3:16) may also be defined as Spirit-inspired utterance.

Menzies is not alone to observe in 1 Corinthians chapters 12 and 14 a distinction between the broad generalization of charismata and a charismata sub-category, which may be identified as the πνευματικών (1 Cor 12:1). The πνευματικών may of course well signify “higher gifts” that believers are to seek (1 Cor 12:31; 14:1) on account of their edification value to the gathered community through the dynamic of prophetic inspiration. With consistent acknowledgement to Roger Stronstad’s seminal Charismatic Theology of St. Luke, contemporary Pentecostal scholarship has emphasized the conviction that the primary characteristic and purpose of Spirit-baptism is the expression of prophetic utterance for the believer’s missiological vocation in the world. This prophetic purpose of Spirit-baptism can be further appreciated, in view of Clinton & Clinton’s suggestion, that the charismata can be classified according to three functional clusters with some measure of overlapping: power gifts, love gifts and word gifts. According to them, word gifts would encompass any charism that involves a communicative character

53 Clinton & Clinton, Developing Leadership Giftedness, pp. 125-26
and purpose (i.e., prophecy, word of wisdom, word of knowledge, pastoring, evangelism, exhortation, teaching, apostleship and ruling).\textsuperscript{54}

This discussion illustrates that the ministerial exercise of the teaching charism as a word-oriented gift should involve a prophetic purpose and dynamic, by virtue of a teacher’s experience in Spirit-baptism. Clarifying this observation is that there are some inferences within early church thought that the teaching charism may have been more or less linked in function and nature, to those charisms or roles foremost involving a prophetic dimension and purpose.\textsuperscript{55} Lim similarly proposes that teaching should be viewed as a prophetic charism, with the charisms of revelation, prophecy and knowledge in 1 Corinthians 12, all relating to the teaching charism (to which Lim elsewhere also links the wisdom charism to teaching).\textsuperscript{56} More specifically, Lim chooses to categorically define the charisms of wisdom and knowledge as teaching type gifts (1 Cor 12:8).\textsuperscript{57} Russell Spittler also observes that the two charisms have long been associated with the ministry of teaching.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{54} Clinton & Clinton, Developing Leadership Giftedness, pp. 125-26; Dunn, The Theology of Paul the Apostle, p. 555 similarly suggests two broad classifications, “charisms of speech and charisms of action.” Dunn cautions, however, that it may not be wise to press any classification too tightly, as Paul himself does not seem to indicate desire to do so. This observation need not negate, however, the possible distinction between χαρισματα and πνευματικαι in 1 Cor 12-14.


\textsuperscript{57} Lim, Spiritual Gifts, pp. 65-74.

\textsuperscript{58} Spittler, “Spiritual Gifts,” p. 603; M. Scott Fletcher, “Teaching,” Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, ed. James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1922), vol. 2, pp. 550-553. The two gifts may thus be considered as a necessary component to “pedagogical ministries,” Ralph Martin, “Gifts, Spiritual,” The
While noting that the two charisms have been linked to the teaching ministry within the Pentecostal tradition (i.e., Donald Gee’s *Concerning Spiritual Gifts*), Fee discerns that the purpose of the two charisms involves a “spiritual utterance of some revelatory kind.” When manifest in an educational or teaching setting, Donald Gee therefore defines the word of knowledge as “flashes of insight into truth...often dropped into the midst of a prepared lesson in such a way as to bring the truth home to those listening.” This definition somewhat corresponds to common ideas about the two charisms among many people in Pentecostal and Charismatic circles. It may be wise not to press too strong a distinction between the two gifts, with the understanding they are complementary, perhaps “knowledge tells us what” while “wisdom tells us how.” In conclusion, the link between the charisms of knowledge and wisdom to teaching essentially signifies how a “teacher” within the Pauline understanding of spiritual gifts is to “be led and built by the Spirit.”

5. The Didactic Purpose of Communal Worship
for Facilitating Ministry through the Teaching Charism

5.1 Pentecostal Theology Primarily Taught through Oral Liturgy

Westerhoff has argued that “the liturgical and ritual aspects of life in the church need to become a major dimension of Christian education.”

---


Such a endeavor is in fact a distinctive to Pentecostal spirituality, wherein at its center is the conviction that charismatic ministry is facilitated through participation with the gathered community in worship. Correlated to this Pentecostal distinctive is that within the Pentecostal tradition throughout the world and primarily throughout the non-western world, theology is articulated foremost through oral liturgy. Hollenweger argues that this “oral theology” has been primarily conveyed not through “books” but “parables,” not “theses” but “testimonies,” not “dissertations” but “dances,” not through a “system of thinking,” but through “stories and songs.” Russell Spittler similarly notes that “musical choruses, passed on orally, function in Pentecostal circles like catechisms do elsewhere.” Daniel Albrecht has also observed that within Pentecostal and Charismatic circles, Pentecostal/Charismatic liturgical practices tend to serve a greater “catechizing” purpose than “structured verbal catechesis.” According to Cheryl Johns, “the context of worship becomes a primary context” for spiritual formation, as “such rituals as singing and testifying carry pedagogical significance” in Pentecostal tradition.

5.2 The Didactic Purpose of Worship According to Colossians 3:16

The utilization of worship as a didactical medium, as underscored through various observations on Pentecostal faith and practice, finds strong biblical precedence via the Colossians 3:16 text, which I will now provide a brief examination, as it touches upon how pneumatic experience provides an essential methodology to the teaching charism. This discussion first requires, however, a concise overview of the Colossian setting. Attempts over the past century and half towards defining the precise nature of the “Colossian heresy” have led to an exhaustive reservoir of proposals. At risk of over simplifying discussions pertaining to the Colossian setting, it seems reasonable to say that a vast

---

69 C. Johns, Spiritual Formation, p. 124.
number of proposals more or less focus on some kind of synthesis or overlapping of Jewish and Hellenistic beliefs and practices, bearing an unhealthy influence on the nature of Colossian Christian life.\footnote{Peter T. O’Brien, \textit{Colossians, Philemon}, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982), p. xxxii.}

Robert Wall provides a helpful overview to the Colossian life setting, which I find some measure of personal agreement with. To begin, Wall argues that the life setting must be placed within the greater context of the tension between Paul and an influential segment of Jewish-Christian leadership in the early church who questioned the theological validity of Paul’s approach to his gentile mission, which seemed devoid of any endeavor to assimilate gentile converts within a Judaistic defining of Christian faith.\footnote{Robert W. Wall, \textit{Colossians and Philemon}, IVP New Testament Commentary (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), pp. 21-22.} The specific form of tension challenging Paul’s pastoral and theological influence over the Colossian church, therefore, centered on a “hollow and deceptive philosophy” of a “Hellenized form of piety” merged with Jewish traditions of faith. This synthesis of belief essentially involved the placing of one’s spiritual trust in “legalistic observance of religious traditions (2:16)” rather than in one’s personal relationship to Jesus, with the cognition of his immediate presence within the Christian community.\footnote{Wall, \textit{Colossians and Philemon}, p. 23, 24-25.}

By virtue perhaps of its primary focus on matters of Christology as prescriptive to the specific challenges contextual to the Colossian setting, the epistle bears an “almost complete lack of reference to the Spirit” (with 1:8 as a single reference). Paul’s four time use of the adjective forms of \textit{pneumatikos} (1:9, 11, 29; 3:16), however, well implies the Spirit’s active presence and role within both the believer’s life and in the life of the gathered community.\footnote{Fee, \textit{God’s Empowering Presence}, p. 637.} By placing the Colossians 3:16 text within this kind of life setting, Paul’s reference to the “word of Christ” may mean the immediate speaking of the Spirit (i.e., Spirit of Christ, or of the risen Christ) in the gathered community, rather than to the idea of a more written or fixed “collection of Jesus’ sayings.”\footnote{Wall, \textit{Colossians and Philemon}, pp. 149-150. The participles “teaching and admonishing (διδασκοντες και γοργητοιντες) in all wisdom” find their source “from the indwelling of the word,” O’Brien, \textit{Colossians, Philemon}, p. 207.}
In his book *God's Empowering Presence*, Fee defines the Colossians 3:16 as a conclusion to a text unit beginning with verse 12, which focuses on “relationships within the community.” This unit is thus climaxed with a challenge suggesting that corporate worship provides a setting simultaneously purposed not only for worship, but for instruction through the medium of Spirit-inspired worship, of believers’ “obligations to one another” within the community of faith. Fee examines several possible syntactical displays of the text, and on the basis of typical Pauline balancing of symmetrical ideas, concludes that the following display best captures the flow of Paul’s thought:

> Let the word of Christ dwell in your midst richly,
> in all wisdom
> teaching and admonishing one another
> with psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs
> in grace
> singing
> with your hearts
> to God

This display thus parallels “horizontal and vertical” dimensions to Christian worship, with the phrase *ἐν τῇ χαριτί* being instrumental: “by means of the divine grace;” this would thus infer that the capacity to sing Spirit-inspired songs comes by virtue of one’s conscious “awareness” of God’s presence in the worshipping community. From this position towards the text, coupled with observation that the greater context examines the nature and purpose of the Christian community gathered in worship, Fee postulates that worship in the gathered community always has a two dimensional purpose of providing didactic ministry towards the participants as well as a worshipful expression of praise towards God. While these “spiritual songs” are inspired by the Spirit during times that the community is gathered together in worship, it can be said that “where the Spirit of God there is also singing.” Furthermore, such “Spirit-
inspired songs” serve to provide a “treasure grove of our ongoing teaching and admonishing of one another.”

A number of commentators have observed an inference in Colossians 3:16 that at least within the gathered worshipping community, worship through song appears to be a viable medium of instruction to the gathered community. James Dunn reflects on how “prior to the invention of printing, hymns and songs were [i.e., always] a necessary and invaluable means of implanting Christian teaching.” The three terms ψαλμος, υμνος, and ψαλατικαις seem to convey a comprehensive picture of how the congregation may express worship spontaneously inspired by the Spirit. That the three forms of worship are together sourced in the “hearts” of the gathered community (“in your hearts”) implies that such worship reflects the state of one’s “whole being” before God. A derivative of Spirit-inspired worship was the establishing of a setting conducive for Spirit-directed teaching. This observation may provide then a rationale for the placement in the gathered assembly, of a “teaching” between the “psalm” and the giving of a prophetic revelation (1 Cor 14:26).

Dunn has delineated another helpful study on the three terms regarding their portrayal in the early church of worship as a medium of teaching in the gathered assembly. First to note is that the term ψαλμος
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79 Fee, God’s Empowering Presence, p. 656; Fee (p. 657) thus observes that the “psalm” in 1 Cor 14:26 (and in 1 Cor 14:15-16) is to be sung forth precisely for the purpose of “building up” the gathered congregation.

80 James D. Dunn, The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon: A Commentary on the Greek Text, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), p. 237 argues that the three terms ψαλμος, υμνος, and ψαλατικαις may be interpreted as in the locative case would confirm their role as the medium in which the “teaching” and “admonishing” occur within the gathered congregation. Richard R. Melick, Jr., Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, New American Commentary (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1991), p. 305. If, however, the three terms are interpreted to be in the dative case, this would reinforce the position that Paul is defining melodic worship as a decisive vehicle for facilitating Christian teaching in the gathered community. See Wall, Colossians and Philemon, p. 150.

81 Dunn, Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, p. 237.


83 Fletcher, “Teaching,” p. 551.
ψαλλω “to pluck or play,” as on a stringed instrument) gives the idea of “a song sung to a harp” (i.e., 2 Sam 23:1; Acts 13:33), which may be synonymous to υμος (“hymn”). The third term, ψηφαις πνευματικαις (“spiritual songs”) would highly likely convey the idea of “songs” spontaneously made or immediately inspired by the Spirit. This conclusion is reinforced by Paul’s similar use of the concept in 1 Corinthians 14:15 (ψαλω τω πνευματι), which Ephesians 5:18 infers as sourced in the singing worshipper/worshipping participant being “filled with the Spirit”

While Richard Melick’s treatment of this text more or less reflects a typical Evangelical perspective, his comment on the didactic purpose of worship inferred in Colossians 3:16 bears profound implications to the prophetic dimension of the teaching charismata under the anointing of the Holy Spirit:

[M]usic may become an effective vehicle for the exercise of a gift. The gifts are teaching and admonishing.... Singing effectively teaches and encourages. In 3:16, the pastoral function Paul claimed for himself in 1:28 is broadened to include the entire congregation and the medium of music. Few activities has such ability to teach, prompt recall, and encourage, and they have always been a vital part of Christianity.

6. Conclusion

This paper has briefly sought to answer the question: What is distinct about the teaching charism when ministered through and by the Pentecostal concept of Spirit-baptism, especially when a person may already be effectively cognizant and trained in contemporary teaching and learning methodologies? The objective of this inquiry was to better understand how people in a teaching ministry in the local church as well as in theological education. It can ensure that they are ministering under the anointing of the Spirit, rather than by natural teaching methodologies.

84 Dunn, Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, pp. 238-39 on the basis of the text’s parallelism to Eph 5:18, Fee, God’s Empowering Presence, p. 650 similarly concludes that the expression of these didactic songs are the “result of their [the worshippers] being filled with the Spirit.”

85 Melick, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, p. 305 is further prompted to observe in a seeming mood of irony, how in “contemporary church worship, most pastors do not sing their messages through these vehicles!” (i.e., the “vehicles” of Spirit inspired song).
alone. I will now summarize three major observations derived from this study that may help cultivate a teaching ministry that is authentically anchored in some of the major distinctives defining the essence of Pentecostal faith.

6.1 The Methodology of Pneumatic Experience

The first and perhaps most important suggestion gleaned from this study is that, as the paper’s title proposes, pneumatic experience is the most essential methodology to the teaching charism within Pentecostal tradition. When one makes a deliberate though quick survey through a few dozen sources of literature pertaining to Pentecostal spirituality and tradition, the one word that seems to most often characterize Pentecostal belief, liturgy, missiological praxis and spirituality is experience, or more specifically, pneumatic experience. Clark Pinnock makes the observation that this centrality of pneumatic experience actually emphasizes a “relational theism” that heightens one’s awareness of God’s immanence among his people. Pinnock further stresses that herein is an important contribution Pentecostalism offers to the greater Christian world regarding a biblical doctrine of God: the “relationality of God.” From this inherent value, Pentecostal scholars and theologians have been consistently driven to both articulate for themselves and justify before Evangelical scholarship the legitimacy of experience and specifically pneumatic experience as a correct and necessary component in the exegetical and hermeneutical process of biblical interpretation.

Given the fact that Pentecostalism affirms pneumatic experience as a prerequisite to the hermeneutical process of theological formation, it stands to reason that pneumatic experience should be given ample room within educational methodology as well. Tarr gives this admonishment to educators at the National Educators Conference of the General Council of the Assemblies of God in 1995: “For us to survive as a viable Pentecostal movement in the future, our future ministers must get the
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biblical fundamentals of New Testament Christianity in your classrooms, plus the experiential (praxis) from your personal life." Tarr clarifies this exhortation with a further challenge that Pentecostal educators not to “be bound by the noetic view (known as information, reflection, propositional) which obscures the ontic (immediacy, presence, reality).” Benny Aker reflects upon how in a “strictly rational Western way,” educators and students in the classroom “think about God” in the third person, so much that such thinking “becomes a substitute for the presence of God…thus to remove the presence of God” out of the educative process.... My approach to education now takes great pains to have at its center a consciousness of the presence of God and his miracle-working power.” In summation, I presume it would be correct to say that a Pentecostal educational distinctive would be a careful and consistent check that educators do not fall into a habitual practice of talking about God, without an affective consciousness of his very presence and involvement in any given didactic situation.

6.2 The Didactic Purpose of Worship in the Educative Process

Related to the centrality of pneumatic experience for facilitating the teaching charism is reliance upon the didactic purpose of worship in the Christian and theological educational process. For Pentecostals, and I would personally say that more often so for Charismatics, worship in the gathered community serves to facilitate a theo-centric encounter. The goal of worship in a very experiential manner, involving the full range of auditory, visual and kinesthetic dimensions of human movement, is to come towards “a sense of the presence of the Holy,” that the worshipper may “experience God directly and intimately.” Conscious remembrance of this didactic purpose of worship helps the educator or any believer,
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90 Aker, “Spiritual Experience and Rationalism in Tension,” pp. 16-17.

functioning in a didactic role or function, cultivate a rightful “space” in the educative event or process for God to speak, guide and sovereignly break into the educative process, even if only via the “still small voice” (1 Kings 19:11, 12) by the Spirit’s presence.92 The integration of worship within both the educative process and process of theological formation is therefore anchored in one’s recognition of the “epistemological priority of the Holy Spirit in prayerful receptivity.”93

6.3 The Didactic Goal of Self-Evaluation towards Missiological Praxis

Pneumatic experience in the educative process should naturally create in learners’ lives a renewed understanding of missiological praxis that touches upon one’s own life in relation to God’s missiological movement outside the community gathered for instruction. This implies then a cyclical pattern of pneumatic experience, worship and discovery of missiological praxis resident or integrated within Spirit-directed instructional settings. Albrecht observes that within the exercises of Pentecostal liturgical (i.e., corporate modes of worship) practices is the concept of “reflexity,” referring to “a self-conscious questioning.”94 Albrecht’s empirical research on Pentecostal liturgy led him to conclude that “in Pentecostal ritual participants repeatedly report being moved to the edge of profound self-investigation...which in turn, frequently moves them towards moments of conversion and spiritual changes.”95

Finally to note is that Albrecht’s observation is in keeping with the reference I have earlier made regarding the Johns’ conviction that the Hebraic yāḏa’ concept is effectively resident within the Pentecostal epistemological framework. The concept of yāḏa’ coupled with the concept of “reflexity,” therefore, suggests a missiological purpose that perpetually invites the Pentecostal worshipper towards “a life of responsible action (orthopraxy).”96 Consequently, “knowledge’ in the

93 Land, Pentecostal Spirituality, p. 38.
context of Pentecostal experience involves the response of the total person. 97

It seems fitting to close here with a brief reference to Johns’ examination of Paulo Freire’s praxis concept, which is a major focal point in various writings by the Johns. While acknowledging limitations to Freire’s revolutionary and Marxist objectives via his own model of praxis, the Johns have demonstrated how much of his concept of “critical reflection/action” clarifies Pentecostal objectives via its pneumatic experience in the context of worship. 98 This pattern of “critical reflection and action” as a didactic purpose seems to reflect then the Acts 13:1-2 missiological paradigm, wherein both the didactic and prophetic ministries help the church respond to what the Spirit is saying.

97 Johns, Spiritual Formation, 100.
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