

# Salvation in Christ and Baptism in Spirit: A Response to Robert Menzies, "Evidential Tongues: An Essay on Theological Method"

Roli G. dela Cruz

[[HTTP://www.aps.edu/ajps/98-2/98-2-delacruz.htm](http://www.aps.edu/ajps/98-2/98-2-delacruz.htm)]

## INTRODUCTION

This reaction essay seeks to review the current article of Robert P. Menzies, "Evidential Tongues: An Essay on Theological Method." My aim is not only to review this present work but also to assess many contributions of R. Menzies to Pentecostal literature. In this essay I will react to his outlook in articulating the Pentecostal claim. Then, I will review his methodology and product. It is also vital to integrate his endeavor to my region, Asia in general, and the Philippines in particular. Thus, I will discuss the relevance of his contributions to my locality. Finally, since R. Menzies asserts that the Pentecostal gift is an empowerment for witness, I will reflect on the missiological implications of his presentation of Pentecostal empowerment.<sup>1</sup>

### 1. PROGRESSIVE PENTECOSTAL PERSPECTIVE

First, I commend R. Menzies for a fine article concerning the Pentecostal distinctive. He attempts to secure honestly and objectively the doctrine of baptism in the Spirit and the evidential nature of glossolalia. I feel that his contributions to the current Pentecostal-Evangelical<sup>2</sup> debate concerning how we might best articulate a truly biblical doctrine of the "Pentecostal gift" are crucial for the direction of future Pentecostal scholarship.<sup>3</sup> In "Evidential Tongues: An Essay on Theological Method," Menzies takes the Evangelical hermeneutic seriously. He recognizes that Pentecostals generally accept Evangelical presuppositions. Thus, his analysis of the biblical data follows methodological principles widely accepted within the Evangelical world. His analysis centers on the doctrine of "subsequence," which he notes is "the foundation for any Pentecostal understanding of tongues." Menzies concludes that there is an important theological distinction between salvation in Christ and baptism in the Spirit.<sup>4</sup>

Secondly, as an Asian Pentecostal, I value the invitation to respond to R. Menzies' stimulating work. My heritage leads me to believe that "speaking in tongues" is the "initial physical evidence" of receiving the Pentecostal gift. Menzies highlights the holiness roots and the revival setting of the Pentecostal pioneers who gave me my heritage. He then contrasts the context of early Pentecostalism with the contemporary

setting of the movement. Presently, the Evangelical hermeneutic provides the basis for the Pentecostal approach to the Scriptures.<sup>5</sup> Through the application of these interpretive tools, Menzies establishes a sharp contrast between the pneumatologies of Paul and Luke.<sup>6</sup> While he emphasizes this diversity, he also maintains that a clear, harmonious fusion is possible. Consequently, as he investigates glossolalia in Luke and Paul, a deductive and systematic synthesis of the two biblical authors emerges. Menzies asserts that this synthesis provides a plausible argument for the "normative character" of evidential tongues.

Thirdly, I adhere to R. Menzies' belief that Pentecostals have something beneficial to share with the larger Evangelical family. It is obvious that Menzies thinks that Pentecostals can trailblaze a path that the Evangelical mind can fruitfully follow. He carefully tracks and critiques the Evangelical hermeneutic in its treatment of the Pentecostal gift in Luke-Acts.<sup>7</sup> As Menzies demonstrates, a clear articulation of the Pentecostal position, particularly as it relates to common Evangelical assumptions, might greatly help us all recognize our particularities and commonality. Unless Pentecostals can clearly define their distinctive doctrine, they, in one way or another, may succumb entirely to the Evangelical theological system and lose the unique dimension of our experiential theology.<sup>8</sup> Therefore I hope that the kind of approach that Menzies has taken will help shape future reflection on the biblical validity of the Pentecostal experience. The ultimate purpose of this endeavor is to produce a clearer presentation of Pentecostal theology - one that might open the way for Evangelicals to consider it seriously, if not to affirm it entirely.<sup>9</sup>

## **2. SIGNIFICANT SYSTEMATIC SUMMATION**

R. Menzies, through careful treatment of the biblical material in Luke and Paul, forms the fruit of his studies into a coherent synthesis. His methodology enables Luke to speak for himself and not merely parrot the perspective of Paul. Menzies then allows Paul to interact with Luke. Thus he brings the goal of biblical theology into focus. As he deals with the issue of the "initial physical evidence" of baptism in the Spirit, he acknowledges that it belongs to the realm of systematic theology.<sup>10</sup> I concur with Menzies that the question of evidential tongues is neither a part of Paul's agenda nor the concern of Luke. Hence, the question cannot be addressed through a purely descriptive approach. Instead, the resolutions drawn from Luke and Paul are systematically consolidated in order to come up with a holistic solution to the question concerning the pertinence of glossolalia.<sup>11</sup> The foundation for this systematizing of data is not overly dependent on our contemporary theological agenda; rather, it is rooted in the agenda of the scriptural writers.<sup>12</sup> In this way, Menzies establishes theological inferences, which strongly support a Pentecostal understanding of tongues.<sup>13</sup>

However, this sort of argument, based as it is on implications or inferences, may raise further questions. It should be acknowledged that this systematizing or consolidation of material inevitably involves a subjective inclusion and exclusion of categorized data. Thus the dialogue of the biblical writers is put into a classified system in order to answer present questions. The end result may mean that those things that do not fit into the

system are simply set aside. The choices a systematic theologian makes - whether to include or exclude various data in his or her scheme - are often quite subjective. Nonetheless, the integrity of the systematic theologian is not diminished. We need to recognize that the theologian is placed in a position, which requires him to make necessary choices: What material will help us answer the current theological question and what material may we safely ignore? Yet, it is possible that Menzies, in his attempt to deal with the question concerning the evidence of baptism in the Spirit, will be criticized for overemphasizing the role of tongues-speech and setting aside prophecy.

Let me illustrate the problem of R. Menzies' process of drawing the relevant answer to the question of evidential tongues. If we evaluate the way he handles the biblical material gathered from Luke and Paul, the result of that method suggests that prophecy might also serve as an accompanying sign for baptism in the Spirit.<sup>14</sup> Luke's pneumatology, as R. Menzies admits, implies that the Spirit is prophetic.<sup>15</sup> In fact, when one traces the Spirit in Luke-Acts, the occurrence of prophecy is much more prevalent than speaking in tongues.<sup>16</sup> Menzies' argument for the normative character of tongues is based on the universality of the gift as presented in Luke-Acts.<sup>17</sup> Yet, even the quotation of Joel's prophecy in Acts 2:17-21 highlights prophecy as an indication of the reception of the Spirit. The same may be said for Paul as well. The apostle encourages everyone to prophesy for the edification of the body and at the same time encourages everyone to speak in tongues for their own edification (1 Cor 14:1-5, 31, 39). Therefore, it appears to me that the very strength of Menzies' methodology is also its point of weakness. Menzies concludes that speaking in tongues is a prominent accompanying sign, but using the same method one might also argue that prophecy functions in the same manner.<sup>18</sup>

### 3. THRIVING THEOLOGICAL TREND

In presentations of Pentecostal theology, such as that provided by Menzies, it is vital to establish that the movement's experience of the Spirit is genuine. The veracity of the Pentecostal encounter with the Spirit should not be negated or minimized; rather, it must be upheld and highlighted. In the beginning stage of the movement, i.e., the pre-Evangelical recognition, the simple dismissal of the validity of the experience led Pentecostals to be apologetic or defensive.<sup>19</sup> Hence, a variety of literature was produced which sought to defend the experience of tongues as authentic and biblical.<sup>20</sup> As Pentecostals were welcomed in the Evangelical world, the focus shifted from questions pertaining to scriptural legitimacy of the experience of tongues to the validity of the hermeneutical underpinnings, which supported the doctrine of initial evidence.<sup>21</sup> In this regard, Menzies' work is significant, for he attempts to address the key issues in the current Pentecostal-Evangelical debate. As such, he interacts with key dialogue partners such as James D. G. Dunn and Gordon D. Fee. Menzies has also responded adequately to the critiques of his work and argued cogently for the prophetic nature of Luke's pneumatology.<sup>22</sup>

Menzies, who is a third generation Pentecostal, has clearly set the context for the current debate concerning the nature and validity of Pentecostal theology. In this present article, he provides a framework for theologizing which holds much promise for Pentecostal

thinkers. I concur with him that there is a desperate need to come up with a reinterpretation of the Pentecostal experience that might communicate more clearly to our Evangelical brothers and sisters. The present generation of Pentecostals, those to whom Menzies speaks, largely adheres to Evangelical tenets of faith and hermeneutical methods.

The Pentecostal acceptance of the Evangelical hermeneutic is indeed an important development. With this in mind, Menzies appropriately reviews the deficiencies of "two-stage patterns" as noted by James Dunn. Menzies recognizes that the Pentecostal interpretive model of "two-stage patterns" in Acts does not adhere to hermeneutical principles accepted within contemporary Evangelicalism. The traditional presentation of Pentecostal theology, based as it is on "historical precedent," is therefore no longer convincing. Dunn's critique was indeed devastating. Thus, Menzies concedes that Dunn is correct when he challenges us to consider the whole theological emphasis of a biblical author such as Luke, not simply isolated texts.

Another eminent scholar, a son of the Pentecostal movement, Gordon Fee, is noted by Menzies for his critique of the Pentecostal treatment of pertinent passages such as the Samaritan episode in Acts 8.<sup>23</sup> Again, Menzies acknowledges that Fee's treatment of this particular passage is largely valid. Menzies wisely recognizes that Pentecostal interpreters should learn from Dunn and Fee in their concern for a biblical approach, which considers "all of the relevant evidence." Menzies' work is significant, for it calls us to recognize our hermeneutical weaknesses and yet, by highlighting Luke's distinctive theology, also points to a valid alternative.

Menzies has offered a constructive critique of traditional Pentecostal presentations which emerged in the polemical context of an earlier era. While these traditional presentations served their purpose in the history of Pentecostal interpretation, contemporary Pentecostal scholars should seek to utilize the hermeneutical tools of Evangelicalism in order to express Pentecostal claims. In other words, Menzies challenges us to be consistently Evangelical in our scriptural interpretation, but distinctively and faithfully Pentecostal in our theology. This, I believe, is the real significance of Menzies' contribution.

Menzies clearly feels called to harmonize Pentecostal interpretive methods with those utilized by Evangelicals. As I have noted, this is precisely why his work is significant. Nevertheless, I do believe that we as Pentecostals should not feel constrained simply to harmonize our hermeneutical model with that of the Evangelicals. This might attract the attention of the Evangelicals and perhaps influence their thinking. Be that as it may, I still believe that we should feel free to explore different hermeneutical methods as we seek to rearticulate our Pentecostal heritage.

I commend Menzies for seeking to explain our theological position to our Evangelical counterparts in a way that they can appreciate. However, we need not fear innovative ways of critiquing our own position,<sup>24</sup> approaches which perhaps might set aside the Evangelical agenda for a while and which might enable us to refine it. Here the emphasis

should be on the maturation of Pentecostal theology, for every generation needs a fresh interpretation of what we believe. However, if we kept on following the trend of Evangelical hermeneutics simply for the sake of acceptance, we will become stagnant and disintegrate.<sup>25</sup> We will simply keep in step with Evangelical theology. Perhaps, we will simply be satisfied with harmonizing our Pentecostal theology with Evangelical tenets of faith. Therefore, I do not think that the Evangelicals should dictate how we as Pentecostals approach the arena of biblical interpretation.

Particularly here in Asia, I do not believe the western Evangelical perspective should dictate how we interpret the Bible,<sup>26</sup> for the logic and norms of our Pentecostal pioneers are acceptable to Asians. Nevertheless, our western Pentecostal counterparts need to respond to the deductive and linear Evangelical model of western biblical interpretation. Asians, however, should not be satisfied with ready-made western theology and instead address their own issues.<sup>27</sup> The declaration issued by the East Asia Christian Conference is worth considering:

A living theology is born out of the meeting of a living church and its world. We discern a special task of theology in relation to the Asian renaissance and revolution, because we believe God is working out his purposes in these movements of the secular world. The Asian churches so far, and in large measure, have not taken their theological task seriously enough, for they have been largely content to accept the ready-made answers of Western theology or confessions. We believe, however, that today we can look for the development of authentic living theology in Asia.<sup>28</sup>

Let me illustrate my point. Before the work of I. H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian Theologian* (1970), we Pentecostals were criticized for drawing our doctrine from narrative portions of scripture. Thus Evangelicals emphasized that Paul should interpret Luke. Marshall's declaration that Luke should be treated as a theologian in his own right became the foundation for the works of R. Stronstad (*Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* [1984]) and R. Menzies (*The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* [1991]). In the work of Marshall, Stronstad, and Menzies, the basis for a Pentecostal theology has been established. Now we can move on and address other issues, such as the issue, which compelled Menzies to write his article on evidential tongues.

With all respect to the development of Pentecostal scholarship in the west, the struggle for a valid basis for Pentecostal theology and attitudes toward various Pentecostal interpretive approaches might conceivably be different if the theological debate had started here in Asia.<sup>29</sup> Wonsuk Ma, an Asian Pentecostal thinker, observes how "less prominent attention" is given by Asians to the debate concerning the role of glossolalia. Asians, he states, have "assumed the consequence of the western debate."<sup>30</sup> In Asia, the didactic purpose of the narrative genre is taken seriously. John C. England, from New Zealand, a westerner in the Asia-Pacific region, declares:

In seeking to understand and respond to the realities of our people's experience nothing has been more important in recent decades than the recognition of *story-telling as a theological process* - stories in folk-literature or scriptures, from people-movements, tribal groups or urban communities, and especially the stories of women in all these.... How can we clarify further the movement between human life and scripture (or tradition)? A simple drawing of parallels or the assembling of related texts will not be adequate. We must come to recognise the framework and assumptions for our use of scripture, to critique any self-serving, imperialist or patriarchal interpretations, and to discern the prophetic and gospel story *within* our stories.[31](#)

Hence, to say that Luke teaches the theology of the Spirit in his "stories" in Luke-Acts is not a problem. In other words, Asian Pentecostals, who are familiar with "using folklore as a way of doing theology,"[32](#) do not face the same struggles as those of their western counterparts. It is interesting to think of what might have happened if we had started with the assumption, widely accepted in Asia, that Luke sought to teach theology through his narrative. Would we not be way ahead in the development of Pentecostal theology? Instead, Pentecostals exerted their energy in an attempt to harmonize Pentecostal doctrine with basic western Evangelical presuppositions. Of course, the Pentecostals are correct to emphasize that the narrative of Luke-Acts can be a source of sound theology. This is very clear to the Asian mind. Here we see that Menzies' contributions to the development of Pentecostal theology are very relevant to the Asian context. I wonder, however, if Menzies is willing to set aside his western Evangelical assumptions and accept the Asian perspective in his theological method so that he might articulate more clearly an Asian Pentecostal theology and make his contributions more relevant to the context and region where he is serving as a missionary.[33](#)

Therefore, whether the Evangelicals accept it or not, our Pentecostal experience has brought us to believe ahead of them that Luke-Acts has "didactic" value.[34](#) Our Pentecostal forefathers and mothers were not wrong after all. Let us admit then that, whether our presuppositions are Pentecostal or Evangelical, they are human. If Pentecostal assumptions are scrutinized by Evangelicals, are we not allowed as Pentecostals to critique Evangelical assumptions pertaining to the interpretation of the Scriptures? As Fee comments:

[B]eing a Pentecostal within the larger framework of North American evangelicalism has also brought tensions from this side as well. Whereas for the most part there has been a genuine, if not at times wondering, acceptance of "this strange oxymoron among us" - a Pentecostal New Testament scholar is considered by many a contradiction in terms - there are others for whom such a person is something of an anathema. This has been especially true of many within the Dispensationalist and Reformed traditions on the matters of Spirit and women in ministry to be particularly full of inconsistencies - not to mention resulting in some less than satisfactory exegesis. [35](#)

Is it not the Spirit who inspired the biblical authors to write the scriptures the same Spirit who started the modern Pentecostal movement? Would not the same Spirit interpret the Pentecostal experience the way he illuminates Evangelical biblical interpretation?

Another observation that is relevant to the discussion is the present openness of Evangelicals toward the miraculous. A significant number of Evangelicals, better known as the Third Wave movement, are experiencing miraculous manifestations of the Spirit in a manner similar to the Pentecostals.<sup>36</sup> In the early days of the Pentecostal revival, testimonies of miraculous occurrences were looked down upon by the larger Evangelical bodies. But now there has been a shift from a closed outlook to a new openness. Again, we can only wonder what would have happened if the Pentecostal revival had started in Asia, where people are aware of the supernatural.<sup>37</sup> Perhaps the reactions and responses would have been different. Instead of focusing on the cessation of the miraculous as the point of biblical debate, the discussion might have been focused on the power and sovereignty of God.<sup>38</sup> The Asian worldview, which centers on the spirits which permeate our world, would have encountered (as it now does) the Pentecostal claim of the Spirit's power. Accordingly a challenge is given by Yeow Choo Lak:

The spirit-world is alive and is doing well in Asia. Seemingly, education (eastern or western) has done little to dampen the influence of the spirit-world. Whilst writing these few lines, a neighbour is having his front yard done up. He is highly educated and is doing well in the corporate world. Yet, before the workmen started digging up his garden he was burning joss papers and joss sticks. That was his way of ensuring success and prosperity in this venture. One cannot say that he is uneducated and uninformed. In spite of his high education he is still very much influenced by the spirit-world.

It is in the midst of the influence of the spirit-world that Christians in Asia are endeavouring to make sense of the Spirit's movement in Asia. What is the Spirit telling us of its activities here? How do we discern its actions? What meaning can we make of the Spirit's movement in the people's struggles in Asia?<sup>39</sup>

I am not trying to make the long, complicated Pentecostal-Evangelical debate that we have inherited here in Asia as simple as I may appear to put it. I do not want to be misinterpreted as having no regard for the history of Pentecostal interpretation. I am indeed grateful for the scholarly contributions of western Pentecostals in my region. I believe that I have a basis for what I say because of the history of biblical interpretation, which includes Pentecostal and Evangelical contributions. I also believe that Menzies would agree that the Asian Pentecostal setting is different in that it must confront a unique range of issues. Nevertheless, I believe that we Pentecostal thinkers, particularly here in Asia, should not be afraid to think freely with regard to interpretative methods and the analysis of the biblical data. The purpose of our theologizing, after all, is to respond to the concerns and demands unique to the circumstances of the Asians.<sup>40</sup> Such an attitude would facilitate the development of a theology, which is relevant for Asian

Pentecostals and Evangelicals alike. It is from this creative posture that Asians can also greatly contribute to the development of theology in the west.

## **4. RELEVANT RESPONSIBLE REFLECTION**

R. Menzies makes a clear theological separation between salvation in Christ and baptism in the Spirit. This distinction is based on his conclusion that Luke has his own pneumatology, one that is separate from that of Paul. According to Menzies, the Pentecostal doctrine of subsequence can be defended by using the assumptions of biblical theology - i.e., that every biblical writer must speak for himself. I compliment Menzies for his achievement. His methodology provides a basis for a clearer articulation of the Pentecostal position. By highlighting the differences between the pneumatologies of Luke and Paul, Menzies is able to establish a clear distinction between the experience of regeneration and empowering.

When the mainline Evangelical organization Philippine Council of Evangelical Churches (PCEC) accepted the Pentecostals,<sup>41</sup> some of the anti-Pentecostal/Charismatic Evangelicals formed the National Association of Conservative Evangelicals (NACE). Why would they react like that? The PCEC are more open to the Pentecostal experience, while the NACE continues to challenge the validity of the Pentecostal claim.<sup>42</sup> It is obvious that this is a reasonable response for any Christian tradition, which fears being swallowed by a new, thriving revival movement. They would like to preserve their belief system, for they do not want to lose their identity.

Menzies' conclusions regarding the nature of the Pentecostal gift and evidential tongues have important implications for the Philippines. On the one hand, Evangelicals in the Philippines, which is a Roman Catholic country, generally consider Catholics to be unsaved.<sup>43</sup> Thus, theologically speaking, Roman Catholics cannot be baptized in the Spirit, for they have not been saved. On the other hand, Pentecostals in the Philippines believe that the Evangelicals in general and perhaps some among the other mainline Protestants are saved and thus prime candidates for the Pentecostal gift. But something phenomenal took place when the Charismatic movement came to the Philippines. The Catholics experienced the same baptism in the Spirit that the Pentecostals had experienced. The experience of the gift of Spirit among Charismatic Catholics, Protestants and Pentecostals brought - and continues to bring - "spontaneous ecumenicity."<sup>44</sup> Sadly, fewer mainline Evangelicals speak in tongues, regardless of whether they believe that tongues have already ceased or is still a valid gift for today. Interestingly, in the Philippines, Roman Catholics and mainline Protestants are experiencing the Pentecostal gift in their Charismatic services with more frequency than the Evangelicals.<sup>45</sup>

This kind of phenomenal experience raises questions that need to be addressed. What enables a person to be baptized in the Spirit? Is it a person's theological presuppositions or experiential openness?<sup>46</sup> As I have visited our Pentecostal churches in the Philippines, I have noticed that the genuineness of the Catholic's experience, their glossolalia and baptism in the Spirit, is often doubted. Pentecostals readily accept that an Evangelical

might be baptized in the Spirit as evidenced by glossolalia, but it is hard for Pentecostals to believe that a Catholic might have had a genuine experience of speaking in tongues. However, Koichi Kitano concludes that "in general, the Catholic church is much more open" to the Pentecostals message.<sup>47</sup> Let us learn from the story of Mr. Pentecost, David J. Du Plessis, who was disfellowshipped by the Assemblies of God due to "pressure"<sup>48</sup> from Evangelicals who were offended by his ecumenical work among the Roman Catholic and mainline churches.<sup>49</sup> Du Plessis noticed, however, that "the Pentecostal experience" was happening among the mainline churches, but "this was not occurring amongst the Evangelical leaders with whom the Pentecostals had become so cozy."<sup>50</sup> Vinson Synan narrates the tension of Du Plessis' ecumenical ministry:

Pentecostal leaders had not approved of Du Plessis' close ties with mainline Protestants, but they allowed him to proceed. But when he went to Rome, as far as they were concerned, he had gone too far. The Assemblies of God revoked Du Plessis' ministerial credentials, which meant Du Plessis had no official link to any Pentecostal group.<sup>51</sup>

Nevertheless, Du Plessis, who was popularly known as Mr. Pentecost, "never compromised" his "Pentecostal witness" in his "ecumenical work."<sup>52</sup> When the Charismatic movement was later established, it became obvious that the Assemblies of God had made a mistake. Du Plessis' credentials as an Assemblies of God minister were restored.

It appears, then, that Menzies' distinction between salvation in Christ and baptism in the Spirit is important for us here in the Philippines. We should seriously consider questions raised by, on the one hand, Spirit-baptized Catholics, who receive from the Spirit due to their openness; and, on the other, Evangelicals, who do not share in this experience because of their theological assumptions.<sup>54</sup> While Pentecostals and Evangelicals agree on salvation in Christ, the Pentecostal perspective on baptism in the Spirit seems to find more acceptance from the Catholics than the Evangelicals.<sup>55</sup> In fact in the 70s and 80s Narciso Dionson of Cebu<sup>56</sup> and Virginia Cruz (now Roberts) of Manila,<sup>57</sup> both ordained ministers of the Philippines General Council of the Assemblies of God (PGCAG), rubbed their elbows with the Catholics. They proclaimed the Pentecostal message in Catholic pulpits and saw these "unsaved Catholics" being baptized in the Spirit and speaking in tongues. Just like Du Plessis, Dionson and Cruz were able to see the Pentecostal message penetrate the Roman Catholic Church. They too were loved by the Catholics, yet they never compromised and they stayed with the PGCAG.

What then is it that really matters? I believe that unity of experience binds Pentecostals together with Charismatic Catholics and, this in turn, affords Pentecostals a unique opportunity to reach out to the Catholics. Pentecostal-Catholic dialogue concerning the experience of the Spirit might be a good starting point.<sup>58</sup> Kitano's conclusions should be taken seriously by the Pentecostals in the Philippines:

Undeniable evidence of genuine experiences with the Spirit among the Charismatics has created trans-denominational atmosphere in the

meetings, and have produced a spontaneous ecumenicity among the Catholics and Protestants. However, some Protestant churches have begun to question the authenticity of such ecumenicity because it is scripturally unexplainable, while the Catholic hierarchy has become concerned with losing its "sheep."

If the situation is a matter of misconception of the charismatic movement, a dialogue may be necessary. A research such as this may provide valuable material for such a dialogue between Catholic and Protestant leaders in order to minimize even on a small scale "the scandal of disunity of the churches."[59](#)

A vital question should be raised: Is the Evangelical way of understanding salvation in Christ the best way, if not the only way? Can Pentecostals, assuming that the gift of the Spirit is genuinely received by Catholics, be open to those from a non-Evangelical tradition? Since Catholics have experienced the Spirit just as we Pentecostals have, must we not also conclude, with Peter in Acts 11, that salvation has come to this group of people. I am not saying that there is something wrong with the Evangelical soteriology. It is the foundation of Pentecostal soteriology. However, the Pentecostal doctrine of baptism in the Spirit as an experience "distinct from and subsequent to" conversion seems to match the expectation and experience of Catholics more closely than that of the Evangelicals. Should we not also re-assess the Evangelical theology of salvation in Christ in light of that espoused by Roman Catholic? I believe that if there is any body that can minister to and bridge the gap between Roman Catholics and Evangelicals, it is the Pentecostal church. In this Filipino context marked by the differences and similarities between Catholics and Pentecostals, Emerito P. Nacpil challenges us to engage in theological reflection that is relevant:

A responsible theology is attained mainly when the Christian faith is interpreted in conscious relationship to the fundamental problems of human life as they appear in specific forms and in particular environments, and when it is in dialogue with other faiths-religious or otherwise-which have their own ways of structuring the questions of human life and formulating their own answers to them.[60](#)

## **5. MEANINGFUL MISSIOLOGICAL MOTIVATION**

Menzies does a good job of evaluating previous Pentecostal approaches, which have centered on establishing two-stage patterns in Luke-Acts. His suggestion that we must allow Luke to speak for himself and dialogue with Paul enables him to put forth a persuasive argument for the doctrine of subsequence. His treatment of tongues-speech in relation to baptism in the Spirit is also a better attempt than the traditional way of historical precedent. However, his synthesis might be questioned at this point due to the subjective and selective way in which he handles the data. Tongues-speech is given prominence as an evidence of baptism in the Spirit, while prophecy is largely set aside. Nevertheless, Menzies seeks, in a fresh way, to establish the doctrine of evidential

tongues - a doctrine that has played a significant role in the worldwide growth of the Pentecostal movement.<sup>61</sup> This kind of attempt is valuable as we seek to understand more fully the significance of the Pentecostal distinctive. It is appropriate at this point to quote Vinson Synan concerning the impact that this doctrine has had on Pentecostal missions:

A final look at the results of the initial evidence teaching may provide some clues to the future. The Pentecostal churches that have held strongly to this teaching have surpassed all others in church growth and missionary success in the period since World War II. A striking case is that of the Church of God in Christ (COGIC), which separated from the Church of Christ (Holiness) in 1908 over the question of tongues. Beginning as groups roughly equal in size, the growth of the two churches is instructive. By 1990 the church that rejected tongues as initial evidence number only 15,000 members in the USA while the COGIC had grown to number 3.7 million members. Likewise the CMA, which is much older than the Assemblies of God, can serve as a model for those who wish to soften the position on tongues as evidence. As we have seen, the adoption of the "seek not, forbid not" policy effectively ended the Pentecostal renewal in the CMA church. By 1992 the CMA had grown to 265,863 members in the USA and an estimated 1.9 million members around the world. On the other hand, the Assemblies of God, which has strongly maintained the teaching from its founding, had grown by 1992 to 2,170,890 members in the USA with an estimated worldwide constituency of 25 million members.

Even more striking is a comparison between the worldwide constituencies of the Holiness churches that led the opposition to the initial evidence position early in the century as opposed to the classical Pentecostal churches. According to David Barrett, by 1992 the anti-Pentecostal Holiness churches numbered 5.4 million in the world in contrast to 205 million denominational Pentecostals. And that is not to mention the independent and charismatic Pentecostals in the mainline churches. Altogether these groups numbered some 420 million in 1992, or 24.5 percent of all the world's Christians. Indeed, by the 1990's the Pentecostals had become the second largest family of Christians in the world, exceeded only by the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>62</sup>

Significant as it is, I think that the issue of evidential tongues cannot be solved by biblical and systematic theology alone. Menzies recognizes the limitations of both in another work.<sup>63</sup> As a New Testament exegete he limits himself to the systematization of biblical data. He is not expected to go into the realm of the entire epistemology of the Pentecostal experience. Menzies should be respected for his acknowledgment of his limitations.<sup>64</sup> Nevertheless, Menzies' theological distinction between salvation in Christ and Spirit-baptism raises important questions for us as we re-examine the Evangelical understanding of salvation in light of the Catholic experience of baptism in the Spirit. As we have noted, Catholics have also experienced the Spirit in Pentecostal power, largely

due to their openness and sense of expectation. Menzies notes that the biblical call to anticipate the "gift" of Spirit is maintained in the Pentecostal distinctive on tongues.<sup>65</sup> The factor of expectation that he links with "evidential tongues" is noteworthy. Does this mean that Catholics who speak in tongues have also experienced prophetic power to bear witness of Christ? Do they not also live with this same sense of expectation that the Spirit will be there in time of need? Can they not also win their neighbors to Christ, just as the Evangelicals and Pentecostals do?

Perhaps the work of William W. Menzies, which goes beyond the exegetical and synthetic levels of scriptural interpretation, can help explain the similar experiential patterns of the Pentecostals and Catholics. W. Menzies seeks to locate the key questions of exegesis, theology and experience in the Pentecostal interpretation of Acts.<sup>66</sup> Accordingly, he speaks of three levels of interpretation. He presents the "inductive level" as involving the exegetical-biblical study of Acts; the "deductive level" pertains to the realm of systematic theology; and the "verificational level" deals with personal experience.<sup>67</sup> Here W. Menzies calls for a synthesis of the exegetical, doctrinal and applicational layers of analysis.<sup>68</sup> Since Kitano notes that here in the Philippines the "spontaneous ecumenicity" of the Catholics, Protestants and Pentecostals in Charismatic services is rooted in experience and not necessarily theology,<sup>69</sup> should not Pentecostals be willing to approach the Catholics at the "verificational" level? The experience-verified theology of the Pentecostals seems to be an effective way to reach out to the Catholics. Like Du Plessis, Dionson, and Cruz, we can fellowship with the Catholics and yet not compromise, though we should change and grow with the Catholics since the Spirit of God is also at work in them.

The important missiological truth emerges that the gift of the Spirit is potentially available to everyone. God's promise to pour out the Spirit in the last days is not restricted by class, race, or gender. Thus anybody who would believe in Christ, regardless of whether he is a Catholic, Protestant, Evangelical, or Pentecostal can be baptized in the Spirit. Consequently, we need to ask ourselves whether the distinction between salvation in Christ and baptism in the Spirit is theological, experiential or both. I believe the answer is both. We try to understand our experience in accordance with Evangelical hermeneutical tools, but we find ourselves experientially closer to the supernatural expectation and dynamic experience characteristic of many Catholics. This issue, which is not directly addressed in R. Menzies' article, should be addressed by Pentecostal thinkers in the Philippines. It might be a fruitful area to consider in the Filipino Pentecostal-Catholic dialogue.

## CONCLUSION

R. Menzies' contributions to Pentecostal theology are invaluable. His approach, while perhaps still in need of refinement,<sup>70</sup> provides a strong basis for establishing the distinctive nature of Luke's pneumatology and the Pentecostal gift. His synthesis of the Lukan and Pauline perspectives on tongues enables him to maintain the biblical sense of expectancy for receiving the Spirit. Menzies, being a biblical exegete, limits himself to the New Testament data. Thus he is unable to address many issues pertaining to

glossolalia. His work, however, is an excellent way of looking at the question of evidential tongues in the New Testament. I suggest that he should dare to go to the experiential level of Pentecostal empowering, analyze Pentecostal experience, and integrate his findings here with his exegetical and theological conclusions.[71](#)

His work also represents a positive challenge to Asian Pentecostal scholars. His claim that the narrative of Luke-Acts possesses a distinctive theological viewpoint and a didactic intent is particularly instructive. Asians in general will readily accept his methodology and his conclusions with reference to Luke's story. Filipino Pentecostals will also benefit from his work.[72](#)

Menzies is probably unaware of how his work has influenced me in my own search for my identity as a Pentecostal working alongside my Evangelical brothers and sisters. He helped me shape my own Asian Pentecostal perspective as I reflected on my experience of conversion and Spirit-baptism. I believe that Menzies has a lot more to contribute to us here in Asia Pacific. I remember he used to say to us: "It has been said that the first truly indigenous Pentecostal theology will come from Latin America, and it will not have any footnotes. But I say to you the first truly indigenous Pentecostal theology will come from Asia, and it will have many footnotes!" Perhaps this kind of dialogue is just the beginning of the fulfillment of his prophecy.

---

Footnotes

1. As a personal colleague and friend of Bob Menzies, I would also like to reflect on his contributions to the shaping of my own thought as an Asian Pentecostal Christian.
2. Here, I am following the terminology of Menzies. On the one hand, the Pentecostals are those who believe that "baptism in the Spirit" is an experience "subsequent to" (if not chronologically, at least logically) salvation (conversion) in Christ and marked by "speaking in tongues", which serves as the "initial physical evidence" of this experience. On the other hand, the Evangelicals are those who believe that baptism in the Spirit is an initiatory experience, not separate from conversion, and not necessarily marked by glossolalia.
3. For a better understanding of Menzies' foundational views, see Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup. 54 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); cf. Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, JPTSup. 6 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
4. I agree with R. P. Menzies, p. 120 of the current *AJPS* article, when he states:  
...[D]rawing from the full scope of Luke's two-volume work, it focuses on the nature of Luke's pneumatology and, from this framework, seeks to understand the character of the Pentecostal gift. The judgment that the gift is distinct from conversion is rooted in the gift's function: it provides power for witness, not justification or cleansing. The universal character of the gift, established in Luke's narrative rather than historical precedent, is the basis for its normative character. I would suggest this sort of approach, which actually follows Dunn's methodology (and that of modern Evangelicalism) in a consistent manner, enables us to articulate in a convincing manner a fully Pentecostal theology.
5. For a fuller treatment of the relationship of the Evangelical hermeneutic with the Pentecostal interpretation of Luke-Acts, see Robert P. Menzies, "Coming to Terms With an Evangelical Heritage," in *Contemporary Issues in Pentecostal Theology*, APTS First Annual Pentecostal Lectureship Series (Baguio, Philippines: APTS Press, 1993).
6. See Robert P. Menzies, "The Distinctive Character of Luke's Pneumatology," *Paraclete* 25 (1991), pp. 17-30, for a discussion of the thesis that Luke and Paul have different theological perspectives.
7. See also Robert P. Menzies, "Luke and the Spirit: A Reply to James Dunn," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 4 (1994), pp. 115-38; cf. James D. G. Dunn, "Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993), pp. 3-27.
8. This concern is felt deeply by Menzies. Since the emergence of the Third Wave, a "sub-group within Evangelicalism," the differences between Evangelicals and Pentecostals have narrowed. Robert P. Menzies, "A Pentecostal Perspective on Signs and Wonders," *Pneuma* 17 (1995), pp. 265-78, interacts with Third Wave perspectives. He describes how Third Wavers maintain their Evangelical perspective on baptism in the Spirit as an element of regeneration. Hence, Menzies seeks to show how Pentecostal theology might assist these Evangelicals, who have experienced the Spirit's enabling, as they seek to ground their experience in the scriptures.

9. See also Gordon D. Fee, *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), p. 104, for the concern that Pentecostal exegetes operate in a manner which Evangelicals will "find...at least viable, if not always compelling."
10. Menzies, pp. 177f., under, "The 'Intention to Teach' Fallacy," notes that both Pentecostals and Evangelicals fail to recognize that the issue of evidential tongues must be treated as a question of systematic theology.
11. For further treatment of the issue of tongues in Paul and Luke see Robert P. Menzies, "Coming to Terms with an Evangelical Heritage-Part 2: Pentecostals and Evidential Tongues," *Paraclete* 28 (1994), pp. 1-10. See also the expansion of the preceding article in chs. 13 and 14 of R. Menzies, *Empowered*, pp. 244-57.
12. In another article, "Coming to Terms with an Evangelical Heritage-Part 1: Pentecostals and the Issue of Subsequence," *Paraclete* 28 (1994), p. 24, Menzies argues, with reference to the works of H. Gunkel, E. Schweizer, D. Hill, G. Haya-Pratts and M. Turner, that Luke's pneumatology is different from that of Paul's. Thus, Menzies sets the agenda for Pentecostals and Evangelicals alike: "The real issue centers not on hermeneutics and historical precedent, but rather on exegesis and the nature of Luke's pneumatology."
13. Cf. Robert P. Menzies, "Spirit-Baptism and Spiritual Gifts," in *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*, eds. W. Ma and R. Menzies, JPTSup. 11 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 48-59.
14. Simon Chan, "The Language Game of Glossolalia, or Making Sense of the Initial 'Evidence'," in *Pentecostalism in Context*, pp. 82-83 n. 12, also raises this issue:  
Given the preponderance of prophetic utterances in Luke-Acts, it would seem equally, if not more, plausible to infer prophecy as initial evidence. Menzies' preference for tongues because of its 'unusual' character (*Empowered*), p. 251) seems to be going beyond legitimate inference.
15. Chan, p. 83, points out that the question of tongues in relation to the Pentecostal claim should be addressed in terms that go "beyond biblical and systematic theology to larger philosophical considerations which integrate Pentecostal doctrine with Pentecostal religious experience."
16. This point of view is the basic assumption of Menzies' entire work on Lukan Pneumatology. His doctoral dissertation, which was written at Aberdeen University and under I. H. Marshall, has documented and established that Luke's understanding of the Spirit is basically that of Judaism. The Spirit in Luke-Acts is the Spirit of prophecy. Menzies also highlights in the same seminal work published as a monograph that, in Luke's perspective, the Pentecostal gift is universally available to the disciples of Jesus and has eschatological significance. See Part 1 and 2 of R. Menzies, *Development*, for a thorough presentation using primary sources.
17. See Roger Stronstad, *Spirit, Scripture and Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective* (Baguio, Philippines: APTS Press, 1995), pp. 79-98, for his discussion of the New Testament personalities who encountered the Spirit. Luke describes them as being filled with the Spirit. Stronstad, p. 98, concludes that the filling of the Spirit refers to the characterization of a prophetic role or an expression of "prophetic speech."
18. See R. Menzies, *Empowered*, pp. 250-51.
19. R. Menzies, *Empowered*, p. 251, contends that "tongues-speech uniquely 'fits the bill' because of its intrinsically demonstrative character." He notes that in Acts 2:4-5, 17-20; 10:46, 45-48 the manifestation of tongues is compatible with Luke's pneumatological outlook in general. He also asserts that the "emphasis on the sign value of tongues-speech is rooted in Luke's prophetic pneumatology." Does this not, however, open up the possibility that both tongues and prophecy - both are forms of Spirit-inspired speech - might serve as the accompanying sign of Spirit-baptism? In Menzies' perspective, the pneumatology of Luke-Acts suggests that every inspired speech is prophetic, whether tongues or intelligible prophesies. Tongues, as a kind of prophetic manifestation, fits into the larger category of Spirit-inspired speech. Cf. Part II of R. Menzies, *Empowered*.
20. A Pentecostal apology is well represented in the classic work of Carl Brumback, "What Meaneth This?": *A Pentecostal Answer to a Pentecostal Question* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1947).
21. A good book representing the Pentecostal defense of tongues is Robert Chandler Dalton, *Tongues Like As of Fire: A Critical Study of Modern Tongue Movements in the Light of Apostolic and Patristic Times* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1945).
22. Note the classic work of James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970), and the issues raised by Gordon D. Fee, "Hermeneutics and Historical Precedent-A Major Problem in Pentecostal Hermeneutics," in *Perspectives on the New Pentecostalism*, ed. R. P. Spittler (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1976), pp. 118-32.
23. A good example of this debate is the discussion of Menzies with M. Turner concerning the nature of the Spirit's work in Luke-Acts. Here Menzies continues to maintain that the Spirit in Luke-Acts is basically a prophetic Spirit and that "miraculous activity" is more loosely connected to the Spirit than "inspired speech." Menzies insists that the Spirit is the sole origin of prophetic activity, while *dunamis* is used as an important qualifying term with reference to miracles. See Robert P. Menzies, "Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts: A Response to Max Turner," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 49 (1993), pp. 11-20.
24. See also Fee, *Gospel*, pp. 96-98, 110.
25. Hence, Fee's critique of our Pentecostal method of interpretation is significant. His analysis of our position as an insider helps us to listen, change, and grow; but not compromise our distinctive.
26. Fee, *Gospel*, p. ix, negatively remarks:  
...I am convinced the present generation of Pentecostals has almost altogether abandoned its historic roots.... When the Pentecostals joined the National Association of Evangelicals, an erosion took place in the area of church and ministry that is bidding fair to destroy the very thing that God the Holy Spirit created in the first place.
27. Daniel L. Espiritu, "A Case For Hans-Georg Gadamer's Hermeneutical Description" (MA Thesis, Baguio, Philippines: Saint Louis University, 1997), p. x, finds that:  
Underlying Filipino conservative Evangelical hermeneutics are some philosophical presuppositions inherited from Western Evangelicals. In addition to presuppositions, religious aims direct Evangelical hermeneutics. Furthermore, the investigation revealed that Evangelicals study the Bible with their concerns in view; they always attempt to mediate the texts with the present questions and problems.

28. Cf. Emerito P. Nacpil, "The Critical Asian Principle," in *What Asian Christians Are Thinking*, ed. Douglas J. Elwood (Quezon City, Philippines: New Day, 1976), pp. 3-6.
29. "The Task of Theology in the Asian Churches," in *Asian Voices in Christian Theology*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976), p. vii.
30. It is sad to observe that the classic work of W. J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals: The Charismatic Movement in the Churches*, trans. R. A. Wilson (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1972), pp. 66-67, has "very little" to say about the Pentecostals in Asia.
31. Wonsuk Ma, "Toward an Asian Pentecostal Theology," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 1 (1998), p. 28.
32. John C. England, "Doing Christian Theology in Asian Ways," in *Doing Christian Theology in Asian Ways*, eds. Alan J. Torrance and Salvador T. Martinez, ATESEA Occasional Papers 12 (Singapore: ATESEA, 1993), pp. 66-67.
33. See Yusak Tridarmanto, "Using Folklore as a Way of Doing Theology," in *Doing Christian Theology in Asian Ways*, pp. 12-23. See also Ian S. Williams, "Doing Theology With Asian Folk Resources," in *Doing Theology with Cultures of Asia*, ed. Yeow Choo Lak, ATESEA Occasional Papers 6 (Singapore: ATESEA, 1988), pp. 110-15.
34. Cf. Archie C. C. Lee, "Prophetic and Sapiential Hermeneutics in Asian Ways of Doing Theology," in *Doing Christian Theology in Asian Ways*, pp. 1-3, as he deals with the issue of "text, context and hermeneutics" in an Asian setting.
35. Cf. See how Fee, *Gospel*, pp. 100-104, critically assesses his dialogue with William Menzies and Roger Stronstad concerning the issue of Lukan narrative as "didactic." This shows how western Pentecostals are engrossed with the issue of "Lukan intentionality" in relation to the Pentecostal claim. This concern has been inherited by Asian Pentecostal thought. R. Menzies has entered in and contributed to this same dialogue. Asian Pentecostals should observe and learn from this kind of dialogue. Nevertheless, Asian Pentecostals might constructively choose to pursue another direction as they seek to articulate a Pentecostal theology.
36. Fee, *Gospel*, pp. xi-xii.
37. The theological perspective of the Third Wave Movement is clearly represented in Gary S. Greig and Kevin N. Springer, eds., *The Kingdom and the Power: Are Healing and the Spiritual Gifts Used by Jesus and the Early Church Meant for the Church Today?* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 1993).
38. See for example Rodney L. Henry, *Filipino Spirit World: A Challenge to the Church* (Manila: OMF Literature, 1986).
39. Cf. Ma, pp. 26ff.
40. In Yeow Choo Lak's "Preface" to John C. England and Alan J. Torrance, eds., *Doing Theology with the Spirit's Movement in Asia*, ATESEA Occasional Papers 11 (Singapore: ATESEA, 1991), p. vi. See also the fine articles in this particular volume.
41. Nacpil, "The Critical Asian Principle," p. 5; cf. Gerald H. Anderson, "Introduction," in *Asian Voices in Christian Theology*, pp. 3-9, for his discussion of the trend in Asian theology to be relevant to the pertinent issues of the region.
42. Cf. Koichi Kitano, "Spontaneous Ecumenicity Between Catholics and Protestants in the Charismatic Movement: A Case Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, Manila: Centro Escolar University, 1981), p. 30.
43. The anti-Pentecostal/Charismatic attitude of the NACE is illustrated by the January-February 1995 issue of the *Evangelical Life International Magazine*. It is ironic, however, that the front-page feature story entitled, "Heaven's Gardener," treats the popular Pentecostal radio evangelist, Rev. Proceso S. Marcelo. Whether the editorial staff of the magazine were making a mockery, or whether they simply did not know that Rev. Marcelo of the *Hardin ng Panalangin* radio program was a *bona fide* Assemblies of God minister is hard to judge. The three primary works written against tongues which appear in this issue are that of Gadiel T. Isidro, "Tongues Have Ceased," pp. 9-11; Merle R. Ruth, "The Gift of Tongues and Its Supposed Reappearance," pp. 12-15; and Fred G. Saure, "Speaking in Tongues: Three Positions," pp. 16-19. These disappointing articles miss the pertinent issues raised by the current Pentecostal/ Charismatic revival in the Philippines.
44. Kitano, p. 29, notes that "[t]he term, Evangelicals, refers to those Protestants who: repudiate Roman Catholic polity, liturgies, piety, and doctrine, and at least used to regard the Roman Catholic Church as the Anti-Christ...."
45. Kitano, p. 29. Note Kitano's thorough sociological research concerning Roman Catholics, mainline Protestants and Classical Pentecostals in the Charismatic movement in the Philippines in the 1970s.
46. See chapter 5 of Kitano, pp. 202-20.
47. Kitano, pp. 202-20.
48. Kitano, p. 231.
49. See Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., "The Assemblies of God and Ecumenical Cooperation: 1920-1965," in *Pentecostalism in Context*, pp. 144ff, for his assessment of the Assemblies of God's attempt to be fully accepted by the Evangelicals and their repudiation of the effective ministry of Du Plessis in bringing the Pentecostal message to non-Evangelicals.
50. See Russell P. Spittler, "Du Plessis, David Johannes (1905-87)," *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, eds. S. M. Burgess, G. B. McGee and P. H. Alexander (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), pp. 252-53.
51. William W. Menzies, "Reflections of a Pentecostal at the End of the Millennium: An Editorial Essay," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 1 (1998), p. 11.
52. Vinson Synan, "A Tribute to Mr. Pentecost," *Charisma* 12 (April 1987), p. 22.
53. David J. Du Plessis as told to Bob Slosser, *A Man Called Mr. Pentecost* (Plainfield, NJ: Logos, 1977), p. 245. Killian McDonnell, a Roman Catholic priest and theologian, quoted by Synan, p. 23, states: "(Du Plessis') life is a witness that ecumenism means change, but it does not mean compromise. He prayed, he learned, he grew, he changed, but he did not compromise. We praise the Lord for the life and witness of this small giant."
54. See Spittler, p. 252; also Synan, p. 23.
55. See Kitano, pp. 193-201.
56. See Kitano, pp. 232-34.

57. I have spoken with Rev. Dionson concerning his ministry in Cebu and his work among the Catholics on several occasions.
58. See Kitano, p. 40. I have heard reports concerning Rev. Cruz' ministry among the Catholics.
59. Cf. Jerry L. Sandidge, "Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue: A Contribution to Christian Unity," *Pneuma* 7 (1985), pp. 41-60.
60. Kitano, pp. 238-39.
61. Emerito P. Nacpil, "Philippines: A Gospel for the New Filipino," in *Asian Voices in Christian Theology*, p. 117.
62. See Vinson Synan, "The Role of Tongues as Initial Evidence," *World Pentecost* 52 (Spring 1997), pp. 9-10, 15-17.
63. Synan, "The Role of Tongues," pp. 16-17.
64. R. Menzies, *Empowered*, pp. 244-55.
65. R. Menzies, *Empowered*, pp. 244-55.
66. See R. Menzies, pp. 120-21 for his discussion of "The Synthetic Task." He points out that the doctrine of "evidential tongues" does "retain a biblical sense of expectancy." See also pp. 122-23 for his "Conclusion: A Strategy for the Future."
67. William W. Menzies, "The Methodology of Pentecostal Theology: An Essay on Hermeneutics," in *Essays on Apostolic Themes: Studies in Honor of Howard M. Ervin*, ed. Paul Elbert (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985), pp. 1-14.
68. W. Menzies, "The Methodology of Pentecostal Theology," pp. 4-14.
69. W. Menzies, "The Methodology of Pentecostal Theology," pp. 4-14.
70. See Kitano, pp. 1-5, 13-14, 28, 80-86, 235-239, etc.
71. A thorough critique of R. Menzies' thesis, which views Luke's pneumatology in terms of prophetic empowering, has been presented by Max Turner, "The Spirit in Luke-Acts: A Support or a Challenge to Classical Pentecostal Paradigms?" *Vox Evangelica* 27 (1997), pp. 75-101. Against R. Menzies, Turner argues that the "soteriological" and "ethical" dimension of the Spirit is included in the "prophetic" character of Luke's pneumatology. Turner, following James Dunn, affirms that Luke links the Spirit to "a theologically unified conversion-initiation complex." Thus, he finds no support in Luke-Acts for the Pentecostal understanding of baptism in the Spirit as an experience subsequent to conversion.
72. See for example W. Menzies, "The Methodology," pp. 1-14, who highlights the "verificational" or experiential layer of interpretation. For Pentecostals, the issue of evidential tongues is not only a biblical doctrine, but also an experiential phenomenon.
73. Three recent theses produced by Filipino Pentecostals build upon the work of R. Menzies. See Joseph Rommel L. Suico, "A Strategy of Social Action: A Filipino Pentecostal Perspective" (Th.M. thesis, Baguio, Philippines: Asia Graduate School of Theology, 1993); Nelson P. Estrada, "A Redaction Critical Study on the Relationship of Spirit, Proclamation, and Miracle-Working Power in Luke-Acts" (Th.M. thesis, Manila: Asia Graduate School of Theology, 1994); Roli G. dela Cruz, "Anointed to Proclaim Christ: The Implications of Luke's Use of Joel 2:28-32 in Acts 2 for the Eschatological Mission of the Philippines General Council of the Assemblies of God" (Th.M. thesis, Baguio Philippines: Asia Baptist Graduate Theological Seminary, 1995).
74. This sentiment is well reflected in my "Anointed to Proclaim Christ."