

**A Critical Study of the Doctrine of Impartation in
the Church of God Denomination**

by

Billy Darrell Bewley

for

the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Theology

at the

South African Theological Seminary

Supervisor: Dr. C. W. T. Joubert

May 2020

Declaration

I hereby acknowledge that the work contained in this dissertation is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted to any academic institution for degree purposes.

Billy Darrell Bewley
Chattanooga, TN, USA
May 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

One does not complete a task of this magnitude without assistance, and while there are numerable persons who have provided support and encouragement during the writing of the dissertation, I am particularly grateful to the following people:

- My wife Phyllis for her persistent love, patience and the time she sacrificed when we could have been together during the process of my research.
- My children and grandchildren for their devotion and understanding.
- My supervisor Dr Callie Joubert. His patience, scholarly insight and academic guidance have been invaluable to me.
- Drs Reuben van Rensburg, Kevin Smith, and Johannes Malherbe for their assistance throughout the writing of the dissertation. It is an honor to have been afforded the opportunity to pursue my research project through SATS.
- The members of Grace Point Church for their support and financial partnership.
- The staff at Dixon Pentecostal Research Center for the use of their facilities and resources.
- Dr Russell Morris and Dr Tony Richie and Sue Richie for their unceasing encouragement without which this dissertation would not have been completed.

Billy Darrell Bewley

May, 2020

ABSTRACT

Research reveals that many of the major pentecostal denominations as well as the Church of God accept impartation as a biblical doctrine and practices it in assembly meetings. However, there is some definite inconsistency in how the term ‘impartation’ is understood which has created controversy among church leaders. The problem surrounding the doctrine relates to two main areas: (1) the theoretical, which refers to an unbiblical understanding of the doctrine, and (2) the practical, and that is the manner in which impartation is practiced in the churches. In other words, there is strong indication that the doctrine of impartation although practiced has not been given adequate theological and/or hermeneutical attention. The Greek word for impart is *metadidomi*, which means to ‘give over, to give a share’. Consequently, some pentecostals and charismatics incorrectly view *metadidomi* to mean the ability to transfer one’s own anointing and/or spiritual gift/gifts to another person or persons. Also problematic is the unscriptural bias towards the impartation of extraordinary gifts over and above those gifts considered to be ordinary. This, in turn, has led some to conclude that the definition of impartation has become so hermeneutically skewed and misunderstood that it consequently distorts the nature and intention of God’s gifts. The findings of this study reveal that although impartation is a valid biblical doctrine, there is no evidence to support the view that believers can seek impartations from the dead, initiate healings and blessings at will or volitionally impart their spiritual gifts and anointings to other persons. Rather, the study reveals that all gifts are spiritual in origin and available for impartation, that God imparts His gifts and blessings sovereignly, and may alternatively use human intermediary assistance to impart through the laying on of hands, spoken words and acts of service. The study attempts to formulate a correct biblical understanding of the doctrine of impartation and provides a biblical model of impartation that can be considered for adoption and implementation by Pentecostalism and, more specifically, the Church of God.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.	Background	1
2.	The main problems and research question	7
3.	Research Question	11
4.	The Objectives	11
4.1	Main objective	11
4.2	Subsidiary objectives	11
5.	Overall Purpose and Value of the Study	11
6.	Delimitations	12
7.	Research Design and Methodology	12
8.	Conclusion	17

CHAPTER 2: THE DOCTRINE OF IMPARTATION AND THE CHURCH OF GOD: A CRITICAL EVALUATION

1.	Introduction	18
2.	Overview of Pentecostalism	19
3.	The Birth of the Church of God Denomination	21
4.	Theoretical Affirmations of the Church of God	22
5.	Current Hermeneutical Understanding of Impartation	24
5.1	The definition of impartation: Pastoral perspective	25
5.2	The definition of impartation: Leadership perspective	28
5.3	The definition of impartation: The educator perspective	33
6.	The Church of God's Developing Theology of Impartation: Historical Development and Current Practice	37
6.1	The baptism in the Holy Spirit	38
6.2	Current understanding and practice of the doctrine of impartation and Holy Spirit baptism	43
6.3	The biblical-theological understanding of Holy Spirit baptism and the doctrine of impartation	48
7.	Impartation and Spiritual Gifts in the Church of God	49

7.1	Historical understanding of the relationship between the Doctrine of impartation and spiritual gifts	49
7.2	Current understanding of the relationship between the Doctrine of impartation and spiritual gifts	51
7.3	The biblical-theological understanding of the doctrine of Impartation and spiritual gifts	52
8.	Impartation and divine healing in the Church of God	55
8.1	Historical understanding of the relationship between the Doctrine of impartation and divine healing	57
8.2	The current understanding of the doctrine of impartation and divine healing	59
8.3	The biblical-theological understanding of divine healing and the doctrine of impartation	61
9.	Impartation and Blessings in the Church of God	63
9.1	Historical understanding of the doctrine of impartation and blessing	63
9.2	Current understanding of the doctrine of impartation and blessing	65
9.3	The biblical-theological understanding of blessing and the doctrine of impartation	66
10.	Summary and Concluding Remarks	68

CHAPTER 3: AN ANALYSIS OF ROMANS 1:11

1.	Introduction	72
2.	Aim or objectives of the author	73
2.1	The author	74
2.2	The audience	74
2.3	The context	75
3.	An analysis of the Anchor Text: Romans 1:11	76
3.1	The implication of Paul's impartation	78
3.2	The recipients of the impartation	80
3.3	The means of imparting spiritual gifts	82
3.4	The gifts to be imparted	87
3.5	The purpose for the impartation	96
4.	The Anchor Text and the Church of God	98

4.1	Hermeneutical models and the Church of God	99
4.2	Hermeneutical assessment	103
4.3	Hermeneutics and the current understanding	106
5.	A comparison of the Anchor Text and the Church of God's Doctrine of Impartation	107
6.	A Comparison of Supporting or Developing Texts and the Church of God's Understanding of Impartation	109
6.1	<i>Metadidomi</i> in Romans 12:6-8	109
6.2	<i>Metadidomi</i> in Luke 3:11	113
6.3	<i>Metadidomi</i> in Ephesians 4:28	114
6.4	<i>Metadidomi</i> in 1 Thessalonians 2:8	116
6.5	1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6	117
6.6	Hebrews 6:1-2	120
6.7	Acts 6:6 and 13:3	121
7.	Strategies to Hermeneutically Defend and Define Impartation	124
8.	Summary and Concluding Remarks	127

CHAPTER 4: CURRENT THEOLOGICAL AND DOCTRINAL VIEWS ON IMPARTATION: A CRITICAL REVIEW

1.	Introduction	130
2.	Eddie Rogers	130
2.1	Roger's view of impartation through association	133
2.2	Roger's view of impartation through prophecy	134
2.3	Roger's view of impartation through the laying on of hands	134
2.4	Roger's view of impartation through giving and receiving money	136
2.5	Roger's view of impartation through intimacy	138
3.	Phillip Rich	140
3.1	Rich's view of impartation and covenant relationships	140
3.2	Rich's view of impartation through perception and reception	141
3.3	Rich's view of impartation and spiritual fathers	143
3.4	Rich's view of impartations and the five-fold ministry	144
4.	Ervin Budiselić	148
4.1	Introduction to the problem	148
4.2	Defining impartation	149

4.3	Conceptual implications of impartation	150
4.4	Impartation in Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14	151
5.	Paul Goulet	160
5.1	Impartation defined	161
5.2	Impartation in the ministry of Jesus	162
5.3	Impartation in the life of the believer	163
6.	Michael Chung	174
6.1	Impartation defined	175
6.2	Paul's practice of impartation	176
6.3	Chung's view of Paul's methods of impartation	177
7.	Randy Clark	186
7.1	The definition and biblical foundation of impartation	187
7.2	Impartation and blessing	191
7.3	The impartation of healing	193
7.4	The impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit	195
7.5	The impartation of spiritual gifts	197
7.6	The receiving of impartations	199
7.7	The purpose of impartations	201
8.	Summary and Concluding Remarks	203

CHAPTER 5: AN INDUCTIVE STUDY OF THE INFORMING TEXTS

1.	Introduction	206
2.	Impartation of Anointing and Spiritual Gifts	206
2.1	Impartation and the elders in Numbers 11:16-17, 24-25	207
2.2	Joshua's impartation in Numbers 27:18-23	210
2.3	Joshua's impartation in Deuteronomy 34:9	214
2.4	Elisha's impartation in 2 Kings 2:9-15	216
3.	The Impartation of Blessing	219
3.1	The blessing of Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3	220
3.2	Melchizedek and blessing in Genesis 14:18-20	221
3.3	Priestly blessing in Leviticus 9:22; Numbers 6:22-27	222
3.4	The family blessing in Genesis 27:21-41, 48:1-20, 49:1-27	224
3.5	Blessing children (Matt 19:13-15, Mark 10:13-16, Luke 18:15-17)	227

3.6	The impartation of blessing in Luke 24:50-51	229
3.7	Blessing in Matthew 5:44, James 3:8-10 and 1 Peter 3:9	230
4.	Impartation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit	232
4.1	Impartation of the Holy Spirit in Joel 2:28-29	232
4.2	Impartation of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament	234
5.	Impartation and Divine Healing	247
5.1	God as Healer in Exodus 15:26 and Psalms 103:3	247
5.2	God as Healer in Isaiah 53:4-5	248
5.3	Examples of impartational healings in the Old Testament	249
5.4	Impartational healings in the New Testament	252
6.	Summary and Concluding Remarks	257

CHAPTER 6: A THEOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS OF THE TEXTS

1.	Introduction	259
2.	A summary of the Theology of Impartation in Romans 1:11	259
3.	The Biblical Precedent for Paul's Impartational Theology	261
4.	The Spiritual Qualities Required for Impartations	262
5.	Biblical Gifts Imparted by Paul	265
6.	Diversity in the Operation of Gifts	265
6.1	Similarities of gifts in the Old and New Testaments	266
6.2	The <i>pneumatika</i> in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11	266
6.3	The <i>charismata</i> in Romans 12:6-8	268
6.4	The <i>domata</i> in Ephesians 4:8-11	272
7.	Biblical Methods Used in Impartation	276
7.1	Impartations and the sovereignty of God	276
7.2	Impartation through spoken words	276
7.3	Impartation through the laying on of hands	277
7.4	Impartation through acts of service	277
8.	The Biblical Model of Impartation in the Church of God: Consistencies and Inconsistencies	278
9.	Summary and Concluding Remarks	282

CHAPTER 7: THE CONTEMPORARY SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

1.	Introduction	284
2.	An argument for the Contemporary Practice of Impartation	284
2.1	The contemporary significance of Holy Spirit Baptism	285
2.2	The contemporary significance of spiritual gifts	286
2.3	The contemporary significance of healing	287
2.4	The contemporary significance of blessing	288
3.	What is spiritual impartation?	290
4.	What are the scriptural guidelines for the practice of impartation?	291
4.1	The recipients of impartations	292
4.2	The means of impartations	292
5.	Which Biblical Impartations are Valid for Continual Practice and How are They to be Understood	297
5.1	The baptism in the Holy Spirit	297
5.2	<i>Pneumatika, charismata, and domata</i> gifts	299
5.3	Divine healing	300
5.4	Blessing	301
6.	The Meaning of Impartations for the Believer	302
7.	Steps to Discourage the Abuse of the Doctrine of Impartation	303
7.1	Impartation of blessings and gifts: A legitimate biblical practice	304
7.2	The relevancy of imparted gifts for believers	304
7.3	Imparted gifts and ministry to others	304
7.4	Doctrinal practice and Biblical reproof	304
7.5	Impartation and scriptural accountability	305
8.	Overview and Summary of the Study	306
9.	Suggested Future Research	312
	Bibliography	313

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The theological doctrine of impartation, its biblical meaning and understanding, has been perceived by many Bible commentators, expositors and Christians in general as synonymous with Pentecostalism.¹ In addition, the doctrine is not only considered as a 'major theme of the Pentecostal message' (Clark 2013:47), but also as the core doctrine of revivalism within the pentecostal and charismatic movements (Bay and Martinez 2015). Research reveals that five of the major pentecostal denominations as well as the Church of God accept impartation officially as a biblical doctrine and a common practice (Kay 2011:2).² By 'practice' is meant prayer and impartations by the laying on of hands that are often provided to members during church services and those who attend conferences.

Research reveals that none of those who are ministered to and were questioned about their understanding of the meaning of impartation could provide a well-formulated statement explaining either the doctrine or the practice. Furthermore, there exists a complete lack of uniformity in the

¹ Pentecostalism is used here to include, Classical pentecostals, charismatics, and the Third Wave movement. Although they often disagree in theology, some, when discussing pentecostal beliefs, differentiate between the three sub-groups. For most people these groups fall under the same umbrella (Grudem 1996; Hanegraaff 2001; MacArthur 1992; McConnell 1995; Yun 2003).

² These are the denominations that participated in a six question survey: Church of God in Christ, Memphis, Tennessee; Assemblies of God, Springfield, Missouri; Church of God, Cleveland, Tennessee; International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, Los Angeles, California; International Pentecostal Holiness Church, Bethany, Oklahoma; Pentecostal Church of God, Bedford, Texas. Those who participated in the survey and phone interviews spoke from their own theological, doctrinal understanding, what they believe and have experienced within their respective denominations. Their viewpoints are considered as a fair representation of their constituency. However, it is not to suggest that they are representative of the theology of every pastor and member within their churches. For example, The General Overseer of the Church of God of Prophecy, Cleveland, Tennessee, chose not to participate in the survey.

manner and frequency in which the doctrine is taught by preachers, including inconsistency in the language used when talking about impartation. Whereas some preachers rarely use the terminology of impartation in formal communication, others tend to overemphasise it. For instance, it is the opinion of Elder Oscar Owens Jr., Christian Education Minister and Bible College President of the West Angeles Church of God in Christ, that the terminology of impartation is rarely used in the Church of God in Christ, and although not frequently articulated, it is a very common phenomenon in church services.³ Doug Beacham, presiding Bishop of the International Pentecostal Holiness Church, shared similar thoughts. It thus appears that ministers are not hesitant to use the terminology of impartation at all. Part of the explanation of this anomaly can be contributed to a habit or tradition that has taken a certain terminology for granted by ministers of the denominations in general, but more specifically, by those of the Church of God.⁴

Sterling Brackett, Corporate Secretary of The Foursquare Church, claims that there is a strong emphasis on the laying on of hands and referred to a recent impartation service in support of the claim.⁵ General Bishop Loyd Naten of the Pentecostal Church of God confirmed the practice, and although admitting that it is not a regular occurrence, he has prayed for people and considers the gifts manifested to be the work of the Holy Spirit.⁶ Mark Williams, a former General Overseer of the Church of God, admitted that the term 'impartation' is heard from time to time during meetings, usually when needs arise for anointing, Spirit baptism or when a change in leadership occurs. He adds that at times 'impartation' has been used at funerals and believers expecting that a transfer of the deceased's anointing to someone else or to the next generation would occur.⁷

³ Taken from a questionnaire survey and phone interview on 8 July 2016.

⁴ Taken from a questionnaire survey and phone interview on 7 July 2016.

⁵ Taken from a questionnaire survey and phone interview on 11 July 2016.

⁶ Taken from a questionnaire survey and phone interview on 2 August 2016.

⁷ Taken from a questionnaire survey and phone interview on 22 June 2016 and 14 July 2016.

While there is some definite inconsistency in how the term 'impartation' is understood, a consensus is clearly centred in the practice of the doctrine and the use of the term. All of the individuals spoken to recalled occasions involving ministry such as the laying on of hands by pastors/leaders during the ordination of ministers, prayer for healing and for receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit. Most importantly, there is wide agreement on their theology of the Holy Spirit: they believe the Holy Spirit, His gifts, healing and other spiritual blessings can be imparted by the laying on of hands and prayer.

However, they were also quick to add the same disclaimer: it is God who does the work. In different words, the anointed vessel (the minister) is used as a 'vehicle' in the act of impartation, but the bestowal comes through grace and is the initiative of a sovereign God who chooses the time, place, and manner through which gifts, healing or other blessings are received. Or, as pointedly stated by George Wood, General Superintendent of the Assemblies of God, which is also the largest pentecostal denomination in the world, 'In the apostolic movement there is the idea of a magical transmission from one to another; I don't agree with that'.⁸

In light of the research conducted, it is reasonable to conclude that the ministry of impartation is an established theological doctrine in the Church of God as well as in other prominent denominations in Pentecostalism. Yet, each of the persons that were interviewed was careful how they articulated what they consider to be the most appropriate hermeneutical understanding of the doctrine. While many endorse impartation as a biblical and spiritual practice, others do not in order to avoid controversy. Historical and contemporary evidence exists that substantiates these concerns inside as well as outside Pentecostalism. For example, BB Warfield (1918:21-22) argued that the charismata belonged to the era of the apostles and constituted one of the signs of an apostle. However, he added that 'there is no instance on

⁸ Phone interview on 23 June 2016.

record of their conference by the laying on of the hands of anyone else than an Apostle'. John MacArthur (1992:77) states that the common practice of 'being slain in the spirit' through the laying on of hands or going into a trance by the touch of someone considered to be a transmitter of divine power 'has more in common with occultism than with anything biblical'. Bay and Martinez (n.d.), suggest that the belief is unbiblical and the practice is often associated with questionable manifestations that create confusion. Others who share concern are Grudem (1996), Hanegraaff (2001), McConnell (1995) and Yun (2003).

Much of the controversy about the doctrine of impartation in churches not classified as pentecostal or charismatic involves the question of whether the continuation of the Spirit's gifts is taught in the Scriptures. Randy Clark (2013), for example, is a major proponent of the doctrine of impartation.⁹ However, in his book, *There is More!*, he questions whether a biblical precedent exists to teach impartations of an anointing of the Spirit as has been the tradition within the orthodox Pentecostal Christian heritage, or whether the doctrine is just a bizarre blip on the screen of time. He states that 'questions about impartation stir up a whole range of opinions and cause controversy that still swirls around today's renewal movement' (p. 15). Clark is just one example that is illustrative of the controversy between cessationists such as Gaffin (1996), MacArthur (1992), Stitzinger (2003), Thomas (2003) and Warfield (1918) and those who subscribe to the pentecostal doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the continuation of spiritual gifts such as Archer (2009), Deere (1993), Fee (1991), Macchia (2006), Menzies and Horton (1993), Ruthven (2008), Tipei (2009) and Wagner (2006).¹⁰

⁹ Clark is the founder of Global Awakening, which is a teaching, healing, and impartation ministry across denominational barriers and is very successful among pentecostals and evangelicals.

¹⁰ The proponents of cessation do not argue against believers being empowered by the Holy Spirit. Their argument is that the experience of the Holy Spirit with the gift of tongues as recorded in Acts 2 and thereafter was unique and not to be taken as normative for today. Nor do they contend that all miracles and gifts of the Spirit have ceased. The question for them is not in the validity of spiritual gifts, or the possibility of miracles, but which of those gifts continue today and are miracles performed in the same manner with the same miraculous phenomena as experienced by the early church and

Just as important as the theoretical understanding of impartation in this controversy is the practical aspect, for example, the manifestations of the Spirit's gifts in church meetings. Farnell (2003:235) states, 'Throughout church history, the nature and practice of spiritual gifts have acted as a proverbial lightning rod for controversy'. Many of the cessationists' arguments seem to stem from what they believe as aberrant manifestations and experiential abuse. It suffices to say, the legacy of Pentecostalism has been one of tension between a valid and invalid biblical doctrine of impartation and between order and disorder in church meetings.

A comparable experience involving this theological tension arose within the Assemblies of God during the 1940's (AOG: 2015). The doctrine became so contentious that the denomination faced a near division because of it. The teaching and practice was connected to a movement called 'New Order of the Latter Rain' and the misuse of prophecy connected with the laying on of hands. General Superintendent, Ernest Williams (1949:5-13), in an issue of the *Pentecostal Evangel*, addressed the problem. He wrote, 'concerning the nine gifts spoken of in 1 Corinthians 12, if you will carefully read the account I think you will discern that they each come from God's sovereign bestowment; I do not find any record where they are to be bestowed by means of an intermediate channel'.

Added to this were other problematic doctrinal issues related to impartation that needed to be addressed. A response in a 1949 General Presbytery Committee report labelled the practice as a departure from biblical teaching. Subsequently, a resolution of disapproval was adopted in which the following errors related to impartation were specified: (1) the overemphasis relative to imparting, identifying, bestowing or confirmation of gifts by the laying on of hands and prophecy, (2) the erroneous teaching concerning the impartation of the gifts of languages as special equipment for missionary service, and (3) the extreme and

as delineated in 1 Corinthians 12:9-10 (Gaffin 1996:30-42; MacArthur 1992:220-230; Saucy 1996:98-100; Warfield 1918:21-27).

unscriptural practice of imparting or imposing personal guidance by means of the gifts of utterance. Following a brief debate, the resolution was passed and welcomed by an 'overwhelming majority' (AOG 2015; Bay and Martinez 2015). However, the attempt to bring about a more perspicuous view of the doctrine among leaders resulted in the separation of several of them and their churches from the Assemblies of God (Graves 2016:29; Riss 1987:127-128).

A similar statement was adopted by the General Presbytery on 11 August 2000 that was yet again aimed at questionable revival and impartational practices in the church. The response paper from the denomination's 'Commission on Doctrinal Purity' was presented to the General Presbytery and unanimously adopted. In the document, the Presbytery shared their desire not to quench or grieve the Holy Spirit, on the one hand. On the other hand, they expressed the need to adhere to Paul's admonition to 'Prove all things; [and to] hold fast that which is good' (1 Thess 5:19-20 KJV). Also included was the following statement:

The spiritual gifts are gifts of the Spirit, distributed as He "gives them to each one, just as he determines" (1 Cor 12:11). When the Spirit empowers the gift He bestows, there is no need for anyone to assume the Spirit's role. As the Holy Spirit inspires the operation of the gifts, the identification and confirmation will be obvious to all without assistance from humans who would share some of the glory...Paul says that gifts were bestowed through the laying on of hands (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6), but the biblical record neither names a specific gift Timothy received nor implies that Paul or elders had imparted the gift. The Holy Spirit bestows the gifts, not the minister who prays the prayer for empowerment (AOG 2016).

By way of summary, the brief background description of the understanding of the doctrine of impartation within Pentecostalism and the Church of God reveals several inconsistencies and misunderstandings of the doctrine, on both a theoretical and practical level. The excesses that are the consequences of the misunderstanding explain why cessationists and many other Christians within Pentecostalism deny that impartation is a biblical doctrine and, therefore,

choose to ignore it. It is for this very reason that the rest of the study will be dedicated to a critical analysis of the doctrine and its practice in the Church of God.

2. The Main Problems and Research Question

Although impartation is generally accepted as a valid biblical doctrine and a common practice by the Church of God, the problem with the doctrine relates to two main areas: (1) the theoretical, which refers to an unbiblical understanding of the doctrine, and (2) the practical, and that is the manner in which impartation is practiced in the churches. There is, as noted earlier, strong indication that the doctrine has not been given adequate theological and/or hermeneutical attention. In other words, although impartation has been taken for granted for many years, there has been little attempt to provide a correct biblical and theological understanding of the subject. For instance, none of the denominations that were surveyed have a formulated doctrinal statement that biblically represents their theological and ecclesiastical understanding of impartation. Also, none, with the exception of the Assemblies of God (2015; 2016), have a position paper¹¹ on the subject. This could indicate that there has been a lack of hermeneutical effort to present a concise teaching of the doctrine.

Thus, in order to help correct this state of affairs, the study focuses on the role of God and Christians in impartation and attempts to correct faulty traditional and habitual practices as well as identifying and clarifying many of the scriptural grounds of the doctrine; for example, the general notion that ministers can act in the place of the sovereign God and impart gifts and blessings at will, that Christians can seek impartations from the dead¹² and, that through impartation, one is able to receive deification (Hanegraaff 2009:29, 48-51; McConnell 1995:16-20).

¹¹ This position paper can be accessed through their international website under 'Beliefs'. It addresses concerns related to impartation and the 'Latter Rain Movement', but does not treat the doctrine with serious hermeneutical intent.

¹² This practice of impartation has been associated with Benny Hinn (Bay and Martinez 2015; Hanegraaff 2009:29). The confession came in a sermon entitled, *Double Portion*

However, those in Pentecostalism and specifically the Church of God have seemingly overlooked the need to properly address theoretical and practical problems through a coherent biblical and doctrinal agreement of the doctrine of impartation, which is largely connected to how it is defined. The Greek word for impartation is *metadidomi*, which means to 'give over' or 'to give a share' (Vine 1952:149). Richie,¹³ (2016) in a broader sense, defines the word thus:

A biblical and theological description of impartation suggests it is God's gracious gift, or charism, of the Holy Spirit's enabling influence and energy for the purposes of identifying, affirming, and equipping one's calling in Christ's service, and thus for the effective fulfilment of that divine vocation in accordance with God's Word and in keeping with the beliefs and values of God's Kingdom--and all to the glory and honour and praise of the Triune God.

Wuest's (1973, 1:21-22) suggestion, which is also that of Richie's (2016), is that impartation involves 'a favour received without merit on the recipient's part'. Wuest (1973,1:21) further suggests that Paul's terminology, namely, that he would like to impart 'some spiritual gift' (Rom 1:11), can also refer to the imparting of gifts considered 'ordinary' (Rom 5:15-16; 6:23) which would include the free gift of Christ and eternal life, and those gifts of grace given to strengthen others. In addition, Wuest views the impartation in a technical sense, as 'denoting extraordinary powers bestowed upon individuals by the Holy Spirit such as gifts of healing, speaking in tongues, prophecy, etc.' (ibid). Other gifts that may be given by impartation may include the bestowal of the gifts necessary for the office of an evangelist (2 Tim 1:6). In this sense the gifts that are imparted are tantamount to the confirmation of the believer's service. Cranfield (1975:78-79) and Fee (1987:587) agree with Wuest's

Anointing, part 3, audiotape #A031791-3, sides 1 and 2. It was aired on TBN on 7 April 1991. It has also been connected to Bill Johnson (2016a; 2016b), pastor of Bethel Church.

¹³ Tony Richie provided this definition via email on 22 August 2016 upon completion of a survey conducted on 29 June 2016 on the subject. He presently serves as a pastor in the Church of God and as Lecturer in Theology with the Pentecostal Theological Seminary.

understanding of impartation being both ordinary and technical, and as such as a gracious expression of divine favour.

From that point of view, the doctrine of impartation within Pentecostalism and specifically the Church of God appears to be scripturally valid. God does impart sovereignly as indicated in 1 John 2:27: 'But the anointing which you have received from Him abides in you' (NKJV);¹⁴ and in 1 Corinthians 12:11: 'But one and the same Spirit works all these things, distributing to each one individually as He wills'. Arrington (2016) indicates that this sovereign bestowal is exactly what can be inferred from Romans 1:11. God uses the Apostle Paul as an instrument but there can be no doubt that Paul understands that the Holy Spirit is the Source and Giver of spiritual gifts.

On the other hand, given that the meaning of *metadidomi* is to 'give over' or 'to give a share', some pentecostals/charismatics have hermeneutically embellished the definition. Among other things, the definition has come to mean the ability to transfer one's own anointing to another person or persons. Clark (2013:16) is illustrative of this position. He says that 'the best translation of the English word *impartation* is, in fact, the phrase "transference of the anointing"'. Put differently, it means the ability to transfer to others that which God has given sovereignly to a particular individual or that which has been given through other anointed vessels (Francis 2015). The implication of that definition has created concern among pentecostal leaders. In the words of Arrington (2016):

Some pentecostals understand that it means the ability to transfer from themselves to other believers a special anointing or gifts of the Spirit. This understanding has created fervent debate as to whether a Spirit-anointed believer is able to impart spiritual gifts or other spiritual blessings to fellow believers.

This, in turn, has led some to conclude that the definition of impartation has become so hermeneutically skewed and misunderstood that it

¹⁴ Hereafter, all Scripture references will be from the New King James Version (NKJV) unless otherwise noted.

consequently distorts the nature and intention of God's gifts (Arrington 2016; Bay and Martinez 2015; Budiselic 2011:246).

Although much emphasis has been placed on impartation of 'extraordinary' gifts such as the word of wisdom, the working of miracles, or the gift of faith, (1 Cor 12), Wuest (1973,1:21-22)¹⁵ also understands the meaning of *metadidomi* to include the 'ordinary' gifts that, according to Budiselic (2011:250) and Stitzinger (2003:174), can refer to those gracious gifts shared in the physical as well as spiritual realm (Rom 12:8), such as the sharing a coat (Luke 3:11), money (Eph 4:28) and sharing the gospel or one's soul (1 Thess 2:8).

These theological perceptions of and differences about the definition of *metadidomi* create questions that, when examined through careful hermeneutical methods, helps to address the problematic concerns as well as to formulate a doctrinal and positional statement on the doctrine of impartation for the Church of God. The suggested critical analysis is, therefore, aimed at addressing issues relevant to the doctrine, for example, the all-important question of whether it is a valid biblical doctrine. The analysis also anticipates and answers questions related to the role of God and the human person in impartation and determines precisely what is to be understood by 'impartation'.

In short, the purpose of this study is fulfilled in the critical investigation of the doctrine of impartation against the background of the problems highlighted in this section.

¹⁵ Wuest (1973, 1:21-22), as is also Cranfield (1975:78-79) and Morris (1988:60), is of the opinion that Paul's use of the word μεταδίδομι with *charisma* has a variety of meanings, for instance, man's soteriological needs (Rom 5:15-16, 6:23), the giving of gracious gifts (Rom 11:29) and an imparted individual gift for a special or specific purpose (Rom 12:6) or extraordinary gifts in general (1 Cor 12-14). However, for the purposes of the study, the use of 'ordinary' will refer to those imparted gifts not considered 'extraordinary' and due to the limited scope of the study will not be inclusive of every application of the word.

3. Research Question

The question chosen to guide this study is: What is the doctrine of impartation that the Church of God denomination should adopt from the Bible?

4. The Objectives

The study has one main objective and five subsidiary objectives.

4.1 Main objective

The main objective is to formulate a correct biblical understanding of the doctrine of impartation for the Church of God denomination.

4.2 Subsidiary objectives

The subsidiary objectives are as follows:

4.2.1 To determine the need to formulate a doctrinal position statement on impartation for the Church of God denomination that is theologically sound.

4.2.2 To offer a biblical foundation that defines *metadidomi* and the concept of impartation.

4.2.3 To present a critical review of the current theological and doctrinal views on impartation.

4.2.4 To complete an inductive study of specific biblical texts that will inform a contemporary understanding and practice of impartation in the Church of God.

4.2.5 To use the theoretical understanding of the doctrine to change the practice of impartation throughout the Church of God denomination.

5. Overall Purpose and Value of the Study

There is little question that the doctrine of impartation among pentecostals is regarded as an important part of what it means to be an

assembly of believers or a church in a certain locality. However, it is also a contentious theoretical and practical doctrine and was confirmed by the denominational leaders and pastors who were interviewed. Yet, it is a doctrine that has been given minimal hermeneutical attention for far too long. As indicated earlier, it is evident in the fact that no official doctrinal statement exists detailing a biblical understanding of impartation.

Formulating a biblical understanding of the doctrine provides at least the following three positive outcomes: (1) uniformity of understanding and teaching of the doctrine among the churches; (2) the prevention of excesses in practice; and most importantly, (3) a more concise understanding that contributes to defending the doctrine with greater thoroughness as well as defining the parameters for its use. It is the opinion that the study would make a significant contribution to both systematic theology and ecclesiology.

6. Delimitations

The study does not attempt to provide a critical analysis of every belief or expression related to the doctrine of impartation. To do so would be an insurmountable task. Instead, it focuses on specific tenets and practices associated with impartation.

The study is specifically limited to the Church of God denomination and Pentecostalism.

7. Research Design and Methodology

The approach that is followed in the proposed study is a literature study that employs Smith's (2008:183-201) generic systematic model. This model helps to establish an outline of the research by allowing for the introduction of the subject to be examined, the reason for it, and the means by which it is to be accomplished. Added to that is the emphasis on researching current views and beliefs advocated by key authors and their works. This aspect of Smith's systematic design allows for the presentation of definitions and a description of those views along with the

option of giving theological and scriptural rebuttal and proper critique. Since several sources are analysed based on multiple theological premises, Smith's (2008:189, 190) design that addresses current views, and a critique of scholars and their works, proves to be a favourable option.

The model's focus upon gathering and analysing all scriptural texts related to impartation in order to exegetically determine the possibilities of God's intended plan for application is viewed to be the most appropriate for the hermeneutical task. The alternate choice of anchor texts also assists in interpretative focus. For the purposes of the study, Romans 1:11 forms the anchor text. Establishing a biblical foundation for understanding the doctrine of impartation is then used as the basis for a critical evaluation of the Church of God denomination's theoretical understanding and practice of impartation. Since words of Scripture have power and are the primary source in the formulation of theology, the approach is also considered to be suitable to reveal hermeneutical strengths and weaknesses.

Smith's (2008:192) design encourages an inductive method that allows for all relevant texts related to the research topic to be gathered, examined and their contribution assessed. Then, by deduction, key propositional ideas can be isolated and used in the next key step, which is theory construction. Eventually this allows the study to flow into what has been labelled 'retroduction' or theory construction that helps to form a holistic picture of what the Bible teaches about the proposed doctrine (ibid, pp. 188-195). The final step explores the contemporary significance which helps with the needed assessment and the formulation of a doctrinal statement and position paper that could be used by pastors within the Church of God denomination if not also among other pentecostal churches.

Finally, what might be the most significant reason for choosing this model is the aspect of relevancy. It provides a means to address doctrinal and

practical aspects of impartation in order to make a difference within the Church of God denomination.

The main research method comprises a literature study in the field of systematic theology. The systematic examination of the doctrine of impartation draws upon literature that supports and opposes the doctrine, and the study is developed along the following steps.

Chapter 2: The first research objective of this study is to determine the need to formulate a doctrinal position on impartation for the Church of God denomination that is theologically sound. A critical evaluation of the understanding of impartation as it has evolved in the Church of God denomination will be conducted. First, attention will be paid to the birth of Pentecostalism and the Church of God. Second, the analysis focuses on the current theology of the doctrine of impartation within the Church of God denomination. Third, the analysis then moves to a brief historical review to provide clarity of the church's current doctrinal beliefs about impartation in order to show why those beliefs have largely been uncritically inherited from the past.

Chapter 3: The focus of this chapter is on the second subsidiary research objective, namely, to offer a biblical foundation of the concept of impartation. In this chapter an analysis on the anchor text (Rom 1:11) is conducted. First, attention is paid to how *metadidomi* is defined and what personal experience of the gifts of the Spirit has in contributing to an understanding of the concept of impartation. Second, since impartation involves much that is subjective and experiential, the focus will then shift to how the denomination has addressed positive and negative aspects of the doctrine as well as the steps taken to hermeneutically defend and define aberrant manifestations and abuses of the doctrine in practice.

Chapter 4: The focus of this chapter is on the third subsidiary research objective: to present a critical review of the current theological and doctrinal views on impartation. In this chapter a literature study will be conducted that maps the current theological and doctrinal views on

impartation. The writings of pastors, itinerant ministers and Christian organisational leaders are considered. Of the leaders considered, arguably the most prominent is Randy Clark (2013)¹⁶, for the following reasons. First, he is a major proponent of impartation. Second, a Church of God ordained bishop serves as Clark's executive administrator. Third, several Church of God leaders have attended his conferences and have adopted his understanding of impartation. Fourth, he is one of the few authors that have written an entire scholarly book on the subject. Fifth, Clark is an influential voice on the subject of impartation among pentecostals and charismatics in general. Finally, he is a highly popular conference speaker on the impartation of healing. His book, *There is More*, is compared with the impartation theology of the Church of God. This exercise helps in the assessment of doctrinal similarities and differences between the Church of God and other pentecostal churches, and by so doing, brings greater clarity to the beliefs and practices that need to be rejected or endorsed.

Chapter 5: The focus of this chapter is on the fourth subsidiary research objective, namely, to complete an inductive study of specific biblical texts that will inform a contemporary understanding and practice of impartation in the Church of God. This chapter comprises the gathering and exploration of biblical texts relating to impartation. All relevant Scriptures are examined and given consideration which includes the different contextual meanings that may have a bearing on the manner in which impartation is bestowed.¹⁷ The main objective is to assess the texts, deduct and analyse the key ideas related to the theology and to identify the methodology and the practice of impartation in context. The result is then used to assess whether the meaning of the texts can be used to

¹⁶ Clark was a key figure in the well-known 'Toronto Revival' which began during January 1994 and drew thousands of people and lasted for over 12 years. Clark's theology has been examined by Hanegraaff (2001:41-46), Budiselic (2011) and Scott (2012).

¹⁷Gen 12:1-3, 14:18-20, 27:21-41, 48:1-20, 49:1-27; Ex 15:26; Lev 9:22; Num 6:22-27, 11:16-25, 27:18-23; Deut 34:9; 1 Kgs 17:19-24, 4:17-35; 2 Kgs 2:9-15, 4:17-25, 5:1-27; Ps 103:3, 107:20; Isa 53:4-5; Joel 2:28-29; Matt 5:44, 8:5-13, 19:13-15; Mark 6:12-13, 10:13-16; Luke 7:1-10, 10:34, 18:15-17, 24:50-51; John 4:46-54, 11:1-44; Acts 2:1-4, 8:14-17, 9:17-19, 10:44-47, 19:1-6; Jas 3:8-10, 5:14-15.

endorse current interpretations and practices of impartation in the Church of God. To ensure that the biblical analysis will be adequate and successful, various commentaries, books, journal articles and theses will be used, including those that are not from a pentecostal perspective.

Chapter 6: The aim of this chapter is to focus on the fifth subsidiary research objective: to use the theoretical understanding of the doctrine to change the practice of impartation throughout the Church of God denomination. This chapter comprises a retroductional phase consisting of an examination of the key biblical ideas in order to formulate a theological synthesis of scriptural teaching and current practice. This helps to form a holistic picture or model of what biblical impartation should be, of how bestowal is to be understood and the kinds of impartations evident in Scripture. The model is then compared with the doctrine in the Church of God denomination in order to stipulate areas in which it is consistent or inconsistent with a sound biblical view of impartation.

Chapter 7: The final chapter comprises an analysis of the contemporary significance of the study and the aim is to determine whether impartation can be practiced in Pentecostalism and, more specifically, in the Church of God in accordance with biblical teaching. If so, then first, doctrinal and practical suggestions are proposed. Second, a sample of questions that are used to guide the proposal are questions such as the following: (1) what is spiritual impartation?; (2) what are the scriptural guidelines that serve as the basis for practice in the church or assembly?; (3) what biblical impartations are valid for practice and how are they to be understood?; (4) how should believers understand the meaning of impartations in their life?; and (5) what steps could be taken to discourage abuse of the doctrine of impartation? The chapter concludes with an overview and summary of the study and suggestions for future research.

8. Conclusion

This introductory chapter provides a brief background to the current understanding of the doctrine of impartation in the Church of God and it has been explained why it has become a problem. On the one hand, no uniform and/or consistent theological understanding of the doctrine exists among leaders and, on the other hand, highly questionable practices have taken root as a consequence of an inadequate biblical understanding of the doctrine. There is, therefore, only one solution, and that is to establish an adequate biblical understanding of impartation. Hence, the understanding of the doctrine in the Church of God is compared with that of the Bible in order to identify similarities and differences. Of consequence would be to develop a model and the formulation of a doctrinal position for adoption and implementation by all leaders of the Church of God denomination.

CHAPTER TWO

THE DOCTRINE OF IMPARTATION AND THE CHURCH OF GOD: A CRITICAL EVALUATION

1. Introduction

The focus in this chapter is on the first subsidiary objective, namely, to determine the need for a doctrinal position on impartation for the Church of God denomination that is theologically sound. The intent is to critically evaluate the understanding of the doctrine of impartation as it has evolved in the Church of God denomination. The doctrine's evolution originates from a desire to move beyond the declining religious climate of the 19th century and the influence of the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition (Conn 1979:27). The revivalistic and religious fervour of the latter group of believers was an almost irresistible alternative to those who found themselves opposing the formal worship and waning of spiritual vitality that characterised most churches of that day (Sims 1995:77). However, with the desired renewal came an increased activity of the Holy Spirit involving Spirit baptism with evidentiary tongues, spiritual gifts and divine healing. Moreover these unique experiences of the Spirit resulted in impartational issues that necessitated theological critique. That critique was not only needed during the early years of the church but also now, including a critique of how the doctrine is practiced. Thus, the discussion in this chapter will first focus on a brief historical review in order to provide clarity on the church's current doctrinal beliefs about impartation and to show why those beliefs have been uncritically inherited from the past. To accomplish the task, the review cannot be restricted to the denomination itself, but must also trace the origin of the notion of impartation, which is the biblical book of Acts. It will then focus on the Church of God denomination to indicate how the doctrine progressed to its current

acceptance in the Church of God denomination. The chapter will conclude with a brief overview and summary.

2. Overview of Pentecostalism

Pentecostalism as a movement identifies its origin with the Day of Pentecost as recorded in Acts 2, when the disciples and other believers were initially baptised with the Holy Spirit. This initial outpouring of the Spirit and subsequent Spirit baptisms in Acts have been adopted as the norm for members of the Church of God. However, the term 'Pentecostalism' was coined several centuries after the outpouring in Acts 2, and is today a term that is accepted worldwide. Ken Archer (2009:9) describes Pentecostalism as a 'highly complex, theologically multi-cultural organism that has literally covered the earth'.¹⁸ He suggests that the 'gestation' of the movement took place during the 'social chaos and revivalistic vigor of the late nineteenth century in North America' (ibid, p. 11). However, if looked at in its modern or, more specifically, its contemporary form, Pentecostalism's roots can be traced to primarily the revivalist era of Methodism (Bare 1993:32; Kay 2011:1). Wesley's doctrine of salvation, his theology of the 'second blessing' and his emphasis on the continuation of Spirit imparted gifts served to attract those who were weary of the lethargic spirituality among the churches (Dayton 1987:11, 44-45; Fanning 2009:4). Thus, viewed as 'the spiritual and intellectual father of modern holiness and Pentecostal movements' (Synan 2001:13), Wesley 'provided a template for post-conversion religious experience' that has largely prepared the way for pentecostal theology (Kay 2011:58).

The emergence of the pentecostal movement was also part of an ongoing struggle to re-visit primitive Christianity and to find relevance for the contemporary New Testament church (Dayton 1987:35-41). Although the movement's origin¹⁹ is largely associated with Wesley's theology, it

¹⁸ Stats are found in Burgess (1988:180-195, 810-830), Cortez (2014) and Schmidgall (2013).

¹⁹ For more on the origin of Pentecostalism, see Anderson (2013), Dayton (1987), Hollenweger (1997), Phillips (2014), Synan (1997) and Williams (1990).

is arguably the case that Pentecostalism developed from multiple geographic locations (Archer 2009:11; Williams 1990:262). On the one hand, Pentecostalism as we know it today is said to have begun in 1901, at a Methodist college in Topeka Kansas whose teacher and founder was Charles Parham.²⁰ Parham had come to believe that there was a connection between the baptism of the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues which he termed as a 'third blessing' (Synan 1997:89). Upon experiencing this phenomenon, he laid hands upon several of his students for the impartation of the Holy Spirit and witnessed the same phenomenon that initiated, at that time, a period of spiritual renewal (Kay 2011:23; Stephens 2016; Synan 1997:96).

On the other hand, some Christians proclaimed that the actual beginning of the contemporary pentecostal movement came about through the experience and preaching of an African American pastor named William Seymour.²¹ He had sat in Parham's classes and embraced his teacher's theology about the speaking in tongues. According to Hanegraaff (2001:142-143), 'Seymour was so convinced of Parham's position that even before he personally spoke in tongues, he told parishioners of a Los Angeles Holiness church that tongues, not sanctification, was evidence of the baptism in the Holy Ghost'. Shortly afterwards, Seymour spoke in tongues and the news of his impartation created a 'firestorm' (Synan 1997:96). The subsequent teaching concerning baptism in the Holy Spirit resulted in swelling crowds that became instrumental in what is known as the 'Azusa Street Mission Revival' during 1906 to 1909 (cf. Hanegraaff 2001:142-143). In any event, while it is accepted that human persons were involved in the birthing of Pentecostalism, in reality the movement is seen as a sovereign act by the Holy Spirit in the church (Archer 2009:15; cf. Bare 1993:33).

²⁰Conn (2008:25), Goff (1988:11-16) Stephens (2016) and Parham (1969:51-56) credit Parham as founder. Hollenweger (1997:20) lists Parham and Seymour as co-founders.

²¹ Stephens (2016) suggests Azusa Street was the second phase of the movement. Synan (1997:170) seems to agree arguing that Parham laid the doctrinal foundations while Seymour served as the catalyst for its popularization.

3. The Birth of the Church of God Denomination

Pentecostalism, by the middle of the twentieth century, gained considerable recognition among conservative, non-pentecostal Christians because of its extraordinary growth (Arrington 2012:13). It was not long before believers who had received the Holy Spirit baptism organised themselves into various denominations and affiliate groups and, over time, became designated as 'Classical' and 'Neo-pentecostals', 'Charismatic' and 'Third-Wave' constituents of the movement.

One outcome of spiritual renewal which preceded the Azusa Street Revival of 1906 was the organising of the Church of God with its headquarters in Cleveland, Tennessee, in the USA. Although a small tributary within this magnanimous stream of millions of Christians identified with Pentecostalism, the roots of the denomination can be traced to the year 1886 and a small group of believers lead by a Baptist preacher named Richard Spurling. The group had grown weary of the creeds and traditions that had stifled spiritual vitality in the churches (Sims 1995:77).²² In an effort to bring about change to the spiritual inertia that existed, they began to meet in the community of Coker Creek, in Monroe County, Tennessee, to study the Scriptures, and committed themselves to a life of holiness and prayer (Conn 2008:9; Synan 1997:73).

For more than two years Spurling and his group met and prayed for personal renewal while also appealing to their churches for revival and reformation. However, their appeals were either ignored, scorned or met with hostility. Internal strife eventually led to the formation of the Christian Union whose mission was to 'reassert the basic doctrines of the Bible' and 'to restore primitive Christianity' to the church (Conn 2008:9-12).²³

²² Phillips (2014) gives a detailed account of Spurling's desire for spiritual restoration.

²³ Between 1880 and 1926 some twenty five Holiness and Pentecostal churches were formed. Historian, Kenneth Latourette (1953:1260) notes that they spoke of the 'second blessing' beyond conversion and promoted the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as at Pentecost with evidentiary speaking in tongues. Synan (1997:68) records a far greater

It was around 1896, that the impartation of the Spirit became a serious topic of discussion in the Christian Union as the result of a series of revival meetings led by William Martin, Joe Tipton and Milton McNabb. The three were associated with the 'Fire Baptized' movement and had received a similar experience to that of John Wesley.²⁴ Their preaching was characterised by an experiential message and a multitude of people responded to receive the experience of sanctification. While this work of grace resulted in expressions of overwhelming joy, it was only a prelude to the pentecostal outpouring. Once the series of nightly meetings ended, the holiness believers continued to gather for prayer. It was during one of their prayer services that they received the baptism in the Holy Spirit with the speaking in tongues as its sign. Thus the Church of God²⁵ as a pentecostal church was born (Conn 2008:29; Juillerat 1922:7-14). From a meagre beginning the small group has grown from eight congregants to over 7 million members worldwide (Minutes 2018).

4. Theoretical Affirmations of the Church of God

The impartation of the Holy Spirit led several nominal church leaders to challenge the validity of impartation as a biblical doctrine. Yet, after studying the Bible, Spurling and his group were unwavering in their faith and were convinced that the experience they had received was the same as the one recorded in Acts 2 (Tomlinson 1922:12; cf. Phillips 2014:106-119). However, searching the Scriptures in order to gain biblical confirmation for ecclesiastical practice was only the beginning of their problem. Conn (2008:47-54) notes that the church was endangered by

number of no less than two hundred groups who adopted some version of the name 'Pentecostal' or 'Church of God' to designate their churches.

²⁴ This movement was started by Benjamin Irwin who had been influenced by the holiness movement and Wesley's writings. He began to teach a third experience, the 'baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire'. He testified to receiving this impartational experience himself where he felt as if he were 'literally on fire'. Those who received often shouted, fell in trances, and spoke in tongues. He formed the 'Fire Baptized Church' and later taught that one could receive multiple baptisms (King 1921:4; Phillips 2014:119-135; Synan 1997:51-60).

²⁵ The church was restructured and during a May 15th, 1902 meeting the name was changed from Christian Union to the Holiness Church. On January 9th, 1907 the name was changed again by the assembly to the Church of God. After discussion this name was deemed to more biblically appropriate with supporting Scriptures 1 Corinthians 1:2 and 2 Corinthians 1:1 (Conn 2008:86; Synan 1997:78).

individuals whose endeavour it was to introduce unscriptural doctrines into the Church of God denomination:

With a suddenly enlarged body of believers, the places of worship were scattered to numerous homes across the area. Everyone was free to project beliefs, conjectures, speculations, and interpretations of Scripture without the guidance of maturity and sage counsel. Even worse, outsiders were attracted into the area, bringing their miasma of error. The lack of organization in the Christian Union proved to be more dangerous than the lack of regulation; it left the flock exposed to dangers not envisioned by the founding compact. Also, in a paradoxical but understandable way, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost had increased the exposure still further. Those who are newly filled with the Spirit are sensitive to the supernatural and ready to accept the deeper revelations of God without the scrutiny [*sic*] that experienced believers develop in their life of faith.

Conn (2008:52-53) also notes that unscriptural practices proved to be costly, especially during the earlier years (1896-1902) of the Church of God.²⁶ Those who made an attempt to bring correction to ecclesiastical practice were labelled as unbelievers or hinderers of the works of the Spirit. Although thus convinced, clarity was difficult to establish because believers were conditioned to believe whatever anyone taught on the work of the Holy Spirit. It is reasonable to conclude that they were unprepared to discern error and, therefore, were most vulnerable to deception. At least, it explains why most members separated themselves from the Church of God. In simple terms, they became frustrated and confused. Due to the threat of false teaching and a decrease in church membership, leaders moved towards a series of reorganising of and restructuring within the Church of God in order to curb doctrinal and ecclesiastical excesses.

²⁶ Subsequent to this was a hermeneutical misunderstanding on the theology of divine healing which will be addressed later. Their acceptance of this tenet led to the discouragement and denial of medical care. They became very critical and judgmental of those who resorted to its use (Conn 2008:242-243; Evangel 1910).

Assisting with the needed organisational changes was AJ Tomlinson. Under his leadership the church surged forward with monumental accomplishments. One of those was initiated during a General Assembly meeting in 1910. Knowing that the church lacked the theoretical foundation necessary for ongoing stability, a committee was commissioned to draft a list of beliefs about the work of the Spirit in the church, together with Bible references, to assist ministerial candidates in their decisions on sound biblical teaching. Although it was not intended to serve as a formal codification of Church of God affirmations, it became such. The set of affirmations were officially published in the Assembly Minutes of 1912 and became the Church of God's official statement of faith (Conn 2008:140; Minutes 1912:30-31).²⁷ A companion document, titled the 'Declaration of Faith', was formulated at the 42nd General Assembly in 1948. Its purpose was to provide a concise creedal statement defining the doctrinal and ethical positions of the church (Gause 1973:223-224; Minutes 1948:188). The drafters of the declaration also wished to maintain the basic principles upon which the Church of God was founded, namely, the Wesleyan Holiness paradigm and a commitment to pentecostal theology (Morris 2012:54). The point is that both the Assembly Minutes and Declaration of Faith contained numerous beliefs that are important to understand the theoretical developments of the doctrine of impartation in the Church of God denomination.

5. Current Hermeneutical Understanding of Impartation

The biblical, historical, and experiential information presented thus far has been documented to demonstrate how the doctrine of impartation has developed over the years in the Church of God. Each new development had had its influence on the church's hermeneutical

²⁷ These original teachings have been discussed by the body on various occasions but were virtually unchanged until the Assembly in 1974 when they were divided into two sections, the Doctrinal and Practical. Modifications were made to the Practical with the greatest being a more positive expansion in 1988. However, the Doctrinal commitments have never been altered testifying to the church's resoluteness to its faith (Conn 2008:140, 512-514).

understanding of impartation, which will be addressed shortly. For now it will suffice to note how the doctrine is currently understood in the Church of God.

5.1 The definition of impartation: Pastoral perspective

To find a common definition of impartation among pentecostals and especially the Church of God is no simple task. One reason for the problem is that some leaders in the Church of God believe, without further thought, that the doctrine has never been clearly defined by leaders of the church. When asked, 'Do you believe in the doctrine of impartation', some answer, 'it depends on what you mean by impartation'.²⁸ This response comes with the admission that, although the terminology is used and the practice accepted as common, it has not been clearly defined or theologically understood within the church.²⁹ Yet, when giving thought to the meaning of the doctrine, there seems to be an underlying consensus. For example, among Church of God pastors, the majority define impartation to mean (1) the act of sharing or transmitting what God has given into the life of others, (2) the act of laying on of hands to receive the Holy Spirit, (3) the ability to transfer something tangible such as blessings, gifts, or one's anointing to another, or (4) that a believer is free to transfer personal gifts or an anointing to another at will.³⁰

²⁸This response is commonly given when the question is randomly asked of pastors, educators and church leaders. Most admit the practice is common but also confess they have given little thought as to the definition of impartation.

²⁹The terminology is used often in church services and conferences without definitive instruction as to its theoretical and practical application. In gathering research, there have been six occasions where in churches or large conferences this deficiency has been confirmed. Impartation was referenced but no explanation as to its meaning.

³⁰ This assessment was conducted (24 June -22 July, 2016) through 'Monkey Survey' and onsite during one of our church conferences with some 100 pastors responding. Only 5 surveyed favoured this definition. The majority believe God sovereignly chooses the time, place, and means in impartation and often uses humans in the process.

Further inquiry reveals several more definitions of the doctrine provided by pastors affiliated with the Church of God.³¹ One pastor describes impartation to be,

The act of sharing or giving to another who is willing to receive knowledge, wisdom and/or spiritual giftedness by the Holy Spirit's leading, so that the one who receives the impartation may be used by God for even greater effectiveness. Thus, the one who is sharing the impartation is used as a channel for the Spirit's anointing for a distinctive and divine purpose of which God desires. Therefore, impartation is the work of God through man and not the design of man.

This pastor is correct in defining impartation to be an 'act of sharing or giving' and that the Holy Spirit should lead in the process. However, while conveying his definition, he falls short in describing how recipients indicate their willingness to receive gifts and the manner in which a person might serve as an agent (channel) of impartation in a way that is scriptural.³² Furthermore, he fails to communicate whether the gifts to be imparted are natural in origin or whether a 'word of wisdom' and 'word of knowledge' are those described by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12:8. Also, he leaves unanswered the question of how one is to determine the Spirit's leading in gifts that are to be imparted. His failure is especially problematic due to the fact that leaders can misinterpret the voice of the enemy or the leading of their own spirit for that of the Holy Spirit while attempting to impart gifts to others. As it stands, the ambiguity of this definition is representative of the problem that exists among leadership. There is therefore a general concept of impartation that lacks serious hermeneutical attention.

A second pastor refers to the example of Paul and his desire to impart gifts to the believers in Rome (Rom 1:11), and states that 'several examples are given throughout the Scriptures that teach the importance

³¹ The two senior pastors, affiliated with the Church of God, have conducted impartation services in their churches. They participated in the 'Monkey Survey' of 24 June and 22 July 2016 and provided expanded definitions via email on 2 and 7 February 2017.

³² Caution should be taken with the use of this terminology in as much as it could be misunderstood as having association with the New Age concept of 'channelling'.

of spiritual impartation between mentors and their student(s), whether it be to an individual, a group or even a nation'. It is easy to see that the example of Paul is assumed to fit into a mentor category. The pastor stated his definition as follows:

Impartation in a ministry environment, in addition to the bestowal of spiritual gifts, can be the passing on of Godly information received that is to be redistributed to others with the understanding that it has spiritual significance. I would also like to think that such an impartation is given with the understanding that it is for the continuation of the believer's God-given vision and assignment.

His definition can be summarised into three core elements that he regards as key ingredients in impartation: (1) the information given must be information received from the Holy Spirit and the Bible, (2) the information received must be information acted upon, and (3) the information will produce the desired results. It means that no received impartation can yield any results until the believer has taken certain stipulated actions.

The argument for impartation through mentorship is certainly plausible (cf. 1 and 2 Tim; Philem), but the pastor leaves the manner in which Paul completed his task open for speculation and, therefore, offering only his understanding of impartation in a ministry environment. Questionable is the nature of the information to be acted upon and whether Paul mentored through his preaching, teaching, praying or some other aspect of his calling. Although he believes in the existence of several scriptural examples that demonstrate this student-mentor relationship, he provides no definite biblical reference to warrant that belief. Also, the pastor's definition fails to address what seems to be the larger issues for pentecostals and believers in the Church of God, namely, (a) the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit with the laying on of hands as described in Acts 8:14-19, 9:17 and 19:1-6, (b) the impartation of spiritual gifts as listed in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11), and (c) the impartation of healing by anointing with oil and the laying on of hands (James 5:13-16). These concerns are important when defining impartational ministry.

5.2 The definition of impartation: Leadership perspective

Viewed from a leadership perspective, Tim Hill (2014)³³ feels that much of the problem in defining the practice of impartation stems from conflicting understandings of the doctrine. He remarks, 'I don't know of anybody using that word unless you are an experienced theologian [who] probably understands the extent of the definition'. When the word impartation is used, it is mostly used to refer to spiritual gifts. Hill also believes that impartation is a biblical phenomenon that can be found in the Old Testament, the ministry of Christ and the laying on of hands in the New Testament.

Hill enumerates several concerns related to the doctrine of impartation: (1) the doctrine cannot be used to heighten curiosity or highlight interest where people are drawn to an impartation service thinking, 'I'm going to get what another person has'; (2) a person cannot bestow something he does not have nor can he receive blessings if he is spiritually unqualified or unprepared; (3) impartations are not given just because someone desires to receive one; and (4) while someone may want to lay hands on another to receive the Holy Spirit or praying for the sick to be healed, it is not up to the minister to determine who should and who not to receive an impartation. These points help to explain subjectivism and why some leaders over-step Scripture's instructional boundaries.

Although Hill (2014) defines impartation as 'the taking of something you have been given by God and bestowing, sharing, or giving it to someone else, while working in partnership with the will of the Holy Spirit', his definition creates several problems. In the first place, when does the minister know that he is in working partnership with the Spirit? And in the second place, and most importantly, how does he know what is the will of the Holy Spirit for a particular person? How should these questions be answered to avoid the challenge of subjectivism? According to Jesus,

³³ Hill presently serves as the General Overseer of the Church of God. He is the author of *Beyond the Mist*, *Sermons for Shepherds*, and *The Amos Paradigm*. His remarks are taken from a survey conducted on 5 July 2016 and a personal interview on 12 January 2017.

the determination of whether ministers are working in harmony with the Spirit is based upon the fruit they bear. He communicates this principle in Matthew 7:15-16: 'Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous wolves. You will know them by their fruits'.

What seems obvious from and unspoken by Hill is the fact that ministers confirm their partnership with the Holy Spirit and become qualified to pray for impartations when conducting themselves in a manner representative of Jesus. But also, confirmation of that partnership is received when those being prayed for demonstrate signs/fruit comparable to those mentioned in Mark 16:17-18, 19:6 and James 5:14-15. Thus, where there is no fruit there could be no claim to partnership.

Just as important and left unanswered by Hill is the question, 'How do ministers know the will of the Holy Spirit for a particular person?'. This is an important oversight due to the fact that ministers confuse the will of the Spirit for their own purposes and desires. Often subjectivism rules with words such as, 'The Lord told me to tell you' or 'I feel in my spirit that God is going to give you this gift, healing or blessing'. Routinely, words of this nature are used to create a desired emotional response. However, there are occasions in the NT where persons were told the specific will of the Spirit for their lives. One example is when Jesus anointed the blind man's eyes with clay and told him to 'Go, wash in the pool of Siloam' to receive his healing (John 9:1-7). A second example is Peter's promise to the people in Acts 2:38: 'Repent and let every one of you be baptized... and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit'. A third example is Ananias' words of impartation to Saul: 'Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus, who appeared to you on the road as you came, has sent me that you may receive your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit' (Acts 9:17). In this way, God's will was communicated in a very concise manner. Jesus spoke audibly to the blind man, as well as Peter to his listeners, and Ananias spoke words from the Lord received through a vision (Acts 9:10-16).

Just as important and left unanswered by Hill is how do leaders hear from God and know they are speaking for God? Callie Joubert and Nick Maartens (2018:1-21) offer a noteworthy critique on this topic. Both recognise that hearing the voice of God is a part of the everyday life for many Christians, but believers must be able to distinguish between God's voice, their own thoughts or feelings and other voices (ibid, p. 1).³⁴ Joubert and Maartens (2018:2) admit that many believers receive spiritual guidance and make decisions based upon personal prophecies that are given to them, but this practice leaves room for deception, mistakes and inaccuracies because what is asserted is often based upon a mixture of truth and error. For them, the problem lies in the fact that Christians claim to hear from God and utter prophecies based upon an 'inner witness' in their spirits or an 'impression' and consider it as from God. However, Joubert and Maartens argue that 'the Bible nowhere indicates that an 'inner witness' is the standard for deciding whether someone has heard God's voice or not, let alone whether it is the truth' (ibid, pp. 8-9). Further, there is no scriptural evidence where someone received a message from God through an impression let alone 'how can one test something by listening to an inner impression when "the heart is deceitful more than all else" (Jer 14:4, 17:9)'. Joubert and Maartens (2018:17-18) also offer three ways through which leaders can minimise spiritual deception in this area: The first is the 'Use of precise language' when uttering a prophecy. Leaders should listen carefully to the terminology that Christians use to describe their experiences, then correct and clarify with precise language to reduce problems and misunderstandings.

³⁴ Joubert and Maartens (2018:2) state that 'Christians, specifically those in the pentecostal and charismatic traditions, claim to hear God's voice mainly in three ways: through an audible voice; through an inner voice in their spirit which is also often referred to as an "impression" or "prompting" and is expressed in words such as "God spoke to me in my spirit", "God laid it on my heart" and so on; and through personal prophecy from someone else'. They address two problems related to hearing God in this way. Most problematic is the assumption that God's voice is a 'still small voice' in a Christian's spirit or that it is the voice of Jesus referred to in John 10. Secondly, hearing God's voice through prophecy spoken out in the first person, singular, present tense, for example, 'Thus says I the Lord your God', does not allow for the biblical principle that all prophecy has to be judged (1 Cor 14:29; 1 John 4:1).

The second is to 'Examine all claims'. 'If a person claims to have received a message, vision, revelation or a "word from the Lord", examine them. All such claims, including the character of the speaker, must be judged (1 Cor 14:29-33; 1 Thess 5:19-21; 1 John 4:1)'.

Their third suggestion to minimise deception is by 'Confronting an inaccurate speaker'. 'If someone has claimed to provide a revelation but is found to be inaccurate, he or she must be confronted in biblical love (Matt 18:15-20; Gal 6:1; James 5:19-20). Claiming to have heard from God when someone has not is, therefore, a serious issue in the church (Jer 14:14; Ezek 22:28).

Furthermore, it is not necessary for leaders to say that they have heard from God or that they speak a 'Thus says God' when impartations are being given. Some persons such as the blind man in Acts, whom Peter preached to, and such as received by Paul through the ministry of Ananias in Acts 9:10-17, were told the specific impartations thereof. Yet, there are other scriptural examples given where people are prayed for and receive impartations by the sovereign will of the Spirit without those impartations being named by the persons doing the praying or a 'word from the Lord' being spoken (Acts 8:17, 9:36-41, 19:6, 28:8). Thus, although Hill, in keeping with the denomination's early commitment to its 'Declaration of Faith' believes the practice of impartation within the Church of God should be based on a biblical foundation, further clarity is required if the Church of God wishes to prevent excesses to which practice of the doctrine leads.

Mark Williams³⁵ provides a similar leadership perspective: 'To impart means to communicate, to convey, to transmit, or to bestow knowledge or something tangible into the care of another'. He clarifies his perspective as follows:

³⁵ Mark Williams is the former General Overseer of the Church of God (2012-2016) and now pastor of the North Cleveland Church of God. This information was provided via email on 22 June 2016.

Impartation implies that someone has ownership or control of that which they are attempting to give. In this regard, I feel that the word is often misused when applied to anointing, healing, spiritual gifts, and even leadership. God remains sovereign over His gifts, distributing them as He wills (1 Corinthians 12:11). Through the laying on of hands we recognize and affirm those whom God has called and ordained. Through the laying on of hands we invoke God's blessings but we do not impart God's blessings. The Apostle Paul acknowledged this in the above referenced citation to the Corinthian church. Even Peter and John in the healing of the lame person at the Beautiful Gate stated, "Why do you gaze at us, as if by our own power or piety we had made him walk? The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, has glorified His servant Jesus...on the basis of faith in His name, it is the Name of Jesus, which has strengthened this man...(Acts 3:12, 16).

On first appearance, William's definition is an improvement on that of Hill. However, his language is highly ambiguous, and leads to several questions: How is his reference to 'ownership', 'control' and 'give' to be harmonised with the apostles who said that it is not by their own power that miracles occur (Acts 3:12, 16)? And what is meant by 'Through the laying on of hands we invoke God's blessings but we do not impart God's blessings'? Williams seems to imply that the concept of impartation is misunderstood and therefore misused. If so, then the Church requires details as to how the misunderstanding should be addressed. Perhaps clarification of Williams' terminology will help. The term 'invoke' means to call upon someone such as God for support through prayer or invitation (Webster 1913). Given this meaning, the understanding could be that leaders are impotent and can neither impart nor invoke without prayer and the involvement of our sovereign God. Williams' use of Peter's question 'Why do you gaze at us, as if by our own power or piety we had made him walk?' seems to confirm the explication. Peter and John were powerless as mere humans to impart healing to a lame man. Prayer coupled with the name of Jesus made God the Spirit to perform the miracle (Acts 3:12-16). Thus, although the definition presented by Williams is helpful, it needs to be clarified if the practice of impartation is to be biblically understood.

5.3 The definition of impartation: The educator perspective

Educators such as John Sims (1995)³⁶ and Don Bennett (1990) find themselves in the same position as the previously mentioned leaders, namely, the desire to establish a clarification of the denomination's understanding of impartation.³⁷ To clarify the terminological problem, Sims offers his own definition. Impartation is 'a sovereign work of the Holy Spirit whereby the Spirit graciously bestows a spiritual gift upon a believer through prayer and the laying on of hands for the purpose of building up the Body of Christ.' He also offers the following additional qualifying remarks:

This definition focuses on three things: (1) the source of the gift; (2) a means of receiving the gift (though certainly not the only means). The gift must be desired and responded to, and (3) the true impartation and reception of the gift must be tested by its biblically based use in the edifying of the Body (the test of all spiritual gifts).

Sims' definition is very concise but leaves much to the imagination of the reader. First, he suggests other methodologies can be used for receiving impartations but fails to mention what those methods are. Second, what he means by the words 'the gift must be desired and responded to' is unclear. Is the reader to assume that (a) one must 'ask' to be baptised with the Holy Spirit and respond with speaking in tongues (Luke 11:13; Acts 2:4)?; (b) one must present oneself for the impartation of a gift and then respond by using the gift as evidence to confirm that one has received the impartation (1 Cor 14:1)?, or (c) that healing requires one to respond by calling on elders of the church for prayer and/or allowing oneself to be anointed with oil (Jas 5:14)? Third, what Sim's means by 'the true impartation and reception of the gift must be tested' also remains unclear. Do the words 'true impartation' mean that the gift cannot be humanly fabricated and must be accepted as one of the biblical gifts listed

³⁶ Sims is a former professor at Lee University, Cleveland, TN, and served as Chairman of the Department of Bible and Christian Ministries. He provided this information via email on 18 December 2016.

³⁷ Bennett presently works with the Church of God Division of Education, Cleveland, TN. He provided the information via email on 10 January 2017.

by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12 and Ephesians 4? Fourth, Sims suggests that impartations and gifts ‘must be tested’ but fails to provide biblical examples describing how believers may test the use of a gift or gifts as stipulated in 1 Corinthians 14:26-33. This is an important oversight. As pointed out by Joubert and Maartens 2017:106-107), many Christians believe that God’s Word can be used as a guide in their daily lives, but often scriptural texts are ‘decontextualised’ and ‘recontextualised’ to say something that the texts were not originally meant to say. They explained it thus:

What is disconcerting about this practice is that the recontextualised meaning is then taken as a personal message from God and used to legitimise beliefs, decisions, and actions of either oneself or those of others. The most unfortunate result is that this practice has led to the assumption that such guidance is not to be questioned, since it is ‘from the Lord’.³⁸

This ‘decontextualised’ and ‘recontextualised’ use of Scripture is often used to legitimise the means by which gifts are imparted, the practice of gifts, and to justify prophecies that are scripturally incorrect or unfulfilled. Impartational practices such as ‘words of the Lord’ and prophecies that are contrary to, and involve the misuse of Scripture, must be judged (1 Tim 6:20; 1 Pet 1:20). Persons who provide spiritual guidance are never exempt from scrutiny. In this respect, Joubert and Maartens (2017:118-124) suggest: ‘We should, therefore, “not believe every spirit”, but test (1 John 4:1) their utterances, especially those in the form of subjective (self-

³⁸ Joubert and Maartens (2017:105-132) present four excellent examples of the practice of the ‘decontextualised’ and ‘recontextualised’ use of Scripture to validate their argument. They rightfully argue that ‘the practice of decontextualising Scripture to recontextualise it and then using it as an authoritative ‘word from the Lord’ to legitimise beliefs, decisions, and actions of either oneself or those of others, has serious implications for the integrity of an individual Christian and the body of Christ’ (2017:110). They also point out three wrongful assumptions that Christians make in their decontextualising and recontextualising Scripture. First is ‘the wrongful assumption that opening the Bible at random is a legitimate way to discern God’s will’. The text randomly selected is assumed to be a ‘Word from the Lord’. Second is ‘the wrongful assumption that reasoning leads to confusion and that understanding a biblical passage is not important’. And third is ‘the wrongful assumption that a text can have more than one meaning’ (ibid, pp. 111-117). Arguably, if the text can have more than one meaning, the meaning it has for you may not be the meaning it has for me. However, they state: ‘If we are to accept that a text has multiple meanings, then we are to accept that no text has an actual meaning, but this idea is easily refuted’ (ibid, p. 117).

generated) prophecies (1 Thess 5:20-22)'. Put another way, when assessing 'words from the Lord' pertaining to spiritual guidance and the practice of impartation, the following points become important to consider: (1) are persons decontextualising and recontextualising a text to legitimise their own beliefs and actions and those of others?; (2) are the words and actions of the person contradicting the Scriptures (Rom 16: 17-18)?; (3) are the Scriptures being used in their immediate context, the context of the chapter and book and then the larger context of the whole Bible?; (4) are the words and practice in violation of God's moral will as revealed in Scripture (Rom 12:2; 1 Cor 13; Phil 4:8); and (5) are the words and practice bringing edification to the body of Christ (1 Cor 14) (ibid, pp. 125-129)?³⁹

In sum, Sims' concise but generic definition, when looked at closely, is indicative of the problem faced by Church of God leaders. The definition provides mostly conceptual knowledge.

Bennett (1990) defines impartation as 'something essentially occurring through direction on the part of God and desire on the part of the recipient for the purpose of equipping people to be used in the expansion of the kingdom of God and for edification of believers'. In this view, God initiates the impartation, therefore, and in agreement with Hill, impartation is not something people can receive from a gifted minister just because believers are requesting one. Neither does it occur just because people declare their faith in God. It is rather that God is the Person who calls and gives impartations even if it is through His anointed spokesperson. Bennett explains:

Three biblical examples come to mind about the question. Based on the instructions from the Lord (1 Kings 19:15-21), Elijah called Elisha to follow him in a special way. Elijah did not call all of those associated with him as he called Elisha. Jesus called His apostles to follow Him. They did not initiate their becoming an apostle. In Acts 8, Peter and John were instructed by the

³⁹ Although Joubert and Maartens (2017 105-132) do not address the subject of impartation per se, their thoughts are certainly relevant. The section on 'The Alternative view of Guidance' was very apropos and germane to assessing excess and abuse.

church leaders in Jerusalem to oversee what was happening in Samaria. When they got there they prayed for them to receive the Holy Spirit and they did. Simon saw what happened when Peter and John laid hands on the believers and he wanted their power so that he could do the same. However, what they had could not be passed on to someone else to use in the display of self-aggrandizement or an extension of personal power.

Simply put, blessings and the giving of gifts for ministry come from God because God is sovereign and He bestows them on His own initiative when we present ourselves to God to receive them.

Bennett's definition coincides with that of Sims. Both believe impartations are given because they are desired and serve to build up the kingdom of God and edify believers. Both mention the laying on of hands. Bennett, however, adds the example of the Samaritans receiving the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands (Acts 8: 14-17) which explains how God might presently impart the gifts. Bennett also mentions the calling of Elisha by Elijah as an example of impartation. However, he fails to address that which is most significant, namely, the means through which God imparted the 'double portion' to Elisha (2 Kgs 2:9-15). He also fails to address the question of whether or not God continues to use prophets to impart gifts. In Acts 13:1-3, prophets imparted to Barnabas and Saul through the laying on of hands which indicates the possibility of God using this means today: 'As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, "Now separate to Me Barnabas and Saul, for the work to which I have called them" Then, having fasted and prayed, and laid hands on them, they sent them away.' Furthermore, Bennett's definition could be understood to mean that God only imparts to a select few. In contrast, Scripture is very clear about those who are eligible to receive impartations. Jesus teaches that the Holy Spirit is available to everyone (Luke 11:13); Paul encourages all believers to pursue spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12; 14:1)⁴⁰ and James admonishes 'anyone' sick to seek healing

⁴⁰ The gifts of the Spirit are for everyone. However, what is often forgotten is that there are diversities of gifts that are imparted to members of the body of Christ. Members are to use those gifts appropriately for the edification of the church. Not all are toes, fingers, or eyes. Not all are given the gifts of healing, miracles or tongues. Not all gifts are as

(Jas 5:14). Likewise, Bennett proposes that impartations are not given because someone asks for one or has a confession of faith. Consequently though, he fails to answer a most important question: If inquisition and mere confessional faith fails to merit impartation, by what criteria or means is someone qualified to be a recipient of God's blessings?

These definitions by pastors, leaders, and educators prove that commendable attempts have been made to bring clarification to the Church of God's doctrine of impartation, but it is also evident that the definitions only provide a limited understanding of the practice. If the Church of God desires to perpetuate the doctrine of impartation and avoid spiritual excess then more attention needs to be given to the study of Scripture, which means that greater theoretical and practical clarity of the doctrine is required.

It becomes, accordingly, important to continue with the critical analysis of the Church of God's theology of impartation by exploring how the doctrine has developed through the denomination's historical development to its current practice.

6. The Church of God's Developing Theology of Impartation: Historical Development and Current Practice

Although the Church of God survived the initial challenges that came with doctrinal excess, its theoretical and experiential theology, including its affirmations of faith, require further development. Thus, in order to evaluate the church's doctrine of impartation, the affirmations applicable to impartation will be discussed by using three points of interest: the historical development of the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit with evidentiary tongues, and the excesses that may be associated with the practice, the current understanding of the doctrine of impartation, and the biblical understanding of the doctrine.

honourable as others, but all are necessary if the body is to be unified and complete (1 Cor 12:1-31).

6.1 The baptism in the Holy Spirit

High on the list of spiritual priorities in the Church of God is a biblical understanding of the doctrine on the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Although the church focused upon sound doctrine and institutional structures as its early history reveals, doctrine and structure were never the primary concern. In the words of Sims (1995:17), 'What was important to them was their experience of the presence of the Holy Spirit in their lives'. As noted earlier, the Church's first encounter of the Holy Spirit came in 1896. Subsequently, believers were greatly influenced by the doctrine of the impartation of the Spirit and evidentiary tongues and considered the experience to be biblically valid for every believer (Conn 2008:29). The belief along with scriptural passages promising the Holy Spirit to all believers (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4-8, 2:38-39) provided impetus to inscribe the impartational experience of the baptism of the Holy Spirit into the Church of God's official statement of faith: 'We believe, in the baptism of the Holy Ghost subsequent to a clean heart and in speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance' (Gause 1973:229). In other words, in the eyes of the leaders of the Church of God, the divine effusion of the Spirit is not just one of the dogmas of the church among others; it is far more than that. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is a distinct experience and one that should not be moulded into any specific ecclesiastical or denominational straitjacket (Horton 1972:82). Unfortunately, with this freedom to experience the blessings of God appeared spiritual excesses regarding the doctrine of impartation.

6.1.1 The practice of impartation

From the establishment of the Church of God denomination, both leaders and members looked to the narratives of Scripture as normative for their impartational practices (Arrington 2003:88-89).⁴¹ Their experience of

⁴¹ While this hermeneutic has received criticism, it is one that Daffe and Lombard (2005:176-177) feel has merit. They state, 'the argument that doctrine cannot be drawn from narrative is really an out dated one ... It is outdated because modern scholarship has reaffirmed the importance and power of narrative'. Also Pinnock (1984:7), in the preface of Stronstad's, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, writes that Luke's

being baptised in the Holy Spirit occurred while praying. It was then followed up with a search of the Scriptures to justify that what they had received was the biblical experience as recorded in the book of Acts (Conn 2008:29). In short, their theoretical stance and practice were substantiated by their reading of the Bible and applying what they interpreted to be a correct understanding of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. With their understanding and practice came also the encouragement for people to seek their own impartation from God, taking Acts 2:1-4 as their warrant.⁴² This litany might include calling out words, such as ‘I love you Lord, “glory, glory” or “hallelujah”’.⁴³ It was anticipated that this repetition of words or phrases would lead to the desired impartation of the Spirit. In addition, those wanting the impartation were urged to ‘tarry’ for the baptism in the Spirit. The biblical precedent used in support of that was Luke 24:49. Jesus promised the Holy Spirit’s coming and instructed His listeners to ‘tarry in the city of Jerusalem until [they were] endued with power from on high’.⁴⁴ Although these proof-texts have been understood as containing the concepts of tarrying and worship, the question is whether anyone can substantiate these practices as being necessary for the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit today? That assumption is problematic due to the absence of NT teaching indicating that Acts 2:1–4 is intended as normative for the church in general.

narrative storytelling is a widely used technique in Scripture and concludes that ‘Deriving normative doctrine and practice from narratives is a valid exercise’.

⁴² Barrett (1994:112) points out that the gathering of the 120 has been understood by some to be a worship service. Arrington (2008:74) similarly suggests they were praying and waiting for the Spirit.

⁴³ An example of her experience is provided by Penny Hagy (2006:10-11) in the 1950’s. Upon being asked to go to the altar to seek for the baptism in the Holy Spirit, she complied and began to pray, ‘Blessed be God, blessed be His holy name. Blessed be His Son Jesus Christ, true God and true man. Blessed be the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Trinity’. Often the desiring recipient would ‘tarry’ in the altars for hours repeating words of prayer and praise.

⁴⁴ Multiple examples are given of this practice in the *Church of God Evangel*. One evangelist giving a report about a lady that was delivered from an evil spirit, states, ‘She was saved, sanctified, and is now tarrying for the Holy Ghost’ (11 April 1914). A pastor reporting on a revival remarks, ‘five received the Holy Ghost. Many more hungry hearts are tarrying for the Holy Ghost’ (29 March 1930). Church leader, Paul Walker (11 November 1933) writing on the subject said that if Jesus commanded the early believers to tarry for the experience ‘then it surely holds good today that we should tarry for such an experience...therefore we should tarry for the Holy Ghost as outlined by the Scriptures’.

In addition to the previously mentioned practices is the issue of the laying on of hands for the impartation of the Spirit in passages such as Acts 8:14-17, 9:17 and 19:1-6. Although Scripture's support for ecclesiastic practices is undeniable, the influence of the teachings of Parham and those subsequent to the Azusa Street Revival cannot be disregarded, let alone the fact that many who were involved in the development of the Church of God received their impartations under Seymour's ministry (Cashwell 1906:3; Synan 1997:91). In spite of these influences, an uncritical acceptance of the laying on of hands formed an integral part of the Church of God's ecclesiology.

6.1.2 Personal experience and the Spirit of God

Historically, and presently, when engaging in the practices mentioned above, the tendency is to focus more on subjective experiences of the gifts of the Spirit than the Spirit as Person. This focus explains why speaking in tongues, as the initial evidence of receiving the Spirit, became one of the central beliefs in the Church of God's Declaration of Faith (Gause 1973:229). Tongues held a place of importance in the Church and went hand-in-hand with descriptions such as a joyful and glorious experience (Tomlinson 1910a:3-4).⁴⁵ Horton (1972:105) sums up the importance of tongues thus: 'This evidence of the Spirit's indwelling is the acme, the zenith, the mountain peak of spiritual excellency and ecstasy'. Unfortunately, rhetoric of this kind, while emotionally stirring, is merely a subjective description that lacks a biblical focus. Worrisome is the fact that this experiential emphasis seemingly led to the view that speaking in tongues is the primary purpose of the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which must be questioned. From a biblical perspective, impartation was and is about the bestowal of

⁴⁵ After the Azusa Street revival, the baptism in the Holy Spirit with the evidence of tongues was given prominence and raised to doctrinal status by most classical pentecostals (Conn 2008:30-31; Sims 1995:120; Synan 1997:111-112). In the words of Sims (1995:120): 'This doctrinal distinctive, more than any other theological tenet, separated Pentecostals from the main body of the Holiness Movement, which had otherwise provided the infrastructure upon which the gestalt of Pentecostal doctrine had been built'.

the Holy Spirit and not tongues.⁴⁶ In other words, an unscriptural focus on tongues distracts attention from the Spirit Himself.⁴⁷

This one-sided emphasis on signs exacerbated the problem of a correct understanding of impartation for various reasons. First, speaking in tongues became the primary objective for seeking the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. As a result, some who prayed for others to receive the impartation resorted to all kinds and manners of manipulation and excesses. For instance, requesting or instructing recipients to repeat certain words and syllables or even to breathe a certain way (Hughes 1986:171). Second, an emphasis on tongues as a sign created a gap that was and is filled with deception. The result is that combatting counterfeit phenomena became problematic (cf. 1 Tim 4:1; 1 John 4:1) and has been and remained a serious concern in Pentecostalism.⁴⁸ Parham (1911:55) warned against those who replicate the biblical evidence of the Spirit. Tomlinson (1910c:1) exclaimed that 'there is a true pentecostal experience accompanied with speaking in tongues but also a counterfeit and mockery [of such]'. Thus, impartational validation based upon tongues alone falls short of the manner in which Paul chose to prove authenticity (1 Cor 13; Gal 5:22).

The lessons to be learned from this brief account of impartation as it developed in the Church of God are straightforward: Leaders are vulnerable to deception just as anyone else; God's work cannot be accomplished on the basis of human schemes; doubt in and scepticism

⁴⁶ For a thorough examination of tongues and their historical context, see Cutten (1927) who looks at the phenomenon from both the religious and psychological perspective. Also, see Hogue (2010), Horton (1986), McGee (2008), and Powe (2016).

⁴⁷ Some, such as Parham (1911:66) and Taylor (1907:8-9, 22, 121-128) taught that Spirit baptism was the 'seal of the Spirit' and those who refused the experience were in danger of experiencing the plagues of the great tribulation or losing their salvation.

⁴⁸ Synan (1997:15) records that the Azusa Street Revival experienced problematic issues with occult societies contributing and interrupting the nightly services. Interestingly, Seymour (1906-1908) later changed his view that 'tongues' is the only sign for Spirit baptism. He wrote, 'wherever the doctrine of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit will only be known as the evidence of speaking in tongues, that work will be an open door for witches, and spiritualists, and free loveism'. Hanegraaff (2001:143-144) and MacArthur (1992:167,221) argue that pentecostals have been susceptible to deception in the area of speaking in tongues. They compare the practice to that of spiritualists and mysticism. While the enemy can only counterfeit that which is authentic, caution can never be dismissed in the exercising of spiritual gifts and tongues.

about a true work of God is often the result (cf. Simon the sorcerer in Acts 8:18-19); there is no acceptable standard against which counterfeit manifestations can be judged; and an emphasis on tongues and other manifestations cannot be a substitute for the evidence of the fruit of the Spirit. However, when speaking in tongues and other spiritual manifestations occur in association with spiritual fruit, it bears witness to their authenticity and integrity.

6.1.3 Multiple baptisms of the Spirit of God

Impartations were initially referred to as 'holy dynamite', then the 'holy lyddite', and still later as the 'holy oxidite' (Dayton 1987:97-98; Phillips 2014 119-136). These are examples of a terminology that is without any biblical support whatsoever. Although the early believers in Acts 2 associated the baptism in the Holy Spirit with fire,⁴⁹ the metaphorical sign was a reoccurring theophany in the Old Testament representing judgment and cleansing (Marshall 1986:68-69; Richie 2019:168). Moses experienced the fire of cleansing at the burning bush and at Mount Sinai (Ex 3:2; 19:18). Elijah witnessed the fire of judgment in 1 Kings 18:38 ('Then the fire of the Lord fell and consumed the burnt sacrifice'), and Isaiah experienced the same: 'Behold the Lord will come with fire...for by fire and by His sword the Lord will judge all flesh' (Isa 66:15). In contrast, the tongues of fire in Acts 2:3 were a sign of God's blessing upon each individual that was a member of the believing community.⁵⁰ Corroborating these thoughts and expressing a Church of God viewpoint, Archer (2011:18) states that 'fire signifies the transforming energy of the Holy Spirit' while Tomberlin (2010:18) and Barnett (2008:8-9) compare the fire with God's presence, His holiness and power. It seems, therefore,

⁴⁹ AJ Tomlinson (1921:1) indicates how some understood fire and the presence of God.

⁵⁰ Peterson (2009:133) points out that the middle participle in the plural (*diamerizomenai*) 'dividing up' implies that there were various tongues of flame spreading across the room. The second verb (*ekathisen*) 'sat [or] rested' is singular, meaning that a single flame-like tongue came to rest upon each person (Barrett 1994:114). For Pervo (2009:62) the phenomena resembled jagged edges that looked like fire with a single flame finding each person, paralleling that of the 'dove' in the case of Jesus' reception of the Holy Spirit.

that the imagery implies something about passion and zeal in a person's spiritual life.

Although the idea of multiple baptisms is connected with increasing levels of spiritual power, Conn (2008:51) suggests that the idea is a fantasy rather than a scriptural fact; therefore, God's reoccurring impartational presence cannot be categorised as such (cf. Acts 4:31; 10:44-46; 19:6). The same counts for the words 'tongues of fire'. Arrington (2008:74) and Taylor (1907:17-18) do not think that 'tongues of fire' should be accepted to accompany every impartation of the Holy Spirit. One reason is because Scripture makes no mention of any 'rushing wind' or 'flames as of fire' subsequent to Acts 2.⁵¹

6.2 Current understanding and practice of the doctrine of impartation and Holy Spirit baptism

The Church of God continues to maintain its historical belief in the impartation of the Spirit with evidentiary tongues. The theoretical basis for the practice is the belief that the experience is biblical and relevant for the church. Conn (1986:26) asserts that the baptism in the Spirit is a deepening work of the Spirit and valid for every regenerated Christian.⁵² To justify the belief in the impartation of the Spirit many point to the day of Pentecost as recorded in the Book of Acts (Lombard and Daffe 2005:114; Sims 1984:77). Unsurprisingly, since 1896, the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit has remained as one of the denomination's most distinct articles of faith (Conn 2008:29-31).

⁵¹ Street (1914:6) argues that there is no record or hint showing the continuance of the rushing sound or tongues of fire, but then adds suggestive comments that would make one think otherwise: 'How can anyone think that he has "had his Pentecost" when he has had neither the sound of the rushing mighty wind nor the visible fire upon his person, nor has ever spoken in other tongues as the Spirit gave utterance'.

⁵² Conn (1986:30-33) views this impartation to be distinct from regeneration and draws support from RA Torrey (1933:271-273) who wrote: 'In regeneration there is an impartation of life, and the one who receives it is saved; in the Baptism with the Holy Spirit there is an impartation of power and the one who receives it is fitted for service...It is the impartation of supernatural power or gifts in service, and sometimes one may have rare gifts by the Spirit's power and few graces' (cf. Arrington 2008:158-159; Lowery 1997:27-28; Sims 1995:112-114).

6.2.1 The current practice of impartation

Although the Church of God has yet to formulate a document presenting its doctrine of impartation, the historical practice of praying, worshipping, tarrying and the laying on of hands continue to form an integral part of its ecclesiology. The emphasis on tarrying for the baptism in the Holy Spirit is less discernible as in the past, but praying and worshipping remain a common practice (Vanoy 2006:6-7). In addition to these practices, is the laying on of hands which continues to be the most common approach to those seeking the impartation of the Spirit. Hence, what is important to emphasise is a brief indication of factors that contribute to the denomination's understanding of impartation and the laying on of hands.

In the first place, justification of the doctrine is sought in multiple passages of Scripture. Acts 8:14-17 reveals that Peter and John laid hands on the believers in Samaria 'and they received the Holy Spirit'. Ananias laid hands upon Saul that he might 'receive [his] sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit' (Acts 9:17), and Paul did the same for the disciples at Ephesus: 'And when Paul had laid hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied' (Acts 19:1-6). These scriptural narratives are examples of the impartation of power with evidentiary tongues through the laying on of hands. Tipei (2009:194) highlights several elements in Acts 8:14-17: (1) believers received the Spirit when the apostles laid hands upon them and not through any other means; (2) they received not only a charismatic manifestation, but the Spirit Himself; (3) the Holy Spirit was imparted to believers by believers who already possessed the Spirit; and (4) the bestowal was accompanied by perceptible supernatural manifestations, which most likely included tongues (cf. Arrington 2008:158-159).

In the second place, these examples of impartation became a normative rule for congregants who desire the baptism in the Spirit, which explain the regular plea to congregants to present themselves for prayer and the laying on of hands. However, this practice raises certain questions. For example, does a response to an invitation guarantee the reception of the

Spirit in the manner assumed? Does it follow, logically speaking, that whenever a person responds to an invitation that God is under the obligation to fill the respondent with His Spirit? What leaders seem to ignore is that God is not only sovereign—He cannot be dictated to by anyone—but also that certain conditions need to be in place before God responds to any requests offered to Him in prayer. Three examples will suffice to illustrate the point. The first is the most familiar one: anyone approaching God must, by necessity, first believe that He exists (Heb 11:6). Secondly, believers or unbelievers cannot expect God to forgive them their trespasses when they are unforgiving toward others (Mark 11:25-26). And thirdly, even after Simon the magician became a believer in Jesus and was baptised, Peter said to him ‘your heart is not right before God’ (Acts 8:21; NASB), which underlines what makes open invitations to receive the Spirit so problematic: ‘[T]he heart is more deceitful than all else . . . who can understand it?’ (Jer 17:9). It is also clear from Peter’s communication with Simon that the latter desired power for all the wrong reasons in the world.

In the third place, while the laying on of hands is scriptural, the practice might open the door for spiritual excess. For example, as was the case historically, on occasion believers who responded to invitations to receive the Holy Spirit have been asked to repeat syllables or ‘breath in the Spirit’. John 20:22 is used in support of breathing in the Spirit: ‘He [Jesus] breathed on them, and said to them, “Receive the Holy Spirit”’. However, people, such as Daffe and Lombard (2007:6-7) and Vanoy (2006:7) view this practice as without scriptural justification. So does Hughes (1986:171), who states that ‘the Holy Spirit does not need this type of human intervention’. What leaders fail to understand when allowing these practices is that human interventions such as these are not substitutes for the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit; the focus has effectively shifted from the Spirit to human effort; and that it leads to the same spirit that was characteristic of Simon (Acts 8:14-21).

Finally, while the Church of God believes in the impartation of Spirit baptism by the laying on of hands, the experience does not necessarily

imply that the believer is to be touched. Receiving the Holy Spirit without the laying on of hands is substantiated from passages such as Acts 2:1-4 and 10:44-46. Conn (1986:52) explains the Church of God's theoretical understanding of these passages as follows:

In both Samaria and Ephesus the disciples received the Holy Spirit when Peter and John, in the former instance, and Paul, in the latter, laid hands on them. It is in no way implied that the apostles imparted the Spirit to the people, or that they had power to do so in themselves. The laying on of hands is significant as a token of confirmation, of encouragement or blessing, but not as a means of dispensing any grace. No hands were laid on the disciples at Pentecost; they were filled with the Holy Spirit as they worshipped. Nor were hands laid on Cornelius and his family; the Holy Spirit fell on them as they listened to Peter preach. The Holy Spirit comes as a response to personal faith. For some that point of effective faith is reached through the stimulus of prayer. For others it is reached through the hearing of the Word, and still others through the touch of anointed hands.

6.2.2 Impartation and the Holy Spirit of God

The Church of God's doctrine of impartation was the result of the assimilation of views on the baptism in the Holy Spirit among proponents of the Holiness movement and views of proponents of the belief that speaking in tongues is the perceived evidence thereof (Archer 2009:174). The most unfortunate result was the tendency to focus more on tongues than the Person of the Spirit. Although Church of God leaders and pastors currently discourage emphasis on tongues rather than the Spirit, it is important to know why this mind-set continues to persist in some congregations. Archer (2009:173-174) seems to think that the problem is linked to exegesis of biblical narratives associated with the speaking in tongues.

A related problem seems to be the misdirected passion for experiential 'evidence' rather than holiness, love of the Lord and truth (John 15:26, 16:14). The fact of the matter is, however, that some educators, leaders and pastors within the Church of God have realised that tongues is not

the only evidence of the impartation of the Spirit (Hughes 1976:172; Sims 1984:95; Willis 1986:252).⁵³

6.2.3 Personal experience and multiple baptisms of the Spirit

It was noted earlier that it was during the development of the Church of God denomination that the belief in multiple impartational baptisms in the Spirit became an accepted initial sign of progressive steps of spiritual power. However, the belief of multiple baptisms was resisted and deemed spurious by church leaders. Due to the resistance, leaders came to distinguish between the baptism with the Holy Spirit and multiple re-fillings or renewals of the Spirit (Acts 4:31; 13:52; Eph 5:18).⁵⁴ Although the terms are often viewed as synonymous, 'baptism with the Holy Spirit' is believed to be an initiating experience while 'being filled with the Spirit' is believed to be a continuing experience (Arrington 2008:227; Gause 2009:114). In other words, the former is interpreted as not intended by God to be a repetitive experience while the latter is. For instance, in Acts 4:31 the imperfect tense ἐπληροῦντο is used ('were being filled') and in Ephesians 5:18 the present imperative πληροῦσθε ('be filled') to refer to a continuous or repeated action. Several points deserve mention in light of these passages.

The first is God's sovereignty, for He is not obligated to respond to a request for re-filling or renewal simply because someone asks. Secondly,

⁵³ Although many pentecostals, especially in the United States, consider speaking in tongues as evidence of the experience of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, not all pentecostals globally hold to this doctrine. But the *experience* of glossolalia is arguably widespread in the movement. And even among those who hold this initial-evidence doctrine, the relationship between tongues and Spirit baptism varies (Macchia 2006:35). Clark (2013:44), and Lederle (2008:131-132) do not believe one must speak in tongues to be baptised in the Spirit. Williams (1996:211-212) argues that tongues are the primary evidence, but not the only or the necessary evidence. For an overview of the different positions, see Grudem (1994:763-787).

⁵⁴ Although the words 'refilling' or 'refilled' are not found in Scripture, the terminology is used frequently in the Church of God. The necessity of a 'refilling' is not due to the loss of the Holy Spirit baptism but is understood to be an experience where the believer receives a renewal or a fresh or new empowerment from the Spirit. Such was the case in Acts 4:31. Believers had already received the baptism in the Holy Spirit, but 'they were all filled with the Holy Spirit' which indicates a re-filling or renewal of the Spirit. Wuest (1973, 1:128) suggests the phrase 'be filled with the Spirit' in Ephesians 5:18 means to 'be constantly being filled with the Spirit'. For the purposes of this section, 'refilled' and 'renewal' will be used interchangeably.

renewal is not an act of God in response to someone's desire for an emotional thrill, but a response of God to the need of believers to endure intense persecution and to overcome the temptations of the flesh. Thirdly, re-fillings occur for the purpose of spiritual development, the great commission and equipping an individual or individuals to perform a specific role in the church. Finally, renewal is not meant to perpetuate self-aggrandisement but to bring glory to our sovereign God. Taken together, these points clarify the conditions for a request to be re-filled or renewed with the Holy Spirit.

6.3 The biblical-theological understanding of Holy Spirit baptism and the doctrine of impartation

Both the Old and New Testaments refer to the impartation of the Holy Spirit. However, the promise and criteria for the experience is more thoroughly mapped out in the NT. In other words, the Old Testament introduction of the Holy Spirit received its relevance and application in the New Testament. In John's gospel the Holy Spirit is associated with 'rivers of living water' (John 7:38)⁵⁵ and the Spirit is another παράκλητον ('Helper') (John 14:16) who is to perform a similar role in the church than that of Jesus among His disciples when He was on Earth (Thomas 2005:167). In this work of Helper the Holy Spirit provides comfort, teaching and guidance. The disciples were promised that He, when He comes, would 'teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance' (John 14:26) as well as to 'guide you into all truth' (John 16:13). But not only that, the Person of the Spirit will 'glorify' the Father and the Son: 'He will glorify Me, for He will take of what is Mine and declare it to you' (John 16:14). It should, therefore, be evident that the role of the Spirit cannot be limited or restricted to just the impartation of experiential or evidentiary signs such as speaking in tongues. His work in the lives of believers extends far beyond that.

⁵⁵ John's statement 'as the Scripture has said' implies the fulfilment of Old Testament Scripture. However, there is no corresponding statement found that duplicates the phrase 'out of his heart will flow rivers of living water'. Yet, the statement does harmonise with some OT passages (Isa 44:3, 55:1; Ezek 47:1; Zech 13:1; Joel 2:23).

By way of summary, Scripture describes the conditions for receiving the Holy Spirit's baptism as an impartation: a person must be a repentant sinner (John 14:17; Acts 2:38), have sound motives and live in obedience to God's will (Luke 6:46, 11:13, 24:49; Acts 5:32). Scripture also teaches that impartation can occur in various ways, for instance, through prayer and praise, the preaching of the gospel and by the laying on of hands (Acts 2:1-4; 10:44-46; 19:6). But what cannot be supported by Scripture are breathing exercises or the repetition of syllables to receive the Spirit, let alone any passage that unequivocally mandates speaking in tongues as confirmation for the impartation of the Spirit.

7. Impartation and Spiritual Gifts in the Church of God

The historical, current and biblical understanding of the impartation of spiritual gifts in the Church of God will next be briefly discussed, including the manner in which gifts can be imparted, and excesses that may occur with the practice. However, the study will proceed with an intentional caveat in mind. The Church of God in its codified list of 'Doctrinal Commitments' chose to include 'Divine Healing' as a separate tenet of faith from that of spiritual gifts. The two tenets are understood as being distinguishable in the sense that, although all healing is considered to be divine healing, all healing does not necessarily involve the spiritual gifts of healing. The practice of divine healing and the spiritual gifts of healing will be given further attention in section 8 below.

7.1 Historical understanding of the relationship between the doctrine of impartation and spiritual gifts

Included initially tentatively, and now forming more permanently part of the Church of God's official statement of faith, is the resolute belief in the Spirit's impartation of spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:1, 7, 10, 28, 31; 14:1). At inception, the doctrine's original formulation stated that '[We believe in] the full restoration of the gifts to the Church'; it now reads, '[We believe in] spiritual gifts' (Gause 1973:229). Concomitant with the impartation of the Spirit is the belief in 'signs following the believer' (Mark 16:17ff.) and

the Holy Spirit who imparts or distributes spiritual gifts 'individually as He wills' (1 Cor 12:4-11). Although, the purpose of the doctrine was not self-aggrandisement, unfortunately, some who search for 'signs and wonders' opened themselves to questionable subjective impressions that created at least two concerns. On the one hand, some, citing Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14, chose to believe that it is within their prerogative to impart the gifts (Conn 1963: 12). On the other hand, some believed that gifts could be imparted by prophecy and/or by the laying on of hands (Horton 1986:200). Both beliefs raise a number of questions.

Firstly, is there scriptural precedent upon which anyone may validly conclude that God abdicates His sovereignty and allowing humans to impart the Spirit's gifts as they choose to see fit? Secondly, what scriptural evidence exists to justify the freedom of leaders who choose which gifts to impart? Thirdly, since prophecy is highly subjective and often involves self-generated impressions rather than revelations, how do leaders discern between words from God, a self-generated word and a word from the evil one in order to prevent recipients from being manipulated by a prophet (cf. Gause 2009:125; Joubert and Maartens 2017; 2018)?⁵⁶ These questions reflect concerns that indicate that prophetic ministry can be a highly detrimental practice in the church, especially in respect with impartation. Friesen (2004:89-98) lists the following reasons: impressions can come from various sources, for example, God, Satan and human emotions; the vagueness of the impressions; and the absence of biblical authority to validate impressions. Gause (2009:125) lists two reasons, namely, the attempt to impart, through prophecy, that which is humanly self-generated rather than divinely inspired, and the confusion that results from the failure to distinguish between a Spirit-inspired impartation and a human imitation thereof.

⁵⁶ Very early in the development of the Church of God, some who received prophecies from others were led to believe that they were given the impartation of foreign languages. They left for mission fields only to return disillusioned and disappointed (Hall 1949:5; Phillips 2014:126; Sims 1995:122). Others have been told that they were called to be pastors or teachers but were unable to teach or pastor an assembly.

In short, the historical development of the doctrine is problematic, for while Scripture teaches about the impartation of gifts by the laying on of hands and prophecy (1 Tim 4:14), it is questionable whether it served as a normative model for ministry in the church.

7.2 Current understanding of the relationship between the doctrine of impartation and spiritual gifts

It has now become common practice in the Church of God to provide opportunity for believers to receive and exercise their gifts during church meetings. Also, leaders have endeavoured to avoid falling prey to the historical misunderstanding of Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14. However, notwithstanding the Church of God's apprehension about prophecies, it has retained the practice of praying and laying on of hands as a way to impart spiritual gifts (Tipei 2009:217). Furthermore, characteristic of the present understanding of the practice is that gifts, such as were imparted to Timothy, are not part of the nine 'extraordinary' gifts of the Spirit described in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11. The latter gifts are not imparted by human hands or by prophetic utterance apart from the sovereign will of the Spirit.⁵⁷ In respect to, and seemingly in conflict with the previous thought, leaders continue to believe that there are ministry gifts and callings to ministry that are ordained and confirmed by the laying on of hands (Arrington 2008:300; Conn 1963:12; Hughes 1986:173-174).

In summary, the Church of God believes spiritual gifts are available to every believer and opportunity should be given for the impartation of those gifts. Therefore, worshippers are encouraged to follow Paul's admonition to pray for and 'desire spiritual gifts' (1 Cor 14:1). However, the idea that persons can lay hands on others and on their own initiative declare that a gift will be imparted to them is an unscriptural practice.

⁵⁷ One example is that of Kenneth Copeland (2016), who during the funeral service of a renowned minister within the Church of God, prayed for the man's son and told him he was going to receive his father's 'mantle'. The laying on of hands was accompanied by the following proclamation: 'In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, by his instruction I impart this anointing and mantle upon you'. Copeland's use of the name of the Lord in Old Testament prophetic style (Deut 18:19-22) places him in the position of accountability. According to Scripture, he should be judged on the viability of his words.

Irrespective of these impartational differences, Church of God leaders maintain their belief that gifts can be imparted. Moreover, the following are considered to be conditional criteria for impartation and reception: the receiver must be a believer who confesses the lordship of Christ (1 Cor 12:3); the recipient must have an intimate relationship with the Holy Spirit,⁵⁸ and while numerable ordinary and extraordinary gifts are available for impartation, believers are encouraged to trust the Holy Spirit to choose which gift is best for their life (Hughes 1986:174; Sims 1995:46); and recipients are to yield to the method by which the Holy Spirit chooses to impart the gift.

In addition to the aforementioned criteria are several points that both the imparter and the recipient should bear in mind: (1) persons asking for the impartation of gifts are to present themselves before God and not man; (2) although persons present themselves for prayer or the laying on of hands, their doing so does not guarantee the impartation of a gift; (3) the Holy Spirit is the only one who determines gifts that are received; and (4) the biblical way of the manifestation of a gift is the only way to determine whether someone has been legitimately imparted a gift.

7.3 The biblical-theological understanding of the doctrine of impartation and spiritual gifts

Scripture records multiple examples in support of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and impartation by the laying on of hands. In Luke 24:49 it is recorded that the disciples were to 'tarry in the city of Jerusalem until [they] are endued with power from on high'. Acts 2:4 records that those tarrying 'were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance'. Subsequently, Acts 8:15

⁵⁸ The intimacy spoken of here is one where the Holy Spirit is allowed to serve as an Agent bringing about and maintaining sanctification in the life of the believer. Such was the case in Romans 1:4. Paul declared that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of 'holiness' and in Romans 15:16 the Gentiles were made to be 'acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit'. Gause (2009:100-101) regards sanctification as a preparatory experience for the baptism with the Holy Spirit, making way for the cultivation of the fruit of the Spirit. Since the gifts are resident in the Holy Spirit, the relationship one has with the Spirit affects the impartation and operation of the gifts (Triplett 1970:62-75).

reveals that believers in Samaria were prayed for so that they 'might receive the Holy Spirit'. Again, in Acts 19:6, readers were informed that hands were laid upon the Ephesian disciples and that 'the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke in tongues and prophesied'. However, it is Paul who distinguishes in greater detail the gift of the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts.

The book of Acts provides sufficient evidence to conclude that Paul had a very deep conceptual understanding of the nature and work of the Holy Spirit. Acts 9:17 describes the apostle's personal baptism in the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands. Parallel with this experience is his laying on of hands on the Ephesian believers to receive the Holy Spirit (Acts 19:6). However, when reading 1 Corinthians and other Pauline writings such as Romans, 1, 2 Timothy and Ephesians, a more concise theology pertaining to the availability, operation and impartation of spiritual gifts is found. First, in Paul's letter to the Corinthians, he expresses his desire for them to have the gifts of the Spirit. The apostle is thankful that those following Christ have been blessed by God with 'utterance' and 'knowledge', but he does not want them to lack or 'come short in no gift' (1 Cor 1:6-7).⁵⁹ Second, in 1 Corinthians 12:7-28 and Ephesians 4:7-12, he provides a list of extraordinary and ordinary gifts that are available to the church. Paul's list includes such gifts as healing, a word of wisdom, a word of knowledge, faith, and being a pastor,⁶⁰ evangelist and prophet. Third, in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 he names the Holy Spirit as the dispenser of the gifts. Thus, gifts are imparted as discretionary expressions of the Spirit's own sovereign action: 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. There are differences of ministries, but the same Lord. [T]he same Spirit works all these things, distributing to each one individually as He

⁵⁹Paul's thoughts (έν μηδενι χαρίσματοι) are somewhat ambiguous. Morris (1981:37) suggests that they most likely mean spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:4ff.) Fee (1987:42), suggests that the statement 'that you come short in no gift' perhaps correlates with the contemporary church's loss of the spiritual gifts given in 1 Corinthians 12-14. If this is the case, retaining the Spirit's gifts should be emphasised given the church's eschatological anticipation of Christ's return.

⁶⁰ It is debatable whether the Greek (ποιμένα) refers only to pastors or pastor/teacher. In 1 Timothy 3:2, 2 Timothy 2:2, 24 and Titus Paul refers to elders (pastors) that should be able to teach others. Wuest (1973, 1:101) suggests the gifted individual is both pastor and teacher.

wills' (1 Cor 12:1-11). Fourth, Paul informs his readers that gifts are to be used for the edification, unity and equipping of the saints (1 Cor 14:26; Eph 4). Finally, the operation of the gifts are to involve discipline, restraint, and evaluation when necessary (1 Cor 14:27-40).

But Paul also expresses the thought that spiritual gifts can be imparted to other believers. Upon his visit to the Roman believers, Paul promises to impart spiritual gifts to them: 'For I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, so that you may be established' (Rom 1:11). He presents the idea that gifts can be imparted by prophecy and the laying on of hands, and does so by emphasising Timothy's gift which was given to him 'by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the eldership' (1 Tim 4:14). He refers again to the gift in 2 Timothy 1:6. However, Paul's suggestion that he and elders imparted gifts by the laying on of hands and prophecy raises the following question: How can his theology presented in Romans 1:11, 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6 be reconciled with 1 Corinthians 12:7-10 where Paul implies that the gifts are imparted by the Holy Spirit? Two possibilities will be considered. First, Paul's collocation of πνευματικόν χάρισμα in Romans 1:11 does not seem to be associated with the extraordinary gifts in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10 and Romans 12:6. Rather, in the mind of Boice (1991:80) and Fee (1994:488), it means that Paul wants to impart a 'Spirit gift' to them by way of his preaching, his epistle, or his understanding of the gospel. Second, Paul's reference could mean that God will use him to lay hands on the believers and pray but the Holy Spirit will bestow upon them the gifts they need.

Paul's words, 'Do not neglect the gift that is in you' (1 Tim 4:14), which were given to Timothy, may provide some insight into his theology as well. He uses the word 'gift' without πνευματικόν which suggests that the impartation was a particular ministry ability given as a result of his indwelling of the Spirit. Fee (1994:771-774) suggests that the appearance of δια προφητείας μετα ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου is not to imply that prophecy determined the specific gift given, but rather that prophetic utterances were involved in some way

during the impartational service. Additionally, Paul's phrase, 'Therefore I remind you to stir up the gift of God which is in you' (2 Tim 1:6), may refer to the impartation of the 'gift', but the words 'of God' suggests that 2 Timothy 1:6 may represent a separate event where Paul laid hands upon Timothy. The use of 'gift' on this occasion would then refer to Timothy's receiving of the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands which was a reoccurring practice (Acts 8:14-19; 9:17; 19:1-6).

In sum, Scripture provides multiple examples for the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts. However, it was determined that in Paul's writings believers are provided a more detailed account of the availability, operation and impartation of gifts. Through Paul's scriptural example believers are left with the following truths. Firstly, Paul is involved in imparting gifts to the Romans and Timothy, yet there is no evidence that he deceived believers, took it upon himself to act as God, or violated Scripture in the process. Secondly, Paul presents the idea that prophesy can be involved in meetings where impartations are given, but he does not suggest or deny that it is within man's ability to prophesy or choose the particular gifts to be given. Rather, he affirms that the Holy Spirit distributes gifts according to His will (1 Cor 12:11). And thirdly, while Paul's theology gives latitude for leaders to be involved in the impartation of spiritual gifts, he never encourages an attempt to usurp the will and control of the Holy Spirit.

8. Impartation and Divine Healing in the Church of God

The purpose of this section is to discuss what led to the formulation of the Church of God's doctrinal statement on divine healing. It will be explained why the doctrine will receive attention from the foregoing discussion of the Church's doctrinal policy on impartation and spiritual gifts. The doctrine of impartation and divine healing in the Church of God will be discussed from a historical, current, and biblical perspective. Attention will also be given to how the doctrine of impartation and healing has been misunderstood and abused.

Just as important to the Church of God's theology of the impartational ministry of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts is its belief regarding divine healing. Initially believers who comprised the Church of God and experienced the impartation of the baptism of the Holy Spirit with speaking in tongues began to witness multiple healings and miracles. These healings and miracles led to the formulation of a doctrinal statement to reflect the Church of God's understanding of divine healing. Gause (1973:230-231) emphasises that the doctrinal statement remains as it was originally formulated in the *General Assembly Minutes* in 1912: 'We believe divine healing is provided for all in the atonement'. Several scriptural passages are given for support. Psalms 103:3, '[God] heals all your diseases'; Isaiah 53:4-5, 'He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement for our peace was upon Him and by His stripes we are healed', as well as James 5:14-16 and 1 Peter 2:24. The inclusion of the statement as a distinctive tenet of faith in Pentecostalism and especially the Church of God demonstrates that divine healing was and is 'a doctrine not likely to languish' (Bare 1993:71).

Important also to the Church of God's formulated statement on healing is the biblical understanding that divine healing and gifts of healing are different in nature. The Church of God believes that divine healing is provided in the atonement of Christ. French Arrington (1993:259) says in this regard, 'emphasis on divine healing in the Atonement agrees with the theology of the early church that a close bond exists between the spiritual aspects of salvation and physical healing. Jesus came to save the whole person'. On the one hand, as a part of the redemptive provision of Christ, every believer is given the privilege of praying for him or herself and others to be healed. No believer is excluded from practicing James 5:14-15, and through divine healing God heals in multiple ways. Morris (2012:90) suggests that it may be instant or progressive healing, healing following prayer, healing following medical treatment, and healing as a

result of lifestyle changes.⁶¹ On the other hand, the χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων (gifts of healing) in 1 Corinthians 12:9 are viewed as a special endowment or manifestation of the Holy Spirit which enables certain individuals to carry out a miraculous ministry of healing.⁶² Most often, when divine healing results from the use of the gifts of healing, miraculous instantaneous healing occurs. However, healing is imparted by believers who simply obey James 5:14-15 and by persons whom the Holy Spirit chooses to distinctly minister the 'gifts of healing'. In short, Church of God leaders believe all healing is divine healing, but not that all healing includes impartation through the exercise of the gifts of healing. With this in mind, it remains to explore the relationship between the doctrine of impartation and divine healing from a historical, current and biblical perspective.

8.1 Historical understanding of the relationship between the doctrine of impartation and divine healing

At the time of the formulation of the doctrinal statement on divine healing, the leadership of the Church of God understood that God heals through different methods: through the preached word, simple faith and prayer, or by means of the ministry of the gifts of healing. One primary practice associated with healing was anointing with oil and the laying on of hands. AJ Tomlinson (1910a:1-2) encouraged preachers and members to pray for healing of the sick and to follow the practices that are described in Mark 16:17-18 and James 5:14. The laying on of hands was subsequently accepted as one of the common ways God imparted healing to the sick. The doctrinal statement together with scriptural support therefore provided the foundation upon which the Church of God based its impartational theology, succinctly summarised by Conn

⁶¹ Morris fails to include scriptural support for his position. However, Luke 17:11-19, John 9:1-7, Mark 5:25-29, and Acts 3:1-10 are examples of progressive and instantaneous healing. John 11:38-44, Acts 28:8 and James 5:13-15 provide support for healing after prayer. Proverbs 14:30, 17:22, and 1 Timothy 5:23 indicate healing by lifestyle changes and medicine.

⁶² For a greater understanding of the Church of God's doctrine on healing, see Alexander (2006), Lowery (1997:95-116), Thomas (2012), Tipei (2009) and Tomberlin (2010:225-258).

(2008:140) in the following words: 'The doctrines of the church, it seems accurate to say, have always been regarded as sacrosanct and absolute—non-negotiable beliefs that gave the church birth and keep it alive'. Unfortunately, with the 'sacrosanct and absolute' came misapplication of the doctrine of impartation.

Misunderstanding and misuse of the doctrine of the impartation of healing became associated with three core beliefs: all sickness has a demonic origin; consulting physicians and the use of medication were seen as signs of unbelief; and sickness was a sign of the presence of sin in a person's life. These core beliefs were unfortunate because it led to members being judged as lacking faith. Some was seen as suffering from undue physical pain and others died from refusing medical attention (cf. Phillips 2014:309-323). Misunderstanding and misuse of the doctrine also manifested in other ways. Some leaders, who invited others to receive prayer for their healing, claimed that new teeth and teeth fillings would be the result of the impartation of divine healing. Others presenting themselves for prayer received prophecies declaring that they were healed when they were not. Even more so, one minister in a public meeting claimed that blind eyes had been opened, but it was found that the proclaimed healing was the result of his own fabrication and deceit (Tharp 1986:114).

The misunderstanding of the Church of God's doctrine on healing and the false beliefs and unbiblical practices to which it led raise the following concerns. In the first place, it is questionable whether these beliefs and practices can be reconciled with the beliefs and practices of Jesus and His apostles, for He neither attributed all sickness to the demonic nor the presence of sin (John 9:1-3). Furthermore, Jesus never forbid anyone to consult a physician, in spite of the fact that physicians were not always successful in healing the sick (Mark 5:26). As an afterthought, it is difficult to imagine that Luke stopped being a physician when he became a disciple of Jesus (Col 4:14). Second, Paul's encouraging Timothy to take wine for his stomach problems (1 Tim 5:23) is hardly ever considered by

those who misuse the Church of God's doctrine of impartation.⁶³ Most problematic is the fact that leaders in the Church of God fail to discipline false prophets when all prophecy and prophets are to be judged (Deut 18:20-22; 1 Cor 14:29). This failure has serious implications for the integrity of both the Church of God and its individual leaders, as noted by Joubert and Maartens (2017:105–130).

8.2 The current understanding of the doctrine of impartation and divine healing

Although the Church of God's doctrinal statement on divine healing has not changed since its formulation in 1912, the Church's approach to biblical hermeneutics has developed to the point where greater clarity of the biblical concept of sickness and impartational healing can be provided to its leaders and members. What also remained unchanged is the Church of God's acceptance of impartation and the healing of the sick through the laying on of hands⁶⁴ and the common practice of anointing the sick with oil (Jas 5:14-15). Tipei (2009:147) notes that oil was viewed as a common medicine and symbol of God's healing power as is evident in the story of the Good Samaritan where the victim received 'pouring on of oil and wine' (Luke 10:34) and the mission of the disciples in Mark 6:13 who 'anointed with oil many who were sick and healed them'. There are also other means by which the sick may receive healing. The denomination's official magazine *The Church of God Evangel* records healings similar to those in Luke 8:42-48 and Acts 19:11-12, namely, touching someone's clothes or the laying of parts of one's clothing on the sick. Thomas (2016:89) notes that 'from the beginning of the movement, Pentecostals have made use of this means to facilitate healing'.

⁶³ Wuest (1973, 2:88) indicates that this was a deitetic prescription as well as that the word οἶνω (wine) is used here, as everywhere else, means fermented and used as a medicine. The implication is that Paul was instructing Timothy to take wine as a cure for his ailments (Robertson 1931, 4:589).

⁶⁴ The Church of God believes in divine healing which is different from 'faith healing'. Conn (2008:89) distinguishes the two as follows: 'Faith healing takes place in the body of the individual because of his mental attitude or faith. Divine healing is a direct work of God in the body of the afflicted one, usually occurring in response to personal faith but also where faith does not reside in the one healed, such as when the afflicted person cannot exhibit faith because of unconsciousness, insensibility or infancy' (1 Pet 2:24).

Something about the prominence and seriousness of the practice also reflect in literary testimonials of healing (Thomas 2016:93-95). It explains why circulation of pieces of clothing among believers and between churches remains a practice to this day.

There is yet another example of healing in addition to the ones already referred to. It consists of a word spoken to someone who has faith to receive an impartation from God. The practice is based on the example of the centurion requesting healing for his servant from Jesus. The centurion said, 'Lord I am not worthy that You should come under my roof. But only speak a word, and my servant will be healed' (Matt 8:5-13). Also, in Acts 3:6 the lame man is healed as Peter declares, 'Silver and gold I do not have, but what I do have I give you. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk'.

The Church of God's current understanding of impartation and of the healing of the sick raises an all-important question: How does that understanding relate to the belief that divine healing is provided for all through the death of Jesus? Initially many believed the provision of divine healing meant God healed everyone of everything. But, the Church of God no longer believes that (cf. Alexander 2006:113; Morris 2012:89). However believing in divine healing reveals a number of anomalies that requires clarity. Firstly, because God provides healing for all through the atonement of Jesus, does this mean that everyone on whom hands are laid should be healed by God? Secondly, how is the atonement to be reconciled with the fact that God does not heal every believer who is sick? Thirdly, upon receiving divine healing, how can it be explained why everyone is not permanently healed from all infirmities?

In sum, while the general thought in the Church of God at present is that God heals but not everyone who is sick (Arrington 1993:266), it seems that its understanding of impartation is seriously incomplete. What it lacks seems to be an adequate understanding of the sovereignty of God.

8.3 The biblical-theological understanding of divine healing and the doctrine of impartation

The theme of divine healing and the doctrine of impartation appear in numerous scriptural passages. Psalms 103:3 records that the Lord ‘heals all your diseases’; Isaiah 53:5 states that ‘He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement for our peace was upon Him, and by His stripes we are healed’; And 1 Peter 2:24 reveals that ‘[Jesus] Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that we having died to sins, might live for righteousness—by whose stripes you were healed’. Jesus is implicated as the provision for healing. Not only did He provide divine healing, He also imparted healing. Matthew 8:14-17 describes how He, while visiting Capernaum, healed Peter’s mother-in-law and ‘all who were sick’. In Mark 5:27-34, Jesus imparts healing to a woman who believed that ‘if only [she] may touch His clothes [she] shall be made well’. Healing was also imparted to a leper and two blind men when Jesus reached out His hand and touched them (Matt 8:1-3; 9:27-29). The daughter of Jairus was healed and raised from the dead after Jesus took her by the hand and said, ‘little girl, I say to you arise’ (Mark 5:41-42). After thirty eight-years of being crippled, the lame man at the pool of Bethesda is healed when he obeyed the command given by Jesus to ‘Rise, take up your bed and walk’ (John 5:1-9).

Other evidence of impartational healing is documented in the book of Acts. For instance, in Acts 4:12 the church along with Peter and John pray that God would ‘stretch out’ His hand and heal, and that ‘signs and wonders may be done through the name of Your holy Servant Jesus’. Hence, many ‘signs’ and ‘wonders’ were performed ‘through the hands of the apostles’ (Acts 5:12).⁶⁵ Luke does not describe how every healing

⁶⁵ Barrett (1994:273-274) remarks that the *διὰ χειρός* (‘by the hand’) is commonly used as in Acts 7:25, however the use of *διὰ τῶν χειρῶν* (by the hands) in Acts 5:12 is understood by some to be taken literally, meaning the sick were healed by the laying on of hands. Opposite is Peterson (2009:214), who suggests the meaning is most likely a general reference to the apostles taking part in the process by which God stretched out His hand to do the work.

was received, but inferences may be drawn from the following healings: A lame receives an impartation of healing when Peter says to him 'Silver and gold I do not have, but what I do have I give you; In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk'. After which Peter lifts the lame man up by the right hand (Acts 3:1-7). Tipei (2000:106) suggests Saul received divine healing when hands were laid upon him by Ananias. Because, 'Immediately there fell from his eyes something like scales, and he received his sight at once' (Acts 9:18). In Acts 28:8, Paul lays hands upon the father of Publius who is sick with fever and dysentery whereupon the father is healed. One final example is given in James 5. The sick are to present themselves to be anointed with oil by the elders of the church and prayed for. After which James states 'the prayer of faith will save the sick and the Lord will raise him up' (Jas 5:14-15).

Several conclusions may be drawn from the biblical support of the doctrine of divine healing and impartation in the Church of God. First, Psalms 103:3, Isaiah 53:5, and 1 Peter 2:24 indicate the connection between divine healing and the atoning work of Christ and that healing is provided for all. Second, the impartation of healing was practiced by Jesus and the apostles. Third, the impartation of divine healing was a reoccurring experience. Fourth, multiple means were used to impart healing such as, the laying on of hands and anointing with oil, touching the person who is sick, or through spoken words (John 5:8). Fifth, all believers can participate in imparting healing to the sick (Mark 16:15-18; Jas 5:14-15).

In summary, the discussion of impartation and divine healing revealed that the Church of God in its embryonic stage came to view the doctrine of divine healing as sacred. Leaders, as a result, created a formal doctrinal statement which reads, 'We believe divine healing is provided for all in the atonement'. What this doctrinal statement reveals is the understanding that divine healing encompasses the 'gifts of healing' but also that 'gifts of healing' are not always used in an impartation of healing. Divine healing may also occur miraculously by prayer or progressively through medical treatment or a lifestyle change. In addition, divine

healing may be received by means such as the laying on of hands, anointed clothes, or a spoken word. Research revealed that although the doctrine of divine healing is biblically supported and considered 'sacrosanct and absolute', several misapplications of the doctrine led to excess and abuse. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that a better understanding of the Church of God's belief in divine healing and the doctrine of impartation is required, for at least two reasons. First, a study is needed of the biblical perspective on sickness and divine healing that explores (a) the origin of sickness, (b) why believers get sick although they have received atonement, and (c) why faith is confessed although one chooses to seek healing through another means in addition to divine healing. Second, greater harmonizing of the Church of God's statement on divine healing with the sovereignty of God is required.

9. Impartation and Blessings in the Church of God

In this section, the Church of God's practice of impartation and blessing from a historical, current and biblical perspective will be discussed. Attention will focus on the commonality of the practice, the means by which the impartations are given and the scriptural blessings that are imparted to believers. Reasons will be given for the doctrine of impartation and how the blessing has been misunderstood in the Church of God and how that misunderstanding has led to the occasional misapplication of Scripture.

9.1 Historical understanding of the doctrine of impartation and blessing

Viewed from an historical perspective, the doctrine of impartation and blessing seems to be a ritual that has been commonly practiced in the Church of God. The means by which blessings are imparted most often involve spoken words and the laying on of hands. Historical records reveal that impartation became a standard practice very early in the Church of God. During the 1913 General Assembly, RG Spurling laid hands upon AJ Tomlinson and prayed a prayer of blessing (Conn

2008:111-112; Juillerat 1922:103,173). Tim Hill (2014) acknowledges that it has been assumed that there is a connection between the laying on of hands and phraseologies such as 'I bless you in the name of the Lord'. The problem is, as he correctly observed, that the connotations attached to the phrase have never been well defined. Nevertheless, the speaker assumes that his words reflect the intent of God to bestow on, or share with, the person a blessing. One scriptural example describing sharing or bestowing blessing is Genesis 28:1-4. Isaac blesses Jacob and prays that God will give Jacob the blessing of Abraham. A second is Genesis 48:8-20: Jacob lays hands upon Ephraim and Manasseh and prays that God 'bless the lads' and 'let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth'. Other Scriptures used are Leviticus 9:22 and Numbers 6:22-26. These scriptural examples contributed, in part, to establish the Church of God's doctrine of impartation and the means by which blessings are imparted.

Also forming part of the Church of God's doctrine of impartation are examples of the impartation of blessings in the New Testament as a result of the redemptive work of Christ (Gal 3:7-9; 3:11-14; Heb 8:6-13). It is accepted that believers, through Christ, have been given 'all things that pertain to life and godliness' as well as 'exceeding great and precious promises (2 Pet 1:3-4). Through the promise given to Abraham (Gen 12:3), and ultimately the finished work of Christ (Gal 3:11-14), all humankind are blessed. Consequently, the blessings imparted by spoken words or the laying on of hands are accepted as spiritual blessings. However, as Hill (2016) notes, the connotation of 'blessing someone' has not been clearly defined in the Church of God which has led to occasional misapplication of Scripture. Some pastors, who have been influenced by the 'Word of Faith' theology, came to assume that the impartation of blessings meant the conveyance of physical things, for example, land, descendants and material blessings.⁶⁶ However, Morris

⁶⁶ The researcher attended a Church of God conference where an offering was given. The pastor assigned to receive the offering spoke briefly about giving and then asked the congregation to stretch forth their hands and move their fingers in a beckoning

(2012:84-85) correctly points out that the Church of God's historical understanding of blessing is not to be confused with Word of Faith theology, especially the idea that the material entitlements of the Abrahamic covenant can be imparted to Christians (cf. Copeland 1974:51; McConnell 1995:169-174). Although God does on occasion provide material things in answer to believing prayer, nothing about the doctrine of impartation suggests a 'naming and claiming' theology of material wealth or perfect health based on promises given to Abraham.

Although historical evidence confirms that the doctrine of impartation and blessing has been an accepted practice in the Church of God, the misapplication of Scripture and the response by Hill and Morris indicate that more work is needed to clarify what the doctrine means in practice.

9.2 Current understanding of the doctrine of impartation and blessing

Currently, leaders within the Church of God continue to affirm their belief in the doctrine of impartation and blessing. The perspective forming the doctrinal practice mirrors the belief established historically in the Church of God. The belief is that through the Abrahamic covenant and the redemptive work of Christ 'all the families of the earth shall be blessed' (Gen 12:3; Acts 3:25-26). However, there is also the realisation that the promise of land, children and blessings in the Old Testament covenant applies primarily to the Jewish people, whereas the New Testament covenant (Heb 8:7-13) applies to those who are experiencing the redeeming power of Christ. Representative of those blessings in the New Testament covenant are justification by faith, freedom from the law, the promise of the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts (Gal 3; Eph 4).

Because all believers have been promised spiritual blessings, it is accepted that those blessings can be imparted in the following manner. First, leaders feel it is appropriate to lay hands upon recipients and pray

motion and to repeat the words 'money cometh, blessings cometh'. He prayed a prayer of financial blessing over the people and promised that material blessings would come.

for specific blessings such as forgiveness, the Holy Spirit, health and special anointing's of the Spirit. The belief is that praying in this manner replicates Genesis 48:14-16. However, impartational blessings may or may not involve the laying on of hands or physical touch as noted earlier (Tipei 2009:19-20). Second, blessings may be imparted by spoken proclamations such as in Numbers 6:22-27,⁶⁷ where Aaron proclaims, 'The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make His face shine upon you, and be gracious to you, the Lord lift up His countenance upon you, and give you peace'. Leaders also often use 3 John 2 ('I pray [and bless you] that you may prosper in all things and be in health, just as your soul prospers') to convey the idea that blessings are to be expected. Third, leaders often impart blessings in a non-specific (vague) manner, saying things such as 'I bless you in the name of the Lord Jesus to receive all you have need of physically, emotionally and spiritually'. Thus, the current practices of impartation and blessing in the Church of God are seemingly not dissimilar to those of Jesus who blessed children and His disciples by the laying on of hands and spoken words (Mark 10:13-16; Luke 24:50).

9.3 The biblical-theological understanding of blessing and the doctrine of impartation

Leaders have understood the doctrine to be both theologically and biblically sound. The main premise is based upon the following scriptural support. During the period of the Old Testament covenant, the impartation of blessings by the laying on of hands and spoken words seems to have been a normal and significant practice. The biblical example of Isaac blessing Jacob suggests doctrinal proof for the following reasons: (1) Rebekah, the mother of Jacob, is troubled when hearing that Isaac is going to bless Esau (Gen 27:5-7); (2) Rebekah encourages Jacob to deceive Isaac in order to obtain Esau's blessing

⁶⁷ It is not uncommon for Church of God pastors to offer a prayer of blessing over their people at the conclusion of the worship service in similar fashion to the instruction given by God to Aaron (Numbers 6:22-26). Some incorporate a prayer of blessing with the additional laying on of hands when dedicating children or officiating at weddings.

(Gen 27:8-13); (3) Jacob participates in the deception to obtain the blessing of Esau (Gen 27:11-29); and (4) Esau became distressed and bitter when he heard that his blessing has been given to Jacob (Gen 27:30-36). The effort made to obtain a blessing and the emotions that are involved thus confirm the reality and significance of blessings through the laying on of hands.

Another example is found in Genesis 48. Jacob calls for Manasseh and Ephraim, the sons of Joseph, so that he might impart a blessing to them (Gen 48:8-10). Joseph responds unfavourably when Jacob places his right hand upon the younger Ephraim and his left hand upon Manasseh the firstborn (Gen 48:14-19). The reason for Joseph's displeasure was because the greater blessing customarily reserved for the firstborn was given to Ephraim. These examples of Isaac and Jacob blessing their family members by the laying on of hands and spoken words indicate that blessings were a significant practice in the lives of the Israelite patriarchs and, according to Tipei (2009:18-20), is indicative of something real and tangible being imparted.

Significant evidence of the practice of imparted blessings also appears in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus blessed children through physical contact and prayer (Matt 19:13-15; Mk 10:13-16; Lk 18:15-17). Mark 10:13 records that parents 'brought little children to Him, that He might touch them'. The καὶ προσέφερεν αὐτοῖς is in the imperfect tense meaning 'they kept on bringing' them for the impartation (Wuest 1973, 1:199). The reason, according to Robinson (2008:147), was that the parents had witnessed the power of Jesus' touch and wished a similar transfer upon their children. Also, prior to His ascension, Jesus 'lifted up His hands and blessed' the disciples with a spoken word (Luke 24:50). In Luke 6:28, Jesus encourages His followers to practice blessing, saying 'bless those who curse you, and pray for those who spitefully use you'. Paul in Romans 12:14 exclaims, 'bless those who persecute you: bless and do not curse'. Similarly, 1 Peter 3:9 states: '[do not return] evil for evil or reviling for reviling, but on the contrary blessing knowing that you are called to this, that you may inherit a blessing'.

Given the biblical evidence, it is reasonable to conclude that the Bible teaches the doctrine of blessing and impartation through the laying on of hands and spoken words. Nevertheless, what cannot be substantiated by Scripture are (a) the idea that the NT covenant is the same as or an extension of the OT Abrahamic covenant, (b) that believers are promised all the blessings of the OT Abrahamic covenant and (c) that imparted blessings are for the purpose of creating material wealth.

In sum, attention has been given to the doctrine of impartation and blessings in the Church of God. Historically, and currently, the doctrine has been commonly practiced and it is accepted that the primary means used for the impartation of blessings are the laying on of hands and spoken words. Several scriptural passages were provided in support of the Church of God's belief. Furthermore, it was determined that the imparted blessings are not those that pertain to the Old Testament Abrahamic covenant, but those spiritual blessings appropriated by the finished work of Christ, such as justification, peace and the Holy Spirit (Rom 14:17). The blessings, however, may be specific or non-specific. In a word, the evidence confirms that the doctrine of impartation of blessings is biblical, therefore, that the Church of God's practice of impartation is similar to the practice of Isaac, Jacob and Jesus.

However, two issues surfaced that have encumbered the doctrinal practice. First, the Church of God has been reticent in defining the connotations associated with the impartation of blessings, and second, the lack of clear understanding of the concept has led to the misapplication of Scripture to NT believers. These encumbrances indicate that further study of the Church of God's doctrine of impartation and blessing is required.

10. Summary and Concluding Remarks

The focus in this chapter has been on the first research objective: to determine the need to formulate a doctrinal position on impartation for the Church of God denomination that is theologically sound, and to

critically evaluate the understanding of the doctrine as it has evolved in the denomination. The evaluation has provided a brief account of how the Church of God understood the doctrine of impartation from both an historical and the current perspective. It has been shown that the Church of God is very much part of Pentecostalism whose roots are in the Book of Acts, but more specifically, Wesleyan theology. Pentecostalism is associated with believers who experienced the baptism with the Holy Spirit and impartational gifts. It is, however, astonishing that the Church of God taught the doctrine and practice of impartation without any official doctrinal or positional statement on how it has to be understood for practice. The result was nothing less than unscriptural practices and abuse of the doctrine. Church of God leaders responded to the abuse by creating a codified list of doctrinal commitments and beliefs. Although the formulation of the doctrinal beliefs helped to bring greater ecclesiastical and theological stability, it has become evident that further study is required if the Church of God is to adopt an adequate biblical understanding of the doctrine of impartation.

The discussion has also shown that, despite misunderstandings of the doctrine, it continues as a common practice in the Church of God. What thus remains is the need for a unified and fully developed definition and doctrinal position statement for the practice. Several criticisms against the current understanding of impartation in the Church of God have been highlighted. Firstly, there is an incomplete understanding of the doctrine by pastors, leaders and educators. The critique revealed a serious lack of hermeneutical insight into the doctrine when looked at in the light of biblical teaching. It was shown that the definitions were somewhat ambiguous in respect to the particular gift or gifts that are imparted and the manner by which the impartations are given. Of utmost importance is the need to test the genuineness of impartations. Detailed information on how such a test might be performed is clearly absent.

Secondly, the doctrine of impartation and the baptism with the Holy Spirit in the Church of God was addressed. The Holy Spirit is primarily imparted by the laying on of hands and is accompanied with speaking in tongues.

However, there were certain interpretations that created serious concern. For instance, the fact that the experience of speaking in other tongues is more emphasised than the Person of the Spirit of God; the interpretation that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is a multi-baptismal experience with different levels of power and evidentiary fire; and the questionable belief that the impartation of the Holy Spirit is the result of the repeating of certain words or phrases and breathing exercises, all of which are without any biblical support.

Thirdly, the evaluation of the doctrine of impartation and spiritual gifts from a historical, current and biblical perspective reveal two misapplications of Scripture: (a) that Romans 1:11 provides leaders with the prerogative to choose the gifts to be imparted and that they can impart them as they see fit, and (b) that 1 Timothy 4:14 can be used as a rule to justify impartation of specific gifts through prophecy and the laying on of hands. No scriptural precedent was found to support the assumptions.

Fourthly, a critique of the doctrine of impartation and divine healing in the Church of God has shown that leaders view 'divine healing' and the 'gifts of healing' as distinguishable (Isa 53:4-5; 1 Pet 2:24; 1 Cor 12:9) and that healing is primarily imparted through the laying on of hands and the anointing with oil (Jas 5:15). It was also shown that the doctrine of impartation and divine healing has initially resulted in excessive practices in the Church. All sickness was understood to be demonic in origin and believers were taught not to seek medical attention. The misuse of prophesy with impartations is a frequent occurrence. Together, these practices demonstrate that far too many people in the Church of God have fallen prey to an inadequate understanding of prophecy, sickness and the sovereignty of God.

Finally, the assessment of the doctrine of impartation and blessing within the Church of God has shown that the doctrine has not been well understood and that practice most often involves the laying on of hands and unscriptural phraseologies that routinely include the words 'I bless

you in the name of the Lord'. Several examples of blessings in the OT and those related to Jesus in the NT serve as a pattern for blessing, but the blessings imparted are those provided by the redemptive work of Christ. Most problematic, however, is the assumption that the blessings available to believers include those in the Abrahamic covenant. It was argued that the impartations are not wealth or material goods, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. These misunderstandings provide more reasons why further study of the doctrine of impartation and blessing is required.

Irrespective of the need for greater doctrinal clarity, it was found that leaders of the Church of God are resolute on certain beliefs, especially the following: (a) the doctrine of impartation is a biblical practice; (b) the doctrine of impartation should be a normative practice in every Christian's life; (c) believers neither impart the Spirit nor His gifts on their own volition or apart from God's sovereign will and grace; and (d) the doctrine of impartation must always be subject to scriptural authority. Nevertheless, it was shown that the biblical and ecclesiastical understanding of the Church of God's position on impartation needs further development which can only come through further careful hermeneutical study.

It is for these reasons that the next chapter will focus on the meaning of the anchor text (Rom 1:11). The aim is to establish its influence and place in the Church of God's doctrine of impartation because of its ecclesiastical implications. Thus far, the premise has been that the Church of God believes in the doctrine of impartation and Romans 1:11 has been used to solidify that belief. A study of the anchor text will help to determine how the text has contributed to the Church of God's belief and whether or not the doctrine of impartation as presented in this chapter has merit. Furthermore, the study will help to determine whether the gifts that are implicated with Paul's usage of *metadidomi* means to 'give over' or 'to give a share'. An analysis of the anchor text will also help to establish if Paul's use of *metadidomi* implies the impartation of ordinary or extraordinary gifts, including the means by which he intends the gifts to be imparted.

CHAPTER THREE

AN ANALYSIS OF ROMANS 1:11

1. Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on the second subsidiary objective, namely, to establish a biblical foundation for *metadidomi* and to indicate how personal experience of the gifts of the Spirit contributes to understanding the concept of impartation in the Church of God. The book of Romans has been categorised by John Phillips (1981:9) as a literary masterpiece and one of the most important theological documents in the history of the world. Reasonably so, it is in the book of Romans that Paul shares his thoughts on the theological implications of Christianity. Readers learn about truths such as the deeper meaning of the Old Testament and its relation to the cross (Rom 4-5); how confession leads to salvation (Rom 10); how the power of sin is broken (Rom 6); how the law is inadequate to save from sin (Rom 7); how the Holy Spirit assists with intercessory prayer (Rom 8); how governmental powers should be viewed (Rom 13); and how Christians can avoid being a stumbling block to other believers. Hence, the book of Romans is considered by Stott (1994:19) to be a timeless manifesto and the most thorough statement of the gospel in the New Testament. As such, the manifesto holds a special place in the life of the Christian church and not only changed history but also brought spiritual revolutions to the theologically astute as well as to the simple minded (Briscoe 1982:11). Louis Godet (1977:1), however, may have said it best: 'The probability is that every great spiritual revival in the church will be connected as effect and cause with a deeper understanding of this book'. Therefore, a consideration of Romans 1:11 in the discussion of impartation is deemed most appropriate.

2. Aim or Objectives of the Author

From its early beginnings, Pentecostalism was characterised by a set of distinctive beliefs about the doctrine of impartation of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, spiritual gifts, divine healing, and blessing. That set of beliefs were formed on the bases of what the Bible teaches on impartation. Thus, the focus in this chapter is on the anchor text. In a word, the hermeneutical understanding of Romans 1:11 has had a decisive influence on the theology of Pentecostalism and the Church of God. In this respect then, the purpose of this chapter will be to determine if Paul's promise to impart spiritual gifts to the Roman believers in Romans 1:11 provides biblical and theological support for the Church of God's doctrine of impartation. First, the anchor text will be assessed in order to provide limited information on the author, the audience, and the textual context of the book of Romans. An exegetical and hermeneutical analysis of the anchor text will then be presented. The aim is to explore the implication of Paul's promise to impart spiritual gifts to the Roman believers and to determine the scriptural meaning of the text. In this way the evaluation will (1) determine who among the Romans could expect to receive Paul's impartation, (2) identify the method Paul had in mind to impart the gifts, (3) identify the spiritual gifts to be imparted, and (4) to establish the purpose for Paul's desire to impart gifts.

Next, information will be provided on how the anchor text is understood by the Church of God and how spiritual experience has contributed to the understanding of Romans 1:11 and the concept of impartation. Of importance are the three hermeneutical models that will be presented in order to indicate the denomination's approach to the interpretation of Scripture. A brief assessment will be offered to demonstrate how the models have been used by Church of God leaders in the interplay of Scripture and experience. A comparison of the anchor text with the Church's current practice of impartation will be offered followed by a comparison of Romans 1:11 with supporting texts (Luke 3:11; Rom 12:6-8; Eph 4:28; 1 Thess 2:8) in which Paul uses the term *metadidomi*. The comparison will help to assess whether the gifts implicated for

impartation in the supporting texts are extraordinary or ordinary. There will also be a comparison of the anchor text with other scriptural passages that have impartational implications but do not mention the word *metadidomi*. The comparison will hopefully provide information that might help to determine the gifts that Paul intended to impart to the Romans, the means by which he intended to impart them, and whether scriptural support can be found for the Church of God's practice of impartation. It will be briefly shown how the denomination has ignored certain passages that refer to *metadidomi* and how leaders have possibly emphasised some gifts above others. The chapter will conclude with an analysis of the steps the Church of God has taken to correct aberrant manifestations and abuses of the doctrine of impartation and its practice.

2.1 The author

Paul, the great apostle to the Gentiles, has traditionally been viewed as the author of Romans (Gause 1986:16; Hodge 1947:9). Briscoe (1982:14) remarks that the Pauline authorship of the Roman Epistle has rarely been questioned. The reason being, the writer identifies himself as Paul (Rom 1:1). The personal references in the epistle as well as the emphasis given to Paul's apostleship confirm the book as being Pauline (Gause 1986:16; Hodge 1947:9). Important also, and not easily dismissed, is Paul's background. He was a Jewish scholar and Roman citizen who was constantly apprised of Greek culture in the first century. In the mind of Briscoe (1982:14), this repertoire along with Paul's spiritual calling uniquely qualified him to address the particular issues affecting the Roman church. Thus, understanding both Jew and the Gentile, Paul became the authoritative voice to them on the theological implications of Christianity.

2.2 The audience

The book of Romans was most likely written in Corinth and intended to be an official letter from Paul to the church or to groups of believers in Rome. Paul's words in Romans 15:23, 'having a great desire these many

years to come to you', seems to imply that the congregation had been in existence for some years and most likely consisted of both Jewish and Gentile converts⁶⁸ (Gause 1986:11; Hodge 1947:6; Stott 1994:32-33). The origin of the church is unknown, but Gause (1986:14) and Tenney (1982:304) suggest that the church most likely came into existence from believers who had been present on the day of Pentecost and had carried the gospel back to their home in Rome. Alternatively, the church originated from believers who had migrated to Rome from other parts of the world. Ironically, at the time of writing his letter, Paul had made multiple attempts to travel to the church but had been hindered on every occasion. Notwithstanding that, Paul remained persistent in his desire to visit them and to have fellowship with the many acquaintances he had in Rome, such as Pricilla, Aquila, Epaenetus and other Christian believers (Rom 16).

2.3 The context

Various reasons have been provided for the purpose and contextual nature of Paul's letter. Briscoe (1982:16) as well as Stott (1994:32-33) indicate that the communication was to apprise the Romans of his travel itinerary which included a much anticipated visit to them. Furthermore, the letter provided Paul with an opportunity to introduce himself to them, to establish his apostolic credentials and to share with them a full account of the Christian gospel. Given the fact that the church consisted of both Jewish and Gentile believers, the thought cannot be dismissed that the letter was intended to provide an explanation of the theological implications of the Christian faith as well as to address the various ethnic and cultural tensions that were of congregational concern. Gause (1986:17) adds, '[A]though Paul does not charge the Roman believers

⁶⁸Gause (1986:11) and Stott (1994:34) point out that there were at least three groups referred to in Romans 16. If so, then it is most likely that the church in Rome consisted of small groups that met in various places. Furthermore, New Testament scholars have argued that the epistle had a much wider circulation than that of the Roman church. Accordingly, the words 'in Rome' found in verses 7 and 15 of chapter one do not appear in some of the early texts. Briscoe (1982:15) proposes that while the letter was intended primarily for the believers in Rome, it is probable that the epistle was more widely circulated. A more detailed discussion is provided by Guthrie (1973:400-414).

with any corruption in doctrine or practice, he was clearly concerned that they understand the doctrine of grace'. It is, therefore, probable that the book of Romans was written as a didactic monograph and served as a substitute for Paul's personal presence. However, in contrast to 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians, which were controversial or corrective in nature, Tenney (1982:304) suggests that the book of Romans was devoted to teach deeper truths to those who had come to know Christ. In communicating those truths, Paul establishes the fact that salvation is given *sola gratia*, by grace alone (Rom 5:2). He argues that circumcision is not to be understood as an act of the flesh, but of the Spirit through faith (Rom 3:22-31) and that through faith one is made righteous. Last, but not least, Paul indicated his desire to share spiritual gifts with them in order for them to become established in their faith. In short, the Roman believers needed to learn more about the implications of the gospel. But, the church also needed comfort, encouragement, and strengthening. Cranfield (1975:79-81) suggests that Paul was praying that the Holy Spirit would meet their various needs through his visit to them and the impartation of spiritual gifts.

3. An Analysis of the Anchor Text: Romans 1:11

Paul begins his letter to the Roman church with an impressive salutation: 'Paul, a bondservant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated to the gospel of God which He promised before through His prophets in the Holy Scriptures' (Rom 1:1-2). The structure of Paul's opening remarks, according to Cranfield (1975:47), mirror that of the west-Asiatic custom, meaning the intent of the writer was to put 'specifically Christian and theological content into the salutation'. By doing so, this ordinary epistolary prescript clearly distinguishes Paul in name and as the holder of a specific office (Hodge 1947:15). However, he does not view himself as a person of status, but rather as a mere *δοῦλος*. He commences as such with his introduction: he has been divinely commissioned to preach and teach the gospel. Hence his passionate desire to visit the Roman believers and to fellowship with them. Commensurate with his visit is his overwhelming need to provide ministry that will fortify their spiritual lives,

which Paul expresses thus: 'For I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, so that you may be established' (Rom 1:11).

The reader may rightly wonder whether the Roman believers understood or questioned the implication of Paul's promise to impart gifts. The contemporary reader should, therefore, approach the text cautiously, especially since the pentecostal/charismatic believer approaches the text under the impact of the theology and practice of impartation (Budiselic 2011:245). On the one hand, the hermeneutical understanding of Romans 1:11 has led to the belief and teaching that impartations have numerous possibilities: believers can receive impartations of the Holy Spirit, including an anointing for special purposes, spiritual gifts, and unusual blessings. On the other hand, while Paul was convinced that God will use him to impart gifts to the Roman believers, a distortion of Paul's conviction has led to a misappropriation of the text by pentecostals.

Anomalies, such as the following, demonstrate their underlying impartational assumptions. Many believers in the Church of God get attracted to personalities in the hope of receiving their much desired gift. Questionable practices, such as prophecy and manipulation of believers through the use of peculiar words or phrases, are used when attempting to impart gifts. Others have visited the gravesites of deceased men and women for impartations from the dead. Consequently, pentecostals are potentially deceived by believing that gifts or other spiritual blessings can be imparted by or through corpses, volitionally from one person to another, or through various other manipulative practices. All of these practices are questionable, but in the mind of Budiselic (2011:246), seeking impartations from the dead is similar to the Roman Catholic practice of praying to saints in heaven in order to receive blessings from God. Given this situation, certain questions should be given appropriate hermeneutical consideration: What are the implications of Paul's promise to impart a spiritual gift? Who are the recipients of an impartation? What is the method to be used to impart gifts? What gifts are to be imparted? And what is the purpose underlying an impartation? To answer these

questions require careful exegetical analysis of the anchor text in its context.

3.1 The implication of Paul's impartation

Pentecostals/charismatics use Romans 1:11 as the predominant theological support for their understanding of the doctrine and practice of impartation. To them, Paul's promise to impart spiritual gifts to the Roman believers is more than a testimonial to the apostle's ministry; it is an example of normal Christian ministry and church life. Vallotton (2005:63) considers the meaning of the words in Romans 1:11 as denoting the most favourable way to receive a spiritual gift. Simply put, get someone who is already gifted to lay hands upon another. Alley (2002:110) concurs:

This is one of the most significant, consistent and enjoyable aspects of the apostle's ministry. Whenever there is an opportunity to pray for another – a pastor, the church, the believer – there is an opportunity to give a gift. Anointings are imparted, gifts are activated, blessing and increase are released, and authority established and built up.

However, further study should confirm whether Romans 1:11 supports this conclusion and whether the Church of God have given the text an unscriptural meaning.

Paul, as noted earlier, unmistakably had a strong desire to be in the presence of the Roman believers. After being hindered on previous attempts to visit them, he remained determined to fulfil his wish. It can, therefore, be inferred that the church had been continually on his mind and part of Paul's daily prayers (Rom 1:9). Even while writing, the apostle stated the manner in which he had been praying: '[I have been] making request if, by some means, now at last I may find a way in the will of God to come to you' (Rom 1:10). Wuest (1973,1:21), as well as Robertson (1931:325), suggest that Paul used a series of four elements in his prayer to express his eagerness to visit the Roman believers and prayed that if

it is in the will of God, that He will grant him an expeditious journey.⁶⁹ Further indication of Paul's eagerness to visit the Roman believers is found in his use of the words 'some means'. According to Briscoe (1982:32) this 'meant he was open to all possibilities'. The apostle, then, while fully aware of his spiritual zeal to make the journey to Rome, revealed that he is and remains subject to the divine will of God if he is to meet with them and achieve his desired outcomes or goals.

Paul states that 'I long to see you'. The terminology was frequently used to reflect the ardent desire to be in the presence of someone. Jewett (2007:123) surmises that the phraseology was used when discussing family or personal friendships in early Christianity and in reference to a relational bond among group members. The additional use of the infinitive ἰδεῖν ('to see'), coupled with the plural accusative ὑμᾶς ('you'), gives indication that Paul not only desired to renew fellowship with his past acquaintances, but that he was anxious to see all the Roman believers (ibid, pp. 123-124).

Next, Paul reveals the reason for his wish to visit them: 'For I long to see you so that I may impart to you some spiritual gift'. There is little question as to what is implied by Paul. With the use of γάρ ('for'), Paul introduces verses 11-15 in which he provided the reason for wanting to come to Rome. But, according to Moo (1996:59), Paul 'really advances only one reason, which he delineates in three roughly parallel purposive statements: 'to share some spiritual gift' (v. 11); 'to have a harvest' (v. 13); [and] 'to preach the gospel'. Irrespective of whether the apostle's intent was good or not, it is clear that he does not want to appear as spiritually superior to them, which explains the careful wording of verse 11. The purpose clause, 'so that I may impart to you some spiritual gift', introduced together with the usage of ἵνα ('so that'), suggest that he wanted to avoid offending the Roman believers, thus allowing him to convey his reason for visiting in a more delicate manner (Jewett 2007:124).

⁶⁹ In this prayer Paul prays that 'if it is possible, already, now at length, after so long a time, he may be prospered to come to them' (Wuest 1973, 1:21).

In sum, the implication Paul creates for the Roman believers is this: When he arrives they will be imparted with some spiritual gift. His visit is not motivated by selfish desire, but by the good of others. In other words, having been enriched with the gifts of God himself, the apostle feels the need to share those gifts with believers who have not been as fortunate as he was. Essentially, as Dunn (1988:30) remarks, 'a characteristic of a spiritual gift for Paul is it is not for oneself, but for sharing' with one's fellow believers (cf. 1 Thess 2:8). Therefore, Paul's visit will be one of giving and receiving spiritual gifts (Cranfield 1975:78-79; Schreiner 1988:52). In this way, while Paul fails to suggest that Romans 1:11 is a model for all to follow, the implication seemingly provides support for leaders to impart gifts to others.

3.2 The recipients of the impartation

That Paul intended to impart spiritual gifts is quite clear. However, the question is, who were the intended recipients? Paul's answer is very specific, as we shall see.

3.2.1 They are called

Paul's expression in Romans 6:1, '[a]mong whom you also are the called of Jesus Christ', identifies those believers who will receive gifts as the 'called'. They are 'the called who belong to Christ'. Yet, κλητός ('called') is not used in the epistles to refer to someone who is merely invited by the external call of the gospel message. Rather, οί κλητοί ('the called') 'means the effectually called; those who are so called by God as to be made obedient to the call' (Hodge 1947:22; Wuest 1973, 1:18). Stott (1994:52) is of the same mind and defines those that are 'called' as those who are in submission to and having a total commitment to Christ. In other words, they are believers who have not only accepted Jesus Christ but also who have surrendered themselves to His Lordship. It is these that the apostle is eager to impart some spiritual gift to.

3.2.2 They are saints

Paul further identifies the recipients of the gift as saints. He writes: '[t]o all who are in Rome, beloved of God called to be saints' (Rom 1:7). Hodge (1947:23) points out that Κλητός (called) to be ἁγίοις (saints) carries the same meaning as the words used by Paul in verse 1, where he describes his being Κλητός to be an ἀπόστολος (apostle). The wording is also peculiar in the sense that it designates the people of God as those who are called to a life of holiness. According to Hodge (1947:23), 'they are saints because they are a community separated from the world and consecrated to God' (cf. Wuest 1973, 1:18-19). Moreover, the recipients are also the 'beloved of God'. God may love the Roman people, but He clearly distinguishes the 'called' from those persons through this manner of speech (Newell 2009:7). It is, as aptly explained by Gause (1986:23), a calling which is the result of divine choice or initiative:

The Roman believers had been called in that name and by that calling had become the beloved of God (1:7). In their calling they had been made "holy ones" (saints; 1:7). The position of these believers involves the grace of their pardon and the giving of the peace of God. This peace is redemptive peace---the peace of God's reconciliation of man and man's reconciliation with God. These benefits are offered by Paul in this benediction.

Important also is the point made by Dunn (1988:19). Paul's phrase, 'called to be saints', is hardly accidental. For 'it expressed Israel's very powerful sense of their having been specially chosen and set apart to God' (ibid). In essence, the Romans were chosen to share in God's grace and in Paul's impartation of spiritual gifts.

3.2.3 They are people of faith

Paul classifies the Roman believers as being people of faith. He does so in Romans 1:8 where he says, 'your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world' (Rom 1:8). Undoubtedly, their faith had become a regular topic of conversation, possibly the result of a constant stream of people who visited the city and, after having had discussions with the believers,

circulated the news about their life and witness to Christ (Briscoe 1982:31). Wuest (1973, 1:19) suggests πίστις (faith) refers to the faith that was involved in the Roman Christians' experience and daily living. This could mean that the church in Rome were keepers of the precious 'faith' that Jude encouraged believers to earnestly contend for (Jude 3). However, what cannot be denied is that Paul was boasting of their depth of faith which is comparable to that of which Matthew 18:15-19 and Mark 11:22-26 speaks. This faith is representative of believers who work miracles but who also work towards forgiveness and reconciliation with others. In any event, regardless of whether *pistis* (faith) refers to Christian beliefs, faith that secures forgiveness in relationships or the gift of faith through which believers can believe God for all things, Paul's letter to the Roman church 'is still a commendation of note' (Boa and Kruidenier 2000:27).

In summary, Romans 1:6-8 reveal that Paul's intention was to impart some spiritual gift to recipients who are referred to as 'called' by God and 'called to be saints'. Spiritual gifts were to be distributed to believers who were committed to the Scripture's foundational faith and to those who were practicing their gift of faith. Paul's inclusive motif, ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν ('for all of you') in Romans 1:8, indicates that the impartation of gifts will not only include his personal acquaintances, but also the greater community representative of all the Roman believers who have faith in Jesus.

3.3 The means of imparting spiritual gifts

Although Paul informs his readers that when he visits them, he will impart them with spiritual gifts, he does not say through which means that would happen. He merely states, [I am coming], ἵνα μεταδῶ ὑμῖν τι πνευματικόν χάρισμα εἰς ὑμᾶς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ('that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, so that you may be established'). The expression μεταδῶ (impart), means to 'give over, to transmit' or 'to give a share' (Vine 1952:149). The implications of the term (μεταδῶ) are reasonably well-understood; gifts will be shared, but the details of how that 'sharing' will transpire is not

available. Both the Roman believer and contemporary reader can, therefore, only assume how the gifts will be imparted after a consideration of various possibilities gleaned from the letter.

First, Paul may have referred to the laying on of hands. However, he does not. As Robinson (2008:266) suggests, 'since the imparting of a spiritual gift through handlaying and prophecy is noted in 1 Tim 4:14, that handlaying was intended cannot be ruled out, nor substantiated either'. Paul did use this method with young Timothy as is evident from 2 Timothy 1:6 (διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως μου των χειρῶν). More convinced of this method is Straube (2010:209). He points out that the word χάρισμα (charisma), which means 'divine gratuity or a spiritual endowment', together with the root χάρις (grace) (Rom 1:11, 1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6), suggests that 'the laying on of hands was instrumental in the impartation of spiritual gifts'. Although the inference is valid when looked at what Paul said to Timothy, the Roman letter does not make that a foregone conclusion that the laying on of hands will be used in the impartation. On the other hand, that Paul intended to lay hands on them cannot be excluded, especially because of what he wrote to Timothy. He simply saw no need to mention it due to the ritual's parenthetical connection to the initiation of baptism and the impartation of the Holy Spirit (Robinson 2008:267).⁷⁰ For example, in Acts 2:38 Peter states, 'Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit'. Acts 19:5-6 reveals that the Ephesus disciples were baptised in water and that hands were then laid upon them to receive the Holy Spirit. Hebrews 6:1-2 also speaks of baptisms and the laying on of hands. Given the connection between the laying on of hands and the impartation of spiritual blessings, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the Roman church expected that Paul would use his hands to impart gifts

⁷⁰Mason (1893:27) advocates this parenthetical position and suggests that water and Spirit baptism along with the laying on of hands has sacramental implications. In contrast Tipei (2000:110) argues that the close relationship between baptism and the laying on of hands and consequently between baptism and the gift of the Spirit is the result of English translations of the biblical text. In his view the Greek text fails to substantiate the association. For further discussion on the subject of initiation and its relation to baptism and the Holy Spirit, see Dunn (1996:256), Pawson (1999:33-48) and Tipei (2000:106-113, cf. 2009:183-229).

to them. Yet, it remains that although there is a parenthetical sequence found in Acts 2:38, 19:1-6 and Hebrews 6:1-2, the argument that Paul intended to use the laying on of hands to impart gifts to the Roman believers lack conclusive scriptural proof. In short, it is an inference based on an inductive study of Paul's teachings elsewhere in his letters and the Book of Acts.

Second, Paul may have intended to impart the gifts through his preaching or exhortation. According to Cranfield (1975:79), at first sight, the natural inclination is to conclude that the πνευματικός χάρισμα (spiritual gift) to be imparted is among those *charismata* which Paul presents in 1 Corinthians 12 and Romans 12. Stott (1994:56) regards Cranfield's (1975:79) view as problematic and states that 'there seems to be a fatal objection to this, however; namely that in those other passages the gifts are bestowed by the sovereign decision of God, Christ, or the Spirit. So the apostle could hardly claim to be able to "impart" a *charisma* himself'. Hence, Paul appears to speak in a more general sense which perhaps could mean that he will impart whatever the believers are to receive through his own teaching or exhortation when he arrives (Stott 1994:56; cf. MacArthur 1994:42-43). Boice (1991:80) is more emphatic. He asserts that the manner in which Paul will impart the spiritual blessing is clear enough: 'It was by preaching the gospel to them with his whole heart, just as he had preached it to other people'. Jewett, however, questions the use of preaching. He says that Paul felt the need to communicate as a charismatic with charismatics. Therefore, 'it is misleading to reduce χάρισμα πνευματικόν⁷¹ to the preaching of the gospel...because the particle τι ('some, some kind of') leaves open the question of precisely what Paul seeks to contribute within the parameters of a charismatic gift' (Jewett 2007:124). Preaching and teaching have contributory value to

⁷¹Scholars differ on the meaning of the Greek words for 'spiritual gift' used by Paul'. Berry (1982:403) as well as Friberg and Friberg (1981:471) regard the wording as πνευματικόν χάρισμα. Jewett (2007:124), Longenecker (2016:114-115), Moo (1996:59) Schreiner (1998:54) and Wuest (1973, 1:21-22) agree. Cranfield (1975:79) and Stitzinger (2003:151) present it as πνευματικός χάρισμα. Stitzinger (2003:151) however, favours the use of the genitive plural πνευματικόν by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12:1 and 14:1. In light of the difference, the Greek references quoted will be in respect to each scholar's use.

impartation, but it cannot be emphatically confirmed that Paul intended to impart the gifts through the sharing of the gospel or exhortations.

Third, there is another possibility. Denney (1900:588) believes that Paul intended to impart his spiritual gift through the reading of the epistle or perhaps as the epistle. Fitzmyer (1993:248) somewhat agrees and reasons that even if Paul had in mind the charisms of 1 Corinthians 12, he would scarcely have thought of the laying on of hands as the mode of impartation. Rather, the apostle may have thought to use indirect means to share the gifts.

It may be, however that Paul also intends his very writing of Romans to be a way of passing on to the Christians of Rome some spiritual gift. That is, his plan to visit Rome also supplies a motivation for his writing of Romans. This is then a way of discharging his apostolic and missionary obligation, as he writes this letter. He is sharing the gospel as he says in 1 Thess 2:8, and in due time he will share himself (Fitzmyer 1993:248).

Fee (1994:486-489) reflects a similar thought. He proposes that 'the Spirit gift' in the context of the letter means that the apostle most likely wanted to share his understanding of the gospel of Christ Jesus. This is the means by which the Roman believers will be strengthened: 'If so, then in effect our present letter functions as his Spirit gifting to them. This is what he would impart if he were there in person: this is what he now shares since he cannot presently come to Rome' (ibid). Taking the same view is Longenecker (2016:117). These conjectures are thought provoking but remain only that in the absence of clear evidentiary proof. Paul's letter no doubt imparted truths, but it seems unlikely that the letter itself was the means by which he would impart the gifts, especially in light of the fact that he connects the impartation with his desire to personally visit the Roman church.

Although all of the previously mentioned views on how Paul could have imparted the πνευματικόν χάρισμα are possible, the most favourable seems to be that of the laying on of hands. This view appears the most reasonable understanding of Romans 1:11, because it is an inductive

inference based on teachings and practices elsewhere in Scripture, for example, Acts 8:14-17; 19:1-6; 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6. This means of impartation is especially one most pentecostals/charismatics and the Church of God are familiar with (Hamon 1987:69; Clark 2013:26, 206).⁷² Goulet (n.d.:24-25) emphasises the point that God made humans with the powers or capacities that enable Him to dispense His gifts through their powers, including the laying on of hands. Therefore, it is natural to think that Paul wanted God to dispense to the Roman believers everything that God had imparted to him. In this respect then, the hermeneutic applied to Paul's words, μεταδίδωμι τι πνευματικόν χάρισμα, has resulted in the practice of the laying on of hands as a biblical means for the impartation of spiritual gifts.

In sum, it is possible that Paul could have used preaching, teaching or his letter to impart spiritual blessings to the Roman believers. But it is more convincing to believe that Paul used the laying on of hands since this was a characteristic practice of his (Acts 9:17; 19:1-6; 1; 2 Tim 1:6). Thus, to say that Paul did not intend to use his hands just because he nowhere indicated it as such in his letter, is nothing less than a fallacy, otherwise known as an argument from silence. All that is needed to refute the argument is to raise the possibility, however slight, that Paul had intended to lay hands on them by pointing to passages where he deliberately did so, for example, in the book of Acts. Thus, whatever contrary view anyone may adopt about the anchor text, it would be based on an unsupported assumption. After all, it is a sound hermeneutical principle to interpret the meaning of unclear passages of Scripture in light of more clearly understood passages.

⁷² Straube (2010:209) and Vallotton (2005:63) support this premise and believe that one believer can impart the gifts of the Holy Spirit to others. However, Budiselic (2011:251) argues that Straube, and Vallotton fail to understand that Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14 are not talking about spiritual gifts but about gifts of the Spirit. The gifts of the Spirit are not the same as spiritual gifts and the gifts of the Spirit cannot be imparted because one does not possess such gifts.

3.4 The gifts to be imparted

Paul expresses very explicitly his reason for wanting to visit the Roman believers: His desire to see his acquaintances and other members of the church. But even more is his desire ἵνα μεταδῶ ὑμῖν τι πνευματικόν χάρισμα (that [he] may impart to [them] some spiritual gift). It is arguably the case that the apostle created interest in what those gifts might be. The verb μεταδίδωμι (impart) is certainly not foreign to Paul. The usage appears in several of his letters (Rom 12:8; Eph 4:28; 1 Thess 2:8). Of particular interest is the use of the expression τι πνευματικόν χάρισμα (some spiritual gift) with μεταδίδωμι. Longenecker (2016:114) thinks the terminology used by Paul is undoubtedly the most significant exegetical feature of his statement and yet the most difficult to understand. The reason being, the apostle uses χάρισμα in multiple ways in Romans and in his other letters.⁷³ So the quest for proper understanding of the text requires more than casual consideration.

According to Longenecker (2016:114-115), Paul used the noun χάρισμα (gift) in reference to: (1) gifts of righteousness and eternal life (Rom 5:15; 6:23), (2) special gifts given to people individually and corporately for the building of the kingdom (Rom 12:6; 1 Cor 12:4-9, 30-31), (3) gifts of celibacy and marriage (1 Cor 7:7), (4) gifts of wisdom and understanding (Col 1:9) and (5) the gift of an office in the church mediated by the laying on of hands (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6). But, in similar fashion the apostle uses πνευματικόν (spiritual) when referring to: (a) the Mosaic Law given by God at Mount Sinai (Rom 7:14), (b) Jesus, the second man from heaven (1 Cor 15:46-49) and (c) Christians who live by the guidance of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 2:15; 3:1, Gal 6:1). Moreover, πνευματικόν is used both as a noun and adjective. Being so, the noun and adjective are used by Paul interchangeably (1 Cor 12:1-14:37). According to Longenecker (2016:115) and Moo (1996:59), however, in Paul's letters Romans 1:11

⁷³ The term is used in 1 Thessalonians 2:8: 'we were well pleased to impart to you not only the gospel of God, but also our own lives'. Paul uses the second aorist infinitive μεταδοῦναι. The word appears in Ephesians 4:28: 'that he may have something to give [impart to] him who has need' where use is made of the present infinitive μεταδίδοναι. The term is also found in Romans 12:8 and Luke 3:11 (cf. Longenecker 2016:114).

is the only occasion where the noun χάρισμα and the adjective πνευματικόν are brought together into the one expression, namely, 'spiritual gift'. Hence, the combination of πνευματικόν χάρισμα with the addition of the neuter indefinite pronoun τι ('some') has resulted in various interpretations which will be presented next.

3.4.1 Official office in the church

J K Parratt (1967:79) has proposed that the χάρισμα ('gift') Paul wanted to impart was most likely an office in the church that will be mediated through the laying on of hands. He finds support for his view in 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6. However, the particular gift that Paul refers to is not mentioned. At best, it can only be speculated that the gift involved an official office in the church. For this reason, Longenecker (2016:116) suggests that Parratt's view is admittedly a minority view. Yet, the impartation of confirmation or acknowledgement of authority of an office is comparable with that of Moses and Joshua. God spoke to Moses and said, 'take Joshua the son of Nun with you, a man in whom is the Spirit, and lay your hand on him; set him before Eleazar the priest and before all the congregation, and inaugurate him in their sight' (Num 27:18-19). It appears that with the laying on of hands that Joshua was confirmed as someone with a prophetic office. A second example is Acts 6:6. The apostles lay hands upon seven men who are chosen to assist with the menial business of the early church.

Together, Numbers 27:18-19 and Acts 6:6 can only confirm the possibility that impartation by the laying on of hands was used to acknowledge someone's call into an official office of the church. Given the lack of biblical evidence and scholarly support, it is unlikely that Paul's spiritual gifting referred to in Romans 1:11 meant an office in the church.

3.4.2 Ordinary gifts

In retrospect, Paul's terminology, μεταδίδωμι τι πνευματικόν χάρισμα ('impart some spiritual gift'), has been defined so as to include

extraordinary and ordinary gifts.⁷⁴ By definition, ordinary gifts include those abilities such as teaching, giving, pastoring, and helping (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11) that operate within the natural realm of order and as an expression of God's providence. Extraordinary gifts such as healing, prophesy, faith, and the working of miracles (1 Cor 12:7-11) pertain to those gifts in which God's power is applied to change the natural order (Stitzinger 2003:161). Or, as expressed by McCune (1976:15), the display of extraordinary gifts involves 'a suspension, a bypassing, or even an outright contravention of the natural order'.

Paul does not delineate the terms 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' in Romans 1:11, but he does present a differentiation of the gifts in the overall presentation of his literary message (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:1-11; Eph 4:7-12). In short, Wuest (1973, 1:21-22) and Hodge (1947:25-26) believe that μεταδίδωμι refers to such ordinary blessings as the gift of salvation and grace, in addition to extraordinary gifts such as healing, prophecy, the word of wisdom and tongues. Paul's gifts to the Roman believers may also have involved extraordinary miraculous endowments, or those spiritual blessings and giftings that are not necessarily supernatural in origin.

Cranfield (1975:78-79) argues that the Roman believers received ordinary gifts or general blessings. He generalises three ways in which Paul used the words 'spiritual gift': (1) to denote God's gift of Jesus Christ (Rom 5:15, 6:23), (2) to denote a special gift or endowment given by God to be used in His service or the service of men (Rom 12:6-8), or (3) to denote the extraordinary gifts (1 Cor 12-14). Cranfield (1975:79) further suggests that the occurrence of χάρισμα in Romans 11:1 is often linked to the third usage but states, 'it is probably better to take the word here in

⁷⁴ Cranfield (1975:78-79) as well as Morris (1988:60) and Wuest (1973, 1:21-22) hold that Paul's use of the word μεταδίδωμι with χάρισμα has a variety of meanings, such as man's soteriological need (Rom 5:15-16, 6:23), the giving of gracious gifts (1 Cor 11:29), a special imparted individual gift (Rom 12:6), or extraordinary gifts (1 Cor 12-14). For the purpose of this study the use of 'ordinary' will be in reference to those imparted gifts such as helps, administrations, pastor-teacher and such others. 'Extraordinary' will be gifts such as, tongues, miracles, and healing.

a more general sense as denoting a blessing or benefit to be bestowed on the Christians in Rome by God through Paul's presence'.

In contrast, Schreiner (1998:54) asserts that the χάρισμα πνευματικόν (*charisma pneumatikon*) is not a general 'blessing' as implied by Cranfield (1975:79) or a gift of 'insight or ability' as premised by Moo (1996:59-60). Nor does it appear that Paul is making reference to the list of spiritual gifts found elsewhere in his letters such as prophecy, teaching, healing, discerning of spirits, evangelism and faith (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 1:7; 12:8-11, 28-30; Eph 4:11). Schreiner (1998:54) concludes that 'the spiritual gift to be imparted, therefore, must be understood as an apostolic gift', meaning Paul will impart his understanding of the gospel to them. Dunn (1988:30), in turn, holds a different opinion: 'the gift is not necessarily the gospel'; the idea that Paul will impart his understanding of the gospel appears unjustified. An impartation of this nature would not have required a personal visit but could have been provided by an expansion of the Roman letter or by additional letters. Furthermore, if Paul's intent was to impart understanding, he could have easily identified the gift, thus eliminating unnecessary questions or concerns about what the gifts would be.

Stitzinger (2003:149,174), on the other hand, argues that the term *charisma* most often associated with spiritual gifts has been distorted. The word inherently means miraculous, as is commonly accepted by charismatic Christians. However, *charisma*, when transliterated, does not support the meaning of miraculous (cf. Budiselic 2011:252).⁷⁵ Piepkorn (1971:370) explains: 'since the days of Tertullian, western theological language has used *charisma* and its vernacular derivatives in a sense that the Biblical and early post-Biblical usage ... does not support. That is ... as the generic term for the extraordinary and at times miraculous'. More

⁷⁵ Budiselic (2011:252) argues that the translation of the Greek word *charisma* as a spiritual gift is unbiblical because, in general, the word *charisma* does not signify the gifts of the Spirit per se, nor spiritual gifts, but the gifts of God's grace. However, he does regard *charisma* as including the extraordinary gifts when used in connection to the Spirit—*pneuma*. Fee (1994:33) is of the opinion that the word *charisma* on its own has little to do with the Spirit; it is the context or explicit qualifiers that leads us to link *charisma* to the Spirit.

appropriately translated, *charisma* is best understood as χάρις ('grace'). In its verb form, χαρίζομαι means to 'show favour' and is often presented in the Septuagint as 'favour' or 'beauty'. In the New Testament it is used to demonstrate a gracious action in 'favour toward men' (Stitzinger 2003:150). Additionally, the verb means 'to say or do something agreeable' or 'to give graciously or cheerfully' (Arndt and Gingrich 2000:1078-81). In this way, χάρισμα used by Paul, can mean the gift of eternal life (Rom 6:23), the gift of celibacy (1 Cor 7:7) or grace-gifts (Rom 12:6; 1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6). Thus, χάρισμα as used in Romans 1:11 can refer to any grace or endowment from God.

Chung (2009:169-172) focused on Paul's use of μεταδίδωμι τι χάρισμα and believes that the word *metadidomi* most likely implies an impartation of sharing or mentorship. *Metadidomi* occurs five times in the New Testament and in those occurrences the word refers to sharing, imparting or the giving of spiritual things. Chung does not emphasise the impartation of the extraordinary gifts. Rather, he sees the impartation in Romans 1:11 to be more of a sharing of oneself. For instance, *metadidomi* is used in 1 Thessalonians 2:8 where Paul states 'we were well pleased to impart to you not only the gospel of God, but also our own lives'. In other words, Paul and the missionaries were prepared to preach not only the gospel to those who believed; they were also ready to give their lives for the spiritual formation of those who believed. Morris (1988:60) as well as Vine (1952:149) agree, and suggest that Paul and his co-labourers were willing to impart 'their own souls' and anything else that would build up the spiritual lives of the Roman Christians (cf. Boa 2000:28). Thus, according to Chung (2009:172), Paul's promise to μεταδίδωμι τι χάρισμα is intended to be an ordinary spiritual gifting that will involve a blessing of or for the Roman converts and aiding in their spiritual growth.⁷⁶

⁷⁶ Bray (1998:22-23) provides several thoughts from patristic fathers on Paul's impartation. Origen for example stated, 'First of all we must learn that it is an apostolic duty to seek fellowship with our brothers for no reason other than to share some spiritual gift with them if we can'. Ambrosiaster was noted as saying, 'But he wants to come to them as quickly as possible in order to take them beyond tradition and bestow on them a spiritual gift ... that they might be perfect in faith and behaviour'.

There is little doubt that Paul's impartation in Romans 1:11 could have involved ordinary gifts such as general blessings, his understanding of the gospel, evangelism, giving, or mentorship. The impartation of these gifts would have established and strengthened the Roman believers. Hence, it would be unreasonable to exclude that possibility. However, the meaning of Paul's words μεταδίδωμι τι χάρισμα leaves open the possibility that he had the impartation of extraordinary gifts in mind, a possibility we turn to next.

3.4.3 Extraordinary gifts

Paul's usage of μεταδίδωμι with τι χάρισμα, as noted in the previous subsection, is fully accepted by scholars as referring to general blessings and ordinary gifts. However, the use of πνευματικός⁷⁷ in Romans 1:11 creates another possibility, namely, that πνευματικός involves the impartation of extraordinary gifts. One reason is that Scripture often contrasts between that which is natural and spiritual (*pneumatikos*), for example, the distinction between the spiritual and natural man (1 Cor 2:14-15), the spiritual and natural body (1 Cor 15:46) and spiritual and natural food (1 Cor 10:3). Thus, it is not unreasonable to think that the 'some gift' in Romans 1:11 and the gifts mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12-14 belong to the spiritual (supernatural) realm (Stitzinger 2003:151). Both Ervin (1968:122-28) and Walvoord (1958:164) translate πνευματικός in every New Testament occurrence as being supernatural (extraordinary) and as involving the divine ability apart from the natural powers of man.⁷⁸ Therefore, we can infer that Paul's impartation will have superseded any

⁷⁷ Stitzinger (2003:151) points out that πνευματικός occurs often in the New Testament and almost always refers to the divine πνευμα (pneuma, 'Spirit') which correspond to being caused by or filled with the Spirit. Metzger (1972:43) presents the idea that the suffix -ικός expresses belonging to, pertaining to, with the characteristics of the πνευμα as in Romans 1:11.

⁷⁸ Stitzinger (2003:151-152) takes issue with the premise that πνευματικός always means supernatural. He argues that no one would deny that gifts are supernatural because they are received from God, but to insist that, just because gifts are termed πνευματικός they are inherently supernatural or miraculous, is adding meaning to the word. The use of *pneumatikos* does not imply that the gift must be supernatural, or miraculous. There are a few occasions when πνευματικός does mean supernatural in contrast to spiritual (1 Cor 15:44); but according to Stitzinger (2003:152) 'Scripture does not indicate that this is inherent as Ervin 233 would insist' [*sic*].

abilities considered to be natural by him. Jewett (2007:124) remarks, the statement ‘that you may be strengthened’ (εἰς τό στηχθῆναι ὑμᾶς) is formulated in the passive voice, implying that divine action will be experienced’. If divine action is involved, then it can be reasoned that the gifts to be imparted may be those of an extraordinary nature, since those gifts cannot be imparted otherwise.

Although Morris (1988:60) feels that the indefinite expression (τι χάρισμα) favours ordinary gifts, he admits that the idea presented in the noun χάρισμα (*charisma*) is normally used of the special gifts imparted by the Holy Spirit (e.g., gifts of healing, miracles, faith, speaking in tongues, prophecy). Stitzinger (2003:157-158) argues that while spiritual gifts are basically understood as being special abilities beyond that of natural means, one cannot make the mistake of calling all gifts miraculous. For instance, although πνευματικός pertains to the spiritual, for proper interpretation of a text, context must determine whether a gift is supernatural or extraordinary.⁷⁹ Budiselic (2011:251-252) agrees, but also suggests that χάρισμα in itself does not imply a spiritual gift or gifts of the Spirit. However, Conzelmann (1974:403) points out that ‘charis’, with the addition of ‘pneuma’, represents spiritual manifestations called ‘charismata’.⁸⁰ Thus, χάρισμα can be gifts in connection with God’s grace or gifts in connection with the Spirit (pneuma). In this way, the phrase *charisma pneumatikon* should be understood as a gift (charisma) in connection with the Spirit. With the use of *charisma pneumatikon* it seems likely that Paul has the gifts of the Spirit in mind in Romans 1:11.

⁷⁹ Stitzinger (2003:161) raises the point that Paul, in listing the gifts, made no apparent attempt to separate the miraculous and the non-miraculous: ‘Paul did not confine spiritual gifts to the extraordinary but included all spiritual graces and endowments’. Warfield (1918:3-4), a cessationist, highlights the close association between the gifts. He states, ‘charismata ... is broad enough to embrace that [which] may be called both the ordinary and the specifically extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; both those, that is, which were distinctively gracious, and those which were distinctly miraculous’.

⁸⁰ Fee (1987:576) points out that Paul used *charismata* and *pneumatika* interchangeably in accordance with what he wanted to emphasize. He used *charismata* when he wanted to place emphasis on the manifestation of the gifts. When wanting to highlight the endowment of the Spirit, he used the alternative *pneumatika*.

Important also for consideration is Paul's use of μεταδίδωμι (metadidomi) with *charisma pneumatikon*. The verb δίδωμι means 'to give'. However, with the addition of μετα, it means 'to share or give a part of what someone has'. Two options carry impartational significance. On the one hand, Paul may have intended to impart some extraordinary gift that he had himself. On the other hand, he may have intended to visit with the hope that his arrival will be accompanied by a manifestation of the Spirit that would result in an impartation of gifts (Budiselic 2011:254). The definition of μεταδίδωμι along with Paul's disclaimer (1 Cor 12:7-11) that the Spirit is the one who distributes the gifts seems to favour the latter option. Hence, a plausible hermeneutic would be that God will both have accompanied Paul during his visit to the Roman believers and through the Holy Spirit have imparted extraordinary gifts to the believers.⁸¹

Paul's use of χάρισμα πνευματικόν coupled with μεταδίδωμι creates a viable argument for pentecostals and Church of God leaders who practice the impartation of spiritual gifts. However, the premise that Paul imparted extraordinary gifts in Romans 1:11 can at best only be argued for based on other evidence elsewhere available in Scripture. Paul's usage of *charisma pneumatikon*, the immediate context, and scholarly thought, thus fail to provide sufficient support for the idea that Paul had the impartation of extraordinary gifts in mind. This leaves open a third possibility of what Paul had in mind.

3.4.4 Indefinite gifts

The third possibility is that Paul would have imparted indefinite gifts to the Roman believers. Moo (1996:60), Longenecker (2016:116) and Stott

⁸¹ The term plausible is used in lieu of conclusive because the interpretation remains subjective. However, Budiselic (2011:254) points out that, when considering 1 Corinthians 12:11, it would have been contradictory for Paul to place emphasis upon himself. Therefore, better justice is done to the meaning of his words if it is understood that God will have accompanied him with the activity of the Spirit. Accordingly, Paul does not project himself as the source of the gifts but rather the Holy Spirit Himself. An additional argument comes from Horak (1999:184). He suggests that the verb μεταδίδωμι is in the aorist subjunctive which, in Greek grammar, implies 'will, suspicion, excepted or uncertain fact, [a] subjective opinion', meaning that it is not a sure fact. With this thought in mind, one could understand Paul to be saying that he will be coming to Rome and that his visit may result in the impartation of extraordinary gifts of the Spirit.

(1994:57) suggest that there may be a good reason why Paul is tentative with his μεταδίδωμι τι πνευματικός χάρισμα ('impart some spiritual gift'). The reason is because the apostle, although he wanted to impart gifts to the Roman believers, could not have specified the particular gifts to be imparted until he saw what their needs are. Or, as Hughes (1991:26) thinks, Paul could not be sure what gifts he would have imparted to them because he had not been to Rome as yet. Morris (1988:60) favours the indefinite form of the expression (μεταδίδωμι τι) as the more general concept, meaning that when Paul had imparted the gifts, they would have been more in line with those considered ordinary rather than extraordinary. In a general sense, the impartation would be representative of anything that builds up the spiritual life. The list might be inclusive of ordinary or extraordinary gifts, the gift of Paul's presence, his understanding of the gospel, the Roman letter itself or other unnamed gifts.

However, Budiselic (2011:253) suggests that the expression τι 'probably points to the fact that Paul does not define the gift(s) of the Spirit he wants to impart to them, but he is open for the possibility that some of the gifts of the Spirit will accompany his coming to Rome'. Paul's decision at this point could mean that he was unsure of the gifts that would be available to the Roman believers until the impartation actually took place. Even more thought provoking is the idea that Paul had not yet discovered the gifts he had, so he remained ambiguous with the specifics as to what gifts would be imparted.

By way of summary, Paul's words μεταδίδωμι τι πνευματικός χάρισμα indicate that he would impart gifts to the Roman believers. Although the gifts would be spiritual in nature, it cannot be concluded with certainty what those spiritual gifts would be. Several possibilities about what the gifts might have been have been considered: (1) an office in the church; (2) ordinary gifts such as giving, evangelism, helps, or teaching; (3) extraordinary gifts such as healing, faith, miracles, or the word of wisdom; and/or (4) indefinite gifts that are unnamed. The unavailability of evidence prohibits the reader from declaring emphatically which gifts Paul had in

mind to impart to the Roman church, let alone the contemporary church. What can be stated with certainty is that gifts will be imparted and that God will play a role in the impartation by means of the laying on of hands or by some alternative.

3.5 The purpose for the impartation

Although there may be ambiguity with regard to the method and nature of Paul's impartation, the apostle is forthright about his purpose: he wanted to impart gifts to the Roman believers' εἰς ὑμᾶς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ('so that you may be established'). Godet (1977:87) points out that the words 'strengthen' or 'establish' were not intended to mean that Paul is coming to 'confirm' them.⁸² The purpose was not to turn the Romans in another direction but to assist the believers in remaining firmly on that which they have already received. Longenecker (2016:114) suggests that the aorist passive infinitive στηριχθῆναι may be translated 'so as to make you strong'. This expression reveals the apostle's pastoral heart and suggests that he feels a personal responsibility to further strengthen the faith of the Roman believers by imparting whatever gift is needed to bring that about, since life was not easy for first-century Christians (Morris 1988:60). However, Paul, not wanting to appear presumptuous as if this is a one-sided gifting, qualifies verse 11 with verse 12: 'that is, that I may be encouraged together with you by the mutual faith both of you and me' (Stott 1994:57).⁸³ Paul used the powerful infinitive symparaklēthēnai which Thiselton (2016:74) asserts to be a double compound verb, meaning 'to receive encouragement or comfort together'. It is also further clarified by Barrett (1991:26), who emphasises the mutuality of what would take place when Paul visits Rome: 'He trusts that he will be able

⁸² Both Dunn (1988:31) and Godet (1977:87) see 'strengthen' or 'establish' as a typical expression (Rom 15:25; 1 Thess 3:2, 13; 2 Thess 2:17; 3:3). With the use of the passive form, emphasis is placed upon God rather than Paul as being the one who will strengthen.

⁸³ Most scholars, for example, Barrett (1991:26), Hodge (1947:26), Stott (1994:57) and Wuest (1973, 1:21) view Paul's statement in verse 12 as a correction or expanded explanation. Dunn (1988:31) suggests that Paul catches himself and perhaps suddenly realises that his understanding of spiritual gifts may not be familiar to his readers (12:4-5; 1 Cor 12:14-26). Thus, the verse is not so much a correction but more so an elaboration or clarification of what charismatic ministry in the community involves.

to impart a spiritual gift, but he is equally sure that the Romans will have something to bestow on him'.⁸⁴ In essence, the believers and Paul shared the same faith and it is through impartation that mutual strengthening would have taken place (Moo 1996:60). Mutual contributions will come as they talk together about what they believe, their understanding of gifts or their lack thereof, their convictions, and questions as to how their faith works out in daily life (Dunn 1988:31). Robertson (1931:326) aptly expresses the benefit of Paul's visit in his translation of Romans 1:12: 'That I with you may be comforted (sunparaklēthēnai en humin). "My being comforted in you (en humin) together (sun-) with you", a mutual blessing to each party (you and me)'.

To summarise, the analysis of the anchor text helped to identify Paul as the author of the Roman letter and the audience as being a church or group of believers in Rome. Paul's purpose for writing the letter was to alert the Roman believers of his plans to visit and to share with them a better understanding of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The analysis showed that Paul planned to visit them so that he may impart to the believers a spiritual gift. The analysis revealed that Paul had people of faith in mind and whom he referred to as the 'called' and 'saints' of Jesus Christ. It was also shown that pentecostals and Church of God leaders used the anchor text as justification for their belief in the impartation of spiritual gifts, thus providing scriptural support for their doctrine and practice of impartation. However, the analysis could neither determine the method that Paul would have used to impart the gifts nor the gifts that would have been imparted.

Since that is so, the next step would be to establish how the anchor text is understood by the Church of God.

⁸⁴ Barrett (1991:26) states that the translation 'encouragement' is not certain here. But Paul's expression συμπαρακαλεῖν σὺν (together with) is used to mean 'comfort' or 'exhort'. It is not likely that the latter word is applicable to verse 12, although exhortation would no doubt have been involved: 'More than consolation seems to be intended, and in modern English "comfort" is scarcely a strong enough word' (ibid).

4. The Anchor Text and the Church of God

The Church of God, during its early inception, endorsed the doctrine and practice of impartation as a result of testimonies regarding Spirit baptism, healing, the gifts of the Spirit (Conn 2008:29-31,166) as well as passages which have impartational implications (Num 11:16-18; Deut 34:9; Acts 8:14-17; 9:17-18; 19:1-6; 1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6; Heb 6:2; Jas 5:13-15). A major plank in the denomination's doctrinal platform is Romans 1:11. It is generally accepted that the text presupposes the agency of the Spirit as well as the idea of human participation in the distribution of spiritual gifts (Arrington 2012b:62).⁸⁵ In support of this view are multiple Church of God pastors and leaders who follow Paul's example, believing that impartation is a biblical doctrine and that *metadidomi* involves the 'act of sharing or transmitting what God has given into the life of others'.⁸⁶

However, Romans 1:11 has often been looked at through the lens of experiential and subjective factors that have created what can be referred to as a 'hermeneutical bias'. This means that, on the one hand, the church has gravitated to those gifts considered more extraordinary and dramatic in operation. These gifts are thought to be tantamount to the functional presence of the Spirit. Or, as expressed by McClung (1986:4), the phenomenon of Pentecostalism itself is its 'insistence upon the necessity of experiencing God through the Holy Spirit' (cf. Archer 2009:22-46).⁸⁷ But on the other hand, this interpretative bias has often been problematic in that it has created spiritual excess. In other words, for the sake of experience, and the implication of imparting gifts in

⁸⁵ The concept is also presented in 1 Timothy 4:14: 'Do not neglect the gift that is in you, which was given to you by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the eldership'; 2 Timothy 1:6: 'stir up the gift of God which is in you through the laying on of my hands'. The apostle seems to suggest that God in a sovereign manner imparts the gifts, but on occasion uses humanity to bring that about.

⁸⁶ Taken from a 'Monkey Survey' and on-site conference during 24 June to 22 July 2016.

⁸⁷ Cessationists such as Gaffin (1996:34), MacArthur (1992:23-24) and Stitzinger (2003:143-145) argue that pentecostals are hermeneutically weak; that their beliefs are primarily based on experience. Differently, their experiences shape their theology rather than vice versa. On the other hand, Archer (2009:136-140), Deere (1993:87-92) and Macchia (2006:33-38) see experience as being normative in the expression of Pentecostalism.

Romans 1:11, some have acted subjectively and on their own initiative (i.e., volitionally) in ways that have exceeded the boundaries of proper hermeneutics, sensibility and common sense. Sims (1984:85) remarks that focus must be on experience, but not for the purpose of exalting experience above everything else. Rather, of chief importance would be to present 'doctrine in a manner that is consistent both with human experience and the clear teaching of Scripture'. Interestingly, hermeneutics within the Church of God is one of a relationship between experience, the Word and the Holy Spirit. Because of the emphasis on the experiential dimension, the interpretative lens through which leaders view Scripture can lead to a skewed understanding that ultimately affects their practice of impartation.

4.1 Hermeneutical models and the Church of God

Because of its emphasis on spirituality, Pentecostalism, according to Stephenson (2009:1), has often been viewed as a movement of merely devotional significance (i.e., pietistic). However, when looking more closely, it was in fact a theological movement from the beginning. Pentecostalism was characterised by theological interpretations that were centred upon religious experiences and biblical texts that became a matter of emphasis in light of those experiences. Although the movement had its strengths, Stephenson suggests that it was marked by at least five detrimental factors: (1) pentecostals were rarely systematic or comprehensive in doctrine. A number of issues such as the Holy Spirit, divine healing and glossolalia were addressed in summary but with few attempts to give a detailed theological explanation on any given subject; (2) most of the early pentecostal leaders had little, if any, formal academic theological training. They studied the Scripture, but many were either deprived or sceptical of formal preparation; (3) their theology was largely informed by pre-critical interpretations of biblical texts; (4) they did not have the philosophical training necessary for reflection and critique of their presuppositions; and (5) pentecostal theology was not for the greater part informed by the theological developments in the wider Christian tradition. Those in the movement often interpreted biblical texts without

the knowledge of the interpretative historical traditions that had preceded them (ibid, p. 2).

These detriments have led pentecostal scholars over the years to call for a better way of doing hermeneutics. Archer (2009:2-3) observed that if Pentecostalism is to be taken seriously, then ‘the movement must embark upon a journey of hermeneutical self-understanding’. Fee (1991:x,86) asserts that the movement’s expression of its historical concerns has left much to be desired, primarily due to their general disregard for accepted principles of exegesis, and allowing experience to precede their hermeneutics. Hence, according to Hollenweger (1997:311), pentecostals have often been left with the inability to conduct penetrating dialogue related to biblical principles and how those are to influence behaviour. Consequently, the Church of God has not been without its challenges in this interpretative struggle. Although evolving, the denomination remains without a cogent definition of biblical hermeneutics despite the fact that there are Church of God scholars who have provided at least three models that bear on hermeneutical understanding.

4.1.1 The model of French Arrington

Arrington’s (2012a:16) hermeneutical model is a common-sense approach to interpreting Scripture that engages the biblical text and the power of the Holy Spirit. Persons studying the Scripture view the pentecostal method of interpretation as being primarily pneumatic or charismatic. In other words, ‘the interpreter relies on the Holy Spirit’s illumination of the biblical text in order to come to the fullest understanding of the text’. The Holy Spirit helps to merge the gap between time and culture, between the original author and the modern interpreter, bringing Scripture into the twenty-first century. Arrington (1994:101-107) acknowledges that scholarly study can enhance insight into Scripture, but argues that the average Christian with limited resources and the help of the Spirit is capable of understanding the Bible.⁸⁸ Enlightenment occurs

⁸⁸ Arrington admits that the study of historical and literary questions can bring precision to the understanding of Scripture and how it was given to humankind. However, the

in four ways through which the interpreter is dependent upon the Holy Spirit:

(1) a personal experience of faith as part of the entire interpretative process; (2) submission of the mind to God so that the critical and analytical abilities are exercised under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; (3) a genuine openness to the Holy Spirit as the text is examined; (4) response to the transforming call of God's Word (Arrington 2012a:17).

Arrington also draws upon human experience as a source of interpretation. On the one hand, the manner in which Christians draw from the Scriptures influence their pentecostal encounter. On the other hand, those experiences impact the interpretative process. Thus, the Spirit deepens insight and turns the Bible into a living book allowing believers to enter into the apostolic experiences of the first-century. Important is also the interplay between Scripture and the personal experience of the believer. Hence, the Spirit must be allowed to work through God's word in the formulation of sound doctrine (cf. Stephenson 2009:30).

4.1.2 The model of Kenneth Archer

Archer (2009:212) offers a contemporary hermeneutical model that takes into consideration the pentecostal community's ethos while maintaining sensitivity to academic methodological perspectives on the interpretation of Scripture. His strategy calls for a tridactic negotiation for meaning that draws upon the biblical text, the pentecostal community, and the Holy Spirit. There is, first the contribution of the biblical text. The Holy Scripture provides the primary arena in which pentecostals seek to understand God. Archer (2009:221) remarks, 'the text provides textual clues as to how it desires to be read and understood'. Yet, for proper exegesis and understanding there are basic guidelines to be considered: (1) there is the

requirement of such for interpretation can be problematic: 'The danger is that it places the Bible in the laboratory of the expert and takes it out of the hands of the ordinary person who can lay no claim to methodological and theological expertise. Grammatical analysis of the text and historical understanding have significance for sound exegesis, but spiritual understanding does not always wait on the acquisition of these tools. It is God who opens eyes of faith and illuminates His Word to the human heart' (1994:103).

literary dimension which affirms the written communication of the Word and investigates how that literature conveys meaning; (2) there is the historical-cultural dimension which takes into consideration that the writers of Scripture wrote from the context of different customs, practices, and languages; and (3) there is the theological dimension which affirms that the Bible is an overarching theological story to be engaged in and merely reading the text can produce an experiential encounter that brings formation and transformation (Archer 2012:178-182).

There is, secondly the contribution of the pentecostal community. Archer (2009:224-24) holds the belief that for proper interpretation it is a necessity for the hermeneut to live among the pentecostal community. Within this environment the Word is heard, but also because 'the community actively participates in the pentecostal hermeneutical strategy, not passively, but actively through discussion, testimony, and charismatic gifts.' The hermeneut may not have experienced every dimension of the gospel but he or she must be willing to participate in the pentecostal story. The final component is the contribution of the Holy Spirit. Since pentecostals desire to be led and empowered, they invite the Holy Spirit to guide and reveal contextual meaning and understanding of Scripture. Hence, the believer has a genuine openness to the witness of the Holy Spirit, whereby the critical and analytical abilities are exercised and become pliable to the influence of the Spirit's voice that comes through Scripture (ibid, p. 252).

4.1.3 The model of Lee Roy Martin

Martin's (2011:25-47) model offers an outline for the hermeneut that consists of six principles. First, the interpreter should give attention to the clarity of the written Word and to the literal, plain meaning of the text. Reflection should be given to the common usage of words, their meaning, the figurative language used, and the genre of the text while using logic and natural reasoning in the interpretative process. Second, emphasis should be placed on understanding a text in context. In the words of Martin (2011:31), 'every biblical word and verse must be interpreted in light of its

context'. Focus on the context helps the reader avoid making the Bible mean anything he or she wants it to mean. Third, one should consider the historical background. The Bible was written in a time when social customs, traditions and political systems were different from those of today. In this regard, it is helpful to understand the mind-set of different historical rulers and people groups against which the Bible was written. Fourth, thought should be given to the unity and diversity of Scripture. Each biblical book has a distinct message and voice. In this respect, Martin (2011:40) suggests that the verses of the Bible should not be read in isolation from each other but rather be read and interpreted by comparing Scripture with Scripture. In this light, the individual passages come together in forming a cogent story for the ages. The fifth criterion for biblical interpretation should involve the work and witness of the church.

Martin (2011:41-43) argues that three principles should be of principal importance when interpreting Scripture: (1) The 'Christological principle', meaning all Scripture must be interpreted in light of the nature and work of Jesus Christ who is the full revelation of God in human form; (2) the principle of love which means all Scripture should be read in light of the great commandment—love God first and your neighbour as yourself (Matt 22:37-40); and (3) the principle of faith which involves taking into consideration the Church's past and present interpretations.

The final criterion for adequate biblical interpretation is the work of the Holy Spirit (2011:44-45). It is because it is the Spirit who gives meaning, who teaches and reveals the things of God. Thus, it is the Holy Spirit who has the authority of the meaning of the Word and who enables the interpreter to hear, discern and comprehend the Scriptures' relevancy for the church of today.⁸⁹

4.2 Hermeneutical assessment

Given the five challenges stipulated by Stephenson (2009:1-2) as indicated earlier and the lack of hermeneutical sophistication and

⁸⁹ cf. Byrd (1993:205), Land (1993) and Thomas (1994: 41-56).

consistency presented by Fee (1991:x), it is understandable why a biblically sound hermeneutic is required for the Church of God. The three models are also representative of the hermeneutical approaches of Church of God pastors, leaders and members. Each model offers a strategy for the hermeneut that is assumed to help to bring about an understanding of the meaning of the Bible.

An assessment of the Church of God's hermeneutical approach reveals how the Scripture has been hermeneutically understood. For example, very early in the church's existence, a bond between the Bible and experience in the interpretation of Scripture has been fostered. Laymen, such as Richard Spurling, his son, and John Plemons studied the Bible in an effort to find a synthesis between the Word and spiritual renewal. Although they were without academic training, their study of proof-texts⁹⁰ allowed them to assimilate knowledge of the Scripture that led to moderate progress in the Church's understanding of the Holy Spirit (Conn 2008:9-15). A deeper understanding of the church's hermeneutical approach to the Bible came with the baptism in the Holy Spirit in 1896. Immediately upon reception, a group of Christians questioned what had happened to them as well as the significance thereof. Conn (2008:31) explains: 'Pneumatology was too profound a doctrine to comprehend, but experience would teach them, even before the Scriptures, that they had received much more than [only] joy.' Subsequently, the worshippers began to search the Scriptures (Acts 2:4; 10:46; 19:6) and determined that the experience they had received was the impartation of the Holy Spirit with evidentiary tongues (ibid, p. 29). The hermeneutic used by Spurling and Plemons, as well as those who received the baptism in the Holy Spirit, is representative of Arrington's (2012a:16-18) model. In this model, there is an inextricable connection between Scripture and experience. What this means is that common sense, uneducated people,

⁹⁰ Pentecostals have been accused of placing experience before Scripture, among other things, by choosing certain passages that seem to support their personal experiences and so allow them to formulate doctrine, rather than looking at the Bible as a whole. This practice, also called inductive Bible study, was what led to the doctrine of the baptism in the Spirit at the turn of the twentieth century (Arrington 2012a:19; Budiselic 2011:256; Osborne 1991:11).

could read and understand the Scriptures and, by so doing, allow its message to inform their beliefs, practices and their encounters with God. Arrington (2012a:19) puts it thus: 'the truths of the Scriptures are not contemplative truths, removed from actual experience. Rather, experience is put in dialogue with the Scriptures'. This kind of dialogue, as such, creates a bridge between the historical and the reader's contemporary setting, thus confirming the experiences received.

In addition to Arrington's emphasis on the interplay of Scripture and experience is an emphasis on the hermeneut and community involvement. Those who made up the Church of God are those that received impartations; they gathered together for discussion, testimony and sharing of their charismatic gifts. This way of being the church is representative of Archer's (2009:224-233) model. These believers believed in the literal meaning of the Scriptures as well. Upon reading the narratives in Acts concerning those who received the baptism with the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues, they gave credence to the impartation, witness and leadership of the Spirit (Martin 2011:25, 44-45). In sum, their hermeneutic is one which allows each believer to draw upon the Spirit's pneumatic influence, Scripture, experience and communal dialogue.

The Church of God's hermeneutic continued to evolve with the interplay of Scripture, experience and communal dialogue at its core. It is evident in the formulation of the church's 'Declaration of Faith'. The codification of this document came as the result of searching the Scriptures and the desire to experience the continual presence of the Holy Spirit and His gifts (Sims 1995:17-18). Simply put, this codified document represents the heart of the Church of God which asserts that 'spiritual and extraordinary supernatural experiences of the biblical characters are possible for contemporary believers' (Byrd 1993:205). Although valid, experience must always be critiqued by objective norms of Scripture.⁹¹ Hence, given

⁹¹ The subject of pentecostal hermeneutics and its relation to experience falls outside the scope of this study (but see Archer 2009; Arrington 1994:101-107; Fee 1991; McDonald 1976; Menzies in Elbert 1985:1-14; Stronstad 1992:14-30).

the desire to maintain both the doctrinal and experiential, the Church of God has remained ardent in its hermeneutical task. Presently, leaders continue to meet biannually in a communal setting for the purpose of studying the Scripture and experience in order to maintain sound doctrine. Thus, it can be reasonably said that the Church of God's initial understanding of the impartation of the Spirit, the creation of its 'Declaration of Faith' and present desire to maintain both a doctrinal and experiential faith reflect some application of the three hermeneutical models.

4.3 Hermeneutics and the current understanding

The discussion in the previous sections does not make it unreasonable to conclude that the Church of God's understanding of impartation has come through their study of Scripture and personal experience. In keeping with the past, the present Church of God follows the teachings of the synoptic writers as well as the book of Acts to foster support for their practice of impartation. The Church's hermeneutic views the operation of the Spirit as being 'programmatic' (Sims 1995:25). This means that the church, with its roots in the holiness movement, adheres to literal Biblicism, believing in direct accessibility to God through the Holy Spirit, as well as the availability of His power due to their literal understanding of Scripture (McClung 1986:48). In essence, 'Pentecostals read Scripture as a means to hear God so [that they] can do what He says' (Archer 2012:167).

In sum, the Church of God has historically, and presently is, adhering to a hermeneutical approach that incorporates the interplay of Scripture and personal experience of the Spirit of God. Implicit in the approach is a literal understanding of the meaning of the biblical narratives and the community's account of their experiences. As a consequence, the Church of God's doctrine of impartation and practice is perpetuated largely by their understanding of Romans 1:11. The challenge is, therefore, to compare the Church's understanding of impartation with the exegesis of the anchor text as conducted in this study.

5. A Comparison of the Anchor Text and the Church of God's Doctrine of Impartation

The Church of God is resolute that Paul's promise in Romans 1:11 to *metadidomi* (impart) to the Roman believers are experiential gifts; they have historical value but also present reality. The Church's understanding has come through the study of Scripture and experience which has led conclusively to the belief that Paul's impartation is an example to follow. Hence, a comparison between the anchor text and the current practice of impartation in the Church of God leads to several observations. First, there is agreement that Paul's promise to μεταδίδωμι (impart) a spiritual gift applies only to believers (Rom 1:6). Second, there is agreement that gifts can be imparted. Third, while Paul fails to specify the gifts to be imparted, Church of God leaders accept that the meaning of impartation in the anchor text includes the baptism in the Holy Spirit, healing, blessings, ministry gifts or the extraordinary gifts, many of which are listed in 1 Corinthians 12:4-10, 28 and Romans 12:6-8. Fourth, there is agreement that these gifts are imparted for the encouragement and establishment of the body of Christ (Sims 1995:46-47).

Areas in which the Church of God differs from Paul's teaching in Romans 1:11 are the following: (a) believers can impart gifts as and when they choose, hence, on their own initiative; (b) the Holy Spirit can be imparted by the laying on of hands and/or the repetition of phrases and breathing exercises; (c) the text could mean that the impartation of blessings could incorporate wealth and goods; (d) impartations can be received at the graves of the departed; and (e) personal prophecies can be used to specify and convey the gifts.

However, how are these differences to be overcome? Multiple leaders provided an answer to that question. Arrington's (2016)⁹² assessment of the discrepancies provides a theoretical and pragmatic understanding that is representative of the Church of God's:

⁹²Arrington provided information via email between 22 to 24 August 2016.

Paul states in Romans 1:11 that his purpose for visiting the Roman Christians is to impart to them “some spiritual gift” (*ti charisma pneumatikon*). In a shorthand way Paul is saying that he will lay hands on them and pray that the Holy Spirit will bestow on them the spiritual gifts that they need.

However, the apostle has not indicated in the anchor text or anywhere else that he has given any believer the privilege or status to distribute the Spirit’s gifts at will. Nor is any person granted the option to do so through prophecy or to choose the manner in which gifts are to be given to another (Cross 1986:200). Gause (1986:24) states that Paul’s ministerial understanding of the gifts in Romans 1:11 as follows.

Here he combines two words: “gift” (*charis*) and “spiritual” (*pneumatikos*). The first emphasizes the grace (unmerited favour) in which the benefit is given. The second emphasizes the Source of the gift, the Holy Spirit. In Paul’s relation to such spiritual benefits he is only a minister; he has no sovereignty over the gifts and no authority to bestow them.

Furthermore, while Paul may have intended to impart the baptism in the Holy Spirit to the Roman believers, Lombard (2007:7) and Hughes (1986:171) argue that the impartation of the Holy Spirit does not come by breathing a certain way, repeating phrases or learned languages (cf. Triplett 1970:129-131). Rather the gift and utterances of tongues are God’s sovereign work. The assumption that Romans 1:11 could mean the possibility of imparting a blessing in the form of wealth is highly questionable. Morris (2012:215), for example, asserts that there is no biblical reference to substantiate any such inference. Finally, the hermeneutic of Romans 1:11, according to Bay and Martinez (2015), is not a licence for any person to bestow extraordinary gifts to whomever he or she wishes, nor does the text imply or encourage any seeking of impartations from the dead. However, Hughes (1986:173) as well as Bay and Martinez (2015) do believe that the practice of praying for people is biblical. But they also infer from the text that Paul had ‘grace’ or a ‘blessing’ directly and sovereignly given by God in mind.

The Church of God also believes that there are several texts that support its understanding of Romans 1:11.

6. A Comparison of Supporting or Developing Texts and the Church of God's Understanding of Impartation

Of special interest is the term *metadidomi*. It has been argued that the impartation may have involved the laying on of hands, preaching, or Paul sharing the letter itself. The gifts that may have been imparted may also have been the extraordinary and/or ordinary gifts. However, for greater understanding of the Church's doctrinal position, it will be useful to compare the anchor text with texts where the word *metadidomi* is used or is possibly implied. The comparison will also indicate the emphasis the Church of God has placed on the miraculous gifts in contrast to ordinary gifts.

6.1 *Metadidomi* in Romans 12:6-8

Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, let us use them: if prophecy, let us prophesy in proportion to our faith, or ministry, let us use it in our ministering; he who teaches, in teaching; he who exhorts, in exhortation; he who gives, with liberality; he who leads, with diligence; he who shows mercy, with cheerfulness.

In Romans 12:6-8, Paul uses language reminiscent of the language used in 1 Corinthians 12:1-30. Although, there is some variation, Jewett (2007: 744-745) views those gifts listed by Paul in the Roman passage to be charismatic gifts and indicative of every Christian's possession. The word play between χάρις and χάρισματa replaces the parallel between charismatic gifts and πνευματικόν in 1 Corinthians 12, thus shifting the emphasis away from the extraordinary ecstatic manifestations, such as glossolalia, to a more settled expression of congregational leadership (cf. Cranfield 1975:618). Taking the same view is Käsemann (1980:333), he asserts that the absence of the word 'Spirit' means that Paul intended his message to have a calmer and more 'anti-enthusiastic thrust'. The emphasis in terminology is thus understood to mean that there is a

difference in the scope and function of the gifts in Romans 12:6-8 and those extraordinary gifts named in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11.

The gifts listed in Romans 12:6-8 are given 'according to χάρις (grace)' and differentiated into 'speaking gifts' and 'service gifts' (Stott 1994:326).⁹³ Apart from prophecy, which appears in Paul's list in 1 Corinthians 12:10, the gifts that are identified as service gifts are viewed as more mundane in function than the others. This means that they are gifts the Roman believers would have exercised by grace. The gifts will require the enablement of the Spirit, but their operation will not draw upon the πνευματικόν with the same intensity as those extraordinary gifts sovereignly imparted by God in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11. Moreover, as Moltmann (2001:183) suggests, Paul's list of gifts are those prescribed to render service to the everyday world. They are the '*everyday charismata of the lived life*' to be used for the 'building up of the community of Christ's people'.

Included in the list in Romans 12:8 and of the same function is the gift of charity which 'μεταδιδούς'⁹⁴ (imparts) with liberality'. Wuest (1973, 1:212) says that the impartation is the deposit of one's earthly possessions. Morris (1988:442) agrees and contends that the use of ὁ μεταδιδούς (he that imparts) implies that the impartation comes from one who is gifted at coming to the assistance of the poor. Thus, the preferred meaning would seem to be that of one distributing what is one's own. Paul is also suggesting that the distribution be done with cheerfulness and without ulterior motives (Cranfield 1975:625). In sum, from Paul's usage of μεταδιδωμι (impart), or the more preferred μεταδιδούς, three observations can be made: (1) In contrast to Romans 1:11, Paul presents the impartation in Romans 12:6-8 as being more communal in function; (2)

⁹³ Those considered 'speaking' gifts are prophecy, teaching and leadership. The 'service' gifts are gifts such as giving, leading and showing mercy (Stott 1994:326). However, Thiselton (2016:223-224) presents the option of prophecy as being more ordinary and comparable to normal preaching. Cranfield (1975:619-620) as well as Morris (1988:440) differ in opinion and compare the gift to the one listed in 1 Corinthians 12.

⁹⁴ Berry (1982:427), Cranfield (1975:624) Friberg (1981:500) and Jewett (2007:751) use the verb μεταδιδούς, while Marshall (1978:142) and Wuest (1974:212) use μεταδιδωμι.

the absence of the expression πνευματικόν χάρισματa implies that while someone may have a χάρισματa (gift) of giving, the impartation may involve that which is more physical in nature (money, clothing, food); and (3) in tandem with enabling χάρις is the option for those sharing with others to use greater human initiative to minister to those in need.⁹⁵

Consequently, and problematic for the Church of God, is that inappropriate and an unbalanced emphasis has been placed on the impartation of extraordinary gifts.⁹⁶ One example will suffice to provide greater clarity. Gause (1986:173) states that the word ‘μεταδιδούς is not frequently used in the New Testament, but in Romans 12:6-8 its use is applicable to the giving of material benefits (cf. Luke 3:11; Eph 4:28). Lowery (1997:146) considers *metadidomi* in Romans 12:8 to be a motivational gift which involves generous giving. Yet, what seems to be missing in Church of God services is the opportunity to receive impartations of the ‘gift’ of giving.⁹⁷ Leaders fail to understand the ramifications of ignoring the ordinary gifts. In Romans 12:4-5, Paul stresses the importance of each spiritual gift by giving an analogy of their function with the physical body: ‘For as we have many members in one body, but all the members do not have the same function, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and individually members of one another’. In 1 Corinthians 12:12-31 Paul stresses even more so the need to recognise and utilise every spiritual gift so that the body of Christ analogous to the physical body may conduct itself in a healthy way. As he says,

For in fact the body is not one member but many. If the foot should say, “Because I am not a hand, I am not of the body,”

⁹⁵ The implication by Paul in Romans 12:6-8 is that the gift of giving is a grace gift that should lead one to give liberally to others. This giving may involve the use of natural abilities and talents one has as well as material blessings.

⁹⁶ Leaders refer to the impartation of extraordinary gifts far more than the ordinary gifts. For instance, Lowery (1997) writes two chapters on the ordinary gifts and five on the extraordinary gifts. Triplett (1970) speaks of *charismata* being given (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:4-11; Eph 4:7-12) but only emphasises the extraordinary gifts in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11.

⁹⁷ This statement is made based upon personal observation. In forty three years of attending church services, revival meetings and conferences the author cannot recall one occasion where believers were asked to come forward for prayer for an impartation of the gift of giving.

is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear should say, "Because I am not an eye, I am not of the body," is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where would be the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where would be the smelling? But now God has set the members, each one of them, in the body just as He pleased. And if they were all one member, where would the body be? But now indeed there are many members, yet one body. And the eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of you"; nor again the head to the feet, "I have no need of you." No, much rather, those members of the body which we think to be less honourable, on these we bestow greater honour; and our unpresentable parts have greater modesty, but our presentable parts have no need. But God composed the body, having given greater honour to that part which lacks it, that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care for one another.

As can be seen from this passage, Paul raises the point that when the less conspicuous spiritual gifts are ignored the body of Christ can suffer from division and the lack of mutual care. Gause (1986:170-171) remarks that the body of Christ is not a mechanical device existing of parts but is a living body existing by life flowing from one member to another or one cell to another: 'Multiplicity and diversity are essential for the health and functioning of the physical body. The same application must be made of the body of Christ' (cf. Arrington 1985:123-142). Consequences such as the following can occur when ignoring ordinary gifts: (a) leaders create a void in the total ministry needs of the church because the gift of 'giving' is as important as those gifts more miraculous in nature (1 Cor 12:12-26; Phil 4:10-19); (b) the less conspicuous gifts when not given impartial opportunity lose their place in the church (1 Cor 12:18-25; 1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6)⁹⁸; and (c) ignoring a gift such as 'giving' devalues a spiritual gift thought to be vitally important to Paul, (2 Cor 8-9; Gal 2:10).

⁹⁸ Gause (1986:171) addresses Paul's analogy of the use of spiritual gifts with that of the human body and remarks: 'The spiritual body has a life flow that flows from one member to another as does the physical body. 'In the physical body the most widely separated participants of the body receive the same blood flow and are participants in the same nervous system. This must be understood clearly if there is to be health, harmony, and efficiency in the body of Christ'. If there is no blood flow to members of the physical body those members cease to be active, and the same can be said of spiritual gifts. Fee (1987:610-615), commenting on the same analogy in 1 Corinthians 12:12-31, suggests that 'the point [Paul is making] is the need for all members; otherwise some function of the body would be missing ... if all were one part other functions would

6.2 *Metadidomi* in Luke 3:11

‘He answered and said to them, “He who has two tunics, let him give to him who has none; and he who has food, let him do likewise.”’

John the Baptist has just finished proclaiming God’s message of repentance and the wrath of God to a crowd of people. John also indicated what repentance means, among other things, sharing one’s possessions with those in need. The crowd, unsure as to what his words could mean, pose the question, ‘what shall we do then?’ In response, John states, ‘ὁ ἔχων δύο χιτῶνας, μεταδότη τῷ δὲν ἔχοντι μὴ κανένα και ὁ ἔχων βρώματα ποιείτω ὁμοίως’. Conversely, the fruit is not isolation from society or a departure from the normal activities of life so that someone could give exclusive attention to ‘holy matters’. Simply defined by Nolland (1989:149), one of the marks of repentance is a ‘radical generosity in which everything beyond subsistence necessities is vulnerable to the claim of need’.

The χιτῶνας ‘tunics’ that John refers to was seen in those days as almost indispensable to someone’s well-being. Hence, his use of μεταδότη to indicate the importance of sharing of what one has. Plummer (1951:91) argues that ‘nothing is said or implied about having superfluity or abundance’. Even if one’s possessions are but meagre, the believer might impart a gift of food or a tunic that could be viewed as the fruit of repentance.

In summary, several points are noteworthy about the use of μεταδότη in Luke 3:11: (1) the use is more descriptive of imparting material things as opposed to spiritual gifts which is more applicable to Romans 1:11; (2) impartation is not shared by someone having the gift of giving which seems more relevant to Romans 12:8 (Chung 2009:171-172); (3) the timing and manner of imparting the ‘tunics’ and ‘food’ is left to the discretion of the repentant believer; (4) μεταδότη referred to in Luke 3:11

be lacking...Paul is saying, if one removed an organ because it appeared weak, the body would cease to be whole. So with the church’.

applies to those who want to manifest proof of their repentance, whereas Paul's impartation in Romans 1:11 is aimed at those who have already repented and established in their faith.

The point about the discussion thus far is simply that Church of God leaders have an inadequate understanding of μεταδότη in Luke 3:11. Gause (1986:173), for example, refers to the passage, but he does not elaborate on the meaning of impartation at all. Such an oversight is a reason for concern; Jesus teaches that believers who enter the kingdom will be those who have shared their food with the hungry and clothed the naked (Matt 25:31-40). It is, therefore, a great error to conclude that the impartations of 'clothing' and 'food' are not as important as the gifts the Church of God believes Paul were referring to in Romans 1:11.

6.3 *Metadidomi* in Ephesians 4:28

'Let him that stole, steal no longer, but rather let him labour, working with his hands what is good, that he may have something to give him who has need'.

Paul, in the opening words of Ephesians 4, introduces himself as a prisoner of Christ and encourages his readers to live a life worthy of their divine calling. They can do so by being humble, gentle and loving in an effort to maintain the unity of the body of Christ. The apostle continues by discussing spiritual gifts and reminded the Ephesians that they should respect the incredible place that each has in the church in virtue of being a member of the body of Christ. Paul lists several areas of behaviour that pose a threat to the unity of the church, for example, lying, anger and corrupt speech. Continuing his discussion, Paul mentions stealing among the members of the body and abruptly changed his terminology from the plural to the masculine singular to indicate that someone is personally guilty of theft. Hoehner (2002:624) suggests that the sin of 'stealing' could be considered as being in the past, ('the one who used to steal'), albeit the use of the present active participle *ὁ κλέπτων* as well as the additional adverb *μηκέτι* ('no longer') indicates a present action.

Paul admonished the guilty party to stop stealing and start working in order that ἔχη μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι ('he may have to impart to him that has need').⁹⁹ The use of the term *metadidomi* or its cognate μεταδιδόναι is used to emphasise that the guilty party should be imparting to others. According to Best (1997:185), the impartational responsibility is not placed upon the community as a whole but on the thieves individually.

Comparatively speaking, the *metadidomi* used in Ephesians 4:28 is in contrast to the *metadidomi* used Romans 1:11, for the following reasons. First, the impartation is a natural result of being a member of the body of Christ. Second, Paul's terminology does not implicate pneumatic involvement or the impartation of spiritual gifts. And third the impartation is not restrictive, meaning that those receiving the impartation are other members of the body while unbelievers in the community are by no means excluded.

Like the Church of God's oversight of the meaning of impartation in Luke 3:11, Church of God leaders have generally failed to assess their understanding of μεταδότη in Ephesians 4:28. Gause (1986:173) alludes to the passage and states that μεταδότη refers to the imparting of material benefits which was an important part of Paul's emphasis in ministry (2 Cor 8, 9; Gal 2:10). However, someone does not have to be guilty of theft in order to understand the importance of imparting material goods to those in need, which is a point that is completely overlooked. The writer of 1 John makes that clear: 'but whoever has this world's goods and sees his brother in need, and shuts up his heart from him, how does the love of God abide in him' (1 John 3:17). Thus, if Church of God leaders are to take John's admonition seriously, the thought cannot be dismissed

⁹⁹ Best (1997:180-182) raises the point that the masculine singular can be taken as covering both sexes, but in Ephesians 4:28 the singular cannot. The masculine is appropriate because the argument is made that those who have stolen should now work and earn money. This was something women in most parts of the ancient world were not allowed to do. The theft would not have been the careless use of time while working for an employer, but taking material things. Also, noted by Thielman (2010:315) the κλέπτω with the noun κλέπτειν refers to stealing secretly rather than by violent robbery. Those guilty were not identified but could involve slaves, common labourers and aristocrats (Simpson 1975:109). Best (1997:182), Hoehner (2002:624) and Thielman (2010:315) favour shopkeepers, day labourers, and the working poor.

that there is a common responsibility on believers to impart their belongings to those who are in need. In a word, the lack of exegetical thought on Ephesians 4:28 in the Church of God leaves the impression that the concept of μεταδότη in this passage is not as important as the spiritual gifts thought to be imparted in Romans 1:11.

6.4 *Metadidomi* in 1 Thessalonians 2:8

‘So, affectionately longing for you, we were well pleased to impart to you not only the gospel of God, but also our own lives, because you had become dear to us’.

Paul begins his letter to the Thessalonians with words of appreciation. His powerful ministry has produced fruit within them to such an extent that they have become examples of faith throughout Greece and other parts of the world (Frame 1912:84). However, Paul’s influence on their conduct did not come about by happenstance. It came through the means of impartation; εὐδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν (‘we were well pleased to impart to you’). Paul uses the second aorist infinitive of *metadidomi*, meaning that he and his associates held nothing in reserves (Friberg 1981:621; Robertson 1931:18). Their purpose of the sharing (μεταδοῦναι) was two-fold. First, Paul and his co-workers imparted to the Thessalonians τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (‘the gospel of God’). Bruce (1982b:32) suggests that preaching the gospel in this way caused no diminution of their enjoyment. Second, Paul’s words τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχὰς (‘our own lives’) imply that he and his workers were going to impart far more than the preaching the gospel. They were willing to give their lives which is an expression of ‘utter denial’ of themselves. As pointed out by Bruce (1982b:32), ‘The ψυχή is here the seat of affection and will’, meaning that Paul and others were willing to put themselves at the Thessalonians disposal without reservation. According to Chung (2009:171), Paul’s message conveys the deep love that he and his comrades had for the Thessalonian converts inasmuch as they were willing to give not a part of themselves but all.

Paul's use of *metadidomi* in 1 Thessalonians 2:8 has a notable similarity to Romans 1:11. Although there is no mention of imparting a πνευματικόν χάρισμα (spiritual gift) to the Thessalonians, Paul does discuss imparting through the preaching of the gospel and mentorship. It offers support to those who would argue that Paul intended to impart gifts such as his presence, his letter, his understanding of Christianity or his preaching of the gospel to the Roman believers. It can also be said that the impartations in Romans 1:11 and 1 Thessalonians 2:8 appear to be for the same purpose: it is for the greater establishment or strengthening of the believer's faith. Although similarities exist, the two passages are not identical in every respect. To make the assumption would be to dismiss the possibility of additional ordinary and extraordinary gifts that could be imparted (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:1-11).

As with the other texts the Church of God use to support their understanding of the anchor text, no commentary is available in which Church of God leaders have dealt with *metadidomi* in 1 Thessalonians 2:8 in a biblically and hermeneutically responsible way. Lowery (2004:91,163-164) believes that Paul means imparting to others through the giving of himself and relationships, but ignores to explore any other meanings of the passage in question. Gause (1986:173) implies, with a single reference to *metadidomi* in 1 Thessalonians 2:8, that it pertains to the impartation of spiritual benefits and ignores the passage otherwise. The lack of attention given to 1 Thessalonians 2:8 is further proof that the meaning of *metadidomi* as used by Paul has not been given serious attention by leaders of the Church of God. With the exception of Romans 1:11, the meaning of *metadidomi* in other texts in the NT has been insufficiently addressed in the overall doctrine of impartation in the Church of God.

6.5 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6

'Do not neglect the gift that is in you, which was given to you by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the eldership'.

'Therefore I remind you to stir up the gift of God which is in you through the laying on of my hands'.

Paul's words to Timothy in 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6 are meant to provide encouragement as well as a challenge to the young pastor/overseer. Timothy has been reminded of the spiritual gift that has been imparted to him and the responsibility he has to use it. Although Paul has not identified the gift in the passage, he is not reticent in mentioning the manner in which the gift was received by Timothy, namely, *διὰ προφητείας*¹⁰⁰ ('on account of prophecies') and *μετα ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου* ('with the laying on of hands of the eldership').¹⁰¹ Paul's words would be misinterpreted if it is taken to mean that leaders can lay hands on subjects and impart gifts to others on their own initiative. Likewise, it would be a misinterpretation of the meaning of Paul's words if it is taken to mean that by prophecy the particular gifts may be imparted to others thus specifying whether they are to be ordinary or extraordinary gifts.

Church of God author, John Tipei (2009:263), provides clarity. He offers three possibilities of what the conferral and the nature of the gift that was imparted to Timothy could mean: (1) the laying on of hands could have been a gesture for the reception of the Holy Spirit in connection with Christian initiation;¹⁰² (2) it could have been *charisms* that were imparted as an ordination rite; or (3) the laying on of hands could have been a gesture by which charismatic gifts were imparted to believers as implied by Romans 1:11. These are merely options, none of which legitimates

¹⁰⁰ The word *προφητείας* in the accusative plural can be taken to mean 'a result of, because of' or as a genitive singular 'through'. Fee (1994:774) and Budiselic (2011:258) favour the genitive placing prophecy in a secondary role to that of the Spirit, while Tipei (2009:263) prefers the accusative suggesting the action followed a prophecy that was given.

¹⁰¹ There resides some ambiguity as to who was actually involved in the impartation and the occasion (Robinson 2008:166; Tipei 2009:263). For better understanding, some have suggested that these are separate experiences, one for Holy Spirit baptism while the second was for the reception and impartation of a spiritual gift (Fee 1994:757-795; Robinson 2008:189). Others see the two references as being the same event and associated with commissioning or ordination (Barrett 1963:93; Marshall 1999:564ff; Wuest 1973, 2:75).

¹⁰² Christian initiation is the process in which persons entering the Christian faith begin to learn about the elements of Christianity such as repentance, water baptism and the reception of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:36-38; 19:1-7). According to Tipei (2009:191-229), the laying on of hands can be involved in the initiation or integration of those who become a part of the Christian faith.

the idea that gifts may be given on someone's own initiative or through prophecy. Arrington (1982:103-104) agrees. He describes Timothy's impartation to be a special endowment of the Spirit for ministry. The gift was given by the laying on of hands but neither Paul nor the elders chose the gift or prophesied that the gift that has been given was ordinary or extraordinary.

Budiselic (2011:256-258) views Timothy's gift to be a gift to minister the Word which may have been given prior to or at his ordination. He argues that, while prophecy and the laying on of hands were involved, grammatically the event favours the meaning of their involvement as secondary to the work of God (cf. Fee 1994:774). Budiselic further argues that the *charismatos* given is more in harmony with the spiritual gifts in Romans 12:6-8 rather than the gifts of the Spirit in 1 Corinthians 12:1-9. In this view, the 'some spiritual gift' (Rom 1:11) and 'the gift that is in you' (1 Tim 4:14) referred to by Paul are not the same in nature and function. Therefore, Romans 1:11 is connected to the miraculous working of the Spirit while Timothy's 'gift' is identified with those categorised as ordinary.

When comparing Paul's impartation to the Romans with that of Timothy, it can be seen that there is both a similarity and a distinction. Impartations involve Paul as well as unidentified gifts. However, in Romans 1:11, in contrast to 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6, Paul does not mention the presbytery, prophecy or the laying on of hands. Romans 1:11 also does not imply that the 'some gift' is to be associated with commissioning or ordination as is the case in 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6. The Romans passage states very clearly that the impartation would be for the sake of establishing all the Roman believers in their faith. However, taken together, Romans 1:11, 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6 may be understood to suggest the possibility for the involvement of prophecy and the laying on of hands as well as that the gift could have been either extraordinary and ordinary.

In sum, Romans 1:11, 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6 provide the most favourable support for Church of God leaders who believe in the

impartation of spiritual gifts by the laying on of hands. It has, unfortunately, led to the passages being given more importance than other passages in Scripture that speaks about the impartation of ordinary gifts. It is, in the final analysis, not unreasonable to conclude that that can be contributed to the overall, and often one-sided, emphasis on the experiential aspects of the impartations of spiritual gifts.

6.6 Hebrews 6:1-2

‘Therefore, leaving the discussion of the elementary principles of Christ, let us go on to perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, of laying on of hands, of resurrections of the dead, and of eternal judgment’.

This passage suggests that the laying on of hands was a widely accepted practice in the early church. The practice, however, is part of a body of teachings in the church which the author describes as ‘elementary’ or ‘rudimentary’ (Evans 1985:130; Tipei 2009:220). In practice, ἐπιθέσεώστε χειρῶν (laying on of hands), means to ‘touch or hold’.¹⁰³ The ritual was seemingly followed for purposes such as healing, blessing and imparting the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Robinson 2008:82). Hewitt (1982:105) suggests that the symbolic act denotes the communication of a gift through the prayer of a person who laid hands upon another, further symbolising the power of the Holy Spirit coming into the life of those who become Christians.

In addition, the author’s expression, μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου (have become partakers of the Holy Spirit) and have tasted δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος (the powers of the age to come) in verses 4-5 indicate that a spiritual encounter has occurred. For Tipei (2009:224), ‘the aorist participle points here to a perceptible spiritual experience and,

¹⁰³ When referring to ‘handlaying’, those using the secular Greek preferred ἐπιθέσεώστε χειρῶν. Ysebaert (1962:183-185, 237,255) regards the more favourable New Testament usage to be ἐπιτίθημι χειράς (to lay on hands). Robertson (1932:374) regards the laying on of hands to be out of place in the list of elementary principles but concurs that the practice was used as a common sign of blessing (Matt 19:13), of healing (Mark 7:32) and in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:17f; 19:6). Prayer as a symbol also accompanied the ritual.

therefore, refers to the initial reception of the Spirit'. The phraseology, 'have tasted of the powers of the age to come' apparently refers to charismatic experiences and imparted gifts exercised by members of the community (Hagner 1990:91).

When Hebrews 6:1-2 are compared with Romans 1:11, the following points emerge. First, the passage in Hebrews speaks of the laying on of hands as a customary teaching and practice. Romans 1:11 does not. Second, as opposed to Romans 1:11, Hebrews 6:1-2 does not specify the impartation of spiritual gifts, although Paul does imply that his readers have experienced the impartation of the Holy Spirit and gifts (Rom 6:4-5). Third, the believers in Rome were very resolute in their faith whereas those in Hebrews 6 were warned against defecting from their faith. Fourth, while the laying on of hands is mentioned, Hebrews 6:1-2 does not provide the evidential support required to conclude that Paul would have used this means to impart gifts to the Roman believers.

Two points are relevant to the Church of God's view of Hebrews 6:1-2 and Romans 1:11: (a) since the laying on of hands was a customary teaching and practice of Paul, the impartation of the gifts through this means would be an acceptable biblical practice in the Church, and (b) since the language used in Hebrews 6:4-5 implies the conferral of charismata, both ordinary and extraordinary gifts may be assumed to have been anticipated in Romans 1:11. Nevertheless, the evidence is sufficient to support the Church of God's doctrine of impartation through the laying on of hands.

6.7 Acts 6:6 and 13:3

'Whom they set before the apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid hands on them'....'Then having fasted and prayed, and laid hands on them, they sent them away'.

The accounts recorded in Acts 6:6 and 13:3 signify a need to which the early church responded. First, deacons were chosen to help with the widows and the daily activities of the church. Second, missionaries were appointed to preach the gospel abroad. In each case hands were laid

upon those selected for the task. The laying on of hands most likely served as a means of ratification by the body or as an impartation of strength, gifts and/or graces needed for ministry success.¹⁰⁴ For Marshall (1986:127), the rite indicates the conferral of authority and ‘the accompanying prayer was for the power of the Spirit to fill the recipients’ (cf. Num 27:15-23; Deut 34:9).¹⁰⁵ However, regarding the practice itself, there is a question about who laid hands upon the deacons.

Barrett (1994:315) suggests that the τοῦ πλήθους (‘the multitude’) in Acts 6:5 is still the subject of προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς (‘having prayed they laid hands on them’) in verse 6, which indicates the whole assembly of believers laid their hands upon the men chosen. In contrast, Arrington (2008:133) argues that the Greek is inconclusive to conclude whether the whole congregation was involved in the impartation or just the apostles. Yet, the narrative itself seems to imply that it was the apostles who did that, for they admonish the brethren to ἐπισκέψασθε ἐξ ὑμῶν (‘look out among yourselves’) for men οὓς καταστήσομεν (‘whom we will appoint’) over this business. Most importantly, those who were chosen were brought ἐνώπιον (‘before’) the apostles and only then were they prayed for and hands laid upon them. It can, therefore, be inferred that it was at this point that the recipients received an impartation required to ensure that their ministry would be successful. It is quite evident in the fact that the word of God soon spread and in that multitudes were converted (Acts 6:7).

Several noteworthy points emerge when Acts 6:6 and 13:3 are compared with Romans 1:11. First, the laying on of hands in Acts 6:6 and 13:3 was apparently for the purpose of commissioning for ministry and the impartation of whatever may have been needed for ministerial success. Second, the laying on of hands was seemingly a catalyst for Steven and

¹⁰⁴ Arrington (2008:133, 211), Marshall (1986:127) and Robertson (1973, 3:74,178) support the laying on of hands as being a mere commissioning rather than ordination.

¹⁰⁵ Contra wise is Bruce (1981:130) who argues that the laying on of hands was not to impart the gift of the Spirit, because the seven were already ‘full of the Spirit’ (Acts 6:3). Peterson agrees (2009:377).

Paul performing miracles thereafter.¹⁰⁶ Third, Paul is a receiver of an impartation in Acts 13:2-3 whereas in Romans 1:11 he is the giver. Fourth, the commissioning of Paul by the laying on of hands in Acts 13:2-3 may have served as a paradigm for the impartation of gifts to the Roman believers. However, while Romans 1:11 includes the impartation of spiritual gifts, the passage lacks proof to connect the laying on of hands with impartation, commissioning, or the performance of miracles. Hence, Acts 6:6, 13:3 and Romans 1:11 does not provide any evidence on the basis of which anyone may conclude on either the method Paul may have used to impart gifts to the Romans or the particular gifts that would have been imparted. What can be validly argued is that the impartations involved human participation and sovereign bestowal.

About a Church of God viewpoint, several authors, such as Arrington (2008:133, 221) and Tipei (2009:248), suggested that the laying on of hands in Acts 6:6 and 13:3 represents a commissioning to service or the impartation of strength and blessings needed for a ministry task. In contrast to Romans 1:11, there is no indication that Paul and Silas or one of the seven deacons received a spiritual gift when hands were laid upon them. There is, however, a close association between Romans 1:11 and Acts 6:6 and 13:3 inasmuch that the latter texts serve as a prototype for Church of God leaders and their understanding of the impartation of miraculous gifts.

By way of summary, the comparison of the supporting texts has revealed that passages using the word μεταδίδωμι represent the impartation of extraordinary or ordinary gifts. However, apart from Romans 1:11, more emphasis is placed on ordinary gifts such as giving, teaching, exhortation

¹⁰⁶ Pervo (2009:165) indicates that the imperfect tense in Acts 6:8 is inceptive, meaning that it was after Stephen's installation that he began to work miracles. Lampe (1951:74) agrees and insists that the ability to perform miracles came through the imposition of apostolic hands. Bruce (1981:132-133) suggests that it is unknown whether Stephen performed miracles before his confirmation, but the description of him as 'a man full of faith and the Holy Spirit' (Acts 6:5) seems to indicate the presence of miraculous signs. In contrast, it seems reasonable to assume that there would have been some recorded evidence if miraculous signs had been manifested prior to Stephen having hands laid upon him. The same could apply to Paul in light of the fact that it is after Acts 13:3 that miraculous signs are associated with his ministry.

or oneself as a gift. The study of other texts not using the word μεταδίδωμι revealed that the laying on of hands was a widely accepted practice in the early church as a means for commissioning persons for ministry and the impartation of gifts. The result of the comparison, however, yields no procedural mandate for the use of impartation of only ordinary or extraordinary gifts. Furthermore, the comparison also provides no confirmation about the gifts that Paul would have imparted to the Roman believers or the means that he would have used in the impartation. Therefore, the Church of God has for the most part neglected to pay serious hermeneutical attention to those Scriptures containing the use of μεταδίδωμι other than Romans 1:11. The hermeneutical deficiency could, therefore, be ascribed to a bias towards the idea that the impartation of some gifts is more important than others because they are more closely linked with subjective experiences.

7. Strategies to Hermeneutically Defend and Define Impartation

Maintaining the dominant view of the doctrine of impartation in the Church of God has been an ongoing concern, historically and even presently. As a result, the Church of God has responded both positively and negatively when objections to the Church's understanding of the doctrine have been raised, especially when the need has risen to defend it against excess and abuse.

Positively, the denomination has responded in one or all of the following ways. First, a codified list of doctrinal beliefs and Declaration of Faith was formulated to clarify theological issues and to discourage excessive impartational practices (Conn 2008:134-140; Phillips 2014:363-370). Second, the codified beliefs were then taught and preached in churches and meetings on a regular basis. Third, the doctrinal beliefs and the tenets of faith were printed in the denomination's official magazine and distributed among its leaders and members.

Fourth, denominational leaders publish articles that address subjects such as the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, divine healing

and gifts of the Spirit.¹⁰⁷ The aim with articles related to *metadidomi* in Romans 1:11 were and are written to present a clearer definition of its meaning as well as to avoid unbiblical impartational practices (Conn 1963:11-12; Hall 1949:4-5).

Fifth, the Church of God increasingly reflects its awareness of the importance of hermeneutics in the formulation of its doctrines. Early in the denomination's existence, there was little done by way of serious scriptural exegesis, interpretation and exposition of texts on impartation, let alone on pneumatology (Conn 1979:33). Various monographs¹⁰⁸ have been written that take more seriously the hermeneutical value of subjects that have impartational implications, for example, baptism in the Holy Spirit, speaking in tongues and spiritual gifts.

Sixth, leaders begun to encourage a hermeneutical strategy that allow for all manifestations and spiritual experiences to be evaluated in light of biblical teaching. Manifestations and experiences which have no biblical support are to be declared illegitimate and excessive (Fisher 1996:52-53; Thomas 1994:55). Assisting in this strategy to diffuse doctrinal excess is John Thomas (1994:41-56). He suggests that a hermeneutical paradigm that addresses issues similar to that of the Jerusalem council in Acts 15 should be created.¹⁰⁹ Basically, the community discusses the experiences attributed to the Holy Spirit and then reflects upon Scripture to validate or discount the experience or message (cf. Archer 2009:196-198). In this role the Scriptures' authority and relevance are apropos on any given topic. Thus, Scripture becomes the most important directive for

¹⁰⁷ The following are examples from the Church of God Evangel that were written on the baptism in the Holy Spirit, divine healing and spiritual gifts: Black (1988:20-21), Clark (1943:6-7), Hall (1949:4-5), Hill (2016:14-15), Lombard, J. and Daffe (2014:21), Martin (2006:10-11), Park (2017:10-11), Powers (1988:10), Tomlinson (1910c:1) and (Walker 1996:24-26).

¹⁰⁸ Examples are: Arrington (2003; 2012), Gause (2009), Horton (1986), Lowery (2004), Thomas (2005) and Tipei (2009).

¹⁰⁹ Thomas (1994:41-56) uses the Jerusalem council in Acts 15 as an exemplary model for doctrinal correctness. The council's interpretative approach involved the (1) moving from the present context to past biblical texts, (2) that the Holy Spirit in the community be allowed to provide illumination whereby the Gentiles are accepted as Christians, and (3) the Scripture is used in the process to legitimise doctrine. Thomas suggests that the same can be used to resolve other biblical issues such as the contemporary role of women in ministry.

all doctrine. Or, as stated by Thomas (1994:55), 'ultimately the experience of the church must be measured against the biblical text and in that light, practices or views for which there is no biblical support would be illegitimate'. Using Thomas' exemplary model allows leaders and the believing community to judge matters such as prophecies, divine healing, blessing and other impartational practices, hence rendering discipline when needed.

Finally, in the 2018 General Assembly, it has been scheduled that attention will be given to the Church of God's belief in supernatural gifts. Congregations around the globe will be encouraged to renew their commitment to preach, teach and practice the impartation of baptism in the Holy Spirit, including the Church's pentecostal doctrine of the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit. Unfortunately, several negative aspects remain with the Church of God's doctrine of impartation. Firstly, impartation is spoken of in conferences, renewal meetings, and local church services, but no unified statement or position paper has been formulated to define the practice that is biblically sound. Leaders use the terminology but do not or possibly cannot explain what the doctrine of impartation means.

Secondly, while much emphasis has been placed on the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, divine healing and extraordinary gifts, consideration of the importance of the ordinary gifts cannot be ignored. This means that the impartational implications of the word *metadidomi* as used in Luke 3:11, Romans 12:6-8, Ephesians 4:28 and 1 Thessalonians 2:8 should be given as much hermeneutical attention as that given to Romans 1:11. In this way, opportunities could be created for impartations such as the gift of giving, teaching, mentorship and mercy.

Thirdly, emphasis should be placed on a biblical assessment of the motives of those who desire to practice or receive impartations (Martin 2006:10-11).

Fourthly, greater effort is required for the evaluation of impartations. Possible ways to do that are the following: (1) impartational prophecies should be tested for biblical correctness and their fulfilment; (2) impartational gifts of healing should be evaluated on the basis of verifiable evidence; (3) impartational gifts of giving should be evaluated on the believer's willingness to sacrificially give; and (4) impartational gifts of teaching should be evaluated on the person's ability to understand sound teaching.

Fifthly, a paradigm shift needs to occur in the Church of God's educational institutions if its wish is to ensure a unified and biblical doctrine on impartation. Presently, classes that specifically address the theoretical and practical aspects of the doctrine are non-existent.

Finally, Church of God leaders could be more pro-active in generating dialogue and hermeneutical studies. Additionally, it should hold those who believe in and practice the doctrine of impartation accountable for practices that are contrary to clear biblical teaching.

8. Summary and Concluding Remarks

The aim of this chapter was to focus on the second subsidiary research objective: to conduct a study of the anchor text (Rom 1:11) to determine how the passage has influenced the understanding of the doctrine of impartation among pentecostals, but especially the Church of God. The study began with an overview of the book of Romans and included the identification of the author, the audience that received the letter and the purpose of the letter. The study then centred upon an analysis of the anchor text. It has been shown that Paul desired to visit the Roman believers in order to impart 'some gift' to them. It was determined that the recipients of Paul's impartation would be believers that are 'called' and 'saints' in Christ. The method of the impartation was then investigated. Although Paul left the means unspecified, it was concluded that it could have been any one or a combination of the following means: (1) the laying on of hands, (2) the preaching or teaching of the gospel, (3) the

communication of the letter itself, or (4) an impartation by Paul's mere presence. The analysis continued with a discussion of the gifts that were to be imparted: an official office in the church, ordinary or extraordinary gifts and indefinite gifts. It was shown that Paul's purpose for imparting the gifts was to establish and strengthen the Roman believers.

Next, the anchor text was discussed as it is understood by the Church of God. It was shown that spiritual experiences greatly influence the Church of God's hermeneutic and understanding of Romans 1:11. Three hermeneutical models were presented in order to indicate the importance of personal experiences in the Church of God's interpretation of Scripture. It was followed by an assessment of the denomination's current understanding of Romans 1:11. Included in the analysis is a comparison of the anchor text with the Church of God's current practice of impartation. It has become evident that leaders tend to interpret Romans 1:11 through the lens of the experiential aspect of their relationship with the Holy Spirit. Thus, that the impartation of extraordinary gifts are seen as far more important than the ordinary gifts. To substantiate the argument, a comparison between Romans 1:11 and supportive texts containing the word *metadidomi* was presented along with other passages that bear impartational implications. The evaluation showed that, as a result of the emphasis that the Church of God places on Romans 1:11 and the impartation of spiritual gifts, denominational leaders have largely come to ignore the ordinary impartations in the supportive passages that include the word *metadidomi*. The conclusion is that a hermeneutical deficiency exists in the denomination that needs to be addressed. The chapter concluded with a stipulation of strategies the Church of God has taken to hermeneutically defend objections to its understanding of impartation as well as to define the practice of the doctrine of impartation more clearly in order to avoid excess and abuse of the practice.

The next chapter will be a logical extension of this chapter. It comprises a literature study the aim of which would be to map the current theological and doctrinal views of the Church of God regarding the doctrine of impartation. Although the impartational views of various scholars and

leaders will be occasionally referred to, the focus of the chapter will largely be on those leaders in the pentecostal and charismatic tradition. Along this way, it is believed, a better understanding of what others believe about impartation and why they believe it can be gained. The chapter will also review the doctrinal similarities and differences between the Church of God and other pentecostal churches on beliefs such as the definition of impartation, the gifts that are available for impartation, and the means by which gifts are imparted. The aim of the comparison is two-fold: to identify the beliefs associated with impartation, and clarifying the reasons why some may need to be rejected and/or endorsed.

CHAPTER FOUR

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL AND DOCTRINAL VIEWS ON IMPARTATION: A CRITICAL REVIEW

1. Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on the third subsidiary objective, namely, to conduct a critical analysis of the current theological and doctrinal views on impartation. Although the literature indicates that the doctrine has a biblical and historical context, the current views influencing the body of Christ, the fulcrum of the Church of God and pentecostal theology needs to be critically examined in the light of biblical teaching on impartation. Although the assessment will focus on a selection of monographs that are scholarly nominal, the justification for doing so is their availability and potential to misinform leaders and believers who have an interest in impartation.

Special attention will be paid to how leaders define impartation, the specific gifts that are available for impartation, and the means by which such gifts are imparted. In a word, the primary aim of the analysis and comparison is two-fold: to identify the beliefs associated with impartation and clarification of the reasons why some views or teaching on impartation may need to be rejected and/or endorsed.

2. Eddie Rogers

Eddie Rogers is founder of 'Revival in Power Ministry' and the apostolic leader of 'The Revival Center' in Bremen Georgia. He suggests that the doctrine of impartation is a common theme throughout Scripture. For him, impartations are primarily given to persons who follow 'their respective spiritual fathers... [who are also] teachers and mentors' (Rogers

2006:13-14).¹¹⁰ He refers to, for instance, Joshua who received an impartation from Moses, King Saul who received one from Samuel, and Timothy who received one from the Apostle Paul. Rogers depends on support for his view on Malachi 4:5-6, which reads as follows: 'Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord. And he will turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, lest I come and strike the earth with a curse'.

The use of that passage from Malachi to endorse his view of impartation, and the claim that persons receive impartations primarily from 'spiritual fathers', are highly questionable (Lombard and Daffe 2008:196-200). Malachi refers to family relationships, thus that fathers will influence the hearts of their children through teaching them the 'law of Moses' (Mal 4:4). There is, therefore, no indication in that passage that God has chosen so-called 'spiritual fathers' as the primary means of impartation of gifts; nor is it implied. Roger's interpretation also appears to be based upon what Fee (1991:70-71) and MacArthur (1992:87) call a 'hermeneutical presupposition'.¹¹¹ As expressed by Joubert and Maartens (2017:105), leaders decontextualise Scripture in order to recontextualise a text and then make it to say something it was not meant to say.

It is disconcerting that impartation by 'spiritual fathers' has become a paradigm for how Christians are to understand the doctrine of impartation when it receives only occasional mention in the Church of God.¹¹² Lowery (2004:85-94), however, is one exception. Although he makes regular mention of the paradigm and seems to align himself with Roger's

¹¹⁰ Roger's (2006:14) term 'spiritual fathers' is meant to include both male and female.

¹¹¹ Fee (1991:70) contends that presuppositions play a key role in the larger hermeneutical endeavour of theological relevance and application. MacArthur (1992:87) states, 'The task of hermeneutics is to discover the meaning of the text in its proper setting; to draw meaning from Scripture rather than reading one's presupposition into it'.

¹¹² On 19 June 2018, pastors and church members convened for a special *Legacy* service where opportunity was given for 'spiritual fathers and mothers' to pray for impartation to their 'spiritual sons and daughters' in ministry. To the researcher's knowledge, the impartation service is the first of its kind in the 43 years of his ministry in the Church of God.

viewpoint, he simply refers to Elijah and Elisha as a paradigm of impartation. Because of a fatherly relationship between the two prophets, he says, Elisha was given a 'double portion'. Contrary to his understanding, Lombard and Daffe (2008:83-84) express considerable concern about this teaching and question whether there is any biblical basis for the idea of 'spiritual fathers and mothers' imparting their gifts and ministries to other believers or their successors (ibid, p. 188). Although certain Scriptures suggest that impartations may involve a spiritual father/son relationship (2 Kgs 2:5-12; 1 Cor 4:14-17; 2 Tim 1:1-6), the paradigm could also lead to spiritual error. The danger is that believers may gravitate toward personalities rather than the Person of Christ for impartations (1 Cor 1:10-17) and, in this way, become targets for manipulation and spiritual abuse (Matt 23:1-10). Chung (2009:333) warns that mentorship always involves the potential coercion and abuse of the mentee because the personal motivations of the mentor cannot always be isolated from his or her actions (Bickle 2008:160-162; Enroth 1993). Such was the case with the 'Shepherding/Discipleship' movement in the 1970's and 1980's (Joubert and Maartens 2017:120-121; MacArthur 1992:122).¹¹³

In sum, Rogers (2006:58-59) provides others with an introduction to his theology, but his understanding of impartation is problematic for at least two reasons: he fails to provide a concise definition of *metadidomi* and he fails to specify which impartations are available, whether the baptism in the Holy Spirit, spiritual gifts, divine healing, and/or a blessing in general. Although he mentions receiving personal impartations from his 'spiritual father', such as the gift of discernment and a ministry call to the nations, it will be instructive to consider the several means he believes

¹¹³ Joubert and Maartens (2017:120-121) assert that the 'Shepherding movement' resulted in the misuse of scriptural interpretation on 'divine guidance' which brought shame and harm to thousands of Christians. They note that Bob Mumford, one of the leaders who apologised for his role in the movement, stated openly that people were led into deception 'which resulted in an unhealthy submission' and 'perverse and unbiblical obedience to human leaders'. MacArthur (1992:122) remarks that leaders of the group claimed that they were heirs to apostolic authority and that the Scriptures demand absolute submission to one's spiritual leader. Consequently, this teaching was used to maintain control and influence the lives of their followers.

impartations are received and given. The first to be considered is his view of impartation through association.

2.1 Roger's view of impartation through association

According to Rogers (2006:19-20), impartations are received on the human level. That means that the more time people spend with the imparter, the more they would replicate his or her ideas and gestures. He suggests that in like manner, impartations are received on the spiritual level. For example, in Exodus 24:9-18, Moses is asked to join God on the mountain. During this time an impartation by association transpired. He finds another example in Mark 3:13-14. Jesus called His disciples and, through association with them, spends time with them and eventually sends them forth to preach, heal the sick, and cast out demons (Mark 6:12-13). Significant in this regard is also Elisha's association with Elijah which led to Elisha receiving a double portion of Elijah's anointing (2 Kgs 2). Rogers (2006:20-26) would have us believe that with each of these examples, impartations were given because of a 'spiritual father and son' or mentorship relationship. It deserves mention, however, that impartations, as Rogers see it, only occur through divinely appointed relationships. However, what Rogers does not say, is how he knows which relationships are chosen by God and which ones are not.

In sum, the concept of impartation through 'association' is not one that is overly emphasised by the Church of God. One exception is Lowery (2004:88-94). He stresses the importance of relationships and believes that spiritual impartations can involve the association of paternal as well as 'spiritual fathers and sons'. John Kilpatrick (2015:109-114), pastor of the 'Church of His Presence', concurs with Lowery. At an early age Kilpatrick's pastor, RC Wetzel, became his mentor and 'spiritual father'. He states that through their association, Wetzel's relationship with God was transferred to him.¹¹⁴ Thus, while close associations between two

¹¹⁴ Kilpatrick (2015:112-113) expresses that he does not believe that persons can 'coast' on someone else's relationship with God. But, associating with that person can inspire a person to seek God in a greater extent to seek what they are experiencing.

persons may be involved in impartations, these associations are neither mandated by Scripture nor necessary, contrary to what Rogers avers.

2.2 Roger's view of impartation through prophecy

Rogers (2006:36) also teaches that impartations involve prophecy, for example, when Samuel anointed King Saul. Not only was Saul anointed to be king, but through the prophetic word of Samuel, Saul was also informed that he would prophesy soon and be given extraordinary ability by God: 'Then the Spirit of the Lord will come upon you, and you will prophesy with them and be turned into another man' (1 Sam 10:6). The words of Samuel became true as 1 Samuel 10:9-10 clearly indicates. Although Saul's impartation was in accordance with the word spoken by the prophet Samuel, Rogers does not place emphasis on the idea that particular gifts can be named or created through prophecy, which is unlike the views of others such as Deere (1993:172), Grudem (2000:134) and Hamon (1987:26-27). In this respect, Rogers' teaching aligns with the theology of the Church of God.¹¹⁵ 1 Timothy 4:14 implies that prophecy can be involved in the impartation of gifts, but the prophet's prophecy does not necessarily determine the gifts to be imparted (Arrington 1982:103-104; Cross 1986:200). Budiselic (2011:256-258) and Fee (1994:774) agree.

2.3 Roger's view of impartation through the laying on of hands

Impartations through the laying on of hands are also viewed by Rogers (2006:49-50) as a biblical principle that often involve 'spiritual fathers'

Furthermore, Mentors and those the mentee associate with cannot save him or her; they can only disciple mentees.

¹¹⁵ Hamon (1987:26-27) states: 'When the prophet lays hands on and prophesies gifts and callings to a person, his words have the Christ-gifted creative ability to impart, birth, and activate that ministry into the member'. Grudem (2000:134) disagrees, and suggests that prophetic words do not create a gift in someone but that they can indicate what kind of gift is being imparted. Deere (1993:172) observes that while spiritual gifts can be imparted and identified through the laying on of hands and prophetic impartation, it is not automatic: 'It must be done under the leadership of the Holy Spirit or nothing will happen' However, the question left unanswered by many proponents is: How do you know the directive is from or under the leadership of the Spirit? Friesen (2004) and Joubert and Maartens (2018:38-55) offer helpful information on 'hearing' and discerning God's voice.

imparting gifts to their 'spiritual sons and daughters'. A primary example is that of Paul and Timothy. As he sees it, Paul was able to impart a ministry gift to his young protégé through the laying on of hands because of the nature of their relationship (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6). Rogers (2006:52) suggests that Paul's impartation to Timothy is representative of the most familiar way transference or impartation occurs. It is, therefore, reasonable to infer that Paul saw the laying on of hands as the means to ordain leaders and identify their ministry positions in the church (1 Tim 5:22), as well as a means of creating a greater operation of the charismata in their lives (Rogers 2006:54).

Furthermore, although Rogers (2006:59-61) suggests that God is the one who imparts, he views impartations as the result of the laying on of hands and 'divine appointment' and relationships. For instance, he proposes that Moses served as a 'spiritual father' and mentor to Joshua on whom Moses eventually laid his hands to be his successor:

Take Joshua the son of Nun with you, a man in whom is the Spirit, and lay your hand on him; set him before Eleazar the priest and before all the congregation, and inaugurate him in their sight. And you shall give some of your authority to him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may be obedient (Num 27:18-20).

The result of the impartation is spoken of in Deuteronomy 34:9: 'Now Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands on him'. Given that fact, it is therefore important for 'spiritual fathers' to impart gifts to their 'spiritual sons' through the laying on of hands (Rogers 2006:62-63). However, it was the Sovereign God who decided that Joshua would receive 'the spirit of wisdom' rather than, say, the gift of speaking in tongues (Joubert 2018).¹¹⁶ Just as important to Rogers (2006:62-63), is the desire of 'sons and daughters' to receive impartations from their leaders/mentors. That is of great concern to Rogers (2006:62-63), for 'Without sons and daughters pursuing the relationship, the impartation dies with the fathers'.

¹¹⁶ This information was provided via email (13 November 2018).

In sum, Roger's theology of impartation and the laying on of hands has some similarity to the doctrine of the Church of God. Leaders believe that the gifts remain available for impartation (Archer 2009:174-177; Hughes 1986:143-149; Lombard and Daffe 2005:83). There is also agreement that a prominent means for imparting gifts is through the laying on of hands (Deere 1993:54-56; Menzies and Horton 1993:125-203; Oss 1996:239-283; Saucy 1996:97-148; Straube 2010:209; Tipei 2009:217; Tomberlin 2010:225-237).

However, there is no indication that Church of God leaders believe that gifts are primarily imparted through 'divine appointment' and by 'spiritual fathers', mentors or teachers. Lowery (2004:85-94, 163-164) cites Malachi 4:5-6 to substantiate his claim that gifts are imparted by 'spiritual fathers' but presents this as an exemplary model and not as a primary means for impartation. Moreover, Lombard and Daffe (2008:51), Oss (1996:278) and Saucy (1996:137) assert that gifts are imparted by the Holy Spirit to believers through the manner of His choosing (1 Cor 12:1-11). Moreover, Roger's (2006:63) statement that '[W]ithout sons and daughters pursuing the relationship, the impartation dies with the fathers' is biblically unfounded. The Scripture neither implies nor teaches such doctrine. To the contrary, Conn (1996:105) and Lowery (2004:187-189) argue that gifts are not permanently invested in any person. Therefore, impartations do not cease to exist upon the death of a so-called 'spiritual father'.

2.4 Roger's view of impartation through giving and receiving of money

Rogers (2006:65-74) teaches that impartations are experienced through the giving and receiving of monetary gifts from 'seekers'. He uses Philippians 4:15 and 17 to support his claim: 'No church shared with me concerning giving and receiving but you [Philippian saints] only. Not that I seek the gift, but I seek the fruit that abounds to your account'. However, this is another example of Roger's eisegesis. The 'fruit' that Paul refers to is not a monetary gift, but the spiritual recompense which the gift would

bring to the givers (2 Cor 9:6-12; Constable 2017b:84-85; Fields 1969:108-109). Abraham and Melchizedek (Gen 14) are likewise mentioned by Rogers (2006:66-68) to press the point that believers should tithe and give to someone greater than themselves in order to receive impartations from them. Focus is placed mainly upon leaders who are directly involved in the so-called five-fold ministry—of, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. This is most questionable and if not also heretical.

When passages such as Philippians 4:14-17 and Genesis 14 are considered in context, it appears that Rogers resorts again to a decontextualising and recontextualising of Scripture to prove his point. The passages he refers to applies to tithing and/or giving. However, there is no indication in those passages that tithing and/or giving is required for receiving an impartation or that tithes and offerings are to be given to someone deemed to have a greater ministry than oneself.¹¹⁷ Roger's theology is not only questionable but also in contrast to what is being taught in passages such as Luke 3:11, Romans 12:8 and Ephesians 4:28. In these passages, *metadidomi* means to give to those who are in physical need (Chung 2009:168-175; Morris 1988:442). It was for exactly that reason that the Philippians gave of their income to others, and by so doing, made themselves fellow-partakers with Paul and responsible for meeting his needs. What impressed Paul was their sharing in his affliction.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ The Church of God presently teaches tithing and giving as one of its doctrinal commitments (*Minutes* 2014:22). The doctrinal statement includes Genesis 14:18-20, Malachi 3:10, Luke 11:42, 1 Corinthians 9:6-9, 16:2 and Hebrews 7:1-21 for scriptural support. Leaders encourage members to tithe and teach that blessings can be imparted to those who do so. Hagee (2004:219-220) and Morris (2004) agree. Friesen (2004:355-360), however, shares a different view. He states that this practice is relegated to the Old Testament and that 'Christians are not under obligation to practice tithing'. The threat of a curse for failing to tithe and the promise of prosperity for those who comply are not applicable to New Testament believers. The principle of tithing was replaced by the principle of giving as clearly evident in 2 Corinthians 9:7. See also, Kostenberger and Croteau (2006:71-95; 2006b:237-260) and Snoeberger (2000:71-95).

¹¹⁸ Viola and Barna (2008:171-186) argue that the discussion of tithing in Malachi 3:8-10 deals more with providing assistance to orphans, widows and the poor rather than compensating ministers. They base their view on Malachi 3:5 and state: 'The chambers were set apart to hold the tithes... for the support of the Levites, the poor, the strangers,

Roger's doctrinal views are also at odds with those of the Church of God. The Bible teaches the principle of giving and receiving in the language of 'sowing and reaping' (Luke 6:38; 2 Cor 9:6). What is not found in the NT at all is any scriptural support for status or hierarchical giving in order to receive an impartation (cf. Rom 12:3). In that regard, Willard and Sheppard (2012:64) state that 'Our giving is to be motivated by the gospel of God's grace, not by an expectation of getting something in return' (cf. Hanegraaff 2009:46-47). It suffices to say, Roger's teaching lacks biblical warrant and creates the possibility of the abuse of the doctrine of impartation, for at least the following reasons: (1) persons can be manipulated into tithing and giving; (2) persons can tithe and give for the wrong reasons; and (3) confusion and disappointment may result when the promised impartations are not received by those expecting an impartation.¹¹⁹

2.5 Roger's view of impartation through intimacy

The final means of impartation that Rogers (2006:75-98) delineates involves intimacy with God, and John 17:3 is used as his warrant for the claim: 'And this is eternal life, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent'.¹²⁰ For Rogers worship is a great catalyst for developing intimacy with God. It is through individual and corporate worship that persons come to know and understand that God wants to impart into their lives. Rogers (2006:88-92) uses John 4:22-23, James 4:8, and Revelation 3:20 as support for his views, but also cites Acts 13:2 and implicates that it was in the context of intimate worship that

and the widows... [These] were the rightful recipients of the tithe' (cf. Friesen 2004:355-360).

¹¹⁹ Although God promises to meet the needs of the believer (Phil 4:19), they should never give out of pretence, or because they want or covet prosperity or for some spiritual impartation. God's gifts cannot be exchanged for money (Acts 8:14-23) because they are given by grace (Rom 12:1-8). McConnell (1995:175) explains: There is a difference between a *need* and a *want* and a *want* and a *lust*. 'God has promised to meet every legitimate *need*. But nowhere has God given any indication that he would ever cater to our *lusts*. The only "promise" that God has made with regards to our *lusts* is his promise to crucify them (Rom 6:1-14; 8:12-13; Gal 5:16-24)'.

¹²⁰ Rogers (2006:77-78) claims that the word *ginosko* (know) means an experiential learning process that leads to a relationship. Robertson (1932:275) similarly notes that the clause γινώσκωσίν is in the present active subjunctive, meaning believers 'should keep on knowing'.

Barnabas and Saul 'ministered to the Lord and fasted' and, consequently, received an impartation from God.

With regard to Roger's theology on impartation through intimacy with God, Church of God leaders and others accept the view that intimate worship is vital to receiving impartations from God (Lombard and Daffe 2005:217-218). Also, worship is viewed by some to be the harbinger that led to the impartation given to Barnabas and Saul (Acts 13:2-3). As explained by Marshall (1986:215), the 'worshipping' of God along with the disciple's fasting and prayer, brought significance to the moment. Engaging thus, it created a greater sensitivity to the Spirit's communication which led to their impartation (Arrington 2008:210-211; Bruce 1981:261).

To summarise: Roger's attempts to provide a theology of impartation for believers and ministry leaders while his teachings contain both biblically acceptable and unacceptable concepts. It is suggested, based on the foregoing analysis, that the following principles be rejected due to a lack of scriptural support: (1) that impartations are given primarily through 'spiritual fathers', teachers, or mentors; (2) that impartations require an association with someone 'greater'; (3) that impartations are given primarily by divine appointment; (4) the idea that impartations of a so-called 'spiritual father' cease to exist upon his death where there is no successor to receive them; and (5) that impartations are bestowed through the giving of tithes and offerings to ministers of greater spiritual status or those in the five-fold ministry. Roger's theology also includes aspects that are acceptable in light of sound biblical exegesis and with the impartational doctrine of the Church of God and other Christian leaders. For example, God does involve human agents for the impartation of blessings and gifts (Luke 3:11; Acts 8:14-17; 19:1-6; Rom 1:11; Robinson 2008:203). Scripture suggest the possibility of impartations being received through association with a leader or someone considered to be a 'spiritual father' in the sense of an experienced and spiritually mature person (2 Kgs 2:5-12; 1 Cor 4:14-17; 2 Tim 1:1-6). Also, the impartation of gifts and blessings may involve prophecy, the laying on of hands, giving monetarily to God and intimacy with God. However, Bickle

(2008:102-104), Gee (1967:105), Lombard and Daffe (2008:50) insist that the Holy Spirit imparts on the basis of God's grace and as He wills (Rom 12:1-8; Eph 4:7-8). Therefore, while the aforementioned points may be beneficial to the Church of God's doctrine of impartation, none of them are absolutely imperative in order to receive an impartation from God. After all, God is sovereign.

The next set of views to be examined is those of Phillip Rich.

3. Phillip Rich

Phillip Rich (2007:2) is identified by his followers as an 'Apostolic Prophet'¹²¹ and CEO of Ekklisia [sic] Ministries. He defines *metadidomi* thus: 'to give over-to share based on connection and association'. Taking that meaning as his working definition, Rich (2007:13) teaches that persons can impart their personal anointing or 'giftings' to others as well as that impartations are primarily given or received through connecting to or associating with those who are in the five-fold ministry.¹²² The first principle he discusses is impartation and covenant relationships.

3.1 Rich's view of impartation and covenant relationships

Rich (2007:6-10), like Rogers (2006:19), suggests that impartations are received through association or being in covenant with someone in the five-fold ministry. However, his teaching is questionable and raises concern. Rich (2007:6) argues that there cannot be an impartation without 'covenant relationship'. His argument is based on Ephesians 4:11-12 but also on 1 John 2:27, which states: 'But the anointing which you have received from Him abides in you, and you do not need that anyone teach you; but as the same anointing teaches you concerning all things, and is true, and is not a lie, and just as it has taught you, you will abide in Him'. It seems to be a highly subjective conclusion, for the context of the text

¹²¹ It should be noted that the title 'Apostolic Prophet' is not one found in Scripture.

¹²² Rich frequently makes use of the terminology 'connect' or being 'connected to' persons in the five-fold ministry. Although this is unbiblical terminology it will be used to correctly represent his views.

makes no suggestion whatsoever that anointings are imparted through a covenant relationship between believers in Christ. The passage appears to teach the opposite. John is issuing a warning concerning the 'eschaton' of the church and the encroaching spirit of the Antichrist. Because of impending deception, the church is given the *charisma* (anointing) that abides in each believer. In Greek it means to 'smear' or to 'rub over' (Palmer 1982:48). Clearly stated, the anointing refers to the Holy Spirit whom God has given to each believer in order to discern deception in the church (cf. John 14:26; 16:13). As Wuest (1973, 2:138) expressed the point, when saints are subjected to deception 'their court of appeal and refuge is the instruction of the Holy Spirit through the Word God'. In the words of Palmer (1982:48), 'Christians do not need to seek out other anointings in order to be equipped for their age' (cf. Ruthven 2008:164-167).¹²³ Moreover, 1 John 2:27 explains that the anointing is received from 'Him' and not 'them' or any so-called 'five-fold ministry' leader as assumed by Rich (2007:13-14).¹²⁴

It is reasonable to conclude that Rich offers a subjective interpretation of Scripture in which he gives 'an opinion that cannot be substantiated by an objective source of truth' (Friesen 2004:91; MacArthur 1992:87), which leads to his next view that is also questionable.

3.2 Rich's view of impartation through perception and reception

Rich (2007:25-33) explains that impartations are received through perception and reception. He first discusses perception. Believers must

¹²³ MacArthur (1992:96) and Wuest (1973, 2:138) suggest that 1 John 2:27 does not nullify God-appointed and equipped teachers. That would be inconsistent with Ephesians 4:11. Rather, John makes it clear that the Holy Spirit is the ultimate teacher. Saints' can be taught but are not at the mercy of any human teacher. Palmer (1982:48) expresses that Christians must beware. False teachers are ready to offer a new and different 'anointing'. 1 John 2:27, 'reminds the Christians of the anointing that they already have in Jesus Christ, that that anointing is not from a movement or guru but the Holy One himself, from God'.

¹²⁴ Rich (2007:9-10) states that people often want to lay hands on ministers and prophesy over them: 'I don't need you to do that for me. If I am training you, then I don't need to hear God through you'. However, Paul implies the opposite in Romans 1:11-12. He desires to impart a gift to the Roman believers but also believes that they will minister to him likewise (Barrett 1991:26; Dunn 1988:31; Moo 1996:60; Robertson 1931:326).

perceive the impartation that is being offered if they are to receive, and uses Matthew 13:13-15 to support the claim: 'Therefore I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear; nor do they understand. And in them the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled, which says, "hearing you will hear and shall not understand, and seeing you will see and not perceive"'. He then states that once the impartation is perceived it must be received (pp. 26-27). The woman at the well in John 4:1-30 is used as an example. She began to perceive Jesus as a Jew, then as a prophet, and finally as the Messiah from whom she received forgiveness. In this way, the perception believers have of the leader and his or her gifts determines whether they receive impartations from him or her as a teacher, preacher, or prophet (p. 27). As he puts it: 'You have to perceive what I have before you can do what I do' (p. 29).

In response to Rich's teaching on perception and reception, perception and the willingness to receive impartations are biblical concerns exemplified in the following examples: (1) Peter and John being sent to the converts in Samaria to share with them the deeper experience of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:14-17); (2) Aquila and Priscilla teaching Apollos the 'way of God more accurately' (Acts 18:24-28); and (3) Paul's prayer for the Ephesian church to be spiritually enlightened and instructing them and the Corinthian believers on the availability and purpose of spiritual gifts (Eph 1:15-19; 4:7-12; 1 Cor 12, 14).¹²⁵ With regard to the Corinthians, Fee (1987:576) asserts that Paul most certainly wanted to add to their understanding of 'the things of the Spirit'. Ruthven (2008:154-169) states that Paul in Philippians 1:9-10 and Colossians 1:9-12 prays for believers to have spiritual knowledge, perception and discernment concerning the Holy Spirit and His gifts. Ruthven further contends that such understanding is not produced by human cleverness but by 'the

¹²⁵ Wuest (1973, 1:53-54) translates Ephesians 1:18 thus: 'the eyes of your heart having been enlightened with the present result that they are in a state of illumination'. He suggests that four words are used to describe power: δυνάμειως (power); ἐνέργειαν (natural ability); κράτους (manifested strength) and ἰσχύος (strength, power as an endowment).

revelatory, if not miraculous operation of the charismata' (pp. 153-154). The purpose of this teaching is for the defense and confirmation of the gospel and to assist the church in remaining 'pure and blameless' until the realisation of the *parousia*. Hence, it is true that persons may receive through the teaching or preaching of one leader, or the laying on of hands and prophecy through another. Otherwise there would be no need for the five-fold ministry gifts (cf. Lombard and Daffe 2008:105-119; Lowery 2004:183-194). However, Rich's (2007:25-29) premise that persons receive impartations primarily through perceiving the gifts manifested by those in the so-called five-fold ministry is scripturally unwarranted because it contradicts 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 and Ephesians 4:7-12.

3.3 Rich's view of impartation and spiritual fathers

Like Rogers (2006:13-14), Rich (2007:31-32) also proposes that impartations are given and received through being associated with 'spiritual fathers'. He views Elisha's words, 'my father, my father' (2 Kgs 2:12), as providing proof for his view and suggests the meaning to be 'my inheritor, the one who has something to give'.¹²⁶ He finds further proof in 1 Corinthians 4:15 and Romans 1:11 that read, respectively, as follows: 'For though you might have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet you do not have many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel'.¹²⁷ And, 'For I long to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift'. Rich (2007:35-36) suggests that Paul's language indicates that he needed to be in close proximity of believers in order to build

¹²⁶ Rich (2007:32) suggests calling someone 'father' is not intended to mean that the person is anyone's heavenly Father. Matthew 23:9 strictly forbids this.

¹²⁷ The Greek word παιδαγωγούς ('instructors') was used for the guide or attendant who had to care for a child and took him to school (Robertson 1931:109). The guardian was normally a trusted slave who was to oversee the conduct of the child. While the Corinthians may have thousands of 'tutors', Paul is their only πατέρας ('father'), Fee (1987:185) suggests that the metaphor is used 'to distinguish his own relationship to them from that of all others...That gave him [Paul] a special authority over and responsibility toward them'.

personal relationships that will lead necessarily to an impartation of some sort.¹²⁸

It seems that Elijah and Paul can be considered 'fathers' in the sense that they carried spiritual influence and imparted spiritual truths to those they associated with. However, Rich's view is challenged on at least three fronts. First, Lombard and Daffe (2008:197-19) argue that the exchanging of the mantle of Elijah was not a fatherly impartation but a symbol of the prophetic position that would be Elisha's (1 Kgs 19:16). Dilday (1987:265) and Keil (1950:17) concur. Second, Fee (1987:186-187) argues that the context of Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 4:15-16 relate to circumstances that were being experienced in verses 11-13. As their 'father', Paul wanted the believers to 'imitate' his response to the present trials and tribulations. And third, while Paul had close associations in Rome (Rom 16:1-4), Romans 1:11 does not justify the inference that Paul's impartation required such close associations. Hence, Rich is simply mistaken about impartations involving 'spiritual fathers' in the sense that he understands it. Scripture does not confirm that close associations are necessary for impartations or that so-called 'spiritual fathers' can impart their anointing or spiritual gifts to spiritual sons or daughters on their own initiative.

3.4 Rich's view of impartations and the five-fold ministry

Rich (2007:47-48) suggests four ways through which persons can position themselves to receive impartations from someone ministering in one of the roles comprising the five-fold ministry. First, believers must be willing to be discipled in the manner the disciples requested to be taught in Luke 11:1. For him, this means that discipleship is the result of connecting and listening to a minister who is gifted in the 'five-fold ministry' referred to in Ephesians 4:11. Matthew 10:24-25 is given as an example: 'The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his

¹²⁸ Rich (2007:37) argues that Paul wanted to spend time with the Romans and discounts the idea favoured by some, namely, that Paul imparted gifts to the Roman believers through his letter (Fee 1994:486-489; Fitzmyer 1993:248; Longenecker 2016:117).

lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord'. Rich suggests that 'Master means an instructor who has mastered something in the spirit' (p. 49). Thus, in his mind, if given enough time, through impartation the person will minister in a manner identical to an instructor with the same anointing and power. Second, Rich encourages believers to become helpers in the ministry because God imparts the same mantles, abilities, and anointings to those who are willing to assist in ministry responsibilities in a way similar to what is documented in Numbers 11:24-25 (p. 51-52).

Third, Rich believes that believers receive impartations by being 'spiritual sons'. Rich (2007:52-53) proposes that 'spiritual son' should be taken to mean someone loyal to 'spiritual fathers' whom God spiritually connects him or her with (cf. 2 Kgs 2:4-6). The fourth and final way to receive impartations, as Rich would have us believe, is through becoming 'partners' with 'spiritual fathers'. For Rich a 'partner' is someone who has a part or takes part in the ministry of others as implicated by Paul's use of '*koinonia*' (fellowship) in Philippians 1:5 (pp. 55-56).¹²⁹ Rich also claims that those referred to as 'partners become partakers' are the believers addressed by Paul in Philippians 1:7: 'I have you in my heart, inasmuch as both in my bonds and in the defense and confirmation of the gospel, ye all are partakers of my grace'. Rich interprets 'ye all are partakers of my grace' to mean thus: 'Paul told them they had his grace, his anointing, his divine ability' (p. 56). However, Rich is linguistically incorrect. As Wuest (1973, 2:33) pointed out, 'The word "my" is connected with "partakers" not "grace". The Philippians were Paul's co-sharers in the grace of God' (cf. Robertson 1931:437). Constable (2017c:15) and Silva (2005:47) add that this absolute grace of God strengthened the Philippians and enabled them to suffer with Paul in the defense and propagation of the gospel.

¹²⁹ Rich (2007:55) interprets *koinonia* to mean partnership. Constable (2017c:11) Robertson (1931:436) and Silva (2005:44) define *koinonia* the same and add that the 'partnership' Paul refers to involve the activity of the Philippians in promoting the work of the gospel.

In response to Rich's theology on impartation and the five-fold ministry, certain aspects of it are similar with that of the Church of God and other Christian leaders. Believers can be disciplined through associating with and learning from gifted teachers and preachers. The disciples learned through following Christ and by having a 'teacher/learner' relationship with Him (Sims 2017:21). Smith (2012:162) asserts that through this method of learning the disciples later formulated their theology 'Christocentrically', thus becoming 'reflective practitioners whose beliefs and practices were pervasively shaped by their relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ'.¹³⁰ Put differently, Chung (2009:305) remarks that the company one keeps influences one's life because it allows one to observe another's life and model it; 'This is a crucial aspect of impartation'. Frangipane (2015) agrees: 'Impartation does not take the place of our personal relationship with our Father' but God does 'reward' persons by placing key leaders in their lives to teach them about the power of spiritual impartation. Moreover, Church of God leaders such as Arrington (1982:28-31) and Gause (1986:212-216) do not discount believers being helpers, spiritual sons, and partners in ministry (Rom 16:1-3; 1 Cor 4:14-17; 2 Cor 8:16-23; 1 Tim 1:2).

In sum, what is helpful and can be accepted from Rich's theology is the following: (1) being associated with other believers or leaders can lead to impartations being given (2 Kgs 2:1-15; Rom 1:11; 2 Tim 1:1-6); (2) perceiving that spiritual gifts and blessings are available enhances a person's ability to receive (Acts 10; 19:1-6; 1 Cor 1:4-7; 12:1); (3) believers can be mentored and encouraged through relationships with 'spiritual fathers' (Acts 16:1-5; 2 Tim 2:1-10; Philem 1-16); and (4) being a helper and partner to someone in the five-fold ministry is a way to receive from the person's anointing, abilities and gifts. However, persons

¹³⁰ Peppler (2012:117-135) describes 'The Christocentric Principle' as 'an approach to biblical interpretation that seeks to understand all parts of Scripture from a Jesus-perspective. 'In other words, it is a way of *interpreting Scripture primarily from the perspective of what Jesus taught and modelled, and from what he revealed concerning the nature, character, values, principles, and priorities of the Godhead.*' Three key principles emerge: (1) why Jesus said or did it; (2) what Jesus said and did; and (3) how the apostles interpreted and applied it (cf. Smith 2012:157-170).

should be cautious and study the Scripture thoroughly when using Rich as a resource for the doctrine of impartation.

However, while Rich makes an effort to define and establish a doctrine of impartation, certain premises such as the following cannot be accepted for doctrinal practice. First, his view that impartations come primarily through being associated or in covenant with someone in the five-fold ministry cannot be substantiated by any text in the New Testament. Rather, a contrast to Rich's view is found in Luke 11:13 where it is stated that God gives the Holy Spirit to those who simply ask Him. Second, neither can his view that gifts, blessings, and special anointings are imparted solely by those in the so called 'five-fold ministry'. God is sovereign; therefore, persons cannot discount His using of someone such as an ordinary believer or a deacon to impart gifts to other believers (Acts 6:8). James 5:15 says: 'pray for one another, so that you may be healed. The effective prayer of a righteous man can accomplish much'. Third, nor can his view that believers must 'perceive' or identify the gifts in order to receive an impartation from those in the 'five-fold ministry' be accepted. That is, to put it mildly, to distort the teachings of Scripture. How does one 'perceive', for example, the gift of the discernings of spirits, which is neither mentioned nor anywhere explained in his writings? Furthermore, a person can discern between two things without manifesting the discerning at all. Finally, whether 'spiritual fathers' have the ability to impart their personal giftedness or anointings to spiritual sons and daughters is deeply problematic. It is because the relationship between the Holy Spirit as the Giver of gifts and the sovereignty of God is hardly, if ever, explained in his writings. So the reader must deduce that Rich has little or no understanding of how these themes interrelate with a sound biblical understanding of impartation. Whether the will of the Spirit (1 Cor 12:11) can ever conflict with the will of the human 'impartar' is also left unanswered.

We shall next examine the views of Ervin Budiselić.

4. Ervin Budiselić

Ervin Budiselić serves as Academic Dean for the Biblical Institute in Zagreb, Croatia. The Institute was founded by the Council of Churches of Christ in Croatia and has a cooperative agreement with the Evangelical Pentecostal Church and the Church of God in Croatia. The school's lecturers, staff, and affiliates are also active members of local evangelical churches. Budiselić restricts his analysis of the theology of the impartation of gifts of the Spirit from one person to another to Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14. He concludes that this theology is unbiblical because proponents fail to distinguish the difference between the gifts of the Spirit and spiritual gifts. As a result, the doctrine and practice of impartation encourages believers to rely on people instead of God in order to receive something from God (Budiselić 2011:245-270). He delineates his argument with several key points.

4.1 Introduction to the problem

Budiselić (2011:245) notices that the charismatic Christian world is increasingly being shaped by the theology and practice of impartation. Clark (2013:47), Bay and Martinez (2015) noticed the same phenomenon and surmise that the doctrine of impartation is the core of today's revivalism in pentecostal and charismatic movements. Given the doctrine's influence, Budiselić (2011:246) opines that Christians are being taught by pentecostal leaders that if they can visit the 'right' places, go to the 'right' conferences, get the 'right' persons to pray for them or visit the 'right' graveyards, they can receive an impartation of 'God's anointing, spiritual gifts and other blessings'. Two representative examples are John Crowder (2005) and Tommy Welchel (2013:159-161), who both claim to have been 'told by God' to go and lie on the graves of deceased ministers in order to receive the deceased person's anointing.¹³¹ Welchel (2013:161) also claims to have imparted the

¹³¹ Crowder (2005) shares that the Lord directed him to visit the grave of Evan Roberts for an impartation and receiving of mantles. Once there he lay upon Robert's grave asking for a transfer of the anointing. Welchel (2013:159-160) describes going to the grave of William Seymour and being told by God to 'Lie down on the grave'. He states:

anointing for healing to other believers. Afterwards, these believers were able to heal other sick persons. Budiselić states that being confronted with such numerous possibilities which are being taught by impartation theology, this generation of Christians must be able ‘to discern and test such practices and ideas in order to preserve sound doctrine and practice’ (p. 246).

Budiselić (2011:246) shares his concern that those who teach that spiritual gifts can be imparted from one person to another are misinterpreting the Scriptures. Generally speaking, this is also a concern of Joubert and Maartens (2017:126-129). They argue that there is a major problem with how many Christians, especially those in the pentecostal and charismatic traditions use the Bible as a source of divine guidance and Christian practice. Their point is that ‘no person has the right to make it [the Bible] say what it was not intended to say’. MacArthur (1992:87) similarly expresses the same point as follows: ‘Misinterpreting the bible is ultimately no better than disbelieving it...The truth is, it doesn’t matter what a verse means to me, to you, or to anyone else. All that matters is what the verse means’. Bay and Martinez (2015) agree and suggest that the idea that ministers ‘can dispense spiritual gifts to believers at will is a very serious misinterpretation of Scripture’. Given the proclivity to misinterpret the Scripture, Budiselić explores several key issues related to the theology and practice of impartation in an effort to bring clarity to how it ought to be understood. He begins by addressing the definition of impartation.

4.2 Defining impartation

Budiselić (2011:247) shares several definitions of impartation with those who practice the doctrine: it is (1) the ability to give gifts and blessings

‘As I lay on Seymour’s grave, little tingles of electricity shot through my whole body. Finally and all of a sudden, it was over. I heard God say, “Now you have it.” What I now had was Seymour’s anointing’. Benny Hinn admits visiting the gravesites of Kathryn Kuhlman and Aimee Semple McPherson for fresh anointings (Bay/Martinez 2015; Hanegraaff 2009:29). Joubert and Maartens (2018:38-55) and Friesen (2004:89-111) are valuable resources that help to assess the legitimacy of impressions or ‘words from the Lord’ such as ‘God told me or directed me’.

either sovereignly or through other anointed vessels of God by the laying on of hands (Francis 2015), (2) the transfer of grace from one party to another (Anyasi 2003:295), and/or (3) the transference of anointing, spiritual gifts or the filling of the Holy Spirit (Clark 2013:16). These definitions provide an overall view of the doctrine and coincide with those of Church of God pastors and leaders represented in chapter two (cf. also Hill 2014; Williams 2016).

Budiselić (2011:248) also presents representative views of how impartations may be received, many of which align with the theology of Church of God leaders and others. First, impartations come through the laying on of hands (Vallotton 2005:63; Penn Clark 2008; cf. Arrington 2008:300; Tipei 2009:217; Tomberlin 2010:225-258). Second, they are received through faith and grace (Vallotton 2005:64). Third, impartations are events that occur as the result of a sovereign act of God (Francis 2015). Fourth and last, persons who sincerely desire to receive an impartation, may do so through the teaching, preaching, and examples of leaders (Goulet 2007:xvii-xix; cf. Boice 1991:80; Chung 2009:169-172; Fee 1994:488). However, to understand the practice more fully, Budiselić (2011:244-249) argues that persons must look at the conceptual implications of the doctrine.

4.3 Conceptual implications of impartation

Budiselić (2011:244-250) asserts that contiguous with the practice of impartation are three conceptual modifications that make the theology appear biblically sound and correct. First is the concept taught by M. Chavda and B. Chavda (2008:18-19) that impartations are not only from God to people, but also from anointed leaders to other persons. Also, representative of this view is Anyasi (2003:295) who states that 'impartation is impossible without spiritual and physical affinity between the Apostle and the disciple' (cf. Rich 2007; Rogers 2006). The second concept involves the impartation of 'spiritual substance'. Exemplary of this view is Taylor (2018) who teaches that what one says or does under the anointing affects those who are listening and 'the very "substance" of His

(Jesus)' being will be imparted into the spirit of those who are responsive'. He thinks that through 'spending time with God' he acquires the 'spirit and life' of Jesus, which he terms 'spiritual substance' to impart to others.¹³² The third conceptual modification involves impartational teaching because leaders fail to distinguish between spiritual gifts and the gifts of the Spirit (Budiselic 2011:249-250).

Budiselic (2011:250) argues that these conceptual modifications are used in tandem to support an erroneous theology of impartation. The term *metadidomi* is misconstrued by practitioners to support their theoretical position. Thus, Budiselic holds the same view as was argued in chapter three above, namely, that *metadidomi* has various meanings in Scripture. He rightfully points out that while *metadidomi* is used five times in the New Testament, only Romans 1:11 suggests a 'supernatural transmission' from one person to another. In the four remaining references the contextual meaning has to do with 'giving or sharing' material goods or the gospel with other persons in need (Bruce 1982:32; Chung 2009:171-172; Plummer 1951:91). Budiselic (2011:250) maintains that the aforementioned modifications have been used to formulate a new concept of impartation. Bible passages have been re-interpreted, or as Joubert and Maartens (2017:105) suggest, 'decontextualised' and 'recontextualised' to support erroneous decisions and ecclesiastical practices. However, Budiselic (2011:251) maintains that the faulty claim regarding impartation is easily refuted when the context of Paul's words in Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14 is closely reconsidered.

4.4 Impartation in Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14

Budiselic (2011:251) argues against the claim that impartation of the gifts of the Spirit from one person to another is a simple matter. Leaders who teach that gifts are imparted in this way are easily refuted when one

¹³² Neither Taylor (2018) nor Frangipane (2015) who allude to this principle clearly define what they mean by the term 'spiritual substance'. However, Taylor cites the words of Jesus in John 6:63: 'the words that I speak to you they are spirit and they are life' and implies that 'spiritual substance' is the 'spirit and life' that comes through the Scripture. He also cites John 15:4-5 and 1 Corinthians 2:1-4 giving the impression that 'spiritual substance' means the fruit of the Spirit and the wisdom of God.

compares that idea with a proper interpretation of Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14. In his view, persons such as Alley (2002:110) and Hamon (1987:69) are simply incorrect to insist that ministers can lay hands on other believers for impartations and activate anointings, divine gifts, blessings and ministry callings at will. Budiselic (2011:251) contends that it is a serious question whether Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14 substantiates this premise. Church of God leaders have historically and presently argued the same point (Conn 1963:11-12; Hall 1949:4-5; Lombard and Daffe 2008:196-200).¹³³

Budiselic (2011:251) also emphasises that the problem is not with the word '*impartation*', 'but in the idea and meanings that are connected with the word'. For instance, Straube (2010:209) and Vallotton (2005:63) imply that the use of the Greek word *charisma* in Romans 1:11, 1 Timothy 4:14, and 2 Timothy 1:6 means that gifted ministers can lay hands on and impart gifts of the Spirit to others. In contrast, Budiselic and others appeal to 1 Corinthians 12:11: 'But [the] one and the same Spirit works all these things distributing to each one individually as He wills' (cf. also Fee 1987:599; Gause 1986:24; Saucy 1996:137).¹³⁴ Budiselic emphasises further that the distorted practice of impartation as expressed by Straube and Vallotton is due to an insufficient understanding and conclusion of Paul's use of *charisma* in Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14, which they take as identical in meaning in both texts. However, the presentation of *charisma* in 1 Timothy 4:14 implies 'spiritual gifts' or 'grace gifts'. But the addition of *pneumatikon* with *charisma* in Romans 1:11 means 'gifts of the

¹³³ Conn (1963:11-12) argues that *charisma* can be translated 'variously as "gift" or "grace" or "favour" or "blessing"'. The gift that was to be imparted to the Roman believers as well as the gift imparted to Timothy was not one of the 'nine enumerated gifts of the Spirit. Nowhere are these imparted by human hands... There are however, ministry gifts that are ordained and confirmed by the laying on of hands'. Conversely, Hall (1949:11-12) observes that Paul had no intention to impart to the Roman believers one of the nine gifts of the Spirit referred to in 1 Corinthians 12 or one of the ministry gifts listed in Ephesians 4:11. Lombard and Daffe (2008:200) agree and state that we 'receive our gifts from God firsthand. No human imparts gifts to us no matter how spiritual or used of God the individual may be'.

¹³⁴ Church of God leaders believe that the laying on of hands is a common means for the impartation of healing and the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Mark 5:23; 16:18; Jas 5:14,15; Acts 8:17; 19:6; 28:18; Tipei 2009:191-214; Tomberlin 2010:233). However, in contrast, to Straube (2010:209) and Vallotton (2005:63), Church of God leaders do not teach that the gifts of the Spirit are wilfully imparted from one person to another.

Spirit', and those are not imparted by the laying on of hands 'because one does not possess such gifts' (Budiselic 2011:251).¹³⁵ Budiselic (2011:255-256) argues that the same distinction between 'spiritual gifts' (*charisma*) and 'gifts of the Spirit' (*charisma pneumatikon*) is found in 1 Corinthians 12. In Budiselic's view, *charisma pneumatikon* means 'gifts of the Spirit'. However, while his view corresponds to that of Arrington (2016) and Jewett (2007:124), it conflicts with the view of Bay and Martinez (2015) and Morris (1988:60). The latter writers suggest that the meaning should be that the imparting of God's spiritual grace or anything else that serves the purpose of developing the spiritual life of the believer.

Finally, Budiselic (2011:252) believes that the word *charisma* translated as 'spiritual gift' is unbiblical, 'since the word *charisma* does not signify the *gifts of the Spirit*, per se, nor *spiritual gifts*, but gifts of God's grace in general'. He bases his argument on the thoughts of Conzelmann (1974:403) and Fee (1994:33) who connect the general use of *charisma* more with gifts or expressions of grace (cf. Arndt and Gingrich 2000:1078-81; Cranfield 1975:78-79; Piepkorn 1971:370; Stitzinger 2003:150). Therefore, according to Fee (1987:576), the use of *charisma* alone seems to imply gracious gifts whereas *charisma pneumatikon* refers primarily to

¹³⁵ Conn (1986:55-56) and Willis (1986:271) argue that the gifts of the Spirit have been given to the church and are not permanently vested in individuals (cf. Gibbs 1981:330; Hall 1949:4; Lockwood 2000:417). Rather, the Spirit is the Giver of gifts through persons He chooses, when He chooses. For example, in respect to the 'word of wisdom' Conn (1986:56-57) states: 'The wisdom here [in 1 Cor 12:8] is neither a native faculty nor a permanent impartation; it is a word of wisdom manifested in a time of need'. Likewise with the 'word of knowledge': 'Neither is it a permanent impartation, as though God gives a package of ready-made knowledge for the believer to glory in or to use at his own discretion'. Grudem (1994:902) and Wagner (1979:106) believe Scripture supports the permanence of the gifts of the Spirit in believers (1 Cor 13:2, 14:28; Rom 12:4-8). Yet, Grudem (2000:175) adds that it is not exactly accurate to think of gifts in terms of absolute possession or absolute non-possession. 'It is more accurate to think in terms of a progression along a scale of increasing intensity'. For example, two persons may teach, but God uses the gift of teaching to enhance that of one person above the other. Bittlinger (1967:63) shares an alternate view: 'The gifts are not, in the first place, given to the one who ministers them, but to the one who is ministered to. It is, for example, the sick person that recovers, who receives healing as a gift, not the one who lays hands on him and prays for healing'. Gaffin (1979:54), although a cessationist, provides what may be the best view: 'Probably the most important and certainly the most difficult lesson for us to learn is that ultimately spiritual gifts are not our presumed strengths and abilities, not something we "have" (or even have been given), but what God does through us in spite of ourselves and our weakness'.

'spiritual manifestations' that are associated with the Holy Spirit's endowment of those gifts mentioned by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12 and 14.

In order to elucidate some of the aforementioned points, it will be useful to examine Budiselić's understanding of Romans 1:11 and 1 Timothy 4:14 more closely and separately.

4.4.1 Impartation in Romans 1:11

Given the differentiation between *charisma* and *charisma pneumatikon*, Budiselić (2011:253-255) proposes that Paul has the gifts of the Spirit in mind in Romans 1:11. However, Paul's usage of *τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα* ('some spiritual gift') implies that 'some of the gifts of the Spirit will accompany his coming to Rome'. Austin (2016) states that the use of *μεταδίδωμι* strongly implicates sharing or 'giving a part of what someone has'. Budiselić (2011:253-255) argues that Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 12:11 - 'the same Spirit works all these things, distributing to each one individually as He wills' - makes apparent that Paul will not give a gift of the Spirit that he possesses. Rather, God will be with him and will confirm His presence by the manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit similar to the impartation of tongues and prophecy mentioned in Acts 19:1-6. Fee (1988:589) and Grudem (2000:294-297) apparently agree and imply that Paul uses 'manifestation' in 1 Corinthians 12:7 to emphasise the Spirit manifesting Himself as needed rather than as a person's possession of the 'gifts' as such.¹³⁶ Moreover, Budiselić (2011:256) argues that the best way to bring hermeneutical clarity to passages such as Romans 1:11 is through utilising the principle of *analogia scriptura*. In other words, as MacArthur (1982:94) suggests, persons should always use the 'synthesis principle' and allow Scripture to interpret Scripture.¹³⁷

¹³⁶ Fee (1987:589) observes that Paul's change of words from 'gift' to 'manifestation' in 1 Corinthians 12:7 is to stress that 'each "gift" is a "manifestation," a disclosure of the Spirit's activity in their midst... His urgency, as vv. 8-10 make clear, is not that each person is "gifted," but that the Spirit is manifested in a great variety of ways. His way of saying that is, "to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit"'. Grudem (2000:294-297) emphasises that all gifts are imparted by the Holy Spirit and implies that their manifestations come when needed.

¹³⁷ MacArthur (1982:94) refers to the Reformers who used the expression *scriptura scripturam interpretatur*. 'By this they meant that obscure passages in Scripture must be

In sum, Budiselić rightly concludes that Romans 1:11 leaves in question whether Paul will serve the Roman believers through the gift(s) of the Spirit or whether his visit will be accompanied with a sovereign sharing or bestowal of the gift(s). He is also right to conclude that Paul leaves unanswered the question whether he sees himself as a mediator through whom the Spirit will impart the gift(s) or whether he considers himself as the source of the gift(s) (Budiselić 2011:255).

The analysis of the anchor text (Rom 1:11) in chapter three of this study confirms Budiselić's conclusion. Various suggestions were considered as to how Paul might have imparted the Holy Spirit's gift(s) and which gift(s) it might have been. Consequently, the exegetical study was unable to present evidence to disprove Budiselić's claims that Paul leaves a lot of questions about impartation unanswered, such as (1) the gift(s) Paul wanted to impart to the Roman believers; (2) whether Paul planned to minister to the Roman believers in the gifts(s) of the Spirit which he possesses or anticipated that God will accompany him with the sovereign bestowal of some gift(s); and finally, (3) whether Paul saw the Spirit as the Giver of the gift(s) and himself as a mediator who will assist those receiving impartations or whether Paul saw himself as the source of the gift(s) for the Roman believers (Budiselić's 2011:254-255). However, what can be stated with certainty is that Paul planned to visit the Roman believers and his goal was to impart to them a spiritual gift. It can be also be stated, albeit with less certainty, but with more probability, that 'the apostle could hardly claim to be able to "impart" a *charisma* himself', therefore, that the impartation will come to the believers in Rome through a sovereign decision of the Spirit and the laying on of hands or some other means (Stott 1994:56).

understood in light of clearer ones'. This interpretative model is a challenge to pentecostals who are tempted to adapt to a proof-text method of stringing together a series of scriptural passages on a given subject for doctrinal support. Most often the contextual setting is dismissed leading to the decontextualising and recontextualising of passages that in the end determine practice (cf. Archer 2009; Fee 1991; Joubert and Maartens 2017).

4.4.2 Impartation in 1 Timothy 4:14

Budiselić (2011:256-257) acknowledges that 1 Timothy 4:14 is used to teach that gifts of the Spirit can be imparted from one person to another. He, therefore, suggests that an analysis of Timothy's gift and the role of prophecy and the laying on of hands in the bestowal of gifts will help determine whether the proponents of impartation are correct in their understanding of the text or not. Several observations are listed in Budiselić's analysis: (1) the gift imparted was *charismatos* or a ministry gift; (2) the gift was a continuous possession unlike those gifts in 1 Corinthians 12; and (3) in Romans 1:11 and 1 Corinthians 12 *charisma* is connected with the Spirit whereas in 1 Timothy 4:14 it is not. Based upon these observations Budiselić concludes that the 'some gift' in Romans 1:11 and 'your gift' in 1 Timothy 4:14 'are not the same in terms of their nature and function'. Furthermore, the gift was imparted to Timothy διὰ προφητείας μετα ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου. Of importance is Budiselić's assertion that there is little grammatical evidence to prove that the impartation was caused by or necessitated by the laying on of hands and prophesying (p. 258). This foregone conclusion aligns with those presented in chapter three and coincides with the theology of the Church of God as stated by Arrington (1982:103-104) and Lombard and Daffe (2008:199).¹³⁸

Gross (1990:168) and Warfield (1918:21-22) provide a more rigid rebuttal of the view that Timothy's gift has been imparted to him through the laying on of hands. Both argue that the conveyance of the charismata by the laying on of hands was relegated to the apostles only. According to Warfield (1918:22), 'There is no instance on record of their [charismata] conference by the laying on of the hands of anyone else than an apostle [sic]'. In contrast to Warfield, Deere (1993:172) argues from personal

¹³⁸ Arrington (1982:103-104; 2003:263) states that the gift given to Timothy was a 'gift of grace' or more specifically a gift of the Holy Spirit that enables believers to provide loving service to one another and to others. Lombard and Daffe (2008:199) observe that 'the laying on of hands was a symbolic, outward action or sign of what was already inwardly placed or determined by the Holy Spirit... Paul and the elders were simply conferring on Timothy their recognition and acceptance of God's direction'.

experience that 'gifts can be given through the laying on of hands with prophetic utterance'.¹³⁹ Storms (1996:210) agrees and suggests that prophetic utterances may '*identify and impart spiritual gifts*' (emphasis in the original). Alternatively, although Williams (1996:191-196) admits that the occasion of the laying on of hands and prophecy is the moment when Timothy received his gift, the impartation was the result of the activity of the Holy Spirit. However, Budiselić (2011:258) argues that for the sake of biblical congruence, the most reasonable conclusion is that the impartation was the primary action of God and the accompanying prophecy and the laying on of hands were secondary activities at best (cf. Marshall 1999:696; Mounce 2000:262).

In summary, Budiselić (2011:260) is right to argue that *charisma* is connected to gifts such as salvation (Rom 5:15-16), blessings (Rom 11:29; 1 Cor 7:7) gifts of grace (Rom 12:6-8) and gifts of the Spirit. He is also right in his assertion that the use of *charisma pneumatikon* differentiates between gracious (ordinary) gifts and extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. However, his premise that the gifts of the Spirit are implied only with the use of *charisma pneumatikon* is questionable, for the following reasons: (1) the terms *charismata* and *charisma pneumatikon* are used by Paul interchangeably when speaking of gifts (1 Cor 12:1, 4, 31; 14:1); (2) the gift of prophecy is presented in close relationship with *pneumatikon* in 1 Corinthians 12:1-10 but also as one of the gracious *charismata* in Romans 12:6; and (3) since Paul does not state the gift that was given to Timothy (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6), it can only be assumed that the gift was a 'so-called spiritual gift' (*charismata*) or 'a gift of the Spirit' (*pneumatikon*) (cf. Mounce 2000:262). In essence, 'There is not enough evidence in the context to decide with certainty what this [Timothy's] gift was' (Grudem 2000:134; cf. Arrington 1982:103-104; Tipei 2009:263). Due to lack of biblical evidence to prove otherwise, the greater substantiated argument that the 'gifts of the Spirit' cannot be imparted from one person to another

¹³⁹ Deere (1993:172) adds the following disclaimer to his belief: the laying on of hands and praying for people to receive spiritual gifts is not automatic. 'It must be done under the leadership of the Holy Spirit or nothing will happen'.

is represented in Budiselić's position on 1 Corinthians 12:4, 11, namely, that it is the Holy Spirit who imparts gifts, thus 'distributing to each one individually as He wills'.

Furthermore, Budiselić's textual analysis and conclusion of the use of *metadidomi* in the aorist subjunctive in Romans 1:11 implies that Paul was not the giver of the gifts, is plausible. Also, his view that God will accompany Paul with the impartation of the gifts of the Spirit is most reasonable and coincides with 1 Corinthians 12:11. Thus, Budiselić's view helps to bring harmony to the uncertainty surrounding the specific gifts Paul wished to impart and the means by which they will be imparted in of Romans 1:11. However, Budiselić's (2011:261-267) reaction to proponents of impartational theology and especially those who believe gifts can be imparted from one person to another require further analyses (see also Beck 2007:26; Deere 2008:31-32; Vallotton 2005:64).

It is noteworthy that he makes certain observations that are questionable and/or incongruent with Scripture.¹⁴⁰ First, Budiselić (2011:265) correctly states that not all proponents of the doctrine of impartation carry the same opinion about everything connected with the doctrine. But, he incorrectly concludes that 'they all do speak about transferring gifts, grace or power from one person to another person'. It has been shown in chapter one that several religious leaders of other denominations, including those in the Church of God such as Arrington 2012b:62, Brackett (2016) and Wood (2016), believe in the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, spiritual gifts and blessings, but they do not believe those impartations are passed on from one person to another. Rather, while humans may be involved in the process, impartations are given by God.

¹⁴⁰ Budiselić (2011:261-265) argues that the practice of impartation by those in charismatic Christianity is comparable to the Roman Catholic practice of praying to the saints and violating the Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. As a consequence, there is a 'direct encouragement for believers to seek certain gifts or abilities not from God but by going to certain gifted individuals for the purpose of receiving an impartation from them—not *from God through* them, but *from them*'. His argument for this view is noteworthy, but it is one that reaches beyond the scope of this study.

Second, Budiselic (2011:265) incorrectly states that ‘impartation lacks any biblical support’.¹⁴¹ Although, there are distorted theoretical concepts of the doctrine and practical ministry, the theological implications in Acts 8:17 and 19:6, Romans 1:11, 1 Timothy 4:14, 2 Timothy 1:6 and James 5:14 cannot be dismissed.

Third, Budiselic (2011) concludes that those who practice the theology of impartation openly promote the shifting of the believer’s attention from God to people. In this way, he says, ‘the proponents of impartation theology present God as someone who is unable to grant something to someone directly without mediators’ (p. 266). Although he formulates his position from the views of proponents of impartation such as Deere (2008:31-32), Frangipane (2015), Taylor (2018) and Vallotton (2005:64), he intentionally or mistakenly leaves the impression that all proponents of impartation believe that God cannot impart gifts or blessings apart from the mediation of human persons.¹⁴² In contrast, Clark (2013:17, 140) states that transferring the anointing ‘is not something man can do; it is an act of God, totally dependent on His calling and anointing...God sovereignly chooses to anoint someone with the grace to lay hands on others’ (cf. Deere 1993:172). Frangipane (2015) likewise expresses the same point: ‘Impartation is most effective when we are not in awe of men, but in awe of God who uses men and women to impart spiritual

¹⁴¹ Budiselic (2011:265) bases his argument on his understanding of *metadidomi*. He argues that the Bible does not mention impartation as a gift and does not explain how impartations are given or who the persons are that can impart anointings or gifts to others.

¹⁴² Budiselic (2011:248,266) grapples with an issue that is not easily understood. Proponents of impartation often leave others in doubt about the role of God and humans in the initiation and impartation of gifts and blessings. However, his emphatic statement that ‘the proponents of impartation theology present God as someone who is unable to grant something to someone directly without mediators’ is unnecessarily exaggerated. On the contrary, Budiselic’s presentation of the views of Francis and Clark challenge his premise that leaders through their teaching imply that God is unable to grant impartations without human mediators: ‘Francis sees that impartation can happen in two ways: God can, in His sovereignty, impart a certain ability that enables people to do what they had not been able to do before or anointed men or women can lay hands on others’ (Budiselic 2011:248). ‘Clark warns’, he says, ‘that impartation “is an act of God, totally dependent upon His calling and anointing”...and also that it is a “God initiated event”’ (Budiselic 2011:266). It is quite clear from these descriptions that God’s involvement is needed and expected in the ministry of impartation.

substance'. The summary suffices to disprove Budiselić's assumption that proponents generally leave the impression that impartations cannot be given apart from the mediation of a human person.

Fourth and finally, while Budiselić (2011:245-259) correctly argues that there is a lack of biblical support for the teaching that gifts can be imparted from one person to another, he leaves in question whether there is any circumstances in which God would use people for the imparting of spiritual gifts, the gifts of the Spirit, or blessings to others. Budiselić's (2011:259) claim that 'in theory, the proponents of impartation theology do not view people as the source of the spiritual gifts for other believers, but equally they do not explain why God goes around and needs the people for something he can do himself' appears to be indicative of his uncertainty whether or not God uses human assistance to impart gifts and blessings to others. However, Scripture reveals multiple occasions where God used persons for the purpose of impartation (Mark 16:15-18; Acts 8:14-17; 19:6; 28:8; Rom 1:11; Jas 5:14-15). Hence, greater clarity from Budiselić on this issue would have greatly enhanced the merits of his argument.

In any event, Budiselić's position brings serious thought and insight into the theology and practice of impartation and could be of benefit to Church of God leaders in order to strengthen the denomination's understanding of the doctrine of impartation.

5. Paul Goulet

Paul Goulet (2007:ix-xxiv), senior pastor of the International Church of Las Vegas, testifies that the power of impartation became a reality in his life after he was prayed for by Argentinean pastor, Claudio Freidzon. 'When Claudio prayed, God imparted through him' a 'mighty touch' from the Holy Spirit. He shares his testimony while knowing that the doctrine of impartation has often been faced with suspicion and associated with an aberrant theology, especially during the Latter-Rain Movement. However, he argues that 'it is time to free this important concept from its negative historical context and take a fresh, biblical look at it' (n.d.:7 cf. Graves

2016; Ice 2016; Williams 1949:5-13). His theology of impartation consists of several elements worthy of critical examination, which we next turn to.

5.1 Impartation defined

Metadidomi is defined by Goulet (n.d.:31; 2007:xx) as ‘to give over, or to share’, to ‘confer, bestow, hand over, put, place, and inherit’. He believes that these terms are not meant to imply that impartation is altogether about falling, laughing, shaking, crying, or even healing. Although these manifestations often occur, Goulet (2007:xii) believes that limiting the doctrine of impartation to manifestations alone can result in a genuine experience of the Holy Spirit being labelled as aberrant or ‘satanic’.¹⁴³ For him, impartation is rather about being filled with the Holy Spirit so that those receiving the impartation of the Holy Spirit might ‘pour’ it into the lives of someone else (ibid, p. xiii). Goulet uses Paul’s words in Philippians 2:17 to support his view: ‘But even if I am being poured out like a drink offering on the sacrifice and service coming from your faith, I am glad and rejoice with all of you’ (NIV). However, Goulet seems to be hermeneutically confused about the meaning of Paul’s words. Robertson (1931:447) and Wuest (1973, 2:77-78) state that ‘καὶ εἰ σπένδομαι’ pictures Paul’s life-blood being poured out as a drink offering or libation through his sacrificial service and eventual martyrdom. Constable (2017c:45) remarks that ‘He [Paul] compared his present life to the pouring out of a “drink offering” in Israel’s worship... This was the last act in the sacrificial ceremony, all of which symbolized the dedication of the believer to God in worship’ (cf. also Silva 2005:85-86). Moreover, Philippians 2:17 does not state or imply that imparted believers can ‘pour’ their impartations into other believers. Subsequently, Goulet (n.d.:11-29) avers that this impartational ‘pouring out’ to persons who needed healing,

¹⁴³ Both Hanegraaff (2009:74-86) and MacArthur (1992:77,128-151) believe that many of the manifestations and suggestive practices displayed in charismatic/pentecostal meetings are comparable to those in pagan religions. They are correct to argue that manifestations in charismatic/pentecostal worship should pass biblical scrutiny (cf. 1 Cor 13; 14:26-40; Gal 5:16-26; 1 John 4:1). Bay and Martinez (2015) agree and encourage believers to ‘judge the fruit’ of manifestations and the character of proponents of impartation. The same principles are taught by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12-14.

blessings and deliverance was tantamount to the life and ministry of Jesus, which is explained next.

5.2 Impartation in the ministry of Jesus

Goulet (n.d.:11-13) maintains that 'our beliefs, whether about impartation or any other subject, must be filtered through the life and teachings of Jesus'.¹⁴⁴ He believes that one does not need to read very far into the New Testament to find Jesus imparting healings and blessings to others. Goulet states that the woman with the issue of blood accessed the power of Jesus and received an impartation of healing through her faith, which is understood by Cheddie (2001:3), Storms (1996:307) and Wuest (1973, 1:111) as a transfer of *dunamis* or extraordinary supernatural power.¹⁴⁵ Jesus also gave impartations of power to the twelve disciples in Luke 9:1 and then to the seventy in Luke 10:17-2. However, Goulet fails to discuss the means through which the impartation of power was given. Contextually, no statement or implication is given in either passage that Jesus touched the disciples or prayed for them to receive authority and power. What is stated is that Jesus 'ἔδίδου αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν'. The disciples' 'power and authority' was sovereignly given and declared through the words of Jesus requiring no further action on His part. Wuest (1973, 1:123), commenting on the impartation in Mark 6:7, explains that the word 'gave' is the imperfect tense meaning that 'He [Jesus] kept on

¹⁴⁴ Although Pepler (2012:117-135) and Smith (2012:157-170) are not addressing the subject of impartation per se, they do emphasise the relevance of having a Christocentric hermeneutic.

¹⁴⁵ Cheddie (2001:1-7) believes that this event is to be categorised as an extraordinary miracle and is not to be used to 'prove that the anointing is transferable to clothing and other objects'. The same is true of Paul's anointing handkerchiefs in Acts 19:12. Thomas (2016:89), however, suggests that the practice of anointing 'prayer clothes' is one means pentecostals often used to facilitate healing of the sick (cf. also Tomberlin 2010:249-252). Although pentecostals use Acts 19:12 to support the practice of anointing prayer clothes, no statement is given to prove that Paul laid hands upon the handkerchiefs and aprons, or anointed them with oil. Tipei (2009:122-137) states that there is not enough clarity in Luke's words to form an accurate conclusion (cf. Robinson 2008:96-122). Furthermore, there is no evidence that Paul or any other apostle encouraged persons to lay hands on clothes or anoint them with oil as a means of healing and deliverance from evil spirits. Tomberlin (2010:252-255) points out that while anointing handkerchiefs has been viewed as a 'means of grace' through which the sick may be healed, God's gifts and healings are not for sale. What is troublesome for pentecostals is that the anointing of prayer clothes has become the practice of charlatans who make merchandise of the gospel and take advantage of unwise believers (MacArthur 1992:198).

giving them power all through the tour'. In other words, the disciples possessed delegated authority to command demons to leave individuals and God's power (*dunamis*) was there to see that the command was obeyed. Goulet (n.d.:20-21) further points out that Jesus did not limit His gifting to His twelve disciples or the seventy, but continued with the promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit and ministry gifts for all (Acts 1:8; Eph 4:11), meaning that 'impartation continues to be His vehicle [means] to touch a lost world'. By implication, impartations do not just happen. It is a process, as we shall next see.

5.3 Impartation in the life of the believer

Each believer, according to Goulet (n.d.: 83), is a vessel designed to be used by God to dispense gifts, blessings, power, and anointings. However, for the dispensing to occur, the power of God must be already present in the believer's life. He suggests that impartation is made possible through the consideration of seven 'keys' which he delineates in a number of sub-points.

5.3.1 'You can't give what you don't have'

Goulet (n.d.:83-86) offers two ways through which gifts can be obtained. On the one hand, by developing relationships with mentors, teachers, and pastors: 'It is my firm belief that deep impartations come from deep relationships'. He avoids, however, to emphasise that impartations come solely through relationships or those in the five-fold ministry, as Rich (2007:6-9) and Rogers (2006:26) aver. On the other hand, in contrast to Bonnke (1994:66-67), Budiselić (2011:259), and Lombard and Daffe (2008:197-198), Goulet (2007:xxii) suggests that impartations can be received by searching for persons who already have the gifts that are desired. He uses Elisha and Elijah to justify his belief and admits that he has purposely sought impartations from leaders such as Tommy Barnett, Claudio Freidzon, and Carlos Annacondia. He has, he claims, asked God to give him a 'double portion' of the Spirit that has been imparted to them (cf. Deere 1993:167). However, three caveats are evident in his account

of the impartational process: (1) to prayerfully and cautiously choose the people you ask to pray for you, (2) God, not man, is the source of gifts and the One who imparts the gifts, and (3) persons can pray for others in faith but they cannot guarantee the gifts they will receive when they pray (Goulet n.d.:89-94).¹⁴⁶

In sum, it was shown earlier that while association with persons can be beneficial in receiving impartations, Scripture neither teaches nor implies that other believers must be searched for in order to receive gifts from the Spirit.¹⁴⁷ Furthermore, Goulet's (n.d.:83) claim that 'You can't give what you don't have' is scripturally incorrect (1 Cor 12:1-11). God may sovereignly impart a gift through the prayers of someone who may not have the same spiritual gift. Goulet's (n.d.:85-86) statement that 'deep impartations come from deep relationships' is also questionable. He not only fails to provide scriptural support for his belief and explain what his terminology means, but also does not provide any criteria on how persons would determine if an impartation or relationship is deep, shallow or measured otherwise. Finally, Goulet fails to clarify which gifts are to be sought for impartation, whether they are ordinary, extraordinary or both. However, what can be helpful are his three caveats which coincide with the teachings of Scripture and Church of God leaders (Matt 7:20-23; 1 Cor 12:1-11; 1 John 2:1-3; Conn 1986:58; Hughes 1986:172-174; Lowery 2004:143-154; Sims 1995:117).

¹⁴⁶ Goulet (n.d.:89-90) encourages people to visit the 'gifted' persons, attend their seminars, read their published works and listen to their teachings. That can then be followed up with a request for prayer for oneself. Yet, this should be done with caution, 'because they will be pouring into you not only their gifts, but their philosophy, beliefs, values, teachings and ultimately, their spirit'. He claims that while there are no examples in the NT to justify any of his beliefs.

¹⁴⁷ Although, Scripture does not encourage the pursuit of humans for impartations, one cannot ignore or deny the possibility that God sovereignly uses associations for the purpose of impartation. Nor can one dismiss the experiences of persons who have received special anointings, blessings, or the manifestation of ordinary/extraordinary gifts after associating with and being prayed for by another person (Brown 1997:163-179; Clark 2013:29-39; Deere 1993:171-172; Goulet 2007:xi; n.d.:41-74; Kilpatrick 2015:105-160).

Goulet proposes next that impartations should be understood as contingent upon persons being able to decide which impartation they want.

5.3.2 'You must decide what you want'

Goulet (n.d.:95-100) uses three examples from Scripture to support his idea that 'You must decide what you want'. The first is 1 Samuel 1:10-11 where Hannah asks God for a son. The second is the story in 2 Kings 2:9 where Elisha says to Elijah, 'let me be given a double portion of your spirit'. The third example is in Genesis 32:24-26. In that passage Jacob petitions the 'man' and asks to be 'touched' with a special blessing. According to Goulet, the unifying theme that ties these examples together is faith, desperation, and a passionate pursuit of a gift.

Goulet claims that the idea that believers must believe and desperately contend for gifts is a scriptural principle. In this he is surely correct according to several New Testament passages that are not included in his argument. For instance, Jesus teaches, 'If you then being evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask Him' (Luke 11:13). Paul urged believers to 'desire spiritual gifts' (1 Cor 14:1) while James 5:14 encourages the sick to petition others for the anointing with oil and prayer. Deere (1993:166) concurs: 'The most important thing I have done in pursuing the gifts has been to pray very specifically for the gifts I felt the Lord wanted to give me'. Joubert (2019), however, in contrast to Deere, warns against persons basing their belief and actions upon what is 'felt'.¹⁴⁸ Simanullang (2011:107-108) and Kilpatrick (2015:205) explain that God plays the constitutive role in imparting gifts, but does so in response to those who value, pursue, and long for His presence (cf. Brown 2015:102;

¹⁴⁸ Joubert (2019) shares further concerns about Deere's (1993:166) claims: 'What worries me is that the subjectivity of these statements are taken as unquestionable truth. What he 'felt' is a highly contentious issue. The terminology also does not appear in the NT, let alone the OT (personal communication via email on 16 January 2019; cf. also Frieson 2004:89-98).

Lowery 1997:14).¹⁴⁹ However, while Goulet's premise is correct, he fails to indicate how persons come to know what impartations to ask for, which leads to the next point.

5.3.3 God's impartation to us and our impartation to others

Thus far, two 'keys' have been discussed which Goulet suggests make impartations possible: 'You can't give what you don't have' and 'You must decide what you want'. His third 'key' is presented next and involves God's impartation to us and our impartation to others. Goulet (n.d.:107) begins his discussion with quoting Jesus: 'As you go, preach this message: "the kingdom of heaven is near." Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse those who have leprosy, drive out demons. Freely you have received, freely give' (Matt 10:7-8). He then implies that two things are included in this passage. First, the disciples received an impartation of power, and second, their impartation of power was given so that they might impart to others. Goulet, however, fails to provide additional scriptural references or exegetical support to explain how Matthew 10:7-8 supports impartation and the means through which Jesus imparted to His listeners. Goulet (n.d.:115) further claims that there is a 'direct relationship between the level of one's blessing and the level of one's giving'. In other words, impartations from God continue as believers are willing to impart to others. He implies that such impartations might include extraordinary gifts of miracles and healing as well as ordinary gifts such as giving of one's possessions, deeds of mercy and the sharing of personal time and ministry. However, Goulet leaves open the question whether he means that gifts can be imparted from one person to another, or that imparted gifts should simply be used to minister to others. In retrospect, his previously mentioned caveat that God is the source of gifts

¹⁴⁹ Simanullang (2011:107-108) explains that God is the giver and the cause of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and all that accompanies it. He states however that God's response is not to the people who pray over others to receive, but to those who come to God, seeking God's face in prayer and expectant faith. 'It is not the experience of the participants' coming to God, but their experience of the God who comes upon them' through His Spirit.

and the One who imparts them makes it seem that he assumes that imparted gifts are to be used to minister to others.

Goulet's belief that God imparts gifts to believers so that they may impart to others finds harmony with the theology of those who view *metadidomi* to be the giving of ordinary and extraordinary gifts (Chung 2009:169-172; Nolland 1989:149; Plummer 1951:91). He also aligns with persons who believe impartations should be shared with others such as Deere. Deere (1993:166-167) remarks that one of the most valuable things he has done in his pursuit of spiritual gifts such as healing and the word of knowledge was to use them to minister to others on a regular basis. Hence, according to Deere (1993:166-167), believers should 'think of spiritual gifts in terms of the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30)'. Bonnke (1994:65-66), Lombard and Daffe (2008:201-202) also contend that imparted gifts are not to be left dormant within the believer and considered useful only in case we need them sometime somewhere. Rather, gifts come with the opportunity to minister.¹⁵⁰

By way of summary, Goulet's thoughts on receiving and sharing impartations can be helpful to an understanding of the Church of God's doctrine and practice of impartation from the standpoint that God imparts the baptism of the Holy Spirit, spiritual gifts, and blessings to believers so that they may share the gospel, disciple, heal the sick and edify others (Acts 1:8; 1 Cor 12:7; 14:26; Eph 4:11-12; Jas 5:13-15). However, further exegetical study of Matthew 10:7-8 is needed if Goulet wants to biblically substantiate his view.

¹⁵⁰ Although Bonnke (1994:66-67) and Lombard and Daffe (2008:196-197) believe in the impartation of gifts, they are adamant that it is the Holy Spirit who imparts them. They all argue that gifts do not come 'second-handed' meaning they are not given by God to persons who then give the impartation to others. Bonnke (1994:69) remarks that many have presumed to give gifts to other believers 'second-handed' but this has mainly led to disappointment, because the Holy Spirit is not directed by Christians. Rather He directs Christians. In contrast, Beck (2008:25-26) and Hamon (1987:26-27) contend that the Holy Spirit imparts gifts not for the purpose of transferring them to another, but so that believers may minister to others.

Discussed next is his idea that persons, in order to receive impartations, must position themselves through being humble, worshipful, obedient, and consultable.

5.3.4 Positioning of oneself for impartation

The fourth 'key' of Goulet (n.d.:116-124) comprises the belief that a believer has to 'position' him or herself in a spiritual way in order to receive an impartation from God. He uses 2 Chronicles 20 and how Jehoshaphat, through humility (vv. 18-19), worship (vv. 21-23), obedience (v. 20) and consultation (v. 21) positioned himself and others spiritually on the battlefield to gain victory over the people of Ammon, Moab, and Mount Seir. From these verses Goulet concludes that believers must spiritually position themselves in a similar way if they wish to receive impartations from God. However, his view requires closer examination.

First, 2 Chronicles 20 and the example of Jehoshaphat is not a pericope commonly used to support the doctrine of impartation. Second, no biblical reference or scholarly evidence corresponds with Goulet's view that the word 'position' (v. 17) refers to receiving impartations from God. Rather, the phrase 'position yourselves, stand still and see the salvation of the Lord' means to physically take a position and stand firm as an army would do in anticipation for battle (Klein 2012:289-290; Selman 1994:426-427). Thus, Goulet's contextual application that aligns the word 'position' with spiritual impartation is incorrect. Seeking a gift or an experience from God is not a 'position' that persons can occupy or take as argued by Goulet. However, humility, worship, obedience and consultation are emblematic of actions that persons may engage in to receive impartations from God (Luke 24:53; Acts 1:4-8; 5:32; 1 Pet 5:5-6). Menzies and Horton (1993:130) claim that persons must have obedient faith and that 'joyful praise and expectation prepare our hearts to receive' (Luke 24:52-53). Simanullang (2011:171-179), and Sims (1995:111-112) concur while Gause (2009:124-137) remarks that, whatever a person does to receive

an impartation from God, the one central act 'is the worship of God, not the singular seeking of a gift or an experience'.¹⁵¹

In sum, Goulet's (n.d.:116-124) misuse of the term 'position' is an attempt to change the contextual meaning of Scripture in order to make 2 Chronicles 20:17 say what he wants it to say. Given this concern, actions such as humility, worship, obedience and consultation are acceptable and accepted as beneficial ways through which believers can receive impartations from God. However, Goulet's fourth 'key' regarding the 'positioning of oneself for impartation' is unacceptable because his terminology lacks scriptural support.

Goulet also believes in multiple impartations.

5.3.5 Believers should seek multiple impartations

The fifth 'key' in Goulet's (n.d.:125-144) teaching is that believers should seek multiple impartations of gifts and blessings from the Holy Spirit, which he bases on Ephesians 5:18: 'And do not be drunk with wine, in which is dissipation; but be filled with the Spirit' (Eph 5:18). Goulet also uses Timothy to justify his belief that the latter received impartations of faith (2 Tim 1:5) from his mother and grandmother, including a gift from Paul and/or elders through the laying on of hands (1 Tim 4:13-15; 2 Tim 1:6-7), and refers to Jesus in support of his claim that 'Jesus wasn't filled once; He was filled [with the Holy Spirit] continually'.

In response to Goulet's fifth 'key', are several points worth consideration. First, Goulet (n.d.:126) seems to contradict himself. He urges persons to seek multiple impartations, but then states: 'When the Holy Spirit fills you, He always deposits His gifts in you. He decides which ones you need in any given circumstance'. His statement is very ambiguous and creates

¹⁵¹ Gause (2009:124-129) warns that while there are certain things that believers can do to better prepare themselves to receive the gifts and blessings of God, certain pitfalls must be avoided: prescriptions such as a mandate that persons must become emotionally excited or uncontrolled when praying for the impartation of the Holy Spirit or that people must adhere to unscriptural restrictions and practices or that people speak in tongues or prophesy through behavioural manipulation and imitation (cf. Williams 1971:61; Lovelace 1979:119-133).

concern: Are persons to believe that they receive all of the ordinary or extraordinary gifts when baptised with the Holy Spirit? If this is the intended meaning then Goulet's aim to seek multiple impartations is a *non sequitur* due to the fact that believers have already had imparted to them all the gifts. Alternatively, his statement could be interpreted to mean that persons, upon receiving Spirit baptism, become only active vessels for the manifestation of spiritual gifts but the Spirit chooses the particular gift to give and the time of their manifestation. 1 Corinthians 12 supports the latter possibility as does Fee (1987:582-600), Grudem (2000:168-175), Lowery (1997:60-64) and Lombard and Daffe (2008:54-56). Second, it was indicated that Church of God leaders and other pentecostals believe that persons can receive multiple impartations. These impartations are described mainly as 'refilling's' or renewals of the manifestation of the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 4:31-31). Bittlinger (1967:24), for example, explains that the word δίδοται ('given') in 1 Corinthians 12:7 'denotes a present continual tense, i.e., the manifestation of the Spirit is not just given once, but again and again. The believer is constantly filled anew with the Holy Spirit' (cf. Choy 1990:180-181; Simanullang 2011:93-125; Storms 1996:186-187). In contrast, Bonnke (1994:50-51) believes that *God* never anoints twice because the Holy Spirit abides with us always (1 John 2:27). Irrespective of these viewpoints, it is without question that Timothy was influenced by the teaching and mentorship of his mother and grandmother (2 Tim 1:5). However, there is insufficient evidence to support Goulet's premise that 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6 represent distinct or multiple impartations. Third, and most importantly, while Paul's admonition to 'desire the best gifts' (1 Cor 12:31) and be 'filled with the Spirit' (Eph 5:18) present the possibility of believers receiving multiple gifts and renewals in the Spirit, nowhere does Scripture state or imply that Jesus needed or received multiple impartations of the same as Goulet (n.d.:126) erroneously contends.

5.3.6 Goulet's view of guarding and sustaining an impartation

Goulet's (n.d.:148-167) sixth and seventh 'keys' represent the idea that imparted gifts, anointings and blessings are to be guarded and sustained.

For Goulet, gifts are imparted through the power and relational ability of the Holy Spirit (2 Cor 13:14). Thus, the relationship a person has with the Holy Spirit is not only crucial to receiving impartations, but also to their ongoing manifestation in the believer's life. On the one hand, Goulet claims that believers guard and sustain their impartations when they remain focused upon the Holy Spirit who is the Giver of gifts and anointings (1 Cor 12:7-10). He remarks that 'we must not fixate on the man or woman through whom the Holy Spirit is imparting; he or she is only a conduit' (p. 148). Rather, the believer's devotion must be directed towards God who will not share His glory with another. On the other hand, Goulet believes that guarding and sustaining the relationship believers have with the Holy Spirit and consequently the impartations given, necessitates that they avoid attitudes and actions that can prove to be detrimental to their spiritual life. For example, (1) the Holy Spirit can be grieved (Eph 4:30), (2) we can rebel against Him (Isa 63:10), (3) He can be resisted (Acts 7:51), and (4) we can lie to Him (Acts 5:3). All of these attitudes and actions impede the believer's ability to be intimate with the Holy Spirit which is, according to Goulet, vitally important because 'the more we seek the Holy Spirit and are filled with Him, the more His imparted gifts will manifest themselves through us' (pp. 148-150). Goulet also believes that in addition to avoiding actions and attitudes that can be detrimental to one's spiritual life, believers must also engage in actions that will sustain their impartations. He uses the parable of the sower in Luke 8:5-15 and compares impartations to seeds, which should be guarded, and nourished. He proposes several actions such as that believers can live and be led by the Spirit (Gal 5:22-25), prayer (1 Thess 5:17), reading and studying literary works, and listening to preaching or teaching of gifted ministers.¹⁵² They can also be mentored by leaders who are equipped with the gifts and anointing of the Spirit. Finally, believers

¹⁵² Bonnke (1994:65-66) believes that teaching about gifts is good, but to receive gifts purely by being taught is not plausible. Where there is faith and true desire in our hearts, a gift may be bestowed by the Spirit at any time, for example, when and where people are listening eagerly to explanations about the *charismata*. But it is through the initiative of the Holy Spirit, not man's will. Chand (2017:173-175) makes a similar comparison with the gift of leadership.

can sustain and nurture their impartations by fasting, the study of the Scriptures and submitting to a local church body where the gifts of the Spirit are being taught and manifested. For the latter, Goulet (n.d.:164-165) cites Matthew 16:18, Romans 12:4-5 and Hebrews 13:17 for support.

Goulet's (n.d.:148-167) view as represented in his sixth and seventh 'keys' are to be understood that believers should guard against the pitfalls that would impede relational progress with the Spirit. It is for this reason that Gause (2009:116) explains that the Holy Spirit is active, not only in the experience of repentance, but also in calling persons to intimacy with Himself and holiness of life. Furthermore, it is arguably the case that practices such as prayer, fasting, studying Scripture and listening to the teaching and preaching of gifted ministers are favourable for sustaining imparted gifts (Acts 13:1-3; 14:8-10; 1 Cor 14:26-33; 1 Tim 4:14-16). Prayer 'is the way that the life of God is nourished in us', claims Sims (2017:87); and it is a necessary practice to birth and sustain an atmosphere where impartations can flourish, according to Kilpatrick (1995:46-57). Foster's (1998:1-11, 132-133) view is that fasting and prayer are God-ordained practices meant to sustain the spiritual life of those who engage in them.¹⁵³ Frangipane (2015) teaches the same and suggests that submitting to the teaching of other leaders has sustaining merit (Prov 13:20; Luke 8:18). However, Frangipane (2015) warns that 'what we yield to in unfiltered openness in varying degrees conforms us to itself'. Therefore, believers must be selective in what they are listening to (Luke 8:18).

Although Goulet's sixth and seventh 'keys' include acceptable practices, his point that believers should submit to a local church body where the

¹⁵³ Foster (1998:1-11) and Sims (2017:85-88) point out that these disciplines are not meant to be practiced in a Pharisaic manner so that they become manipulative 'soul-killing laws' (Matt 5:20) that rob believers of their liberty and joy in Christ. Rather, they are to be liberating and nourishing. Ice (2016:5) and Graves' (2016:5-7) point is that fasting became a distinctive practice during the Latter Rain Movement mainly through the teaching of Franklin Hall (2016). Hall's teachings on fasting, according to Hawtin (1949:3), were the catalyst of the Latter Rain Revival. However, others argue that Hall's views were eccentric and the nucleus of the heretical beliefs that unfortunately brought harsh criticism of the movement (Tillin 2018; cf. Riss 1982:32-45; 1987).

gifts of the Spirit are being taught, creates further concern. First, to claim Matthew 16:18 for scriptural support of his views, is questionable. Although this passage refers to the church, it says nothing about submitting to a church body for the purpose of developing and sustaining gifts. Gifts are developed and sustained when believers submit to Scripture and judge their manifestation accordingly (1 Cor 12, 14; 1 John 4:1). Furthermore, Goulet's use of Hebrews 13:17 to support his claims implies submission to leadership, which is yet another cause for concern. He provides no warning or instruction on the matter of manipulation of leaders and aberrant manifestation of gifts (cf. Enroth 1992; Joubert and Maartens 2017; 2018). It is correct to believe, as Goulet does, that believers sustain their gifts by living in the Spirit and learning to be led by Him, but he leaves us in the dark about how this might be done (cf. Frieson 2004).

However, irrespective of the previously mentioned concerns, it would seem unwise to argue against the importance of Goulet's impartational teachings in his sixth and seventh 'keys' since Jesus and the apostles adhered to most of them regularly (Matt 4:2; Luke 4:16-21; Acts 3:1; 13:2-3; 14:23; 2 Tim 3:14-17; Jas 5:13-14). Also, many practices such as prayer, fasting and the study of Scripture have been practiced as ways to guard and sustain imparted gifts since the beginning of Pentecostalism and continue to remain beneficial to the church.

In sum then, while Goulet makes a commendable attempt to present his views on the doctrine and practice of impartation, several noteworthy inferences may be drawn from them. In contrast to Church of God leaders and others such as Bay and Martinez (2015), Bonnke (1994:66-67), Graves (2016:38), Hughes (1986:173), and Lombard and Daffe (2008:197), Goulet's teachings are ambiguous on how NT writers understood the impartation of gifts. On the one hand, Goulet (2007:xxii) teaches that believers can find gifted individuals and receive specific impartations from them which implies that gifts can be transferred from one person to another. On the other hand, he remarks that the Holy Spirit is the source of the gifts and distributes them as He chooses.

Furthermore, while great emphasis is placed upon receiving and sustaining impartations, little is said about the impartations persons may receive. In other words, he pays minimal attention to ordinary and extraordinary gifts (Rom 12:6-8; Eph 7-11; 1 Cor 12:1-11) as well as speaking in tongues as evidence of the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which is a distinct teaching in Pentecostalism.¹⁵⁴ The question remains, however, whether these concerns provide enough reason for believers who study Goulet's literary work to ignore the impartational principles he presents despite the fact that they are recognisable and debatable.

6. Michael Chung

Chung's theology on the doctrine of impartation is presented in a dissertation entitled 'Paul's Understanding of Spiritual Formation: Christian Formation and Impartation'. Chung's (2009:17-18) research is somewhat unique on the topic of impartation. Rather than focusing on the impartation of ordinary and/or extraordinary gifts *per se*, he chooses to concentrate on the Apostle Paul's use of impartation as a means to help converts reach spiritual maturity. The reason for his choice of Paul is the emphasis the apostle placed on sanctification, discipleship, spiritual growth and maturity, all of which pertains to spiritual formation. Chung (2009:17-18) suggests that Paul spiritually developed his converts through relationships.

The following subsections will assess the process Chung believes Paul used to impart gifts to believers, which begins his with definition of *metadidomi*.

¹⁵⁴ For pentecostal teaching on 'initial evidence' of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, see Archer (2009:103-112), Brumback (1947:191-273), Chan (1999:195-211), Fee (1991:85-99), Gause (2009:133-137), Hayford (1992:89-107), Lederle (2008:131-141), Lombard and Daffe (2005:77-88), MacArthur (1992:171-193), Macchia (2006:35-38), MacDonald (1976:65-66), McGee (2008), Menzies and Horton (1993:135-143), Oss (1996:260-263), Richie (2019:270-286), Scott (2012:37-38), Saucy (1996:131-135), Stephenson (2009), Walvoord (1958:66-88) and Yun (2003).

6.1 Impartation defined

Chung (2009:64-74) claims that Paul's goal for his converts was 'spiritual formation'. In order to achieve the goal, the apostle used impartation. However, before presenting Chung's definition of *metadidomi* it will be helpful to understand what he means by the term 'spiritual formation'. 'Formation' has been defined by some scholars such as Demarest (2003:36), Saunders (2002:156) and Sims (2017:138-139) as the shaping of a life after the pattern of Jesus Christ, meaning the cultivation of practices and habits such as doctrine and worship that make believers both attentive and responsive to the presence of God's living Spirit. Chung's (2009:80-81) synthesised definition is as follows: Spiritual formation is *'the maturing process where growth in holiness is accomplished by the interaction of God influencing humankind's growth (divine agency) and humankind's free choice to partake in the maturation process (human responsibility) within a community'* (emphasis in the original).¹⁵⁵

Chung's point is, as was shown in chapter three, that the term *metadidomi* is only referred to five times in the New Testament (Luke 3:11; Rom 1:11; 12:8; 1 Thess 2:8; Eph 4:28). Chung includes the definitions of *metadidomi* of Hoehner (2002:626-627), Lampe (1961:851) and Marshall (1983:71). For them, the term means 'to hand down' or 'to give a share' just as when one shares information with another the gospel or material goods. Chung believes, however, that 'the most dominant foundational meaning of **metadi,dwmi** [*sic*] is for one entity to share something with another' (p. 172; emphasis in the original). With this understanding in mind, he then claims that 'Christian formation'¹⁵⁶ is achieved through the following sources: (1) the divine agency (the power of God), (2) human responsibility, (3) the shared life of the Christian community, and (4) the

¹⁵⁵ Chung (2009:85) uses 'divine agency' to mean the work of God or the Holy Spirit. 'Human responsibility' is used to emphasise the work of the individual that involve obedience and spiritual disciplines.

¹⁵⁶ Chung (2009:178) changes his term 'spiritual' to 'Christian' because 'Paul's perspective on holiness and growth, which are related to spiritual formation, showed that he was holistic in his view of growth, not just spiritual [*sic*] (1 Thess 5:23-24).'

agency [act] of impartation (pp. 175-176).¹⁵⁷ Chung next discusses how the Apostle Paul through these sources imparted ‘the gospel’, ‘gifts’ and ‘his own life’ to his converts.

6.2 Paul’s practice of impartation

According to Chung (2009:170-172), Paul’s use of impartation is evident in Romans 1:11 and 1 Thessalonians 2:8-10. In these texts, Paul states that he and his co-workers have a strong desire to impart a ‘gift’, ‘the gospel’ and their ‘own lives’ (lit. ‘souls’) to their converts so that they may enjoy a blessed life and be perfected in their faith.¹⁵⁸ However, Chung (2009:202) claims that Paul is cognizant of the fact that his goal will only be achieved when ‘the divine agency is explicitly paired with impartation’. This is confirmed in 1 Corinthians 3:6-9: Paul and Apollos have ministered and sown the gospel into the lives of the believers but the statement ὁ αὐξάνων θεός establishes God as being paramount in the impartational process (cf. also Fee 1987:131-133).¹⁵⁹ Chung (2009:206-207) goes on to claim that Paul makes it clear that impartations occur by ‘demonstration of the Spirit and of power’. Therefore, a believer’s ‘faith should not be in the wisdom of men but in the power of God’ (1 Cor 2:1-5). As explained by Fee (1987:94-95) and Morris (1981:53), Paul wanting to ground his converts in the divine power, reminds the Corinthians that the real source of power does not lie in the person or presentation of the preacher but in

¹⁵⁷ Chung (2009:176) uses the word ‘agency’ which is questionable since impartation is neither an ‘agent’ nor an ‘agency’. Impartation is rather an ‘act’ or ‘means’ of sharing the gospel, oneself or material goods with another.

¹⁵⁸ The aorist active infinitive form of καταπρίζω is used to express Paul’s desire to complete or ‘fill in the gaps’ of their faith (Chung 2009:173; Friberg and Friberg 1981:624). This term is used four other times in Paul’s letters (Rom 9:22; 1 Cor 1:10; 2 Cor 13:11; Gal 6:1).

¹⁵⁹ In the phrase ‘God gave the increase’ (1 Cor 3:6), Paul uses the imperfect indicative ἤρξανεν to denote continuous action while he uses the present active αὐξάνων in verse 7. Chung (2009:203) questions whether the imperfect is used to merely highlight the work of ‘divine agency’ in impartation or if the usage is to communicate that at the inception of the act of impartation the divine agency is the controlling factor. Morris (1981:65) favours the latter: ‘Only God gave the increase’, and He did so continuously. Fee (1987:132) agrees and commenting on verse 7, remarks: ‘In Paul’s sentence the word θεός functions in apposition to the substantive ὁ αὐξάνων’ “but the one who makes things grow—God”. Chung (2009:204) concludes that the use of the imperfect and present tense indicates that impartation for spiritual formation ‘is not an action that happens one time but constantly, over time’ and although there is interaction and human responsibility involved, the results should be attributed to God alone.

the work of the Spirit-indwelt believer. Furthermore, although Chung sees the ‘demonstration of the Spirit and power’ as being the manifestation of divine agency in Paul’s impartations, he fails to discuss whether or not the spiritual gifts listed in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 may have been involved in Paul’s impartation. In contrast, Fee (1987:95-96) explicitly states that the demonstration of the Spirit more likely ‘refers to their actual conversion, and concomitant gift of the Spirit, which was probably evidenced by spiritual gifts, especially tongues’. More implicitly, the purpose of the Spirit’s impartation was for transformation and to effect holiness in the believing community. ‘In other words, the purpose of the Spirit’s coming was not to transport one above the present age, but to empower one to live in it’ (ibid). However, even though Chung (2009:202-205) fails to include extraordinary spiritual gifts in his discussion, his view of Paul’s practice of impartation as being inseparably linked to ‘the divine agency’ is congruent with Scripture and shared by Church of God leaders and others (Lowery 1997:18; Saucy 1996:137-138; Storms 1996:185; Triplett 1970:74).

6.3 Chung’s view of Paul’s methods of impartation

For Chung (2009:245-279), Paul’s methods of imparting gifts to others may very well have been influenced by Epicureanism and Rabbinic thought.¹⁶⁰ Similar to the Epicureans and Rabbis, Paul acted as a ‘master teacher’ and worked with his students to help them learn and grow spiritually. As was customary with teachers and learners in Epicureanism and Rabbinic thought, students bore the responsibility to learn and serve, meaning that to ‘study alone did not make a disciple; students had to minister to their teacher’ (Chung 2009:278-279). Learning in this way could be compared to a slave serving a master or a son serving his father (Aberbach 1967:1; Lerner 1983:67-68). Chung (2009:278-279) claims that this conceptual model is comparable to the example of Elisha who

¹⁶⁰ Several impartational methods were used by philosophic schools that may have influenced Paul such as the use of speeches, spiritual exercises, interactive dialogue, constructive criticism, and emulation of teachers (Chung 2009:245-286; cf. Asmis 2004:134-140; Cohen 1999:951-953; Deming 1995:130-131; Glad 1995; Konstan 1998:3-69; Lerner 1983:11, 53-56; Malherbe 1987:10-39; Stowers 1981:53-58).

was a learner but yet a servant, for he 'poured water on the hands of Elijah' (1 Kgs 19:11-21; 2 Kgs 3:11). From that, Chung concludes that Paul's thought is not dissimilar to that of Epicurean and Rabbinic thought, and hence, that impartation be accepted as a cooperative process between teacher and student. In different words, Paul served as a teacher and was willing to give himself unreservedly to his mentees while it requires of them to become participants in the impartation process as well (1 Thess 2:8; Chung 2009:280; cf. Aberbach 1967:10-24).

Chung's teacher-servant concept for giving and receiving impartations is interesting and similar to that of Goulet (n.d.:81-86,137), Rich (2007:45-54) and Rogers (2006:23-27) who also refer to the Elisha-Elijah paradigm. Each believe that becoming a relational learner and providing service to mentors is one of the best means of receiving an impartation. Yet, it must be stated that while Paul had persons serving with him, nowhere in Scripture did he treat persons as slaves or ask anyone to be his servant (Phil 2:22, 30). On the contrary, the apostle practiced servanthood and strongly resisted any notion whatsoever of believers becoming slaves to fellow human beings (1 Cor 7:23; 9:19). The reason, as Morris (1981:115) explains, is that slaves accept unquestionable laws that others lay down for them and this is not the Christian way. Even more so, as pointed out by Fee (1987:320), is the penchant of slaves to let human wisdom disguised in the form of 'spirituality' dictate their anxieties in life.

The specific imparting methods Chung believes Paul and his co-workers used shall be considered next.

6.3.1 Impartation through letters

Chung (2009:288) remarks that the majority of things known about Paul, including his beliefs, are revealed in his letters, which implies that he intended that converts use the information about him to gain knowledge of him as a believer in Christ. If so, then Paul presented significant insights into the nature and goal of prayer, blessings, morality as well as explanations of the Scriptures (Chung 2009:289; cf. Gorman 2004:75;

O'Brien 1993:551). Chung (2009:288-292) in respect to the aforementioned insights, takes a similar view to that of Stott (1994:19) and Briscoe (1982:11) who imply that Paul used his letters to impart knowledge to believers and to bring about change in their lives. It suffices to say that while it seems reasonable to Chung that Paul used his letters as a means of imparting knowledge to his converts, Chung (2009:292-294) also suggests that multiple mentors such as Mary, Phoebe, and Silvanus and Timothy were used to impart gifts to their converts as well.

6.3.2 Impartation by multiple mentors

In addition to letter writing, Chung (2009:292) claims that multiple mentors were used in Paul's impartational process. Using 1 Thessalonians 2:7-12 as warrant for his belief, Chung (2009:292) states that in verse 8 ('We were well pleased to impart to you') and throughout the pericope, Paul uses personal pronouns such as 'we', 'our' and 'ourselves' to indicate that he was working with an 'apostolic party' in the impartational process (Demarest 1984:58).¹⁶¹ The inclusion of others in Scripture is also found in Romans 16 and Galatians 1:2 which, according to Chung (2009:293-294) provide more than ample proof for multiple mentors.

Chung also believes that three dimensions were involved in Paul's impartational process: the cognitive, relational and affective dimension.

6.3.3 The cognitive dimension

Chung (2009:294) begins his discussion by defining what he means by 'cognitive' dimension: 'By the word cognitive, we would mean first, knowledge based, and second, pertaining to the mental [teaching method] process of Paul'. He states that, 'Arguably the most emphasized aspect in the present-day practice of mentoring is the transferring of knowledge

¹⁶¹ Plummer (2009:23) suggests that the use of the plural 'lives' instead of 'life' and 'hearts' instead of 'heart' (1 Thess 2:8) refers specifically to Paul, Timothy, and Silvanus. Multiple mentors were used in Rabbinic thought for the purpose of mentees acquiring different skills (Chung 2009:281; Lerner 1983:53-56). Goulet (2007:xxii) and Lowery (2004:157-168) also argue for the merit of having multiple persons imparting gifts to believers.

from one [person] to another' (ibid). That teaching the gospel is an indispensable part of that transfer of knowledge is clearly evident in Paul's letters (1 Thess 2:8). Chung (2009:294-299) surmises that Paul teaches the Thessalonians the specifics of the Christian faith (1 Thess 1:5-7), about suffering (4:1-12), sexual purity (4:13-5:11), and the eschaton (5:12-19). Teaching these subjects was thus a common feature of the discipling method of Paul, according to Chung (cf. Macchia 2004). In the words of Dunn (2003:1), Paul saw teaching as 'part of his continuing apostolic vocation' and a means to instruct, encourage, and exhort; he taught but also prayed for the 'divine agency' to help him reach his goal, which was to impart truth and bring maturity to his converts as they anticipated the eschaton (Chung 2009:299; 1Thess 3:12-13).¹⁶²

In sum, a few observations can be made about Chung's (2009:294) 'cognitive dimension'. First, Chung uses a term that is not mentioned in Scripture, nor was it found named in the writings of any pentecostal/charismatic believer. However, the practice of imparting knowledge through teaching is found in multiple passages (Mark 4:1; Luke 11:1-4; Col 2:1-8; 2 Thess 2:15; 2 Tim 2:1-2; Tit 1:5-9; Heb 5:12-14). Also, Chung's (2009:294) 'cognitive dimension' as a means of impartation is implied by some pentecostals and charismatics in their writings. Frangipane (2015), for instance, points out that Moses imparted to Joshua through the laying on of hands, albeit that through Joshua's spirit of wisdom God imparted great faith to Israel (Deut 1:38; 34:9). Baker (2013:235) and Lowery (2004:38-42) also emphasise that impartations are given when believers listen to scriptural teaching. Second, Chung rightly claims that Paul's impartation involve a 'cognitive dimension' and 'divine agency' that teaches believers how to endure suffering, avoid sexual impurity, and prepare for the eschaton. However, while Chung (2009:196-240) acknowledges the importance of the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts in Christian formation, he fails to provide additional

¹⁶² Samra (2006:112-131) includes five components of Christian formation or the maturity of converts: (1) identifying with Christ, (2) enduring suffering, (3) experiencing God's presence, (4) receiving wisdom from God and living wisely, (5) and imitating a godly exemplar (cf. Chung 2009:298; Fortosis 1992:283-298).

commentary on the interplay of the ‘cognitive dimension’ and ‘divine agency’ (i.e., the power of God) in regard to converts receiving the impartation of the baptism of the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts which are important teachings of Paul. The importance of these impartations to Christian formation is reflected in Acts 19:1-6. Paul imparts knowledge on the baptism of the Holy Spirit to the Ephesian disciples who were Christians but had no understanding of the gift (Arrington 2008:298-299; Bruce 1981:384-386). And the disciples received, by the power of God, the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands. Also, Paul’s teaching in Romans 12:3-8, 1 Corinthians 12-14 and Ephesians 4:7-12 indicate that knowledge concerning the gifts is needed for the health of the body and that gifts are imparted and operate in the believer’s life through ‘divine agency’ (cf. 2 Pet 1:1-8; Gause 1986:170-171; Lombard and Daffe 2008:49-53, 202). The interplay of the ‘cognitive dimension’ and ‘divine agency’ is also evident again in 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6. In these passages Paul reminds Timothy that he received an impartation of scriptural knowledge; but Paul does not stop there. Timothy’s ministry requires something more: the spiritual gift that was given to him through prophecy and the laying on of hands.¹⁶³ Thus, Chung’s view could be strengthened by stressing how the Holy Spirit uses a believer’s cognitive powers in tandem with spiritual gifts in spiritual formation.

6.3.4 The relational dimension

Chung (2009:299) claims that Paul’s impartation involved more than teaching his converts about the Christian faith. He states that in addition to teaching, ‘Paul lived his life with his disciples so that they understood what Paul experienced in daily life’. For Chung this is indicated in 1 Thessalonians 2:8: οὕτως ὁμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν εὐδοκοῦμεν μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν οὐ μόνον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς, διότι

¹⁶³ Dunn (2012) explores the use of spiritual gifts and spiritual maturity. He argues that knowledge of or identifying gifts is not enough. Paul believed that the use of spiritual gifts developed spiritual maturity. Thus, ‘People seeking just knowledge of spiritual gifts fail to develop the relationship required to use the gifts properly’ (2012:21-36).

ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε. The use of the term ψυχάς can mean 'life, breath, the soul or one's inner life' but is understood by some to mean the inner life of the missionaries (p. 300; Marshall 1983:71). The use of the familial metaphor of mother and father also captures the idea of the relational bond that Paul created with his students (1 Thess 2:7). In essence, then, through the relational dimension described by Chung, the missionaries were able to teach their converts what was involved in living the Christian life. Through the relational dimension students were able to observe how Paul and his co-workers lived their Christian lives day to day, the weaknesses they experienced but also their dependence on the power of God (1 Cor 2:1-5). Ultimately, students began to imitate the behaviour of the persons they associated with (1 Cor 4:15; 1 Thess 1:6; Samra 2006:125-131; Martin 1999:39-49).¹⁶⁴

Although Chung finds common ground between the Church of God on impartation and the relational dimension, Chung also suggests that impartation involves an affective dimension.

6.3.5 The affective dimension of impartation

Paul placed a high priority on impartation involving an affective dimension (1 Thess 2:8). Chung (2009:314) explains that the apostle did so because 'caring must be accompanied with love or it is not genuine caring'. He asserts that Paul's statement διότι ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε reflects the love he and the missionaries had for their converts. Chung views the wording to also reflect the missionaries' understanding that training disciples required more than merely placing them in a program that rehearsed doctrine. Therefore, love, as argued by Chung, serves as the motivating factor for all that Paul did for his converts and was expressed in several ways.

¹⁶⁴ Bandura (1986:55, 73) argues that people are affected by those they regularly associate with whether it be by preference or imposition. Consequently, 'People can acquire abstract principles but remain in a quandary about how to implement them if they have not had the benefit of illustrative exemplars' (cf. Oman and Thoresen 2003:150).

First, Paul demonstrated care by not burdening his disciples with the responsibility of supporting him financially (1 Thess 2:7; Chung 2009:315). In other words, Paul did not exploit his converts or expect preferential treatment although apostleship apparently came with privileges.¹⁶⁵ Second, Chung claims that not only did Paul and his co-workers not desire preferential treatment, there also 'is an aspect of equality/inequality in how Paul saw his status among the community' (pp. 318-319). On the one hand, 'the missionaries try to function as equals in status by referring to the converts as **avdelfoi**, [*sic*]. Paul wanted to establish an aspect of his relationship with the converts where he is viewed as being equal with them and not always the superior'. Chung points out that Paul in 1 Thessalonians refers to the converts as ἀδελφοί (brethren) nineteen times, which indicates that he believed that there was 'equality' in their relationship.¹⁶⁶ On the other hand, Chung avers that while Paul wanted to create a peer relationship with his converts, there were aspects of superiority involved in his mentorship. Paul's superior status, according to Chung, is clearly shown by his maternal/paternal imagery in 1 Thessalonians 2:8-17. With this imagery Paul presents himself and his co-workers as a 'nursing mother' (v. 7) but also as a firm 'charging' (authoritative) father (v. 11). Thus, 'He was parent and at the same time brother' (p. 319). A third way Paul manifested the 'affective dimension' was through prayer. Paul appeals to divine agency to help his converts grow and reach spiritual maturity.

It seems that Chung's conception of the 'affective dimension' in relation to impartation is consistent with a common assumption among Church of

¹⁶⁵ Paul's remark, 'Nor did we seek glory from men, either from you or from others, when we might have made demands as apostles of Christ' (1 Thess 2:6) seems to indicate that as an apostle he could have claimed preferential treatment. Cheung (2008:40-41) argues that Paul rather 'distinguishes himself in this manner from the itinerant charlatans who swindle people by their fanciful philosophies'. Plummer (2009:22) as well points out that Paul and his comrades were endeavouring to contrast themselves from those who fell prey to the two baits which cause most men to fall, greedy gain and the desire for glory.

¹⁶⁶Poliski (1999:109-111) and (Shaw 1983:181) claim that Paul used his position to exercise power over others. However, while there is the potential danger of coercion of the directee Chung (2009:333-335) finds it hard to defend the idea that Paul was an abuser of power. Best (1988:31-56), Copan (2007:10) and Ehrensperger (2007:118) agree.

God leaders and leaders of other pentecostal churches. First, Scripture supports Chung's premise that Paul was affective when imparting his teaching to his converts (Rom 1:11-13; Phil 1:7-8; 1 Thess 2:1-12; Marshall 1983:71; Morris 1988:50; Thurston and Ryan 2005:50) Second, the practice of serving sacrificially, demonstrating love comparable to that of a parent, and praying regularly for converts' spiritual maturity are affective concepts that are discussed by Sims (2017:85-88), Goulet (n.d.:173-185), Gause (2009:177-189, and Lombard and Daffe (2008:215). For Grady (2018b), love is the hallmark of any person sent on an apostolic mission and anyone who mentors without it is a 'counterfeit'.¹⁶⁷ However, while Chung is correct to argue that Paul treated his converts as ἀδελφοί, his claim that Paul's impartation involved teaching his converts that he and they were equal in status raises concern. Chung is unclear as to whether he means that Paul's converts had equal status in receiving the grace of God or if Paul considered his converts to be equal in their calling, position and/or experience in ministry. Scripture teaches that there is equality in receiving the grace of God (Rom 5:12-21; Eph 1:3-7), but does not teach that leaders or believers have equal status in regards to their calling, position and gifts (Luke 14:8, 1 Cor 3:1-3, 12:1-11; Eph 4:7-12).

Given the aforementioned scriptural support and concurring remarks, it seems apparent that Chung's 'affective dimension' could be beneficial to leaders who desire to learn how Paul imparted the gospel, his life (soul), and gifts to his converts in order to develop their spiritual maturity.

In summary, the representation of Chung's understanding of impartation indicates some overlap with that of Church of God. There is consensus that *metadidomi* means 'for one entity to share something with another' (Chung 2009:172; Goulet 2007:xx; Hill 2014). However, Chung's concept

¹⁶⁷ Grady (2018b) very similar to Chung presents Paul's apostolic mentorship thusly: First, it was incarnational. Paul did not just drop in preach and leave, he imparted his life (1 Thess 2:8). Second, it was sacrificial. Paul risk his life for his converts (1 Thess 3:4). Third, it was relational. Paul presented himself as a 'brother' and as family (1 Thess 2:7, 11). Fourth, it was confrontational. Paul confronted sin and brought correction (1 Thess 4:1-8). Additional study on the apostolic office is provided by Katz (2000) and Scott (2012).

of impartation differs from that of the Church of God generally since pentecostals believe impartation refers primarily to the baptism in the Holy Spirit, the bestowal of spiritual gifts, divine healing, and blessings (Acts 19:1-6; Rom 1:11; 1 Tim 4:14). In contrast, Chung (2009:165-172) regards impartation to be primarily the sharing of knowledge, the gospel, material goods, or gifts. He uses Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians as substantive proof to argue that Paul imparted these things for the purpose of enhancing spiritual formation in believers. Chung further claims that the Thessalonian pericope reveals that Paul, along with other missionaries, strategically imparted to their converts through the interplay of 'divine agency' and human responsibility; and the primary methods Paul and his co-missionaries used to impart the 'gospel', 'gifts' and their 'own lives', according to Chung, were his letters which involve a cognitive, relational, and affective dimensions of learning. Thus, approaching impartation in this way allowed Paul to be effective in helping his converts reach spiritual maturity.

However, a few points about Chung's impartational theology deserve mention. On the one hand, Chung addresses *metadidomi* from a vantage point that has not been given serious attention by Pentecostalism. The conceptual link of impartation to spiritual formation/maturity has only been minimally addressed by Church of God leaders and others.¹⁶⁸ Rather, when assessing the views of persons such as Clark (2013), Goulet (2007), Hamon (1987), and Lowery (2004), the meaning of *metadidomi* has for the most part been limited to the impartation of special anointings, blessings and extraordinary gifts. Despite that limitation, Chung's research regarding impartation and spiritual formation could therefore be very beneficial to the Church of God denomination's doctrine of

¹⁶⁸ No Church of God sources were found that confirm Chung's use of impartational terminology. However, the denomination has implemented one program that has some semblance of the impartational process presented by Chung. The Ministerial Internship Program (MIP) is used in the advancement of licensure in ministry. Candidates enrol in a nine-month program involving the following regiments: (1) attending classes once a month; (2) reading assignments and passing exams; (3) completing an internship under the direction of a supervising pastor who assigns various duties to be performed; and (4) passing a comprehensive exam covering the biblical doctrine, history, and polity of the Church of God.

impartation. Chung's literary work could also serve as an impetus for leaders to incorporate into their teaching and practice a more comprehensive view of the doctrine. On the other hand, Chung's disregard for the impartation of extraordinary as well as some ordinary gifts must be taken into consideration. It is understandable that his research would be delimited, but paying only scant attention to Paul's list of gifts in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 and Ephesians 4:7-12 creates the question of whether or not these gifts can be imparted at all and, if so, through what means. A concise statement of clarification regarding these concerns would have given a better understanding of his theology about the impartation of spiritual gifts, anointings, and blessings. Nevertheless, his research on 'Christian formation and impartation' should not be dismissed.

7. Randy Clark

Randy Clark is founder of Global Awakening, a teaching, healing, and impartation ministry in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. He has written and taught extensively on the subject of impartation and is one of the doctrine's greatest proponents. His book *There is More* is the focus of this sub-section. In that publication he explains his aim as follows:

This book's title is about the impartation of that "more." But what exactly is the more? It is many things: more love for God and humankind, more power, more anointing, more joy, more burden of the Lord for the lost, more revelation from God regarding the needs of others, more conviction over sin, more faith in prayer, more conversions, more gifts, more healings, more deliverances, more churches planted and more of the culture being leavened by the Kingdom of God (Clark 2013:11).

Clark became acquainted with the theology of impartation while attending a James Robinson Bible Conference in January of 1984. He describes how he was imparted with 'words of knowledge' and an '*apostolic call*' through lifting his hands in worship and being prayed for by John Wimber. More impartations were received by Clark (2013:31-33) over the years and with each one came greater giftings of words of knowledge, healing

and spiritual anointing. His initial and subsequent impartations resulted in powerful manifestations being experienced in his church and his eventual involvement in the so-called 'Toronto Blessing' revival during 1994.

The next few sub-sections will examine his views on impartation.

7.1 The definition and biblical foundation of impartation

Clark (2013:16) defines 'impartation' as the 'transference of the anointing' which may include 'a gift or gifts of the Spirit, a filling of the Holy Spirit (especially for power) or the baptism in the Holy Spirit'. Furthermore, he asserts that impartations are conveyed primarily through the laying on of hands and 'waiting on God', and uses Hebrews 6:1-2 to support these claims. The text states,

Therefore, leaving the discussion of the elementary principles of Christ, let us go on to perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, of laying on of hands, of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment.

Clark (2013:15) believes that the laying on of hands was a foundational teaching of the apostolic church and that the practice remains relevant for today. However, he also believes that both the Old and New Testament should be considered when studying the subject of impartation.

7.1.1 Impartation in the Old Testament

Three Old Testament passages are provided to support his understanding of the doctrine of impartation from the OT. The first is Numbers 11:16-18. Speaking of Moses and the seventy elders, God says, 'I will take of the Spirit that is on you and put the Spirit on them'. The second is Deuteronomy 34:9 which indicate that Joshua received an impartation through the hands of Moses. He finds a third example of impartation in 2 Kings 2:9-14. In the latter passage, Elijah imparts the Spirit to Elisha through laying his mantle on Elisha. Clark concludes that these Old Testament experiences are the basis for the principle that 'the

transference of anointing is clearly a biblically documented, God-initiated event...totally dependent on His calling and anointing' (p. 17).

The Church of God, along with other pentecostal leaders, posits similar views regarding impartation in the Old Testament. Cheddie (2001:2) avers that Numbers 11:16-18 documents some sort of transference of the Spirit. But, he points out that 'Moses laid hands on no one. It was purely an act of God to sanction and anoint these 70 men to help Moses'. Robinson (2008:39-40) and Tipei (2009:32) take the same view. They suggest that in the transference involving the 70, the latter received a share of Mosaic authority.¹⁶⁹ In reference to Deuteronomy 34:9, Brown (1997:184) and Mattingly (2002:96-99) conclude that Joshua received an impartation of authority and wisdom through the laying on of hands (see also Robinson 2008:46-47). Lowery (2004:98-101) and Rogers (2006:24) also remark that the story of Elijah and Elisha and 'the passing down' of Elijah's mantle is an explicit example of impartation (2 Kgs 2:12-13). However, despite these conflicting interpretations, Clark's understanding of the impartations as initiated and controlled by God is commensurate with those of Church of God leaders as well (cf. Arrington 1982:103-104; Gause 1986:24; Tipei 2009:263).

7.1.2 Impartation in the New Testament

Clark (2013:18) provides several New Testament examples that reflect the impartation of power, gifts, anointings, fillings with or baptisms in the Holy Spirit. He states that these are received through prayer and a period of waiting on God and/or the laying on of hands. However, he focuses mainly on the laying on of hands as a means of receiving impartations and documents several significant events in which the practice is utilised, for example, the 'act of ordination'.

Clark (2013:18) notices that a common way that impartations are imparted in the New Testament is through the act of ordination with the

¹⁶⁹ Tipei (2009:32) views the ceremony in Numbers 11:16-25 as being one of empowerment for 'the language used is not institutional but rather charismatic'. Robinson (2008:39) agrees.

laying on of hands. For him, this method of impartation is described in Paul's words to Timothy: 'Do not neglect the gift that is in you, which was given to you by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the eldership'. Clark finds that the same method was used in Acts 13:1-3 with the deacons and missionaries, and claims that 'These services were not mere rituals, but were the occasions when the Holy Spirit imparted gifts and empowered believers for ministry. Also, these gifts were often accompanied by prophecies' (p. 19). Consequently, according to Clark, in more recent times 'many feel a need for the graces and gifts of the Spirit to be ordered by the formal rituals of the Church'. The result, in other words, is that the elementary teaching of the laying on of hands has been reduced to a ritualistic exhortation given at ordination rather than a God controlled commission to service.

A few comments about Clark's view on impartation and the act of ordination are in order. First, several Church of God leaders and others acknowledge the place of the laying on of hands and impartation as an act of the Spirit and believers at ordination and/or the commissioning of disciples for service. Arrington (2003:132; 2008:133, 211) and Marshall (1986:127, 216) explain that in Acts 6:6 and 13:3 the action of the apostles ratified the commission of those involved and imparted strength and blessings fitting to their assigned tasks. Cheddie (2001:7) concurs.¹⁷⁰ Second, the care taken in choosing the deacons, the fasting and prayer as well as the laying on of hands in the commissioning of the deacons in Acts 6:1-6 and Acts 13:1-3 as well as Paul's words in 1 Timothy 4:14 and 5:22 indicate that impartation at the ordination of ministers is intended to be more than an ecclesiastical ritual, just as Clark (pp. 204-205) claims. The admonition given by Paul to 'desire earnestly to prophesy' and 'do not despise prophecies' to the churches at Corinth and Thessalonica also

¹⁷⁰ Although Cheddie (2001:1-7) believes the practice is still relevant today, he does not agree with Clark that Hebrews 6:1-3 teaches that the laying on of hands is a fundamental doctrine of the church (cf. Robertson 1932:374). Rather, the context of the passage pertains to the rudimentary elements of Judaism. Robinson (2008:269-274) and Tipei (2009:218-225) disagree with Cheddie. Mattingly (2001:191) shares that although the practice of the laying on of hands in Christian ordination began to take on a meaning of its own in the early stages of Christianity it has been structured after the Jewish rabbinic model (cf. Daube 1956:244-245; Smith 1913:47-62).

supports Clark's belief that ritualism should not impede the involvement of the gift of prophecy when ordaining leaders for ministry (1 Cor 14:26-40; 1 Thess 5:19-20).¹⁷¹

However, while Clark calls for balance between ritualism and liberty in the act of ordination, the discussion of some key issues related to the use of prophecy at the ordination of ministries is needed. Clark (2013:204) leaves in question who exactly is at liberty to prophesy in the ordination of ministries. He points to the 'prophets in the church' but it is difficult to ascertain whether he means someone who presumably holds the office of 'prophet' or an elder/member of the church that prophesies (1 Cor 12:28; 14:31).¹⁷² Paul, in 1 Corinthians 14:29-31, states that the privilege is given to anyone who receives a revelation from the Holy Spirit (Fee 1987:694; Grudem 2000:165). Also, missing in Clark's argument is the biblical criteria that are to be followed for prophecies involved in the impartation and ordaining of ministries. However, the Holy Spirit through Paul offers specific guidelines for prophesying in the church (1 Cor 14). Prophecies should edify and comfort the listener (vs. 4-5), be judged carefully (v. 29, cf. Deut 13, 18:21-22), be delivered in an orderly fashion (vv. 30-32, 40), and in content and delivery reflect God's character (v. 33; Fee 1987:696-698; Grudem 2000:97).

In sum, while Clark (2013:204-205) calls for the continuation of impartations through the laying on of hands and prophecy when ordaining ministries for service, his views require clarification. This is especially the case for the use of prophecy during the ordination of ministries. For instance, who is allowed to speak a prophecy of impartation and what are the criteria that are to be followed when speaking a prophecy at ordination services. According to Paul, spiritual liberty vis-à-vis restrictive caution

¹⁷¹ Ash (1976:227-252) and Saucy (1996:128) question the prominence of prophecy in the church today since present experience and church history do not give much evidence of it.

¹⁷² Clark (2013:204) fails to show whether he views 'prophet' as an official office or someone who is moved upon by the Spirit to prophesy. Hamon (1987:51-54), Harper (1970b:43-44), Lombard and Daffe (2008:93-94) see a distinction between the 'prophet' and one who merely prophesies (1 Cor 14:29-32; Eph 4:11). Gee (1963:43-44) and Grudem (2000:161-181) do not agree with that view.

against prophetic abuse is a must (Saucy 1996:128). Thus, adhering to Scripture and especially Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 14 assures the probity of spiritual gifts but also the validation of prophecies that are given by leaders/believers to those being ordained for ministry service (cf. Joubert and Maartens 2018:38-55).

7.2 Impartation and blessing

Another way Clark (2013:19) contends that impartations are transferred or conferred on a believer, in addition to the laying on of hands, is through blessing them with spoken words. Using the examples of Jesus blessing adults and children in Matthew 19:13-15 and Mark 10:16, Clark (2010) concludes that healings and impartations of gifts may occur when saying 'I bless you' or 'I bless you in Jesus name'.¹⁷³ He also claims that blessings may be imparted through an 'extended hand to' and along with 'spoken words' and/or prayer for a particular person or persons. An example of how Clark (2018) might pray a prayer of blessing in this manner is the following:

Father you know the ones who are hungry, the ones who are wanting this in their lives, the ones who believe you for it...I just bless them in the name of Jesus and I ask for heaven to become real to them, for the Spirit of God to come upon them, God for angels to be assigned to them to work with them. I bless them. I pray God that the gifts of the word of knowledge and prophecy would begin to happen in their lives...I bless them in Jesus name.

Clark's view on impartation and blessing seems to represent the kinds of blessings that are found in both the OT and NT (Gen 12:2-3, 27:27-40, 48:1-16; Mark 10:16; Luke 24:50-51). For example, Rolf Garborg (2003:22) provides a historical and etymological view of the words 'bless' and 'blessing' and states that the words 'appear in Scripture in some form or another about seven hundred times'. In this compilation of the words 'bless' and 'blessing' in Scripture are two biblical words that help define

¹⁷³ Kilpatrick (1995:58-73, 2017) cites from Scripture examples of blessing persons, places and things in his writings as well as in a sermon series entitled 'Mystery and power of a blessing' (Gen 1:27-28; 24:60; Matt 5:44; Mark 10:16; 1 Pet 3:9; Jas 3:7-11). See also Cutshall 2018).

the concept of blessing. The first word is *berakah*. To the Hebrews ‘a *berakah* was the transmittal or endowment of the power of God’s goodness and favour, usually through the spoken word and often with the accompanying act of the laying on of hands’ (pp. 23-24; emphasis in the original).¹⁷⁴ A second word found in the New Testament is *eulogeo*, which means to ‘speak well of’ or ‘to express praise’ (Luke 24:50-51; Mark 10:16). Garborg then claims that ‘This kind of blessing was most often the act of calling down God’s gracious power on someone’ (cf. Kopic 2005:247-260; Lenning 1980:74).¹⁷⁵ Wuest (1973, 1:200) adds that the kind of blessing given by Jesus in Mark 10:16 is by no means perfunctory. ‘The verb “blessed” is intensive in its force’ meaning He [Jesus] blessed them [the children] fervently. In other words, ‘verbal blessing is a serious matter’ (Kilpatrick 1995:60-67).¹⁷⁶ Furthermore, the blessing and laying of hands upon the children in Mark 10:16 is understood to be a symbolic way of invoking divine favour and transferring blessings from one person to another (Robinson 2008:143-146; Tipei 2009:18-20, 176-178).¹⁷⁷ Thus, the act of blessing by way of calling down God’s favour, goodness and power upon others seems to be what Clark is claiming in his view of impartation and blessing and is represented in his aforementioned prayer of blessing. But what is most problematic about his ‘prayer for blessings’ quoted earlier is his assumption that one may pray to ‘God for angels to be assigned to’ those prayed for and to ‘work with them’. In a word, it is wholly subjective since it is without scriptural support. It not only opens the door to all kinds of excesses, but it also raises some problematic

¹⁷⁴ This view of blessing seems to underlie in the story of Jacob and Esau (Gen 27:1-40).

¹⁷⁵ Clark (2013:19-20), Garborg (2003) and Kilpatrick (1995: 58-73) simulate the blessings given in the Old Testament (Gen 12:1-3; 27:26-29) but neither argue that believers are promised blessings identical to those pertaining to the Abrahamic Covenant. Enns (1989:52), Kopic (2005:247-260), Morris (2012:84-85) and Simmons (1999:993) place more emphasis on the positional aspects of blessing as opposed to the pragmatic which most often receives greater attention among pentecostals (cf. Rom 11:17-24; Heb 8:6-13; Gal 3:7-14).

¹⁷⁶ Kilpatrick (1995:68-70; 2017) defines ‘blessing’ thus: (1) to make whole or holy by spoken words, (2) to ask divine favour, (3) to wish a person or situation well, (4) to make prosperous, and (5) to make happy or glad.

¹⁷⁷ Daube (1956:228), in contrast to Robinson (2008:143-146) and Tipei (2009:18-20, 176-178), claims that the physical contact of the hands for blessing to be efficacious, meaning that some beneficial virtue inherent in the hand of the blessing party produces its results in the party blessed.

questions that Clark nowhere addresses. For example, from whom has he adopted that view, since it is not from the Bible? And how are those prayed for supposed to know when an angel is 'working with them' as opposed to malevolent spirits?

In sum, Clark formulates his belief that impartations are received through the laying on of hands and blessing primarily from studying Matthew 19:13-15 and Mark 10:16. Although these passages provide examples of Jesus laying hands on children and blessing them, there remains a list of biblical texts overlooked by Clark that would add validity to some but not all of his views (Gen 48, 49; Num 6:22-27; Matt 5:44; Mark 10:16; 1 Pet 3:9). However, further study of the Scripture is urgently required to confirm that blessing is, as Clark claims, a way to impact the lives of others, is relevant for today, and tantamount to a biblical doctrine of impartation.

7.3 The impartation of healing

Clark (2013:19-20; 2015:17-40) teaches that divine healing is provided for all believers through the atonement and that believers should lay hands on the sick for the impartation of healing.¹⁷⁸ Three sources form the basis for that belief. Firstly, the doctrine is supported by Scripture, for example, by Jesus who healed the sick (Mark 5:23; 8:23-25; Luke 4:40), as did the apostles (Acts 9:17-19; 28:8-9; 2013:21). Secondly, early Church Fathers such as Justin Martyr, Hermas, Tertullian, Origen, Irenaeus, and Augustine reportedly witnessed impartational healing in their ministry (pp. 159-165; cf. Clark 2009; Kelsey 1976).¹⁷⁹ Thirdly, credence is found in the testimonies of persons who received impartations of anointing and the gift of healing through the prayers of Clark (pp. 67-85, 109-119). For example, Leif Hetland and Steve Stewart (2013:109-119) claim that since receiving

¹⁷⁸ See also Clark (2004; 2009; 2015).

¹⁷⁹ Clark (2009, 2013:157-192) leans upon Kelsey (1976) for his own views on impartation and healing. Kelsey has provided a comprehensive history of healing in the Christian church (cf. Brown 1984:7-9; Irenaeus 1885:409; Maier 1999:179-182; Martyr 1885:190-214; Origen 1885:415-416; Augustine in Deere 1993:74; Ruthven 2008:17; Schaff 1890:691-697 and Ambrosiaster in Ruthven 2008:17). Other historical support is found in Gregory the Great (Gonzalez 1983:69-72), Venerable Bede (Fanning 2009:2), Giles (1849:57), Hamilton (1975:69) as well as Luther (2004:75).

their impartation from Clark, they have seen every kind of miracle imaginable in their ministry— missing bodily parts, blind eyes and hearing restored. Moreover, Hetland (2013:113) claims that he has passed on to others the healing anointing that he received from Clark.

Given the biblical, historical, and the subjective testimonial support provided by Clark, he offers two disclaimers in respect to the doctrine and practice of impartation and healing. First, impartations are God initiated events: 'God sovereignly chooses to anoint someone with the grace to lay hands on others' (Clark 2013:17, 140). Second, while the laying on of hands is a practice used to impart healing, this means is 'certainly not the only way of receiving an impartation from God' (pp. 16, 19, 102-105).

In sum, although Clark does not show the exegetical prowess of scholars who have written on the impartation of healing through the laying on of hands, his citation of Scriptures from Mark, Luke, and Acts alone suffice to prove that God divinely heals. However, not included in Clark's writings but supporting the doctrine of divine healing are 1 Corinthians 12:9, James 5:14-16 and 1 Peter 2:24. Nevertheless, Church of God and other Christian leaders join Clark in believing that God continues to heal sovereignly (Lombard and Daffe 2008:151-153;¹⁸⁰ Grudem 1994:843; 2000:205¹⁸¹ ; Bittlinger 1967:36-37; Kilpatrick 2015:132; Robinson 2008:140-143; Tipei 2000:100-104). But the claim made by Hetland and Stewart (2013:109-119) that their anointing to heal others was imparted to them by Clark raises concern. Their claim is unbiblical and creates the potential for confusion in the body of Christ, because spiritual gifts and the anointing to impart healing can only be given by God (1 Cor 12:1-11;

¹⁸⁰ Church of God leaders are resolute in their belief that divine healing continues in the church through gifts of healing (Alexander 2006; Arrington 1993:2:258-265; Bare 1993:66-71; Cross 2001:179-231; Lowery 1997:95-114; Sims 1995:81-84; Thomas 2012; Tipei 2009:111-154; Tomberlin 225-258).

¹⁸¹ Cessationists such as Gaffin (1996:23-64), MacArthur (1992), Stitzinger (2003:143-176), Thomas (2003:287-310) and Warfield (1918) argue that miraculous healings through the laying on of hands ceased with the death of the apostles. In contrast Grudem (1994:841-844; 2000:193-216) as well as others offer a reasonable rebuttal to cessationism (Brown 1997:235-258; Deere 1993; Oss 1996:239-283; Ruthven 2008; Saucy 1996:97-148; Storms 1996:175-223). Fee (1991) also offers a sound theological rebuttal while addressing the problematic issues of pentecostal hermeneutics.

1 John 2:27; Bonnke 1994:45; Lombard and Daffe 2008:196-200). Thus, Clark's teaching that divine healing is imparted through the laying on of hands is apropos to the body of Christ if received with the understanding that God alone imparts divine healing.

7.4 The Impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit

Another aspect of impartation that Clark (2013:21-24) considers is the laying on of hands for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Although he acknowledges that there are instances where people were filled with the Holy Spirit without the laying on of hands (Acts 2:1-4; 4:29-31; 10:44-47), he focuses on those accounts in which the baptism in the Holy Spirit was imparted through this means.¹⁸² Clark refers to Acts 8:14-17 where Peter and John minister to the believers in Samaria¹⁸³ and uses the experience of the Ephesian converts in Acts 19:6 in support of his view. Although, these passages indicate that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is imparted through the laying on of hands, Clark (2013:44) adds two more observations. First, 'in both of these stories, Samaria and Ephesus, it is significant that the experience of receiving the Holy Spirit came *after* the experience of believing' and separate from the Spirit's presence in salvation. Second, he stresses that tongues are not required as evidence for the baptism in the Spirit.

Clark (2013:53-54) represents five things from Lindsell's (1983:113-122) work that he believes is connected to receiving the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit: (1) the necessity of being born again, (2) being under the Lordship of Christ, (3) confessing and repenting of all sins in one's life, (4) asking God to fill us with the Holy Spirit, and (5) claiming the

¹⁸² Clark (2013:22-23) notes 'the Day of Pentecost was not the day when the disciples first received the Holy Spirit, but rather the day when they were filled with the Holy Spirit'. They first received on the occasion of John 20:22 when Jesus breathed on them and said 'receive the Holy Spirit'. Thus, the baptism of the Holy Spirit is a distinct impartation from that which occurs at salvation.

¹⁸³ Although the reaction of Simon the sorcerer indicates that there was some visible manifestation involved, Clark (2013:23) does not raise the issue most pentecostals raise, namely, that what caught Simon's attention was the utterance of tongues (Arrington 2008:158-159; 205-214; Brumback 1947:205-214; Gause 2009:136; Hughes 1976:171; Lombard and Daffe 2005:83-85; Menzies and Horton 1993:137; Tipei 2009:194).

promise of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Given these beliefs, Clark claims that God will and does occasionally make His own exceptions when imparting the baptism in the Holy Spirit. According to Clark (2013:55), normally persons receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit who have confessed their sins and are crying out for an impartation, 'but sometimes God sovereignly touches someone in the church who everyone knows does not have his or her spiritual life together'.

Two points are noteworthy in response to Clark's view of impartation and the baptism in the Holy Spirit. On the one hand, Clark (2013:44) aligns with the view of Church of God and other pentecostal leaders that the impartation of Holy Spirit baptism is separate from the work of the Spirit in salvation (see Arrington 1993:3:51; Bonnke 1994:36; Gause 2009:29; Hunter 2009:228-230, Oss 1996:239-257, Richie 2019:228).¹⁸⁴ On the other hand, he disagrees with Church of God and pentecostal leaders who aver that persons must speak in tongues as evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit (Arrington 2008:76; Gause 2009:132-137; Menzies and Horton 134-138, Richie 2019:270-286, Sims 1995:105; Synan 1997:122). Adopting the same view as Clark are leaders such as Lederle (2008:131-141), Macchia (2006:35), Saucy (1996:301), Scott (2012:36) and Storms (1996:305).¹⁸⁵ However, Scripture serves as the ultimate authority, norming or standard, and pentecostals acknowledge that the Bible includes examples where persons received the Holy Spirit with and without speaking in tongues (Luke 1:41, 67-69; 4:1; Acts 2:4, 4:31, 10:46, 19:6). However, pentecostals do not conclude that these exceptions, when taken in context, necessarily undermine commitment to evidentiary tongues (Richie 2020:203). Fee (1991:96-99) who acknowledges the examples given in Scripture and the differing views on the initial evidence of tongues offers a hermeneutical compromise of the two positions. For

¹⁸⁴ However, Clark (2103:44) adds: 'I do believe that the gifts of the Spirit and baptism in the Spirit can occur simultaneously with conversion, though in reality they are almost always subsequent to it'. Clark's view is not an anomaly among pentecostals. Richie (2019:232) explains: 'the Pentecostal doctrine of subsequence articulates a logical distinction rather than a necessary temporal differentiation' (see Sims 1995:114).

¹⁸⁵ The Church of God, Assemblies of God, Church of God in Christ, Church of God of Prophecy, International Pentecostal Holiness, and Pentecostal Church of God teach the doctrine that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

him it means that interpreting the Lukan narrative in a way that insists upon initial evidence as being the only valid sign of Holy Spirit baptism 'seems to place too much weight on the historical precedent of three (perhaps four) instances in Acts'. Speaking in tongues, however, if not normative, was a repeated experience with the coming of the Spirit. Arguably then, 'If the Pentecostal may not say one must speak in tongues, the Pentecostal may surely say, why *not* speak in tongues' (p. 99).

In sum, it suffices to say that there are multiple scholarly positions on impartation through the laying on of hands and impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit with evidentiary tongues. Yet, Clark is not reluctant to argue his own view that the laying on of hands is a normative way to impart the baptism in the Holy Spirit. His view is biblical (Acts 8:17, 9:17, 19:9) and for the most part in harmony with the view of Church of God with the exception of his stance on evidentiary tongues. However, this difference fails to merit the dismissal of his thoughts on the doctrine of impartation.

7.5 The impartation of spiritual gifts

Clark (2013:24-26) also teaches that the impartation of spiritual gifts is a valid practice for our contemporary churches. He finds support for the doctrine in Paul's words to the Romans believers: 'For I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift so that you may be established' (Rom 1:11). Although reticent in naming the gifts that Paul had in mind, Clark appears to be resolute on four issues.¹⁸⁶ First, the passage allows the reader the latitude for the impartation of all spiritual gifts which is a view commonly supported by leaders such as Brown (1997:186), Deere (1993:246), Hamon (1988:69), and Morris (2017). Second, Clark contends that the ability to impart gifts comes through the power of the Holy Spirit (Rom 15:17-19). In other words, as clarified by Bickle (2008:135-136), gifting is an ability that is transferable from one believer

¹⁸⁶ Clark follows the path that is a common thread through all the views that have so far been reviewed in this chapter. He fails to differentiate between ordinary or extraordinary gifts and those that are available for impartation.

to another 'but only to the degree that God sovereignly ordains', thus showing the mysterious interplay between God's sovereign activity and human agency (cf. Richie 2019:171). Third, and in contrast to the views of Rich (2007:14-24) and Rogers (2006:65-74), Clark believes that any believer can be used to impart gifts, and quotes John 14:12: 'Most assuredly, I say to you he who believes in Me, the works that I do he will do also: and greater works than these he will do, because I go to My Father'. He interprets John's words thus: 'beyond a doubt the "greater things" reference pertains to doing acts of power, signs, wonders, healing and miracles'. Clark also cites the example of Ananias in Acts 9 as proof that the impartation of gifts is not restricted to only those called into the apostolic ministry (cf. also Deere 1993:233-246). Finally, Clark maintains that gifts are imparted not to create conflict or to serve as evidence of a person's spiritual status in the church. Rather, they are imparted as gifts that enable effective service to others in complete humility. Through that way, the charismata reflect the very character of God.

In sum, Clark's belief that spiritual gifts are imparted by the laying on of hands and by the sovereign empowerment of the Holy Spirit is a scriptural teaching and supported by Bonnke (1994:9-89), Fee (1987:569-625), Lombard and Daffe (2008:179-206) and Lowery (1997:31-68). However, while Clark cites Romans 1:11 as a basis for his belief, he mistakenly overlooks several important passages that support the impartation of spiritual gifts. In 1 Corinthians 1:4-7, 12:1-31 and 14:1 believers are encouraged to pursue the impartation of spiritual gifts. Ephesians 4:11-12 confirms the sovereign bestowal of spiritual gifts while 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6 teach that gifts may be imparted through the laying on of hands.

Moreover, and evident in Scripture, is Clark's (2013:32) claim that the impartation of gifts is not restricted to apostles or prophets; God uses whomsoever He will. He correctly references Ananias in Acts 9 who laid hands on Paul to receive his sight and the impartation of the Holy Spirit as support for his belief. Scripture reveals that Ananias was simply a 'disciple' of Christ or as Paul describes him later a 'devout man... having

a good testimony with all the Jews' (Acts 9:10-17, 22:12). Also, Scripture states that it was elders who laid hands on Timothy for the impartation of his spiritual gift (1 Tim 4:14). However, while Clark (2013:105) contends that impartation of gifts is not restricted to apostles or prophets, his claim that the "greater things" in John 14:12 means that impartations by believers will exceed 'the acts of power, signs, wonders, healing and miracles' done by Jesus is unwarranted. The disciples duplicated many of the signs and wonders that Jesus performed but Scripture never records them performing any miracle greater than those of Jesus (Acts 3:1-10, 9:36-41). Making more sense of the point are Lipscomb (1959:224) Pratte (2010:260) and Robertson (1932:251). They interpret the 'greater works' to mean that believers will perform works geographically beyond that of Jesus' ministry and that those works--signs, wonders and miracles will be greater in quantity and not quality. Thus, while Clark presents a view on the impartation of spiritual gifts that has biblical support, his elementary presentation shows hermeneutical weakness and provides a less than convincing argument for the impartation of gifts through the laying on of hands.

7.6 The receiving of impartations

Clark (2013:41-60) documents several conditions that he believes are prerequisites for the receiving of impartations. First, persons should be aware of their personal and spiritual inadequacy (Matt 5:3). Second, persons should desire that their spiritual condition change, so that they may become victorious Christians (Rom 7:14-15). And third, persons should desire to be used in God's service and for His glory (Matt 12:29, 16:18). Clark also implies that these prerequisites can only be met through the conviction, grace and desire placed in the believer by the Holy Spirit. In addition to these conditional prerequisites, Clark suggests that three more points should be borne in mind: (1) persons wishing to receive an impartation should anticipate the gift rather than its manifestation. Falling, shaking, laughing and other such phenomena may be manifestations of the receiver but are not themselves prerequisites for receiving a gift; (2) a person who receives an impartation should resist the

temptation to over analyse their experience; and (3) persons should avoid praying when being prayed for otherwise prayer makes the gift more difficult to receive (pp. 56-59).

In light of these views, the following may be said. First, Clark's view that persons should be aware of their spiritual inadequacy seems to be what prompted the action taken by the church leaders in 1 Timothy 4:14 and Acts 13:1-3. The laying on of hands as represented in these passages indicates that believers needed adequate spiritual strength from God in the form of some gift for effective service (Arrington 2008:133; Bonnke 1994:67-68). Second, although he provides no applicable scriptural support for his claim, Clark's view that persons must desire a change of heart and want to use their gifts in service to God and others are concerns addressed in Scripture (Acts 2:38-39; Rom 12:1-2; 1 Cor 12,14; Eph 4:9-16). However, Clark fails to explain how believers might know whether or not the prerequisites needed to receive impartations from God are being met. Even more disconcerting is the fact that he presents his view on receiving impartations by decontextualizing scriptural passages that neither mention nor imply how persons may receive the impartation of the Holy Spirit or spiritual gifts (Matt 5:3, Rom 7:14-15, 21-24, Matt 12:29, 16:18).

Furthermore, Clark is correct to say that persons who desire impartations should avoid equating their reception of a gift with an emotional experience. But, he is incorrect to assert that persons should resist the temptation to over analyse their experience for at least two reasons: Clark provides no scriptural example for support of his view, and Paul instructs all believers in 1 Corinthians 14:26-33 to 'judge' the manifestation of gifts. The apostle John, for instance, says, 'Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits, whether they are of God' (1 John 4:1, cf. Matt 7:15-23). In other words, and correctly pointed out by Wuest (1973, 2:159), spiritual manifestations are to be tested against the teaching of Scripture because manifestations are actuated either by the devil or the Holy Spirit.

A third and final comment about Clark's claim that persons who desire to receive an impartation should resist praying when being prayed for because it makes impartations from God more difficult to receive, is this: Clark fails to include a single text of Scripture to support that view. Although it may seem reasonable that persons in the process of receiving could be hindered by being preoccupied with praying, Clark's view on impartation in this regard remains without scriptural support.

7.7 The purpose of impartations

Clark (2013:102-138) claims that impartations are never given for the sake of experience or as mere proof of God's manifest presence. Rather, their greater purpose is to reveal God's eternal power, divine nature and His glory. Moreover, Clark contends that God's intended purpose for giving impartations is manifested when believers that receive an impartation begin to live lives of radical obedience to God and share the message of Christ with unbelievers. The problem for him is that it is not always understood by believers. For many, the purpose of impartations is not about giving glory to God but is seen as a way to exalt their spiritual status among other believers. In fact, it is one thing to desire a fresh anointing/impartation, but quite another thing for believers to be willing to pay the price that comes with it.¹⁸⁷ That is to acquiesce to God and allow the Holy Spirit to free them from pride and self-seeking motives in order that God may completely have His way in their lives (p. 129).

In response to Clark's view on the purpose of impartations, it seems that believers may mistakenly adopt the perspective of Simon in Acts 8:18-19 and believe that impartation of the Spirit is a way of gaining status and admiration in the church rather than seeing that impartation is one way of honouring God. Yet, Clark leaves unclear the implications of a misconception of the nature and purpose of impartations in the church. Callie Joubert (2018:105-109) warns that misconception in spiritual matters and the desire for status often leads to a display of envy and

¹⁸⁷ Clark (2013:126-138) speaks of missionaries who received powerful impartations, those who were tortured as well as separated from their families for years.

resenting the giftings and callings God places upon the lives of others.¹⁸⁸ In other words, believers become fixated on the gifts that others have and become envious and jealous which threatens the unity of the church. In contrast, the Apostle Paul fully understood the purpose of impartations. They are to help propagate the mission, ministry and unity of the church (Rom 12:1-8; 1 Cor 12:1-31). So does Bullinger (1953:82-83), who states, 'If we desire a special *gift* we incur a grave responsibility. May the giver never give us a gift without at the same time bestowing the grace to use it aright: for our profit, for the good of others, and for His own glory' (cf. Richie 2019: 249-260; Sims 1995:115-118).

In sum, Clark presents a theology on the doctrine of impartation that finds some correlation with the teachings of Scripture and the Church of God. His definition of impartation which is the 'transference of the anointing' which may include 'a gift or gifts of the Spirit, a filling of the Holy Spirit (especially for power) or the baptism in the Holy Spirit' is congruent with Scripture and compatible with the theology of impartation in the Church of God and others in Pentecostalism (Acts 8:17, 9:17,19:6, 1 Tim 4:14; Anyasi 2003:295; Bickle 2008:135-136; Francis 2015; Kilpatrick 2015:109-114). However, Clark's theological views on impartation with respect to ordination, blessing, healing, the baptism in the Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts raise concerns, for several reasons. First, Clark (2013:16) avers that these kinds of impartation are received through two ways in Scripture, namely, the laying on of hands and waiting upon God in prayer. He addresses the laying on of hands but fails to inform persons on how they might receive impartations through waiting on God. If not directly from God without the mediation of another believer, then we need to know how God does that. Second, Clark interprets scriptural texts subjectively and uses non-applicable proof-texts to support his views. It was shown

¹⁸⁸ Joubert (2018:99-113) proficiently explains the toxic nature of an envious spirit. He states that it is reasonable to conclude that the self-gratifying desire for status concomitant with a spirit of covetousness which is possibly the root of envy, was the reason the chief priests delivered Jesus into the hands of Pilate (Matt 27:17-18; Mark 15:10). Joubert also suggests that envy was the cause for the actions of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 4:1-11), for Cain killing his brother Abel and for Simon wanting to purchase the power of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:23).

that he incorrectly interprets John 14:12 to mean that any believer can impart gifts to others and that the imparted will exceed the signs, wonders and miracles done by Jesus. Also, he incorrectly cites Scriptures that neither mention nor imply the practice of impartation in making his claim that certain prerequisites should be considered and met in order to receive an impartation from God. Third, Clark is scripturally incorrect to assert that believers should avoid over analysing their experiences and praying when being prayed for to receive an impartation from God. Fourth, while he contends that tongues are not the initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, he provides no exegetical reason as to why his view is biblically correct and worthy of consideration. These examples suffice to conclude that, while Clark discusses the subject of impartation, his views are systematically and exegetically insufficient to formulate a biblical and acceptable doctrine of impartation for the Church of God.

8. Summary and Concluding Remarks

The focus of this chapter has been on the third subsidiary objective: to conduct a critical analysis of the literature on impartation in order to map out the current and dominant theological and doctrinal views of Church of God leaders and other pentecostal leaders on impartation. Emphasis has been laid upon their definition of impartation, their beliefs about the gifts that are available for impartation and the means by which gifts are to be imparted. The primary goal of the assessment was to identify the beliefs and practices associated with impartation that could be accepted as well as those which necessitated rejection by leaders and believers in the Church of God as well as other pentecostal leaders and believers. Although it is not feasible to include every acceptable or unacceptable tenet, the following paragraphs constitute a synopsis of the results of the study in this chapter.

It may be accepted that there are some common strands between the views of Church of God leaders and other pentecostal/charismatic leaders on the doctrine of impartation. One strand is the belief that impartation is a valid biblical practice and that *metadidomi* involves giving or sharing.

However, it was also shown that there are differing opinions on how impartations are given and the gifts that can be imparted.

The following views were found to be biblically and doctrinally acceptable: (1) impartations can be received through association with leaders, spiritual fathers and mentors; (2) impartations can be received through the laying on of hands and occasionally in tandem with prophecy; (3) impartations can be received through the laying on of hands and spoken blessings; and (4) impartations can be received sovereignly from God as an act of grace and without human agency. In contrast, teachings on and the practices of impartation that are deemed unscriptural and unacceptable are the following: (a) the belief that impartations are primarily received through covenant relationships or association with spiritual fathers and mentors; (b) the claim that impartations are to be restricted to those in the five-fold ministry; (c) the notion that gifts in leaders must be perceived to be received; and (d) the diabolic idea that impartations are likely to be received if and when believers tithe and contribute financially to persons in the five-fold ministry.

It also became apparent that Church of God leaders as well as other pentecostal/charismatic leaders place their central focus upon the impartation of gifts such as healing, prophecy and the baptism in the Holy Spirit. However, it was shown that all spiritual gifts should be acknowledged as gifts of the Spirit and that *metadidomi* is a way to receive ordinary and extraordinary gifts.

Despite different viewpoints on impartation, it appears that there is a consensus among Church of God leaders and pentecostal/charismatic leaders that the doctrine of impartation is a biblical, valid and relevant practice.

The next chapter will focus on an inductive study involving the gathering and exploration of biblical texts relating to impartation. All relevant Scriptures will be examined and will include the contextual meanings that may have a bearing on the manner in which impartations are bestowed

as well as the gifts that may be imparted. The main objective will be to ascertain the meaning of the texts, deduct and analyse the key ideas related to the impartational theology and to identify the methodology and the practice of impartation in context. The results will be used to determine whether the texts can be used to endorse the contemporary understanding and practice of impartation in the Church of God.

CHAPTER FIVE

AN INDUCTIVE STUDY OF THE INFORMING TEXTS

1. Introduction

Thus far the study has endeavoured to explore the doctrine and practice of impartation from a historical, theological and literary perspective. The anchor text, Romans 1:11, has also been given considerable attention. However, in order to adequately understand and assess whether there is biblical justification for the doctrine and practice of impartation, all Scripture must be given consideration. The aim of this chapter is to focus on the fourth subsidiary objective, namely, to complete an inductive study of specific biblical texts that will inform a contemporary understanding and practice of impartation in the Church of God. It, therefore, focuses on the gathering and exploration of pertinent biblical texts relating to impartation. The main objective will be to ascertain the contextual meaning of the texts, deduct and analyse the key ideas related to impartational theology and to identify the methodology and the practice of impartation in context. The results will be used to determine whether the meaning of the texts can be used to endorse the contemporary understanding and practice of impartation in the Church of God.

2. Impartation of Anointing and Spiritual Gifts

One of the primary teachings in impartational theology is the belief that spiritual gifts and anointings are imparted through prayer and the laying on of hands. Those impartations are not limited to but often involve the laying on of hands at ordination and commission to ministry service. It is undeniable that the Old Testament speaks to anointing and spiritual gifts and their conferral to other persons. Hence, for the purpose of this study it is necessary to discuss a few select passages from the Old Testament

that may provide greater insight into those impartations and how they are imparted to those who receive.

2.1 Impartation and the elders in Numbers 11:16-17, 24-25

Numbers 11:16-17 and 24-25 involve Moses who has been charged with the responsibility of leading the children of Israel out of Egypt towards the Promised Land. The journey is protracted and wearisome for the sojourners and results in Moses being faced with disaffection and complaint from the people. Moses reacts to their disfavour by complaining to God about the assignment he has been given. Thus, God interrupts the sequence of events for Israel and divinely bestows an impartation upon the seventy elders in order that the elders may help Moses bear the burden of the people. The passage of interest reads as follows:

So the Lord said to Moses: "Gather to Me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom you know to be the elders of the people and officers over them; bring them to the tabernacle of meeting, that they may stand there with you. Then I will come down and talk with you there. I will take of the Spirit that is upon you and will put *the same* upon them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with you, that you may not bear it yourself alone. So Moses went out and told the people the words of the Lord, and he gathered the seventy men of the elders of the people and placed them around the tabernacle. Then the Lord came down in the cloud, and spoke to him, and took of the Spirit that was upon him, and placed the *same* upon the seventy elders; and it happened, when the Spirit rested upon them, that they prophesied, although they never did so again."

Several thoughts emerge from this text that bear impartational significance. First, the statement 'Gather Me seventy elders of Israel, whom you know to be the elders of the people and officers over them' (v. 16) indicates that the elders were persons commissioned by Moses who were already leaders in the community.¹⁸⁹ Their being summoned to

¹⁸⁹ Noth (1968:87) identifies the 'elders' as being the 'heads of the families who, therefore, originally and properly bore the title of 'elder''. Cole (2000:188), Gray (1965:110) and Riggans (1983:93) in contrast view the elders as being persons already

gather at the Tent entrance, according to Brown (2002:98), is no mere locational detail; it indicates the elders' spiritual status in the community.

Second, the clause 'I will take of the Spirit that is upon you [Moses] and will put *the same* upon them' (v. 17) and the Lord 'took of the Spirit that was upon him, and placed the *same* upon the seventy elders' (v. 25) confirms that 'Yahweh himself sees to the dispensing and distribution of the 'spirit'' (Noth 1968:87). Furthermore, the words 'I will take of the Spirit that is upon you and put the same on them' (v. 17) indicates that the 'Spirit' is separate and independent of Moses, thus the distribution will be the ru'ach--the Spirit of YHWH and not the spirit of Moses (Kessler 2015:7-9; Milgrom 1990:89-90).¹⁹⁰ This event parallels the Spirit's sovereign impartation of gifts in 1 Corinthians 12:11 and Ephesians 4:7-12.

Third, the divine conferral of the Spirit upon the elders apparently meant that God would bestow upon them a part of the gifts of grace given to Moses earlier. On the word 'take' in verse 17, Riggans (1983:94) states: 'The root-meaning of the verb [תִּקְבַּדְוּ] is "to join with, share", and here it means to separate off something from a large block for use in other places'. Noordtjij (1983:103) agrees but makes the reasonable albeit unsubstantiated claim that 'Moses retains a larger measure than they [the seventy] receive'.

Fourth, while no other gift is named other than prophecy in the impartation to the elders, Harrison (1990:188-189) believes that 'God's Spirit evidently bestowed upon them the qualities of power and wisdom, which Paul, in writing under the New Covenant, recognised as gifts of the Spirit (2 Tim 1:7)'. Harrison's conclusion seems plausible, for the elders

called by God to positions of authority such as camp overseers, secretaries or scribes. Riggans (1983:93-94) sees the elders as having similarity to the men chosen in Acts 6:1-6 and the seventy in Luke 10:1-10. See also Stubbs (2009:120).

¹⁹⁰Kessler (2015:6-7) and Milgrom (1990:89-90) point out that God will distribute His own Spirit not that of Moses. Both assert that in the 65 verses in the Old Testament where ru'ach occurs in construct with YHWH, the word is best translated as spirit. The textual evidence and use of YHWH's spirit in Numbers 11:29 identify the ru'ach of Moses as the Holy Spirit.

would need multiple gifts beyond prophecy in order to assist Moses and 'bear the burden of the people' (Num 11:17).

Fifth, and also noteworthy, is the mention that 'when the Spirit rested upon them [the elders] that they prophesied' (v. 25).¹⁹¹ Confirmation of their impartation came through an ecstatic display of prophetic words. Riggins (1983:95) makes the point that the verb *וַאֲבַנְתִּי* (prophesied) connotes the frenzied ecstatic behaviour and speech of those under the control of another's will. Although it is not known whether or not the prophetic words spoken by the elders were comprehensible to the listeners, their prophesying was undeniable evidence that they had been imparted with the necessary equipment needed to assist Moses in leading the congregation (Brown 2002:99; Noth 1968:89). Notable also is that after their initial experience, the elders never prophesied again (v. 25). This seems to imply that while their prophesying demonstrated that they had been imparted with the *רוּחַ* (Spirit) and were being controlled momentarily by the mighty Spirit, it does not confirm them as being prophets (Budd 1984:130; Noordtjij 1983:103). Also of significance is that the Spirit's gift was placed upon Eldad and Medad who were not with the other elders at the time of their impartation (Num 11:26-30). This addition to the story indicates that the Holy Spirit is totally sovereign and imparts to whomever He wills and through the manner He chooses which mirrors the teachings of Paul in 1 Corinthians 12:11. We can therefore infer that the Lord will not be manipulated by either the plans of believers or any resistance they may have to His sovereign will. As Brown (2002:101) points out: 'After all, we do not always know what is best for us [or others]'. This not knowing what is best for us and others is reflected in the response of Joshua who opposes the actions of Eldad and Medad. Thus, Moses in response to Joshua, issues a sharp retort: 'Oh that all the

¹⁹¹ Tipei (2009:32) does not see the ceremony in Numbers 11:16-18 as being a commissioning, but one of empowerment 'for the men chosen have already occupied positions of authority'. He suggests that most of the 'elders' and 'officers' are the men appointed earlier in Exodus 18:13-27. Moreover, in Numbers 11:25 it is told that 'when the spirit rested upon them that they prophesied'. Thus, 'the language used is not institutional but rather charismatic' (Tipei 2009:32). Cole (2000:189) and Robinson (2008:39) in contrast to Tipei believe that the charismatic dimension is what differentiates the seventy in Numbers 11:16-18 from those in Exodus 18:25-26.

Lord's people were prophets and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them' (Num 11:29).

2.2 Joshua's impartation in Numbers 27:18-23

¹⁸ And the LORD said to Moses: "Take Joshua the son of Nun with you, a man in whom *is* the Spirit, and lay your hand on him; ¹⁹ set him before Eleazar the priest and before all the congregation, and inaugurate him in their sight. ²⁰ And you shall give *some* of your authority to him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may be obedient. ²¹ He shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire before the LORD for him by the judgment of the Urim. At his word they shall go out, and at his word they shall come in, he and all the children of Israel with him—all the congregation." ²² So Moses did as the LORD commanded him. He took Joshua and set him before Eleazar the priest and before all the congregation. ²³ And he laid his hands on him and inaugurated him, just as the LORD commanded by the hand of Moses.

Moses, the elder statesman of Israel is commanded by God to journey to Mount Abarim where he will view the Promised Land. After seeing what the new generation of Israel will inherit, he is informed of his impending death. This disclosure prompts Moses to pray that God will appoint a new leader for Israel who will be militaristic and will lead them into battle, but also a shepherd who will attend to an often recalcitrant community and bring them into the land of promise. It is in answer to Moses' prayer that the passage under consideration is birthed and Joshua subsequently imparted with the authority and ability to lead Israel forward.

As was stated earlier, it is believed that Christian rites of ordination often involve impartation through the laying on of hands similar to that of Joshua's confirmation as Israel's new leader (Num 27:18-23). Mattingly (2001:191) remarks that the ordination of Joshua is the first in Scripture and in both Jewish and Christian traditions Joshua's confirmation as the successor to Moses has powerfully influenced ordination practice which

includes the laying on of hands.¹⁹² It is for this reason that this passage is given particular consideration.

Several questions come to bear when looking at the significance of Moses laying hands on Joshua and his selection as the new leader of Israel. First, does the pericope reveal that Moses transferred or imparted anything to Joshua through the laying on of hands? That something was imparted to Joshua through Moses is made clear in Numbers 27:18-20: 'Take Joshua the son of Nun with you, a man in whom is the Spirit, and lay your hand on him... And you shall give some of your authority to him'. Cheddie (2001:3) argues that there was no transference of anything to Joshua in the laying on of hands. However, several scholars are of the opinion that Moses' hands was a visible token of the transfer of blessings, ability or authority from one person to another (Brown 2002:252; Noth 1968:215; Olson 1996:169; Stubbs 2009:211). Mattingly (2001:198) has the same view and emphasises that YHWH's instructions for the confirmation of Joshua in order that he may receive some of Moses' honour only finds meaning or expression in the laying on of Moses' hands (Num 27:22-23).

Second, what exactly did Moses impart to Joshua? Since Joshua is characterised as 'a man in whom is the spirit' (v. 18), it is unlikely that Moses' laying on of hands involved the impartation of the Holy Spirit. Mattingly (2001:196) and Wood (1976:49-50) remark that the word for 'spirit' [תּוּר] has no article, which makes it difficult to develop a simple interpretation of what 'spirit' Joshua possessed. However, the absence of the article attached to 'spirit' does not preclude a reference to the Holy Spirit.¹⁹³ Cole (2000:469) agrees that the meaning of the word 'spirit' is indefinite by terminology alone, but states that 'the life of Joshua evidenced that the [Holy] Spirit controlled his life'. Thus, we may infer that Joshua was already Spirit-imbued and that God chose him to succeed

¹⁹² See Ehrhardt (1954:138) who discusses the OT influence on Christian ordination. Mattingly (1997) also gives a scholarly exegetical review of Numbers 27:12-23 and Deuteronomy 34:9.

¹⁹³ Wood (1976:49-50) cites a similar example in 1 Chronicles 12:18 where the word תּוּר 'spirit' lacks an attached article yet definitely refers to YHWH's Spirit.

Moses (Ashley 1993:55; Sakenfeld 1995:152). Moreover, the phrase ‘in whom is the spirit’ implies that God has already given Joshua a special gift or gifts of the Spirit that has changed him and endowed him for leadership abilities (Mattingly 2002:102; Riggans 1983:202).¹⁹⁴

Since it seems implausible that Joshua was imparted with the Holy Spirit or with every gift needed for leadership, further research of the Numbers pericope reveals the most favourable interpretation of what his impartation involved. Moses is told to ‘take’ Joshua and to ‘set him before Eleazar the priest and before all the congregation, and inaugurate him in their sight. And you shall give some of your authority to him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may be obedient’ (vv. 19-20). Moses was to formally present Joshua to Israel and then ordain or ‘inaugurate him in their sight’. The verb *התירצ* is a piel perfect second masculine singular of *צר* meaning ‘to command’ or ‘to give a charge’ (Mattingly 2001:199).¹⁹⁵ The inauguration culminates in Moses *נתן* (conferring) some of his *הנה* (authority) to Joshua through the laying on of hands (Fisher 1980:608-609).¹⁹⁶ The Hebrew word for ‘authority’ (*hod*), usually translated as ‘majesty’, is frequently ascribed to God or to a king (Noth 1968:215; Riggans 1983:202; Sakenfeld 1995:152; 1 Chron 29:25, Ps 21:5, Jer 22:18). Hence, one comes to understand the position Moses held since ‘authority’ used in this way compares an attribute of YHWH and of kings to that of Moses. In essence, the assignment involving the laying on of hands by Moses was ‘the symbol of investiture with authority’ and was completed ‘just as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses’ (v. 23; Noordtjij 1983:257). Mattingly (2001:207) remarks

¹⁹⁴ Most scholars accept the meaning of ‘spirit’ (*רוח*) in Numbers 27:18 as an endowment for leadership (Ashley 1993:553-554; Brown 2002:252; Budd 1984:306-307; Cole 2000:469; Noordtjij 1983:256-257; Noth 1968:214-215; Riggans 1983:297; Sakenfeld 1995:152; Stubbs 2009:211).

¹⁹⁵ Mattingly (2001:199) points out that both meanings of *צר* (‘to command’ or ‘give a charge’) are used in Numbers 27:19-23. The first is in Moses’ commissioning of Joshua (v. 19, 23). The second is in Moses’ obedience to YHWH’s command (v. 22). The repeated usage is to confirm that YHWH is in total control of Joshua’s selection and commission to office.

¹⁹⁶ Fisher (1980:608-609) makes the point that there are a great variety of meanings for *נתן* ‘give’ such as: pay, thrust, strike, attach and spend. He states, ‘Its usage in Num 27:20 appears to be mainly connected with the more formal meaning of “appoint” thus the translation of “confer”’.

that the juxtaposition of 'commanded' with 'hand' has great import. 'His [Moses] hand became a visible representation of YHWH's communication but also of YHWH's power'.¹⁹⁷ Thus, in the eyes of the people the impartation of authority from Moses to Joshua with the laying on of hands confirms Joshua's empowerment and dedication to office (Ashley 1993:551; Robinson 2008:48-49; Tipei 2009:36; cf. Num 8:9-10).

The third and final question to be addressed is, what effect did the impartation with the laying on of hands have upon Joshua? Although, Joshua has received an impartation of authority to lead Israel, the phrase 'and you [Moses] shall give some of your authority to him' (v. 20) indicates that the impartation was not without limits. This is seemingly the writer's way of saying that Joshua, while an important figure, will never rise to the level of his mentor Moses (Mattingly (2001:201; Tipei 2009:35). In essence, while Joshua becomes Moses' successor, 'he does not become his equal' (Noordtzi 1983:257). This reality is revealed in verse 21: 'He [Joshua] shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall inquire before the Lord for him by the judgment of the Urim'. It is also evident that Moses inquires of the Lord directly whereas Joshua will inquire through Eleazar the high priest. Yet, Joshua will share a portion of Moses' civil and spiritual authority as well as his honour, charisma, and prestige (Mattingly 2001:201). Furthermore, the statement, 'At his word they shall go out and come in, he and all the children of Israel with him', is an expression that indicates an acquired prophetic understanding and places Joshua comprehensively over all leadership duties and responsibilities in the affairs of the state (Gray 1965:400-401; Mattingly 2001:203; Robinson 2008:49). Hence, Joshua who has been imparted with authority through the laying on of hands, will now lead Israel with a portion of Moses' honour, but also Israel's obedience and God's support (Deut 31:1-8, 14, 23; Josh 1).

¹⁹⁷ Mattingly (2001:207) points out that YHWH's 'word' in this instance possesses creative power and effects what it signifies. Thus, Moses' hand enabled Israel to see the 'word' of YHWH in action.

2.3 Joshua's impartation in Deuteronomy 34:9

Deuteronomy 34:9 serves as a companion text to Numbers 27:18-23 and in context concludes with a succession of events that establishes Joshua as the new leader of Israel. Moses prepared the people for the transfer of leadership in chapters 31-34. Through carefully following the instructions of God, Moses imparts to Joshua an investiture of authority through the laying on of hands that enables him to lead the people of Israel into the Promised Land. Deuteronomy 34:9 places the reader on the other side of the death of Moses where further mention is made of Joshua's impartation.

Now Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands on him; so the children of Israel heeded him, and did as the Lord had commanded Moses.

Two points are emphasised in this passage. First, Joshua is referred to as being 'full of the spirit of wisdom'. Although both Numbers 27:18-23 and Deuteronomy 34:9 describe the ordaining or commissioning of Joshua through Moses's hands, there is one distinct difference between the two accounts. In Numbers 27:18 the writer states that Joshua possessed the *רוח* (Spirit) before Moses laid his hand upon him. In Deuteronomy 34:9 Joshua is 'full of the spirit of wisdom' as a result of Moses' impartation through the laying on of hands (Tipei 2009:36).¹⁹⁸ The meaning of *מלא* is to 'fill', 'be full', or 'to make full' (Fairman 1986:23-32).¹⁹⁹ In the structure of verse 9, *מלא* is translated as a verb determined by the addition of the particle *כי* (because) which indicates causality.²⁰⁰ Thus, the Hebrew idiom means that the act of filling is an act of placing something into Joshua, an act of completion (Mattingly 2002:94). Vogels (1982:7) fails to see a problem with the contrast in the two accounts of

¹⁹⁸ For further discussion on *מלא כי* see Tipei (2009:36-38) and Vogels (1982:3-7).

¹⁹⁹ Fairman (1986) provides a thorough study on the meaning of *מלא*. Also Mattingly (1997).

²⁰⁰ The particle *כי* is used in various ways some 4,350 times in Scripture. For further study see Muilenburg 1961:135-160, Williams 1976:72-73, and Vogels 1982:3-7. Although, Joshua's impartation necessitated the physical contact of the hands, Mattingly (2002:97) argues that causality should not be taken to imply that the Pentateuch's intent is to present Moses' hands as having some magical effective power (cf. Noth 1968:215).

Joshua receiving the *רוח* (Spirit) and relegates the issue to a question of punctuation. The particle *ו* is nuanced as being causative, but can also introduce a strong emphatic statement. He translates Deuteronomy 34:9 thus: 'And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom. When (or Since) Moses had laid his hands upon him, the people obeyed him'. Vogels (1982:7) argues that adopting this translation eliminates the discrepancy between the two texts. As such, in both passages, the charismatic empowering of *רוח* precedes the installation of Joshua by the laying on of hands.

Coppens (1925:163) sees no discrepancies between the two accounts, yet offers an alternate view. The *דוה* (authority) in Numbers 27:20 and the 'spirit of wisdom' in Deuteronomy 34:9 are equivalent concepts. He concludes that the laying on of hands by Moses was to impart to the new leader 'a larger measure of the Spirit of Yahweh'. Tipei (2009:38), who accepts Coppens' view, states: 'It is possible then, to conclude that the author of Dt. 34 interprets the *דוה* of Num. 27:20 in a similar way, a spiritual gift which he describes as "the spirit of wisdom"'. If one takes this view, then it means that Joshua's impartation in Deuteronomy 34:9 is not the divine Spirit itself, for Joshua already possesses the spirit of YHWH. Instead, the impartation is an essential spiritual faculty which enables Joshua to discern YHWH's will for his people. This special gift of the 'spirit of wisdom' dispensed by God but mediated through the hands of Moses provided Joshua with the various skills necessary to rightly judge all Israelites and aliens without partiality and fear. It also provides Joshua with the ability to understand, interpret, and apply the law to the lives of YHWH's people (Deut 1:9-18, 4:5-8, 4:6, 32:29; Mattingly 2002:95-98).

A second point regarding Joshua's appointment as leader through Moses' laying on of hands is found in Deuteronomy 34:9. Not only does Joshua receive the impartation of the 'spirit of wisdom', he receives the obedience of the people for it states that 'the children of Israel heeded him'. That the people perceived Joshua to be the new leader of Israel is implied by the last clause of Deuteronomy 34:9: '[they] did as the Lord had commanded Moses'. We can thus infer that during the ordination

service the laying on of hands had become a physical conduit to pass to Joshua YHWH's commission and Moses' honour.²⁰¹ Thus, 'While Moses laid his own hands on Joshua, YHWH did the transferring' (Mattingly 2002:101).

2.4 Elisha's impartation in 2 Kings 2:9-15

A secondary passage that accounts for the impartation of anointings and gifts is the Old Testament example of the transfer of the Spirit from Elijah to Elisha. Elijah, who sensed that his departure from earth is imminent, asks Elisha what he may do for him before he is taken away. Elisha responds with the following request: 'Please let a double portion of your spirit be upon me'. Elisha's request for a double portion of Elijah's 'spirit' seems to parallel the laws of primogeniture in the Old Testament, namely, of the eldest son's right to a *מינשיפ* (double share) of his father's inheritance (Deut 21:17). Thus, the 2 Kings 2:9-15 pericope seems to imply that Elisha solidifies himself as Elijah's main successor and is claiming a unique prophetic status as his right (Bodner 2013:77; O'Brien 1998:10). Already mentally poised to inherit the mantle as a spiritual son, Elijah is taken up in the chariot of fire and Elisha receives the physical mantle and his claim to the double portion of Elijah's 'spirit'.

That Elisha's request for a 'double portion' was met is confirmed initially by the examples of Elisha using the mantle to part the waters of the Jordan (v.14) and the 'sons of the prophets' who proclaimed that 'The spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha' (v. 15).²⁰² Although it is confirmed that an impartation of 'spirit' upon Elisha occurred, the concern is to determine

²⁰¹ Henry (1960:209), Kalland (1992:324-325) and Mattingly (2002:101) refer to the installation of Joshua as an 'ordination'. Riggans (1983:202) in contrast states: 'In this context [Deut 34:9] it is not strictly speaking of an act of ordination like that of the laying on of hands by the elders, for instance. Rather Moses is carrying out a public act of ratifying what God had already done and was about to do through Joshua, an act of confirmation and affirmation'. He admits the text was used in the 'ordination' of rabbis and was eventually adapted by the apostles (Acts 6:6; 1Tim 4:14).

²⁰² For Hobbs (1985:22) the question *והילא אלהי היה היא* 'where is the Lord God of Elijah' is not one born out of anxiety, but is an entrance way that gives Elisha the opportunity to duplicate the miracle of Elijah thus confirming that the true succession had occurred. See also Cohn (2000:16).

the nature of the 'spirit' or anointing as well as the method through which the 'spirit' was communicated to Elisha.

The nature of the 'spirit' that was transferred to Elisha is a subject of controversy among several notable scholars. Britt (2002:46), Brueggemann (2000:295-298) and Lombard and Daffe (2008:199) view the 'spirit of Elijah' to be vitality and positional authority. Hobbs (1985:22) claims 'spirit' to be an instrument of power while Kessler (2015:8-9) and Parker (1978:96-97) view the ru'ach to be the Holy Spirit. Rice (2007:1-12) in contrast, does not believe the 'spirit' in 2 Kings 2:9 belongs to YHWH, but is a 'vital energy' of the person, Elijah. Gertel (2002a:77) concurs and states that the words, 'the spirit of Elijah [of Elijah, not of God] rests on Elisha' (2 Kgs 1:15), is an indication that the 'spirit' differs from that of God.²⁰³ For him, the narrative is 'a clear biblical lesson on the dangers of "Spiritism"' (2002b:174).²⁰⁴

However, a closer study of the context reveals the nature of the 'spirit'. First, God establishes Himself as 'agent' in the impartation of the 'spirit' when He instructs Elijah to 'anoint [Elisha] as prophet in your place' (1 Kgs 19:16). Second, since God is 'agent' in the commissioning of Elisha, it is reasonable to conclude that the nature of the רוּחַ 'spirit' will be His Spirit. Third, Elijah's statement, 'you have asked a hard thing' (v. 10), implies that Elisha's request is associated with a spiritual impartation, and

²⁰³ Eunice Chung (2014:15) and Gertel (2002b:171-177) point out that there are certain elements in the biblical narrative that might appear to undermine the status of Elisha's position and ministry. For example, the narrative does not show Elisha great respect as a top-rank prophet. First the narrative never calls him a prophet per se. Rather, he is referred to in the third person only as a 'man of God' [ish Elohim]. The only one who calls Elisha a prophet [navi] is Elisha himself (2 Kgs 5:8). Second, there are no recorded direct conversations between Elisha and Yahweh. However, Chung (2014:15) contends that these oddities do not negate the reality of Elisha's double portion and that he hears from God (2 Kgs 4:27).

²⁰⁴ Gertel (2002b:171-177) argues that the narrative of 2 Kings frowns upon the human presumption to transfer the prophetic 'spirit'. The notion of the transfer of 'spirit' was popular in certain prophetic guilds, but seen as a brazen use of *ruah*. Although Gertel is correct to assert that God is regarded as bestowing 'spirit' at will, he incorrectly claims that Elijah's transfer is a manipulation of *ruah*. He mistakenly assumes that Elijah imparted 'spirit' to Elisha which Scripture does not substantiate. Moreover, his claim that Zechariah 13:2-4 warns against the transfer of 'spirit' and is an unmistakable reference to the Elijah-Elisha stories is unmerited and biblically unfounded.

as such, that the gifting of 'spirit' be seen as a favour only within the purview of God alone (Piazza 2006:235; Wiseman 1993:195). Fourth, the statement, 'the spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha', also helps to determine the nature of 'spirit'. The verb for 'rest' appears often in Scripture in reference to animals, people, and objects (Gen 18:4; Exod 23:12; Josh 14:15). However, the verb *nu'ach* (rests) associated with *ru'ach* (spirit) only occurs twice in the Old Testament: Numbers 11:29 and 2 Kings 2:15 (Kessler 2015:7). Fifth, Elisha's question at the Jordan 'where is the Lord God of Elijah?' (v. 14) suggests that he is humanly incapable of doing what is required and anticipates the interplay of God and 'spirit' in performing the miracle of dividing the Jordan. Thus, Elisha's use of the mantle in dividing the Jordan attests to the nature of *רוח* 'spirit' being the Spirit of God.

Having determined that Elisha was imparted with the Spirit of God, attention can now be given to the method through which the 'spirit' was communicated to him. Several options can be considered about when and how the 'spirit' of Elijah came to rest on Elisha. The emphasis placed upon the statement *וַתֵּלֶךְ הָאֵלֹהִים וַתֵּלֶךְ עִישָׁא* would seem to imply that the 'spirit' is given as Elisha witnessed the departure of Elijah (Gray 1963:425-426; Hobbs 1985:17). Jones (1984:385) and Wiseman (1993:195) accept this view and claim that the request for the 'double portion of spirit' is met as Elisha successfully demonstrates that he possesses the ability of a visionary able to penetrate into the heavenly world and see Elijah departing. Yet, another consideration is that the transfer of 'spirit' occurred when Elisha picked up the mantle. The statements, 'and he [Elisha] took hold of his own clothes and tore them into two pieces' and 'He also took the mantle of Elijah that had fallen from him', suggest the possibility that the 'spirit' was transferred at that moment (vv. 12-13). Long (1991:28) sees the taking of the mantle as a moment of integration, meaning Elisha taking up the trappings of power--the mantle and makes that power his own (cf. Nelson 1987:163). However, the most favourable conclusion would seem to be that Elisha's impartation came at the moment he witnessed Elijah's departure and that the mantle became a

token of his commission and an instrument of power confirming that Elisha had been imparted with God's Spirit (Britt 2002:46; Kessler 2015:12).

In sum, the transfer of 'spirit' from Moses to the seventy elders and Joshua as well as the additional transfer of the double portion from Elijah to Elisha seem to represent impartations that can occur in the act of ordination or commission to leadership. Several distinct features regarding the impartations given to the elders, Joshua and Elisha are similar to examples given in the New Testament (Acts 6:1-7; 13:1-3, 1 Tim 4:14) and at the ordination and commissioning of leaders in the Church of God. For example, (1) ordination or commission to service is conferred upon persons of faith who are filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts 6:3; 2 Tim 1:5; Minutes 2018:99-103); (2) the impartation of 'spirit' with or without the laying on of hands is not that of the human 'spirit' but anointings or gifts from God which are conveyed sovereignly by the Holy Spirit; (3) impartations may be accompanied by spiritual manifestations such as prophecy or miracles; and (4) anointings and gifts imparted during ordination or commission to service are not given to displace leaders, but rather to support them in ongoing ministry.

3. The Impartation of Blessing

The root word בָּרַךְ appears numerous times in the Old Testament and most often occurs as 'bless', 'blessed' or 'blessing'.²⁰⁵ The terminology is used first in Genesis 1:22 where God looks at the living creatures He has created, blesses them and says, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let the birds multiply on the earth".²⁰⁶ God offers

²⁰⁵ Genesis 1:22-28, 22:17, 26:3, 24; 12:2-3, 27:17-40, 48:1-16, 49:1-33; Leviticus 9:22-23, 25:21; Numbers 6:22-27, 23:11-20, 24:9-10; Deuteronomy 12:7; 14:24; 28:3-6, 33:1-24; Joshua 14:13, 22:6-7; Judges 5:24; Ruth 2:19; 1 Samuel 2:20, 2 Samuel 6:18, 7:29; 1 Kings 8:14-55, 2 Kings 5:15; 1 Chronicles 16:2; 2 Chronicles 6:3; Ezra 7:27; Nehemiah 11:2, 13:2; Job 42:12; Psalms 3:8, 32:1-2, 129:8, 133:3; Proverbs 10:22, 24:25; Ecclesiastes 10:17; Song of Solomon 6:9; Isaiah 44:3; Jeremiah 17:7; Ezekiel 34:26; Daniel 2:19-20, 12:12; Zechariah 11:5, 8:13; Malachi 3:10.

²⁰⁶ Calvin (2019:49) states that God by His blessing 'infuses into them [the living creatures] fecundity by his word...the force of the word which was addressed to the fishes was not transient, but rather, being infused into their nature, has taken root, and constantly bears fruit'.

a similar blessing to the man and woman in Genesis 1:28 with the additional responsibility of subduing the earth and exercising dominion over every living creature that has been created. Thereafter, the concept of blessing through words, the uplifted hand, or the laying on of hands is seen as a common practice in Scripture. Because of the commonality and frequent appearance of the concept of blessing in Scripture, it will be necessary to delimit the passages to those that are most often used in support of the doctrine of impartation.²⁰⁷

3.1 The blessing of Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3

¹ Now the LORD had said to Abram: "Get out of your country, From your family And from your father's house, To a land that I will show you. ² I will make you a great nation; I will bless you And make your name great; And you shall be a blessing. ³ I will bless those who bless you, And I will curse him who curses you; And in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed."

The contextual setting of Genesis 12:1-3 indicates that Abraham was commissioned by God to leave his family and his father's house in exchange for a country which he knows nothing of. As a reward for Abraham's obedience, God says 'I will make you a great nation; I will bless you and make your name great; and you shall be a blessing'. This pronouncement of אברך 'blessing' comes in verbal form, and institutes an irrevocable, unchanging program of divine favour upon Abram (Constable 2019a:188). His progeny will form a great nation; he will be a person of great influence, and he will bless others.²⁰⁸ However, Potter (2015:116) points out that the two imperative commands, 'Get out of your country' and 'you shall be a blessing', are connected by a *waw* copulative and relate to three additional promises: (1) 'I will bless those who bless you [i.e., Abram]; (2) 'I will curse him who curses you'; and (3) 'in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed' (v. 3). Hamilton (1990:373)

²⁰⁷ The root ברכ is used over four hundred and ninety times in Scripture. More than seventy of those occurrences are in the book of Genesis alone (Potter 2014:3).

²⁰⁸ The Hebrew text reads 'be a blessing' rather than 'you shall be a blessing' (v. 2). It augments into a command more so than a prediction (Calvin 2019:259; Constable 2019a:189; Tov 1989:85).

claims that 'this construction means that the first imperative *go* is related as effect to cause to this second imperative *be*. Abram cannot be a blessing if he stays in Haran. But if he leaves, then a blessing he will be'. Thus, Abram will be both a recipient and transmitter of blessing. However, included in the list of promises in verse 3 is a chiasmus which is often used in Hebrew for two sides of a single action (Wenham 1987:266). God says He will 'bless' but also 'curse' if necessary those who treat Abram accordingly. By this admission from God one is left with the impression that Abram held the same power to bless or curse. Also of importance is the use of the root בָּרַךְ in Genesis 12:3b. The verb is found in the niph'al verb stem וַיְבָרְכוּ but its translation has been the subject of debate. Certain scholars argue that the verb should be translated as reflexive while others contend it should be passive.²⁰⁹ If reflexive then the blessing is given by calling upon the name or greatness of Abram. If passive, then as Potter (2015:119) claims, God selectively bestows the blessing, for blessings are not hereditarily conveyed, nor are they bestowed by anyone other than God (YHWH). God's offer of blessing is then, according to Calvin (2019:341) and Wenham (1987:275), equivalent to protection and success, and will be the effect upon Abram and then others, more in the way of miracle than by natural means.²¹⁰

3.2 Melchizedek and blessing in Genesis 14:18-20

¹⁸Then Melchizedek king of Salem brought out bread and wine; he was the priest of God Most High. ¹⁹ And he blessed him and said: "Blessed be Abram of God Most High, Possessor of heaven and earth; ²⁰And blessed be God Most High, Who has delivered your enemies into your hand." And he gave him a tithe of all.

Generally, this passage has been cited by those wishing to garner support for paying tithes in the church. However, the context reveals a

²⁰⁹ Muilenburg (1965:392), Sarna (1989:89) Speiser (1964:86) and Westermann (1985:152) prefer the reflexive, Hamilton (1990:375) and Wenham (1987:276) the passive.

²¹⁰ Similar blessings are spoken to Abraham in Genesis 17:20, 22:17 to Isaac in Genesis 26:1-4, 24 and to Moses in Exodus 20:24.

vocal blessing given to Abram by Melchizedek. Although he is the 'king of Salem', Melchizedek is also named as 'the priest of God Most High'.²¹¹ It is within his purview as priest that he offers his blessing upon Abram.

A few brief observations can be made about the blessing given to Abram and impartation. First, the blessing is imparted in the name of 'ēl'elyōn. According to Arnold (2009:148), it is perhaps 'the first fulfilment of the ancestral promises of [Genesis] 12:3'. Second, Melchizedek's blessing and concomitant announcement of God's name is thought to mediate to Abram God's potency, power, and protection given that the verb בָּרַךְ fundamentally means 'to endow with power' (Waltke 2001:234; Westermann 1985:205; cf. Gen 15:1). Third, Melchizedek's blessing with the words 'God Most High Possessor of heaven and earth' implies that God is the imparter of all that Abram is to be blessed with. Fourth, while Abram refuses to accept the goods taken from war, he is completely at ease with receiving the blessing from Melchizedek, which indicates that he viewed blessing in this way to be an acceptable practice (Arnold 2009:148). Given these observations, it is reasonable to conclude that Genesis 14:18-20 is an indication that blessing someone was a general accepted means to impart to others.

3.3 Priestly blessing in Leviticus 9:22 and Numbers 6:22-27

Then Aaron lifted his hand toward the people, blessed them, and came down from offering the sin offering, the burnt offering, and peace offering.

And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: "Speak to Aaron and his sons, saying "This is the way you shall bless the children of Israel. Say to them: "The Lord bless you and keep you; The Lord make his face shine upon you, And be gracious to you; The Lord lift up His countenance upon you, And give you peace." "So they shall put My name on the children of Israel, and I will bless them."

²¹¹ Although this is the first mention of priests in the Bible, Waltke (2001:233) states; 'The Hebrew has no definite article ("a priest" rather than "the priest"), suggesting the existence of other priests of God'.

The priestly blessings in this pericope are comparable to that of the blessing given by Melchizedek to Abram. However, their contextual setting differs greatly. Melchizedek's blessing was to Abram alone and subsequent to war. The blessings of Aaron were given in the context of sacrificial offerings and subsequent to worship. Although the blessings are somewhat similar in purpose and wording, the reference in Leviticus adds the lifting of the hand towards the people as the blessing is given. According to the Mishnah, this blessing (Num 6:24-26) occurred daily in Jerusalem, albeit with one slight difference: the proper name for Jehovah (Yahweh) was used in place of the altered form 'Adonai'.

The blessing is also divided into three sections and appeals to God for promises and protection (v. 24; cf. Deut 28:2-4), His favourable disposition (v. 25; cf. Ps 31:16, 80:3; Dan 9:17), His manifesting power (v. 26; cf. Exod 34:29-35), and His favourable regard and peace (Isa 26:3; Doty 1973:83-84; Wenham 1981:89). That the blessing was not given randomly but rather offered by the priest at the conclusion of the sacrificial offering is indicated in the phrase 'Then Aaron lifted his hand toward the people' (Lev 9:22). After Aaron had concluded his sacrificial duty, the blessing was pronounced with the stretched forth hand.²¹² Traditionally, the arms were raised above the head and extended toward the people while the hands and fingers of the priest formed a triple division signifying that the blessing was from the triune God (DeWelt 1975:157-158).²¹³ Also, while the act of blessing was commonly thought to be the prerogative of the priest, post-exilic laws changed allowing other persons such as king David to bless the people in the name of Yahweh as well (2 Sam 6:18-20; Gray 1965:72).

²¹² Arnold (1987:50) states that 'the high priestly blessing was pronounced whenever the nation of Israel gathered for collective worship and sacrifice as well as when the individual Israelite brought sacrifices to the Lord. The nature of the blessing was that of an oracle, a sure word from God that He had accepted the sacrifice and was pleased with the worshipper' (cf. Fishbane 1983:115-121).

²¹³ DeWelt (1975:158) states that the hands were joined by clasping the thumbs and the two forefingers, separating the other fingers to form a triple division, thus to represent the triune God. That leaders believed in the effective power of blessings is attested to in Numbers 22-24.

3.4 The family blessing in Genesis 27:21-41, 48:1-20 and 49:1-27

Three additional examples reminiscent of impartation through blessing are found in Genesis 27:21-41, 48:1-20 and 49:1-27. Although similar to the vocal blessings given to Abram by God and Melchizedek (Gen 12:1-3, 14:18-20), the blessings to be studied next differ contextually in as much as they involve vocal blessings being given to family members together with the laying on of hands.

First is the example of Isaac's blessing of Jacob and Esau. Only a cursory reading of Genesis 27:21-41 is needed to reveal the deception that led to Isaac blessing his sons and the subsequent tension that developed in the family. And while all the sordid details of the story are important, the greater need is to address the blessing that was given to Jacob and Esau as recorded in Genesis 27:28-29, 39-40:

Therefore may God give you of the dew of heaven, of the fatness of the earth and plenty of grain and wine. Let the peoples serve you, and nations bow down to you. Be master over your brethren, and let your mother's sons bow down to you. Cursed be everyone who curses you and blessed be those who bless you...Behold, your dwelling shall be of the fatness of the earth, and the dew of heaven from above. By your sword you shall live, and you shall serve your brother; and it shall come to pass, when you become restless, that you shall break his yoke from your neck.

In Jacob's blessing are several promises: (1) the blessing of material prosperity (v. 28), (2) political supremacy (v. 29a), and (3) retribution of blessings or curses upon others (v. 29b). However, the blessing given to Esau is somewhat different: he will live by his sword and under the dominion of his brother Jacob.

The second example of blessing is found in Genesis 48:1-20. In this pericope Jacob blesses Manasseh and Ephraim, the sons of Joseph. In the eyes of Joseph, the ceremony has a positive beginning but a negative ending. Joseph carefully positions his sons before their grandfather Jacob in order that Manasseh, the firstborn, will receive the greater blessing.

However, to the displeasure of Joseph, his father crosses his hands placing his right hand on Ephraim's head, thus bestowing upon the younger the blessing of the firstborn (vv. 14-17).²¹⁴ Joseph, while observing this seeming mistake, attempts to correct his father (v. 18), but Jacob dismissing his protestation continues with his blessing (v. 19). He declares that both grandsons will be great in name and influence, but his blessing elevates Ephraim above Manasseh just as Isaac had elevated Jacob above Esau (v.19).

The third example is shown in Genesis 49:1-28. Jacob realizing that he is near death, summons his twelve sons to gather around him that he might pronounce a blessing over them. Arnold (2009:380) and Sarna (1989:331) claim that Jacob offered to his sons a predictive final testament and that his words carry effective power much like that of a prophet as he made known what they can expect in the future.²¹⁵ Notably is Jacob's blessing of Reuben in that he repeats what he did with Ephraim and Manasseh: he transfers the greater blessing intended for the firstborn to Joseph (Gen 48:21-22, 49:22-26; Arnold 2009:382-383; Waltke 2001:605).

Several thoughts emerge from the three examples as it relates to the practice of blessing. First, with every blessing given there is mention or overtones of God's involvement (Gen 27:7, 48:15-16, 49:25). More specifically, Isaac's blessing to Jacob and Esau is given 'in the presence of the Lord' (Gen 27:7). Waltke (2001:378) claims that this statement is added by Rebekah 'in order to impress upon Jacob the significance of this critical moment in the family's history'. In other words, the vocalized blessing was given by divine inspiration and 'with the Lord's approval'

²¹⁴ The ancestral covenant promise placed the firstborn as first in line for the greater blessing. Arnold (2009:376) points out that Jacob 'knows well that the "right of firstborn" (*békōrâ*) is transferable (25:31-34), and he crosses hands to indicate Ephraim's dominance over his brother.'

²¹⁵ Arnold (2009:380) remarks that these blessings were considered as illocutionary or performative utterances, meaning that the pronouncement of words in itself accomplished the act of blessing. See also Mitchell (1987:79-88).

(Davidson 1979:139; cf. Morris 1976:438). Therefore, blessing was both a patriarchal and sovereign act (Westermann 1985:437-438).

Second, the strategy used by Rebekah (Gen 27:6-25) and Joseph (Gen 48:12-20) to assure that their chosen sons receive the greater blessing testifies to the significance of this patriarchal act. Arnold (2009:380) and Westermann (1985:435) insist that the parental interference was for good reason. The patriarchal family viewed spoken blessings to be more than simple wishes or prayers; they were legally binding wills that, once given, were not to be taken back.²¹⁶

Third, blessings are transferred to the blessed. Davidson (1979:138) explains: 'The giving of the blessing marks the transferring from the father to the son of all the vitality, the material prosperity, the family aspirations and the spiritual hopes which have marked the father's life'.

Fourth, the laying on of hands on, for example, Manasseh and Ephraim, was viewed as being a practice from the time of antiquity (Robinson 2008:50). It was believed by the family to be a custom that transferred something real and tangible to the person being blessed and that the hand was a symbol of power (Kanamori 1986:48; Tipei 2009:19).²¹⁷ However, in contrast to Harrelson (1962:446) and Pedersen (1926:201-203) who believe that magical beliefs were involved in the blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh, the laying on of hands with spoken words should not be considered as magical, but in Jacob's blessing as a means to impart something real and tangible from one person to another (Robinson 2008:50-51; Tipei 2009:19).²¹⁸

²¹⁶ Davidson (1979:141) remarks that if the blessing given to Jacob had been a mere matter of words, Isaac because of the deceit of Rebekah and Jacob would have presumably cancelled it. However, once delivered 'it had set in train consequences which could not be revoked'. Waltke (2001:378) adds a second element. 'The blessing had sanction because the Lord, using the legal social customs of those times, mediated it through the faith of the patriarch'.

²¹⁷ Robinson (2008:50) notes that the use of the word *šim* for touch used in Genesis 48:14-17 as opposed to the usual ritual term for handlaying *sāmak*, demonstrates the antiquity of the practice and perhaps originating prior to sacrificial handlaying.

²¹⁸ Tipei (2009:19) contends that there is nothing in Jacob's words that indicate magical beliefs, rather his words are that of a prayer. In contrast, Pederson (1926:200) relates blessing as a 'self-fulfilling power'. An oral blessing is created by the power of the soul

3.5 Blessing children (Matt 19:13-15; Mark 10:13-16; Luke 18:15-17)

Three passages in the Synoptic Gospels provide examples of Jesus blessing children. While each Synoptic author gives a slightly different account of the blessing, the pericope by Mark is chosen for our study.²¹⁹

Then they brought little children to Him, that He might touch them; but the disciples rebuked those who brought *them*. But when Jesus saw *it*, He was greatly displeased and said to them, “Let the little children come to Me, and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of God. Assuredly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a little child will by no means enter it.” And He took them up in His arms, laid *His* hands on them, and blessed them (Mark 10:13-16).

Mark shares that little children were being brought to Jesus so that He might touch them. The tense of the verb Προσέφερον (brought) is imperfect, meaning ‘they kept on bringing’ the children (Wuest 1973, 1:199). However, Jesus does more than touching the children. He ‘ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ’ αὐτά’ (blessed them). Luke shares the same story but opts to use ‘καὶ τὰ βρέφη’ (infants) instead of ‘children’ and chooses not to include the act of Jesus laying hands on or blessing the children (vv.15-17).²²⁰ Matthew rewords ‘that he might touch them’ to read ‘ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῆ αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεύξηται’ (that he might put his hands on them and pray).

Although each synoptic writer words his account of Jesus blessing the children somewhat differently, neither clarifies the reason why the children were brought to Jesus and to be touched by Him. To Tipei (2009:175), Mark and Luke focus on the form of the act of rather than on the purpose

of the one who pronounces it. However, Scripture neither states nor implies that the effect of blessings is the creation of the soul.

²¹⁹ Robbins (1983:43-74) and Tipei (2009:158-162) give an in-depth analysis of how each synoptic author conveys the account of Jesus blessing the children.

²²⁰ It is unclear why Luke chooses to replace ‘children’ with ‘infants’ or why he chooses not to include the act of touching, laying on of hands or blessing in his pericope. Mark’s use of Παιδία can mean children from infancy to twelve years of age while Luke’s use of τὰ βρέφη can apply to children too young to walk (Robinson 2008:144; Tipei 2009:174).

for the blessing, while Matthew is more specific, indicating that the purpose was to allow Jesus to lay hands on the children and pray for them. Yet, Matthew still does not clarify the reason for the blessing. One may assume, as Sauer (1981:27-50) does, that the purpose was for healing.²²¹ However, there is no indication in the synoptic texts that the children were sick and required healing. The assumption that they were brought to Jesus to be baptized by him also cannot be supported by information from the texts (Robertson 1930:350). Hence, if the scriptural accounts are taken in context, the most logical reason for bringing the children to Jesus is that He might lay hands upon them and impart a blessing—regardless what that may have entailed.

According to Mark, the blessing was mediated by Jesus through spoken words and the laying on of His hands (v. 16). The verb *κατευλόγει* is an iterative imperfect and describes the repeated action of Jesus blessing the children (Robinson 2008:145). Gundry (1993:682) interprets the verb *ευλόγω* with the preposition *κατ* to mean that the blessing flowed through the hands of Jesus to the children. In contrast, Bruner (1987:698) and Wuest (1973, 1:200) opt for the more emphatic *κατευλόγει* meaning that Jesus blesses the children ‘fervently’ or ‘with passion’. Lenski (1964:429) differs from Gundry and states that ‘the blessing did not flow through the hands but came through the words of Jesus’. However, given the fact that all of the synoptic writers include the act of blessing, touch, or the laying on of hands, it is reasonable to conclude that the transfer of the blessing cannot be restricted to pronounced words alone and/or physical touch of the hands. Thus, both the laying on of hands by Jesus and His words served as the means to impart blessings upon the children.²²²

²²¹ Sauer (1981:27-50) implies that Mark 10:13-16 was traditionally written about sick children being brought to Jesus for healing but was rewritten with emphasis being placed upon receiving the kingdom of God like a little child. In contrast is Robinson (2008:144) and Tipei (2009:175).

²²² France (1985:284) and Tipei (2009:177) contend that the laying on of hands in blessing is symbolic and a means of identifying the person who is to be blessed. However, more probable is the opposing view of Robinson (2008:146) who argues that if handlaying were for identification the synoptic writers would have indicated such in giving their account of the blessing.

3.6 The impartation of blessing in Luke 24:50-51

And He led them out as far as Bethany, and He lifted up His hands and blessed them. Now it came to pass, while He blessed them, that He was parted from them and carried up into heaven.

Although the example of blessing with the use of the hands is not an unfamiliar practice in Scripture, the act of raising the hands is found only once in the New Testament and parallels the blessing of Aaron in Leviticus 9:22. The act of the raising of the hands was viewed to be a way in which the person doing the blessing could bless a group of listeners all at once (Robinson 2008:150; Smith 1913:47-62). In comparison to the Aaronic blessing (Lev 9:22), Jesus' blessing with raised hands is understood as a reminder of the atonement and the everlasting covenant given to Israel by God. For as Kacic (2005:252) perceptively concludes, 'Jesus departs and blesses his disciples at the same time; he had made the perfect and final sacrifice, securing the forgiveness of sins for his people (Heb 7:26-27; 10:12)'. However, a major difference exists between the two blessings. In Leviticus the people responded by falling on their faces (Lev 9:22-24) while in Luke the recipients respond with 'great joy' and praise (vv. 52-53).²²³

Furthermore, it is of interest that Jesus in priestly form chooses to bless His disciples after He promises to send the Holy Spirit upon them and concomitant with His ascension into heaven (Luke 24:49,51). Tipei (2009:178-179) claims that Luke's intent is to place the blessing in a missionary context. For the disciples the blessing serves as a ceremonious bridge between the promise of the impartation of the Spirit and their being μάρτυρες (witnesses) for the Spirit.²²⁴ Thus, the act of

²²³ Kacic (2005:247-260) gives an in-depth comparison of the Aaronic blessing and that of the priestly blessing of Christ. Westermann (1968:87) while conceding that Luke's wording could be influenced by a priestly model differs with Kacic and argues against Luke 24:50 being a priestly blessing. The blessing of Jesus with the raising of the hands is simply a gesture of departure.

²²⁴ Robinson (2008:151) and Tipei (2009:179) understand Jesus' raising of the hands and blessing to connote a transference of vitality from Jesus to his followers. However, both believe the blessing was only a prelude to the power of the Holy Spirit that they would be given for their mission.

blessing with the raising of the hands seemingly serve as a commissioning of the disciples similar to that of Barnabas and Saul who immediately after having hands laid upon them were sent away on their mission (Acts 13:2-3).

Kapic (2005:254) views the sequential blessing of Christ as being inseparable from the impartation of the Spirit, while Torrance (1998:118) makes an even stronger claim, stating that 'Pentecost is the content and actualization of that high priestly blessing'. However, while the blessing and the sending of the Holy Spirit are inseparably connected sequentially, it cannot be assumed that the words of blessing pertained to the conferral of the Holy Spirit. Although Luke chooses to include the act of Jesus raising His hands and blessing the disciples, he does not choose to include the words spoken during the blessing. And while it is plausible that the blessing given by Jesus had both covenantal and missional meaning and alluded to the coming of the Holy Spirit, Luke leaves the content in question. Thus, Calvin (1996:246-247) may have given us the most appropriate conclusion: the blessing given by Christ was and is 'an efficacious testimony of God's grace'.

3.7 Blessing in Matthew 5:44, James 3:8-10 and 1 Peter 3:9

Matthew 5:44, James 3:8-10 and 1 Peter 3:9 might be viewed as more contemporaneously suited for believers. These passages address the importance of believers practicing the impartation of blessings and are taken from a contextual platform that identifies the importance of Christian maturity and care for others. They will be addressed in tandem due their thematic similarities.

Matthew 5:44 But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you.

1 Peter 3:9 not returning evil for evil or reviling for reviling, but on the contrary blessing, knowing that you were called to this, that you may inherit a blessing.

James 3:8-10 But no man can tame the tongue. *It is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison. With it we bless our God and Father, and with it we curse men, who have been made in the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceed blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not to be so.*

The words 'εὐλογεῖτε' (bless) and 'εὐλογία' (blessing) mean 'to speak well of' or 'to speak a benediction upon' another (Stibbs 1981:130).²²⁵ Matthew, James and Peter speak of using words that contrast with those spoken through the mouths of uncontrolled and unloving people. James points out that the antitheses of blessing are 'poisonous words' intended to destroy the well-being of others (3:9-10). When viewed in comparison to Genesis 12:1-3, the concept of blessing and cursing is more than positive or negative language. Words spoken are either beneficent or maleficent in nature and are recompensed by God according to the intent of the speaker. Thus, Matthew, James and Peter are addressing at least two points. First, use of impartational language for the good wishes for others remains apropos for the present. Second, uttering impartational blessings is not contingent upon the goodness of others but arise out of a desire to exemplify the goodness of God (Matt 5:44-48). For it is morally incongruous to do otherwise and for blessing and cursing to come out of the same mouth (Jas 3:9-10).

In sum, the scriptural passages that have been discussed indicate that imparting a blessing to another serves a specific purpose. Scripture confirms that blessings can be spoken over individuals, families, and congregants generally but also to specific individuals. And while the record shows that God blessed persons and often used His followers to do likewise, there is no evidence that suggest that leaders have the ability within themselves to generate and speak blessings as they see fit. Rather, it is apparent that while leaders may speak blessings of favour and good

²²⁵ Metzger (1971:11-12) argues that the clause on blessing in Matthew 5:44 is not original but was added later from the parallel account in Luke 6:27-28. He states, 'the divergence of readings among the added clauses likewise speaks against their originality'. However, the clause in Matthew finds similarity with the language in James 3:8-10 which supports the concept of blessing.

will over others, the sovereign God controls the spiritual benefits that are said to be received by the beneficiary.

4. Impartation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit

Although the doctrine of the infilling of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer is embraced by most believers, none are more tenacious in its promotion than pentecostals and more specifically the Church of God. It is for that reason that attention will next be paid to the impartation of the Holy Spirit.

4.1 Impartation of the Holy Spirit in Joel 2:28-29

And it shall come to pass afterward That I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh; Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, Your old men shall dream dreams, Your young men shall see visions. And also on My menservants and on My maidservants I will pour out My Spirit in those days.

Among the multiple references to the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament none is more notable than Joel 2:28-29.²²⁶ The prophet's prophecy is placed contextually between a call for national repentance and a warning of impending judgement of the nations. If one uses the redemptive-historical approach to biblical theology, then Joel 2:28-29 may be seen as foundational to the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the validity of pentecostal pneumatology (Oss 1996:243-244; Richie 2020:11). Thus, God's plan to impart His Spirit to His people is revealed to Joel and accepted as fulfilled in Acts 2:1ff.²²⁷

Joel's prophecy reveals insight into the conditions on which the Holy Spirit is to be imparted to believers. First, the prophet connects the impartation

²²⁶ Several passages allude to the coming and impartation of the Spirit (Isa 32:15, 44:3; Ezek 39:29). Also, individuals are anointed with the Spirit to prophesy (Num 11:24-27, 1 Sam 10:6, 19:20, 1 Chron 12:18), to perform miraculous feats (Judg 14:6, 19, 1 Kgs 18:12) and to exercise spiritual power in leadership (Judg 3:10, 6:34, 11:29, 1 Sam 16:13; Oss 1996:243-244).

²²⁷ Several pivotal questions have been debated concerning the Joel 2:28-32 text. Mainly; (1) how wide is the text's application; (2) how should one interpret its apocalyptic imagery; and (3) was the text fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. See Ice (1994:41), Kaiser (1983:119), Stott (1990:73) and Treier (1997:13-26) for the various positions that have emerged in response to these questions.

of the Holy Spirit with repentance. His statement 'And it shall come to pass afterward' is understood as being a *quid pro quo* to his message on repentance in Joel 2:12-17. Peter's rehearsal of Joel's prophecy and admonition to repent in Acts 2:22-38 is also an indication that the Spirit's impartation depends on repentance. Second, Joel's promise that the Spirit would be poured out upon 'all flesh', indicates that the Spirit's empowerment and charismatic activity will not be restricted to select individuals but will extend to all of God's people (Marshall 1986:81-82; Oss 1996:248-249).²²⁸ Third, Peter's rehearsal of Joel's prophecy that 'this [filling of the Holy Spirit] is what was spoken by the prophet Joel' (Acts 2:16) and 'the promise is to you and to your children, and to all who are afar off, as many as the Lord our God will call (v. 39), indicates that Joel expected believers to be continually imparted with the Holy Spirit until the end of the 'last days' (Menzies and Horton 1993:125-126).²²⁹ Fourth, Joel states that varied manifestations will follow those imparted with the Holy Spirit: prophesy, dreams and visions. Fifth, the cosmic signs that are to follow, according to Treier (1997:21), allude to apocalyptic imagery that will be displayed at the coming of the eschaton. However, Joel does not reveal the particular means by which or evidence of the impartation other than that the Spirit will be 'poured out' (Joel 2:28). There is no mention of the laying on of hands or speaking in tongues as is documented in the book of Acts (Acts 2:1-4; 10:44-46; 19:1-6). However, Marshall (1986:73) sees the mention of prophesy in Acts as 'the nearest equivalent to tongues in Old Testament phraseology'. If so, then the same equivalency in lieu of tongues is manifested when the elders were imparted with spiritual gifts in Numbers 11:16-17, 24-25.

²²⁸ Bruce (1981:78) and Kaiser (1983:119) as well claim the promise is for all people. In contrast, and restricting the promise to Judah or Israel are Finley (1990:71) and Hubbard (1989:68).

²²⁹ Peter in Acts 2:17 uses the *pēšer* form of interpretation and alters Joel's account by using 'in the last days' instead of 'afterward'. This was a common interpretative method that was used to add eschatological emphasis (Treier 1997:18). Arrington (2008:79), Bickle (2009:101) and Bruce (1981:68) regard 'last days' as the period between Christ's first advent and His second coming.

4.2 Impartation of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament

A common theme throughout the book of Acts is the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. On two of those occasions the Holy Spirit is given directly through sovereign initiation of God (Acts 2:1-4, 10:44-48). There are, however, three instances where the baptism in the Holy Spirit is imparted through intermediary human action in the form of the laying on of hands (Acts 8:17, 9:17, 19:6). We will next first consider the occasions in which the Holy Spirit was imparted sovereignly to believers without intermediary human action.

4.2.1 Impartation of the Holy Spirit upon the Jews in Acts 2:1-4

When the Day of Pentecost had fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. Then there appeared to them divided tongues, as of fire, and *one* sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

The coming of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2 marked the fulfillment of the promise made by Jesus to His followers in Luke 24:49. “Behold, I send the Promise of My Father upon you; but tarry in the city of Jerusalem” until you are endued with power from on high.” Those gathered together in an ‘upper room’ in Jerusalem waited patiently in ‘prayer and supplication’ while not fully aware of how the Holy Spirit would make His entrance into their lives (Acts 1:12-14). Yet, their eagerness and obedience was sovereignly rewarded ‘When the Day of Pentecost had fully come’ (Acts 2:1). Since each one of the disciples found himself/herself imparted with the Holy Spirit, a brief textual analysis will provide the significance of this momentous impartational event.

The Holy Spirit was imparted on the ‘Day of Pentecost’ which was a harvest festival among the Jews called the ‘Feast of Weeks’ (Exod 34:22; Num 28:26; 2 Chron 8:13). ‘Pentecost’ was regarded as the anniversary of the occasion when the Law was given to Moses at Sinai and was

celebrated on the fiftieth day after the waving of the first fruits of the harvest and their presentation to God (Bruce 1981:53; Horton 2001:53). Luke also notes that the impartation at 'Pentecost' was preceded by some ten days of waiting by those who had gathered to receive the Holy Spirit. However, although the Holy Spirit was initially imparted to believers on the 'Day of Pentecost' and after a period of tarrying, Luke does not state or imply that the same criteria is to be applied to believers today.²³⁰ Rather, Peter establishes the criteria for those wishing to receive the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:37-39) subsequent to the 'day of Pentecost' as follows: 'Repent and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission on sins; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' (Acts 2:38). Receiving involves repentance, faith and baptism in water.²³¹ Furthermore, the promise of the Holy Spirit was given not only to those listening to Peter, but also to their children, to those living elsewhere and 'as many as the Lord our God will call' (Acts 2:39).²³²

There are thus three distinct elements not in Peter's speech as opposed to that of Jesus in Luke 24:46-49 and the coming of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:1-4. Peter does not mention Jerusalem, Pentecost, or tarrying, meaning the promise of Jesus does not restrict the receiving of the Spirit to a certain location, a particular day, or particular time. Rather, whenever and wherever a person responds to God's προσκαλέσεται (call), he or she can be imparted with the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Luke also informs his readers that the impartation of the Holy Spirit was accompanied with visual and audible manifestations which included the

²³⁰ Horton (2001:53) points out that some relying upon Luke 24:49 have tried to insist that there must be an extended time of 'tarrying' for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. However, there is no evidence in Acts that stipulates any necessary time gap between regeneration and the impartation of the Holy Spirit. Oss (1996:255) as well rightly concludes that for most pentecostals the emphasis has been on 'theological separability not temporal subsequence'. See also Richie (2020:172).

²³¹ Baptism is not to be taken as necessary to procure forgiveness of sins. Rather, εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is translated 'because of the forgiveness of your sins' (Horton 2001:79). Baptism is a visible token of repentance which is made clear in 1 Peter 3:21 (Bock 2007:142; Bruce 1981:77)

²³² Bruce (1981:78) states that believing is not explicitly mentioned in verse 38, but is certainly implied and later confirmed in Acts 2:44. Conzelmann (1987:22) adds also that the expression καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν is not to be taken literally nor is it to determine age or to promote infant baptism.

sound of 'a rushing mighty wind' and 'tongues as of fire' (Acts 2:2-3). Each person gathered in the 'upper room' has heard and seen that. Horton (2001:54) compares the βιαίας πνοῆς to a violent tornado, and Shepherd (1994:160) states that it highlights the 'divine, not human, control of the Spirit's action'. But, there were also διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός that sat individually upon each person present.²³³ These audible 'tongues' (utterances) served as a sign of the Holy Spirit's impartation: 'They were but the physical and visible revelations of spiritual and invisible realities' (Brumback 1947:18).

The foregoing discussion can be summarized with three points relevant to any impartational theology. First, the impartation of the Holy Spirit is available to everyone (Acts 2:36-39). Second, the impartation of the Spirit is not subject to geographic, celebratory, or temporal stipulations. Third, while Luke mentions signs such as the sound of a 'mighty wind' and 'tongues as of fire', he neither states nor implies that those manifestations will be repeated in the future for believers who receive the impartation of the Spirit.

4.2.2 Impartation of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles in Acts 10:44-47

While Peter was still speaking these words, the Holy Spirit fell upon all those who heard the word. And those of the circumcision who believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out on the Gentiles also. For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. Then Peter answered, "Can anyone forbid water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit just as we *have*?"

A second New Testament example where God sovereignly imparts the baptism in the Holy Spirit without human intermediary action is in Acts 10:44-47. Although there are contextual similarities between Cornelius's

²³³ Horton (2001:54) compares the 'tongues as of fire' to a ball or mass of flames that appeared over the group, then breaking up 'a single tongue that looked like a flame of fire settled on the head of each one of them, both men and women'. In contrast, Conzelmann (1987:14) states, 'the tongues entered into them (the sense is not that they formed a halo above them)'.

experience and those believers who received the Spirit in Acts 2:1-4, there are also differences. To begin with, Cornelius is not a common citizen but an authoritative leader and soldier. He and his family lived in Caesarea rather than Jerusalem and are not full proselytes or converts to Judaism but of Gentile descent (Bock 2007:386). Yet, in spite of these differences between him and the believers in Jerusalem, there are several similarities between them, such as being worshippers of God (Acts 10:1-2) and 'devout' keepers of the commandments of God. As stated by Marshall (1986:183), 'The allegiance of Cornelius was far from being nominal, as was shown by his giving of alms to the poor and his frequent prayer' (cf. Acts 4:32-37). Cornelius was also fully acquainted with God which is clearly illustrated in his obedience to God and willingness to yield to the angel's instructions to send for Peter.²³⁴

Peter's arrival in Caesarea signified the beginning of a new era. Once the apostle realized the purpose of his mission, he begins to preach about the crucified and risen Christ (Acts 10:34-43). Luke explains that 'While Peter was still speaking these words, the Holy Spirit fell upon all those who heard the word' (v. 44). The impartation of the Spirit to Cornelius and his household signified that Pentecost was available also to the Gentiles (Acts 11:1-18). Several points of interest emerge from this pericope that have impartational significance.

First, in contrast to the believers on the Day of Pentecost whose impartation of the Holy Spirit was preceded by continual prayer and supplication (Acts 1:14), Cornelius and his household receive the Spirit while listening to Peter's message (Acts 10:44). This indicates that there is not a specific form of worship required to receive the impartation of the Spirit. Second, the impartation to the Gentiles does not follow Peter's

²³⁴ Arrington (2008:187) raises the possibility that Cornelius was already a believer in Christ (cf. Acts 10:37; Horton 2001:196-207). However, this view is not substantiated clearly by Luke or sustainable given Peter's words in Acts 15:7 (Kuecker 2008:192). Bruce (1981:229) points out that on the 'Day of Pentecost' the hearers in Jerusalem were exhorted to repent and be baptized in order to receive the gift of the Spirit, whereas Cornelius and his family experienced the Holy Spirit descending upon them suddenly as with the original company of disciples at Jerusalem. Bruce (1981:230) apparently unsure of Cornelius's status also cites Peter's words in Acts 11:17-18 and 15:7-9 which imply that the Gentiles received the Spirit after they believed.

sequential 'repent, baptism, and remission' motif in Acts 2:38. Therefore, this makes the claim that the impartation of the Spirit is always given subsequent to repentance and baptism in water a very questionable claim (Bruce 1981:230; Kuecker 2008:10-11).²³⁵ Third, the impartation is a divine initiative (Acts 10:44-47). Thus, no Jewish or religious entity holds a monopoly on the experience of Pentecost and no apostolic intermediary action such as the laying on of hands or instruction for receiving the Spirit is always everywhere required (Bock 2007:401; Bruce 1981:230).

4.2.3 Impartation of the Holy Spirit upon the Samaritans in Acts 8:14-17

Now when the apostles who were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them, who, when they had come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. For as yet He had fallen upon none of them. They had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit.

Acts 8:14-17 is the first of three instances where intermediary action of the laying on of hands is involved in the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. In this passage Luke displays the energised advance of the church in reaching the world with the gospel. The disciples have preached in Jerusalem and now they turn their attention towards Samaria. Phillip, one of the duly elected leaders chosen in Acts 6:1-5, preaches Christ to the Samaritans and multitudes experience the forgiveness of sins and were baptised in water. When the apostles in Jerusalem heard about the Samaritan revival, they send Peter and John to them. Upon arriving, the apostles begin to pray for the Samaritans to receive the Holy Spirit (8:15-16). Luke clearly explains what happened next. 'Then they laid hands on

²³⁵ Horton (2001:207) claims that the Gentile's hearts were prepared by the angelic message but they believed and were saved while Peter was preaching which made them eligible for the impartation of the Spirit. Menzies (1994:215-216) argues that the impartation of Spirit baptism given to the Gentiles accompanies conversion and is a 'sign of salvation', but not the means.

them, and they received the Holy Spirit' (v. 17). An analysis of this pericope reveals three important issues related to impartation of the Spirit.

First, Luke's presentation of the Samaritan experience separates impartation of the baptism in the Spirit from that of conversion and baptism in water: 'For as yet He had fallen upon none of them. They had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus' (v. 16). Most pentecostals view conversion and Spirit baptism to be a two-stage initiation (Arrington 2008:158; Menzies and Horton 1993:122; Tipei 2009:194). However, the meaning of Acts 8:16-17 proves difficult for those who claim that this incident is an anomaly and that believers receive Spirit baptism at the point of conversion (Dunn 1970:55-68; Gaffin 1996:30-41; Stott 1990:152-159).²³⁶ In an effort to mitigate the weight of the passage, Stott (1990:154-159) contends that the delayed gift of the Spirit is not to establish experiential normalcy but rather was due to the first occasion of the Spirit's coming to the Samaritans. Williams (1990:156) asserts that the Samaritans had received the infilling of the Holy Spirit at conversion but later given charisms of the Spirit through apostolic laying on of hands. However, William's view is illogical since Luke says nothing about a prior impartation of the Spirit in Acts 8:12-16. Alternatively, Dunn's (1970:63-68) explanation for the delayed gift is that there was an inadequacy in the Samaritan's faith before Peter and John came and preached to them.²³⁷ Dunn's illogic has not found general agreement among scholars because Luke does not imply or substantiate that the Samaritan's initial repentance and baptism was less than adequate or that their faith was somehow defective. Rather, Luke uses unmistakable language to clarify the situation, οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ' οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιτεπωκός, ἠσοῦ which emphasizes the lack of the Spirit's coming (v. 16; Robinson 2008:217).²³⁸ In other words, as translated by

²³⁶ See Tipei (2009:183-203) for the various arguments given for the delay in the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and the Samaritan's conversion and baptism.

²³⁷ Dunn's view has been challenged and found irreconcilable by multiple scholars (Barrett 1994:412; Horton 2001:165; Marshall 1986:157-158; Stott 1990:155; Turner 1996:362-367).

²³⁸ Luke separates Spirit reception from baptism with his comment, 'μόνον δὲ βαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ' (v. 16). Βαπτισμένοι is a pluperfect passive indicating a past completed action with continuing present results

Rogers and Rogers (1998:246), 'The Holy Spirit never was in a state of having fallen upon any of them'. Luke seems adamant to establish the fact that the Spirit was imparted later through the laying on of hands is a separate event from conversion and baptism in water (Turner 1999:7).

Second, of importance is the emphasis Luke places on the Samaritans' receiving of the Spirit through the laying on of hands (Acts 8: 17). In describing the event, (ἐπετίθεισαν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτούς) Luke uses two iterative imperfects to indicate that the action was repeated with each person (Rogers and Rogers 1998:246). Peter and John were laying hands upon the Samaritans and each in turn received the Spirit. Thus, the laying on of hands may be seen as the means for the impartation (Robinson 2008:232). Further confirmation is found in the reaction of Simon to the Holy Spirit being given through the laying on of hands, 'ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Σίμων ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων δίδοται τὸ πνεῦμα προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα' (v.18). The present tense δίδοται represents repetition and διὰ indicates instrumentality, meaning that the laying on of hands was not secondary but the primary means for the impartation of the Spirit (Robinson 2008:233; Williams 1990:100-102).²³⁹ However, Bock (2007:332) and Barrett (1994:412) view the Samaritan experience as a special situation. In their view, the story does not presuppose that receiving the Spirit baptism is contingent upon the laying on of hands or is meant to be paradigmatic. Although, Luke never states or implies that the laying on of hands is necessary for the impartation of the Spirit, his inclusion of Simon's response, 'δοτε κάμοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ᾧ ἐὰν ἐπιθῶ τὰς χεῖρας λαμβάνη πνεῦμα ἅγιον' (v. 19) leaves the impression that the laying on of hands is a means through which the baptism in the Holy Spirit can be imparted.²⁴⁰

(Barrett 1994:412; Robinson 2008:227). 'The perfect is the tense of complete action...It implies a process, but views that process having reached its consummation and existing in a finished state' (Dana and Mantey 1927:200).

²³⁹ Arrington (2008:158) and Horton (2001:167) in contrast contend that faith was the primary cause for the impartation of the Holy Spirit. The apostles were merely agents used by Jesus the baptizer.

²⁴⁰ Luke uses ἐξουσίαν (power) often to convey the right or potential to command or control (Luke 4:6, 32, 5:24, 10:19; Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, Danker 1979:352-353). Simon believes the apostles have the authority to control and distribute the Holy Spirit (Bock

Third is the distinction Luke makes between the superiority of Christian power and that of magic. Simon's offer of money and his request 'Δότε κάμοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ὡς ἐὰν ἐπιθῶ τὰς χεῖρας λαμβάνῃ πνεῦμα ἅγιον' was not well received (vv. 18-19). He wanted authority (τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην) which points to a right or assigned enablement to produce the same visible manifestation that accompanies the Samaritans' impartation of Spirit baptism.²⁴¹ Peter's immediate response to him was that 'your money perish with you, because you thought that the gift of God could be purchased with money' (v. 20) is Luke's way of distinguishing between the manifestation of the Spirit and magic (Bock 2007:333; Conzelmann 1987:65-66). Although it was common to purchase the magical secrets of others and to practice magic for the art of money, Luke wants his reader to know that the impartation of the Spirit is neither associated with the practice of magic or the sin of ecclesiastical 'simony' nor is the Spirit controlled on the basis of human volition (Bruce 1981:183; Parsons 2008:116; Robinson 2008:238).²⁴²

Given what Luke wrote in Acts 8:14-17, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the baptism in the Holy Spirit may be imparted separately from conversion and water baptism through the laying on of hands. However, Luke's narrative also indicates that the impartation of the Spirit is not restricted to a particular sequential paradigmatic model (Acts 2:1-4, 10:44-48). While the laying on of hands is used in the impartation of the Spirit, the act is seemingly meant to be a symbolic point of contact through which God sovereignly conveys the Holy Spirit to believers (Robinson 2008:238-239; Tizei 2000:112-113).

2007:332-333). Thus, he offers them money so that he might possess this distributive power. The offer to pay the apostles for this gift of conveyance is indication that Simon clearly intends to later accept payment when he utilizes its power in the laying on of hands (Barrett 1994:413; Parsons 2008:117).

²⁴¹ Conzelmann (1987:65-66) and others view Simon's desire to be for the power to work miracles or replicate the manifestation of speaking in tongues more than the power to impart the Spirit (Bock 2007:332; Brumback 1947:207; Horton 2001:166; Robertson 1930:107; Robinson 2008:236).

²⁴² 'Simony' is a term associated with paying a price for a priestly office or the use of spiritual gifts for moneymaking (Bock 2007:333; Bruce 1981:183; Marshall 1986:158-159).

4.2.4 Impartation of the Holy Spirit upon Saul in Acts 9:17-18

The next recorded occasion where the intermediary action of the laying on of hands is involved in the impartation of the Spirit is found in Acts 9:17-18. Saul, a persecutor of the church, has had an encounter with Christ through which he experiences his conversion. After that, he is led into Damascus where he awaited further instruction from God (vv. 1-9). During this same time a disciple named Ananias is instructed by the Lord to go and lay hands upon Saul and pray that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost.

Luke's account of Ananias laying hands upon Saul reveals several facts about the practice of impartation. First, the Spirit was imparted to Saul after conversion and prior to his baptism in water, thus confirming again that God works sovereignly and with no sequential order when imparting the baptism in the Spirit (cf. Acts 2:4, 8:14-17, 10:44-48).²⁴³ Marshall's (1986:172) hermeneutic of Acts 9:17-18 differs and makes it unlikely that Ananias conveyed the gift of the Spirit because Saul had not been baptised in water. However, Marshall's argument is unacceptable. Ananias laid hands upon Saul and proclaimed that 'The Lord...has sent me that you may receive your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit'. Luke connects the action of the laying on of hands with the impartation of healing and the Spirit. Barrett (1994:457) and Bock (2008:362), in contrast to Marshall, contend that Saul was imparted with the Spirit before baptism. Tipei (2009:206), in turn, while agreeing that Saul received the Spirit at some point during his encounter with Ananias, believes that it is unlikely that the Spirit was imparted to Saul through the laying on of hands.²⁴⁴ However, Tipei's view is in conflict with Luke's intent in

²⁴³ Saul's conversion on the road is confirmed by his use of κύριε (vv. 5-6), his fasting (v.9), his praying (v. 11) and Ananias addressing him as ἀδελφέ (v. 17). That conversion occurred on the road is agreed upon by Barrett (1994:457), Parsons (2008:131) and Robertson (1930:117). Robinson (2008:240-241) agreeing doubts that the use of κύριε 'is a statement of completed faith'.

²⁴⁴ Hedrick (1981:422) and Tipei (2009:205-206) accept that verse 17 is redactional and that the sources used by Luke did not include the phrase πλησθῆς πνεύματος ἁγίου but was probably a Lucan addition. Arrington (2008:169), Bock (2008:362), Deere (1993:234), Kuecker (173-174) and Parsons (2008:131) contend that handlaying was connected to Saul's reception of Spirit baptism.

recording the action and words of Ananias in Acts 9:17 as well as the similar textual evidence presented in Acts 8:17-18 and 19:6. More conclusive and reasonable are the simple words of the text itself which describe God using Ananias to impart the Spirit to Saul through the laying on of hands (Deere 1993:234; Parsons 2008:131).

The second fact that Luke's account of Ananias laying hands upon Saul reveals about the practice of impartation is that God used a non-apostle as the mediator of the Spirit (Bock 2007:362). Thus, the fact that Ananias is referred to only as 'a devout observer of the law' (Acts 22:12) serves as evidence to abandon the belief that the Spirit's gifts are exclusively imparted by apostles. On the contrary, it confirms the belief that God sovereignly uses any believer to impart His Spirit to others (Deere 1993:233-238).

A final fact that deserves mention is that Luke does not refer to tongues as evidence that Paul received the Spirit.²⁴⁵ However, his silence does not preclude that the manifestation of tongues may initially and sequentially be imparted.

4.2.5 Impartation of the Holy Spirit and the disciples in Acts 19:1-6

Acts 19:1-6 provides the final example where the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit involves the laying on of hands. The context involves an encounter between Paul and certain disciples in Ephesus:

And it happened, while Apollos was at Corinth, that Paul, having passed through the upper regions, came to Ephesus. And finding some disciples he said to them, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" So they said to him, "We have not so much as heard whether there is a Holy Spirit." And he said to them, "Into what then were you baptized?" So they said, "Into John's baptism." Then Paul said, "John indeed baptized with a baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe on Him who would come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." When

²⁴⁵ Paul confirms that he speaks in tongues in 1 Corinthians 14:18. Arrington (2008:169) and Horton (2001:185) contend that Paul spoke in tongues initially as those believers in Acts 2:4.

they heard *this*, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied.

It is of immediate concern to Paul whether or not these disciples have received Spirit baptism. Paul's question, 'Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed', and their retort, 'we have not so much as heard whether there is a Holy Spirit' (v. 2), made it evident to Paul that, although they were disciples of John the Baptist and have been baptized in water, they have not yet received the baptism in the Holy Spirit (v. 2). Paul, not willing to leave the disciples in their present state, re-baptizes them in the name of the Lord Jesus, and then laid hands upon them in order that they might be imparted with the Spirit. As with the other passages considered above, Luke again provides pertinent insights into the practice of impartation.

First, similarly to Acts 8:14-15, Luke conveys that the baptism in the Spirit is given subsequent to conversion. Although commentators question whether or not these disciples have experienced conversion, the answer is made clear by Luke's use of 'μαθητάς' (disciples) in Acts 19:1 and 'πιστεύσαντες' in his question 'Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed' (v.2). Luke commonly uses these terms to refer to Christians (Arrington 2008:298-299; Parsons 2008:264-265).²⁴⁶ Also, it is unlikely that the answer given by the disciples, 'We have not so much as heard whether there is a Holy Spirit' is meant to imply that they have never heard of the Spirit. Given the fact that they were disciples of John and that he was a strong proponent of the Holy Spirit (Matt 3:11, John 3:15-16), it is

²⁴⁶ Marshall (1986:263) and Witherington (1998:570) argue that the disciples are not believers, for without the Spirit there is no possibility of being a Christian. Kurz (2013:291) as well claims they become full-fledged Christians after they are 'baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus'. In contrast, 'μαθητάς' is used in Acts 6:1, 7, 9:1, 11:26, 15:10 and 'πιστεύσαντες' in Acts 8:12-13, 15:5, 18:27, 19:18, and 21:20. Arrington (2008:298) notes that the aorist participle 'πιστεύσαντες' (when you believed) can also be translated 'after you believed' indicating they are already Christians. Parsons (2008:265) as well states: 'The absolute use of *pisteuō* in Acts always refers to Christian believers'. See also Bock (2007:599), Bruce (1981:385), Robinson (2008:246) and Tipei (2009:209).

more logical to conclude that they were ignorant of the Spirit's bestowal at Pentecost (Stott 1990:304; Williams 1990:330).

Second, Luke's mention of Paul's question to the Ephesian disciples, 'πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες', in addition to his question 'Εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε', is a way of confirming the association between impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit with that of belief in Jesus and water baptism (vv. 2-3).²⁴⁷ However, it is unlikely that Luke's intention is what it is believed to be by Williams (1990:329), namely, that the Holy Spirit is received at the moment of initial belief. It is more probable that 'πιστεύσαντες' is used 'as a synonym for what one conventionally terms conversion-initiation' (Tipei 2009:210). Furthermore, it is arguably the case that Luke intends to connect water baptism as being the causative agent in the impartation of the Spirit. That would be in disharmony to his previous separation of the Spirit from baptism (Acts 2:4, 8:14-17, 9:17-18, 10:44-48). Even more so 'If Luke regarded baptism to be the *locus* of the Spirit, why is it that the subsequent Christian baptism of these men failed to confer the Holy Spirit?' (Tipei 2009:210). It seems that Luke's larger goal is to convey how the disciples' faith and baptism made them more receptive to the impartation of the Spirit.

Third, Luke's emphasis that the Spirit was imparted through the laying on of hands have been explained in several ways, such as a beneficial aid when simpler procedures such as belief and baptism has not worked (Dunn 1996:256), as a necessary act to complete the rite of baptism (Kurtz 2013:292), as a special act of fellowship welcoming the disciples into the church (Marshall 1986:308), and as a final remedy for the disciple's deficiencies (Parsons 2008:267). However, these explanations totally ignore the reason implied by Luke, namely, that Paul laid hands upon the disciples in order to impart the Holy Spirit to them. In other

²⁴⁷ It is unclear why the disciples were re-baptized. Bruce (1981:386) and Simanullang (2011:38) contend that their anticipatory baptism prior to Pentecost was inadequate. Kurtz (2013:291) argues that their re-baptism was to distinguish their Christian baptism from the baptism of John. Similarly, Arrington (2008:299) claims the Ephesian disciples in order to solidify their spiritual relationship with Christ requested re-baptism. However, these reasons are merely unsubstantiated conjecture.

words, as Robinson (2008:255) claims, 'Luke notes handlaying as solely responsible for conferring the Spirit'.²⁴⁸ Paul's actions may also be interpreted as his resorting to one of the 'first principles' of the 'doctrine of Christ' (Heb 6:1-4; Bullinger 1953:69).

Fourth, Luke records that immediately after the disciples were imparted with the Spirit, 'they spoke in tongues and prophesied'. These visible charismatic manifestations parallel those recorded earlier in Acts 2:4 and 10:46. Their mention may thus be seen as Luke's way of continuing to legitimize tongues and prophecy as evidence of the baptism in the Spirit.²⁴⁹ However, that does not mean or imply that Luke indicates that these manifestations are the only evidence of Spirit baptism.

In sum, the book of Joel and Acts amply legitimizes the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit for believers. Notable is the fact that God imparts the Spirit sovereignly and without intermediary assistance, but also often uses the cooperation of believers to do so through the laying on of hands. Furthermore, while there is ample record of persons being imparted with the Spirit subsequent to conversion, the book of Acts provides insufficient evidence to believe that God imparts the Spirit with a particularly defined sequential order which is immediately followed by the manifestation of tongues. Although pentecostals and the Church of God may find support for the practice of imparting the Spirit through prayer and the occasional laying on of hands on believers, there is no scriptural support for the idea that leaders may impart the Spirit or produce manifestations such as speaking with tongues on the basis of their own will-power and/or initiative.

²⁴⁸ In contrast, Horton (2001:320) states, 'the laying on of hands did not cause them to receive the Spirit. Rather, it encouraged their faith and preceded, or at least was distinct from, the Spirit's coming'. However, Tipei (2009:211) argues that a syntactical analysis of *καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παύλου χεῖρας* reveals that 'the Spirit is clearly attributed to the LH'.

²⁴⁹ Barrett (1998:898) comments that the imperfects *ἔλαλουν* and *ἔπροφήτευον* are inceptive meaning they began and continued to do these things. Speaking with tongues and prophesying for Luke 'was the clearest indication that the Spirit was at work'.

5. Impartation and Divine Healing

Sickness and death came to be a human experience as a result of the Fall in the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:17-19; Rom 5:12). It is a human malady that God chose to deal with through divine order, thus making Himself the remedy for all the ravages of disease and its eventual consequence, death. Therefore, divine healing is an integral part of the gospel and the theology of Christian believers.²⁵⁰ The next group of passages have been selected for discussion because of their relevance to a biblical doctrine of impartation.

5.1 God as Healer in Exodus 15:26 and Psalms 103:3

That it is God's nature to heal is found in Exodus 15:26: 'For I am the Lord who heals you'. The Hebrew *אֲנִי יְהוָה יוֹדֵם יָרֵם* could be translated as 'I am the Lord your Physician' since *Roph'e* is translated in other passages as 'Physician' (Jer 8:22). Psalms 103:3 also declares that it is God who 'heals all your diseases'. In both Exodus 15:26 and Psalm 103:3 active participles are used to indicate that God as 'physician' continues to heal physical illnesses (Menzie's and Horton 1993:193). In contrast, Utley's (2014:126) position is that the emphasis placed on God being 'healer' has the sin of Israel as its target rather than their physical healing. However, his view is unlikely since God as 'healer' restores the bitter waters in order to meet the physical needs of people (Exod 15:22-25). Also, the declaration made by God, 'I will put none of the diseases on you which I have brought on the Egyptians', refers to diseases that required physical healing (Deut 28:59-61). Therefore, if Utley (2014:126) is correct on the meaning of these texts and Psalm 103:3 applies to spiritual healing, then the Psalmist's statement that it is God 'who heals all of your diseases' is redundant and there is no difference between the forgiveness of *iniquity* and healing of *diseases* which is absurd. For as

²⁵⁰ A full discussion on the doctrine of healing is beyond the scope of our study, however, that God heals is a common belief endorsed by both pentecostal and non-pentecostal leaders. See, Alexander (2006), Cross (2001:179-231), Gaffin (1996:25-64), Hanegraaff (2009:245-280), Kelsey (1976), MacArthur (1992:194-219), Mayhue (2003:263-286), Menzie's and Horton (1993:191-207) Richie (2020:158-162), Thomas (2012), Tipei (2009:110-171) and Tomberlin (2010:225-258).

Exodus 15:26 and Psalms 103:3 indicate, God was and is the source for the impartation of divine healing.

5.2 God as Healer in Isaiah 53:4-5

God's divine order and provision for healing is also in Isaiah 53:4-5. In this passage is a connection between God's provision and the redemptive work of Christ. Isaiah's description indicates that Jesus as 'healer' would bare the griefs and sorrows of all humanity through His suffering and death: 'He was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement for our peace was upon Him, and by His stripes we are healed' (v.5). Matthew 8:17 and 1 Peter 2:24 mirror the same language and thereby confirm that divine healing is provided through the physical suffering and death of Christ (Arrington 2003:330; Sims 1995:82-83). In this way, atonement includes the forgiveness of the consequences of sin and the healing of sickness (Menzies and Horton 1993:196-198).

However, while classical pentecostals believe that healing is provided in the atonement, they do not take the same position as proponents of the 'Word of Faith' theology. The latter group view Jesus' atonement as spiritual, not physical; Christ did not atone for sickness but rather suffered spiritually in hell to procure healing because all disease is simply a physical effect of a spiritual cause. Thus, to 'Word of Faith' teachers a true believer in the healing redemption of Christ should never be sick but be in perfect health.²⁵¹ This hermeneutical view of Isaiah 53:4-5 is both distorted and unbiblical. Nowhere in Scripture is it stated or implied that the impartation of spiritual redemption means automatically the impartation of perfect health. Exactly the opposite is the truth (Acts 9:36-37; Phil 3:25-27; 1 Tim 5:23; 2 Tim 4:20; Alexander 2006:113,229; Arrington 1993:266).

²⁵¹ For a critique of the doctrine of divine healing from the 'Word of Faith' perspective, see Cross (2001:179-231), Hanegraaff (2009:249-280), McConnell (2001:147-168), Morris (2012:156-159).

In sum, Cross (2001:200) appropriately defines the pentecostal and Church of God position in respect to healing and the atonement as follows: 'So is healing provided in the Atonement? Yes! Sometimes, however, healing occurs in this present age and sometimes in the next...but the timing of its delivery remains in the hands of our sovereign Lord who knows what is best for us' (cf. Grudem 1994:1063).

Having established that God is both healer and the provider of divine healing, attention will next be on a select number of Scriptures that exemplify the impartation of healing into the lives of people who are the infirmed.

5.3 Examples of impartational healings in the Old Testament

A cursory glance at the Old Testament reveals numerous miracles that demonstrate the hand of God at work. Among those are three pertinent examples that represent the impartation of healing.

5.3.1 The widow's son in 1 Kings 17:19-24

The contextual setting of Elijah imparting healing to the widow's son in 1 Kings 17:19-24 is quite clear. A widow whom God chooses to provide food for Elijah experiences the death of her son (vv. 8-16). The use of the subordinate clause 'there was no breath left in him' indicates that he was not weak but had stopped breathing altogether (Wiseman 1993:178). She subsequently appeals to the prophet for help (vv. 17-18). Upon arriving at the widow's house, Elijah²⁵² took the boy 'out of her arms and carried him to the upper room where he was staying, and laid him on his own bed' (v. 19). Elijah then prays and stretches himself out on the child three times and the boy miraculously revives. Elijah apparently saw the stretching of himself as a means to effect the transference of health into the boy (Robinson 2008:52-53), thus, as a symbolic action similar to the laying on of hands and an indication that the power of God through prayer

²⁵² The construct use of בֶּן־הָאִשָּׁה בְּעֵלֶת הַבַּיִת 'the son of the woman who owned the house' gives the impression that the boy was young which would explain why Elijah took the child from his mother's arms (Cates 2017:2-3; De Vries 2003:221).

was being imparted into the lifeless child (Constable 2019c:102). Moreover, Elijah's use of *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי* (O, Lord my God) along with his petition 'I pray, let this child's soul come back to him' (v. 21) and the additional phrase 'Then the Lord heard the voice of Elijah' (v. 22) identify Yahweh as the sovereign imparter and restorer of life to the body (Cates 2017:6). The reference of Jesus in Luke 4:24-26 concerning the widow of 'Zarephath' as being chosen by God to receive His grace is yet another example that God imparts healing sovereignly to whomever He wills.

5.3.2 The Shunammite's son in 2 Kings 4:17-35

The second example of impartation and healing is found in the story of Elisha and the death of the Shunammite's son (2 Kgs 4:17-35). Once being notified of the child's death, Elisha attempts to procure healing for the deceased child by sending his servant Gehazi to place his staff upon the child's face (v. 29).²⁵³ When that fails, Elisha chooses an alternative procedure: 'And he went up and lay on the child, and put his mouth on his mouth, his eyes on his eyes, and his hands on his hands, and he stretched himself out on the child, and the flesh of the child became warm' (v. 34). The question is whether Elisha acted in obedience to God or was somehow made privy to the earlier actions of Elijah? The statement, '[Elisha] shut the door behind the two of them, and prayed to the Lord', favours the former interpretation rather than the latter (v. 33). The fact is that the exact sickness of the boy and the religious meaning of the ritual that Elisha performed are left unanswered in the text. However, what is made clear is that Elisha prayed before he executed the ritual act of physical contact, meaning that impartation is first and foremost an act that requires prayer (Becking 1996:37, 52). Thus, through his prayer and ritual

²⁵³ Robinson (2009:53) points out that using the staff in an attempt to bring healing should not be understood as being magical. Objects were often identified in Scripture as a symbolic means of mediating God's power (Ex 4:1-4; 14:15-21; 1 Sam 4:1-3; 2 Kgs 2:8-14; Acts 19:12). In contrast, Becking (1996:53) states that the ritual of Elisha has magical character, however in the case of Elisha there is a theological anomaly in the sense that prayer to Yahweh neutralizes the magical character, thus the ritual is placed in a Yahwistic perspective.

act Elisha, like Elijah, became an agent for the impartation of divine healing to someone selected by the sovereign God.

5.3.3 Naaman in 2 Kings 5:1-27

A third Old Testament example related to impartation and healing is in 2 Kings 5:1-27. In this pericope, a Syrian commander named Naaman comes to Elisha to be healed of leprosy. Elisha willing to assist, sends word to the commander to ‘Go and wash in the Jordan seven times, and your flesh shall be restored to you, and you shall be clean’ (2 Kgs 5:10). Naaman becomes overly irritated and releases an unusual response: ‘Indeed, I said to myself, “He will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God, and wave his hand over the place, and heal the leprosy”’ (v. 11). In this response the overture of impartation is made known. The desire for Elisha to ‘wave over’ (וַיַּגִּיף) the leprous place implies that the commander expected a ritual similar to those experienced in his homeland (Baeq 2010:199). Robinson (2008:54) and Tipei (2009:20) contend that the LXX change of ‘wave over’ to ‘lay his hand upon the place’ suggests that the translators were aware that handlaying was used in healing practices;²⁵⁴ that it was expected that God would heal a Jewish believer but, in this instance, demonstrated His willingness to heal a Syrian unbeliever. What can thus be inferred is that under no circumstances will God allow His sovereignty to be displaced by the will of His human agent (Luke 4:27; Cheung 2012:12). The directive to ‘Go wash in the Jordan seven times’ must therefore also be seen as God’s way of informing Naaman that He is the One in charge of imparting miracles. Hence, the diseased is not able to design his or her own cure or able to negotiate the means and timing of God’s healing power. And Elisha’s refusal to accept a monetary gift from Naaman as

²⁵⁴ The ‘waving’ of the hand for the purpose of healing and purity has been similarly associated with Mesopotamian culture and practice (Wright 1984:32). Gray (1963:455) presents the possibility that the ‘waving’ of the hand was viewed to be a way for the disease to be exorcised. Tipei (2009:20-21) asserts that the translators of the LXX using ἀποσυνάξει τὸ λεπρόν understood the ritual to have an exorcistic feature. However, while Tipei claims the ‘waving’ (וַיַּגִּיף) of the hand suggests a magical gesture by which the leprosy is removed, he correctly states that ‘there is no evidence in the OT that leprosy was attributed to some evil power’.

compensation for Elisha's work and Gehazi's conduct make it very clear what God's attitude is towards those who desire to financially profit from a healing ministry (2 Kgs 5:15-27).

In sum, the three examples discussed above provided ample additional proof that God has made provision for the supernatural healing of people in the OT. However, what is also clear is that, although God uses various means in the impartations, such as obedience to a divine instruction, prayer and physical touch, and the 'eccentric behaviour' of Elijah and Elisha in stretching themselves out upon the dead, the latter should be taken as an anomaly and not as a normative means to be imitated by others.

5.4 Impartational healings in the New Testament

There are numerous examples of healing in the New Testament, and although every healing in Scripture deserves commentary, only a few examples will suffice to demonstrate the means through which healings were imparted to the infirmed.

5.4.1 Impartation of healing in the Gospels

Matthew 8:5-13, Luke 7:1-10, John 4:46-54 and John 11:1-44 contain the stories of the Centurion's servant, a nobleman's son and Lazarus who received an impartation of healing through faith and the spoken word of Jesus. These examples represent an eschatological extension of Psalms 107:20 which states that 'He sent His word and healed them'. Greater still, the examples demonstrate the place of faith and 'provide a prism which reveals the totality of our Lord's authority' (Larson 1983:130). Somewhat later, readers become privy of similar instances where Peter and Paul spoke authoritative words that result in the impartation of healing to two men who are crippled (Acts 3:1-8; 14:8-10). But, one major difference is recorded. Jesus did not rely upon another's authority to impart healing because He was God.

However, the predominant means through which healing was imparted involved touching, the laying on of hands and anointing with oil.²⁵⁵ Multiple examples of touching as a means of imparting healing are found in the Gospels, such as Jesus touching the hand of Peter's mother-in-law (Matt 8:14-15), His touching a leper as well as the tongue of a person who could not speak (Mark 1:40-42; 7:33), and the woman with a blood-flow problem who touched Jesus for healing (Mark 5:25-34; 6:53-56). The desire to touch or be touched in this way was predicated upon the ancient belief that touching someone or something resulted in a transmission of power (Ysebaert 1962:183).²⁵⁶ Hence, this communicable method of healing was used by Jesus through which all those He touched or those who touched Him were healed (Mark 6:56; Luke 6:19). Similarly, Peter, Paul and others imparted healing through using the same method (Acts 5:12; 9:17; 14:3; 19:11; 28:8). Yet, the greatest argument for the perpetual impartation of healing through the laying on of hands is found in Mark 16:15-18 and Hebrews 6:1-2. In Mark 16:15-18 the disciples are told to go into the world and preach the gospel and to lay hands on the sick so that they may recover. Remarkably, Jesus places the practice of impartation in the spectrum of being global, apostolic, and enduringly effective (Grudem 1994:315-316; Oss 1996:167; Wuest 1973, 1:292). The Holy Spirit in Hebrews 6:1-2 does the same by stipulating the laying on of hands as an acceptable elementary practice of the church.

5.4.2 Anointing with oil: Luke 10:34, Mark 6:12-13 and James 5:14-15

In addition to the scriptural passages that involve persons being healed by touching or the laying on of hands, three passages in the New Testament include anointing with oil as a means to healing. The use of oil was a common practice in the ancient world (Isa 1:6; Jer 8:22;

²⁵⁵ Giving commentary and exegetical attention to the numerous passages involving touching, the laying on of hands and anointing would far exceed the scope of this study. For a comprehensive study on these methodologies see Robinson (2008) and Tipei (2009).

²⁵⁶ Mesopotamian ancient literature teaches that the transfer of evil power or a disease could also be transmitted to the body through touch (Becking 1996:40-44; Tipei 2009:22).

Josephus 1987:172; Pliny 1963:23, 39-40).²⁵⁷ Luke 10:34, which relates the story of the Samaritan who poured 'oil and wine' into the wounds of the man who had been robbed and assaulted, attests to the use of oil for medicinal healing. Moo (2000:177) notes that oil in this way was used to cure everything from toothache to paralysis. Mark 6:12-13 records that oil was used to anoint persons for miraculous physical healing as well. In addition, the disciples 'anointed [ἠλείφον] with oil many who were sick, and healed them'. Matthew 10:1 and Luke 9:1 state that Jesus gave the disciples authority to heal the sick but neither text include the use of oil.²⁵⁸ According to Tipei (2009:147), the word ἐξουσίαν in Mark 6:7 refers to more than the permission to minister. It connotes divine power and the oil a symbol of God's healing power.²⁵⁹

James 5:13-18, in similar fashion than Mark 6:13, mentions the anointing of oil for the impartation of healing, but adds the involvement of elders in the anointing of the sick. For this reason, greater focus will be placed upon the James 5:13-18 pericope. To set the context, James throughout his letter addresses topics such as faith, works, wisdom, and the dangers of having an uncontrolled tongue. However, he chooses to conclude his letter by giving a homily on prayer and healing. That prayer is important is evident in every verse that make mention of it.

James begins by encouraging his readers to pray in times of suffering: 'Is anyone among you suffering? Let him pray' (v. 13). The word κακοπαθεῖ implies that prayer is effective for all sorts of afflictions, misfortunes and trials (Davids 1982:191; Moo 2000:175). If any got sick,

²⁵⁷ See also Davids (1982:193), Moo (2000:177), Tipei (2009:147) and Wuest (1973, 1:125).

²⁵⁸ Robinson (2008:133) surmises that Matthew and Luke may have left out anointing with oil because they assumed anointing was understood by their audience, and did not think it necessary to include the methodology. It is also possible that the practice was unknown to them at the time of their writing, since Luke does not mention anointing with oil in Acts. However, the latter view considered by Robinson seems unlikely since James includes the practice (Jas 5:14-15).

²⁵⁹ Wuest (1973, 1:125) believes anointing with oil for healing was a valid practice until the close of the Book of Revelation. However, such working of miracles was restricted to the apostles for the purpose of confirming their messages. 'Since then, there is no need of this. Hence, God heals directly in answer to prayer now, not through individuals'. In contrast is Hodges (1994:117).

says James, 'Let him call for the elders of the church' (v. 14). James uses the word ἀσθενεῖ, which can be used in reference to spiritual weakness, but in this case refers to physical ailments (Rom 4:19, 1 Cor 8:11-12, 2 Cor 11:29).²⁶⁰ This sickness, however, lies outside the human sphere of a weakened faith or a troubled heart. Rather, it is a malady that requires divine intervention.²⁶¹

Several observations can be made regarding the procedure for those persons who fall ill. First, the infirmed person is to 'call for the elders of the church'. The use of the aorist imperative Προσκαλεσάσθω suggests urgency and that he or she is most likely confined to the sickbed and too ill to go to the elders for prayer (Davids 1982:192; Martin 1988:206). Second, a delegation of elders from the church is to respond and conduct a ceremony of prayer for the sick person. The πρεσβυτέρους who are called are not necessarily the oldest members of the church nor are they persons who are invested with special charismata to heal (McCartney 2009:253; Tipei 2009:148). For as Hodges (1994:116) correctly states, 'There is nothing said here at all about a gift of healing possessed by the elders'. The elders are more appropriately to be seen as intercessors and leaders who are called because they represent the church (Thomas 2012:21-23; cf. Acts 11:30, 15:2, 16:4, 21:18, 20:28). James' use of ἐκκλησία 'church' (5:14) as opposed to συναγωγή 'synagogue' (2:2) also suggest that they are intercessors and leaders (Blomberg and Kamell 2008:242; McCartney 2009:253).

Third, when arriving at the house of the sick person, the elders are τοῦπροσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀλείψαντες αὐτὸν ἐλαίῳ'. The mention of 'let them pray' followed by the preposition ἐπ' (over) could mean that the name of Jesus is being invoked upon the person during the prayer

²⁶⁰ Davids (1982:192) and Martin (1988:206) argue that ἀσθενεῖ standing in conjunction with Κακοπαθεῖ (5:13), the need to call the elders to the sick person, the use of oil, and the two terms σώσει (to make whole) and κάμνοντα (to be ill) together are all features of a physical malady.

²⁶¹ Davids (1982:192), Martin (1988:206), McCartney (2009:252) and Tipei (2009:148) agree that the illness is physical. Hayden (1981:258-265) differs based upon the use of σώσει (v. 15) making it a spiritual illness. Motyer (1985:193-194) lists five points on the severity of the person's illness and states that the sick person is bedridden and potentially helpless even to pray for him or herself.

(McCartney 2009:255). Or, as Davids (1982:193) and Moo (2000:176-177) surmise, the unusual phrasing may signify the physical position of the person being prayed for or that hands were laid upon the infirmed during the prayer and anointing. Given that James includes the additional proviso ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου, after having added the prepositional emphasis ἐπ', it is highly probable that he had the laying on of hands in mind when giving his instructions. In any event, the elders pray and ἀλείψαντες αὐτὸν ἐλαίῳ'.

Fourth, in general, persons were anointed with oil for the following reasons: for medicinal or practical purposes as mentioned earlier in Luke 10:34 and as a religious symbol of the presence of God in healing.²⁶² The medicinal use is doubtful in this case since the anointing with oil is followed by emphasis on the prayer of faith to raise the sick (Robinson 2008:134). Moreover as argued by Moo (2000:181), the additional emphasis ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος implies divine healing as well since 'raise up' (*egeirō*) is used to describe the renewed physical vigour of those who have been healed (Matt. 9:6; Mark. 1:31; Acts 3:7). However, while the oil is viewed to have significance in the healing of the infirmed, the appearance of the participle 'anointing' (ἀλείψαντες) indicates concurrent but subordinate action, meaning that the oil is the symbol of God's presence and that prayer is the primary reason for the elders' visit (Blomberg and Kamell 2008:243).²⁶³ In short, James presents a model for healing that is neither time nor culturally restrictive and provides no reason why anointing with oil and praying for the sick should not be apropos for elders and believers today.²⁶⁴

²⁶² Blomberg and Kamell (2008:242) and Dibelius (1976:254) place the anointing of oil by the elders in striking contrast with the traditional Catholic sacrament of extreme unction or last rites. Others discuss more thoroughly the purpose of oil for healing (Martin 1988:208-209; McCartney 2009:253-254; Moo 2000:176-187; Tipei 2009:148-151; Tomberlin 2010:237-252).

²⁶³ When the aorist participle appears after the verb that it modifies, it refers to action simultaneous with rather than prior to that of the main verb (Blomberg and Kamell 2008:243; Davids 1982:193). Martin (1988:207) and Moo (2000:177) stress that the aorist tense could place the anointing as a preliminary to the prayer as well.

²⁶⁴ James adds the possibility of sins being forgiven in addition to healing (v.15-16). Scripture records that sin can attribute to sickness (John 9:1-3; 1 Cor 11:27-30), but unfortunately this concern goes beyond the scope of our study (cf. Blomberg and Kamell

6. Summary and Concluding Remarks

The focus of this chapter has been on the fourth subsidiary objective: to complete an inductive study of specific biblical texts that will inform a contemporary understanding and practice of impartation in the Church of God. It consists of the gathering and assessment of pertinent biblical texts relating to impartation. It was shown that in both the Old and New Testaments the concept of impartation has favorable mention in respect to gifts, anointings, blessings, the baptism in the Holy Spirit and healing. Our assessment was able to determine that the primary methodology used in impartations was that of speaking words, touching, and/or the laying on of hands. It was also shown that anointing with oil was a common practice in imparting healing to the sick. However, although there is biblical evidence that shows that persons were imparted with gifts from God, there is no evidence for the view that impartations are conferred at the discretion and/or decisions of ministry leaders. Rather, the opposite is convincingly communicated. It was through the sovereign will and instruction of God that the seventy elders, Joshua, and Elisha were imparted with the gifts and anointings that were needed for ministry service. Jesus, under the anointing of God, spoke blessings over people and healed the sick (Luke 4:18-19). Apostles such as Peter and Paul and the disciple Ananias imparted healings and the baptism in the Holy Spirit by the direction of God and through calling upon the name of Jesus (Acts 3:6, 16; 9:17, 32-34; 11:1-18). Furthermore, it was found that while God may use ministry leaders in conferring impartations, He sovereignly determines the moment when impartations are given and the manifestations that accompany them. Thus, what this inductive study has shown is that there are principles of impartation that coincide with the theology of the Apostle Paul and the practice of impartation in the Church of God.

2008:243-245; Davids 1982:194-197; Dibelius 1976:255-256; McCartney 2009:256-258; Moo 2000:181-187).

In the next chapter attention will be given to the key biblical ideas that have been gathered in order to formulate a synthesis of scriptural teaching and the current practice of impartation. This will help to ascertain what biblical impartation should be, how bestowal should be understood and the kinds of impartations that are evident in Scripture. The model will then be compared to the Church of God's doctrine of impartation to determine if the doctrine and practice are consistent with biblical teaching.

CHAPTER SIX

A THEOLOGICAL SYNTHESIS OF THE TEXTS

1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to look at the biblical texts pertaining to impartation that have been assessed. The fifth object is to use the theoretical understanding of the doctrine to change the practice of impartation throughout the Church of God denomination, which is the focus of this chapter. Emphasis will be placed upon the key biblical ideas that have been presented thus far in order to formulate a theological synthesis of scriptural teaching and the current practice of impartation in pentecostal churches and the Church of God. The goal is to establish a biblical model of how impartation is to be understood, the scriptural methods used and the kinds of impartations that are evident in Scripture. The model will then be compared with the doctrine of impartation of the Church of God to determine if the denomination's beliefs are consistent with sound scriptural teaching.

2. A Summary of the Theology of Impartation in Romans 1:11

As was highlighted in the study of the anchor text in chapter three, the Church of God has for the most part found support for its doctrine of impartation in its hermeneutical understanding of Romans 1:11. In that passage, the Apostle Paul seems to reinforce the theology of Acts and believed in the impartation of gifts to believers (Acts 9:17-18; 19:1-6; 28:8). It has also been shown that Paul's use of the Greek word *metadidomi* generally means to 'give over' or 'to give a share' (Vine 1952:149). Placed in a more specific context, *metadidomi*, according to Richie (2016) and Wuest (1973, 1:21-22), is understood to mean the giving or receiving of unmerited gifts that apply to the realm of 'ordinary'

or 'extraordinary' manifestations in and for ministry.²⁶⁵ However, according to Arrington (2016), Paul's promise to impart a gift to the Romans and his use of *metadidomi* have been mistakenly interpreted by some commentators to mean that leaders have the ability to transfer their gifts or anointings to other believers. Yet, our analysis of the anchor text found no evidence to substantiate this hermeneutic or impartational model. Rather, the following points seem more appropriate.

First, Paul intends to impart a gift to believers who have a relationship with Christ and are committed to God. Second, although Paul has a desire to impart a gift to the Roman believers, he does not disclose the method through which the impartation is to occur. Several options have been considered such as the laying on of hands, through a reading of the epistle or through Paul's preaching of the gospel, but no definite conclusion about which method will be used could be drawn. Third, although Paul mentions multiple 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' gifts that are available to believers (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:1-11; Eph 4:7-12), he leaves unnamed the gift or gifts that will be imparted to the Roman believers upon his arrival at Rome. Fourth, Paul's use of the words $\tau\iota$ πνευματικός χάρισμα confirms that the Spirit will be involved when he imparts the gift/gifts to the Roman recipients. His syntactical order placing *charisma* with *pneumatikon* makes clear that the Holy Spirit will bestow the eschatological promise.

Given this summary of Paul's theology in Romans 1:11 and the tendency among commentators to 'decontextualise' and 'recontextualise' a text (Joubert and Maartens 2017:105-132), a comparison of the anchor text with that of the impartational language found in distinct informative and developing theological texts in the Old and New Testaments will next be conducted in order to further clarify the biblical doctrine of impartation. Such a study has the advantage that 'Scripture interprets Scripture' and

²⁶⁵ As clarified earlier 'extraordinary' applies to gifts such as those mentioned by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 and Romans 12:6. 'Ordinary' applies to gifts as in Romans 12:12:7-8.

will show how the Bible 'connects into one glorious comprehensible whole' (McArthur 1992:94-95).

3. The Biblical Precedent for Paul's Impartational Theology

A most predominant foundation of Paul's preaching and teaching was his study and insight into Scripture. Several common statements found in his writings, such as 'what does Scripture say' (Rom 4:3), 'Scripture has concluded' (Gal 3:22) and 'according to the Scriptures' (1 Cor 15:4), solidify this fact.²⁶⁶ Thus, when Paul shared his intention to impart some gift to the Roman believers, it is safe to say that he did so based upon his experiential knowledge and biblical precedent. His experience of receiving the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands gave him reason to believe in the practice of impartation (Acts 9:17). Paul's hearing about and/or witnessing several impartational events including Jesus' blessing of children, the commissioning of disciples to ministry, persons receiving the baptism in the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands and various healings also served to reinforce his belief in the impartation of gifts (Mark 10:13-16; Acts 13:1-3; 19:1-6; 28:8). However, our inductive assessment of biblical texts revealed a similar precedent of impartation in the OT.

From his knowledge of the OT he would have noted impartational events such as the impartation of the Spirit to the elders at their commissioning in Numbers 11:16-17, 24-25 and to Elisha in 2 Kings 2:9-15; the impartation of a blessing to Abram in Genesis 12:1-3, 14:18-20 and to Manasseh and Ephraim in Genesis 48:1-20; the impartation of the Spirit promised in Joel 2:28-29; and the impartation of healing to the boys in, respectively, 1 Kings 17:19-24 and 2 Kings 4:17-37, and to Naaman in 2 Kings 5:1-27. It can therefore be assumed that from these examples Paul found biblical validation for imparting gifts to the Roman believers and understood impartation to be the giving of spiritual or grace gifts through

²⁶⁶ Paul references the Scripture in this way some ten times in his writings (Rom 4:3; 9:17; 10:11; 11:2; 16:26; 1 Cor 15:3-4; Gal 3:22; 4:30; 1 Tim 5:18).

the sovereign power of the Holy Spirit (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:1-11; Eph 4:7-11).

Having established that there is biblical precedent for the practice of impartation, we continue with our theological synthesis in order to determine if Paul's theology is consistent with that of the informing and developing texts. The discussion will begin by assessing what Paul may have assumed to be the spiritual qualities of a recipient of an impartation.

4. The Spiritual Qualities Required for Impartations

The believers to whom Paul wanted to impart a gift to are those κλητός (called) into a relationship with Christ (Rom 1:6). They are 'saints' or persons who are called into a life of holiness and people of faith (Rom 1:7; Briscoe 1982:31; Hodge 1947:23). In other words, Paul's model of impartation is one of imparting gifts to persons who are committed to living the Christian lifestyle (Stott 1994:52).²⁶⁷ These qualifications seemingly coincide with those of the seventy elders whom God imparted with the Spirit in Numbers 11:16-17. The wording 'Gather Me seventy elders of Israel, whom you know to be the elders of the people and officers over them' (v. 16) indicate that the elders were devout followers of God and were men of spiritual status among the Israelite community (Brown 2002:98). Joshua's impartation in Numbers 27:18-23 also correlates with Paul's theology. For Moses is asked to 'Take Joshua the son of Nun with you, a man in whom is the Spirit and lay your hand upon him (v.18). The phrase 'a man in whom is the Spirit' confirms that Joshua will be imparted with 'wisdom' and 'authority' because he already has the "Spirit' (Ashley 1993:55). Another example is Elisha who is imparted with a 'double portion' of the Spirit (2 Kgs 2:9-15). That Elisha is already a

²⁶⁷ Paul uses similar language in his letter to the Ephesians (4:1-14). His words 'walk worthy of the calling with which you were called' (v. 1) are indicative of their relationship with Christ. Wuest (1973, 1:93) remarks that the Greek word περιπατήσαι (walk) meaning 'order one's behavior' and the word ἀξίως (worthy) meaning 'in a manner worthy of' is Paul's way of exhorting the Ephesian saints 'to see to it that their Christian experience, the Christian life they live, should weigh as much as the profession of Christianity which they make'. In other words, in a very practical way it means to harmonize one's conduct with his or her calling (Cheung 2014:81; Constable 2017b:60).

person of faith is confirmed in the command given by God to Elijah in 1 Kings 19:16: Elijah is to anoint Elisha to serve as prophet in his place which would hardly be the case had Elisha not been a devotee of the almighty God. Elisha's sacrifice of his oxen as a burnt offering to Yahweh is also proof of his commitment to God (v. 21; Constable 2019c:115).

It can also be shown that Paul's theological and theoretical model of the impartation of gifts is found in several New Testament examples. This is especially true in regard to the impartation of the Holy Spirit. It was noted earlier in our discussion of the informing texts that the prophet Joel connects the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit to repentance (Joel 2:12-17). Peter makes the same connection in Acts 2:22-38 with his statement 'Repent, and let every one of you be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' (v. 38). Moreover, it is unquestionable that the persons receiving the Spirit on the 'Day of Pentecost' were believers (Acts 2:1-4), as was the Samaritans in Acts 8:14-17, Paul in Acts 9:17-18 and the Ephesian disciples referred to in Acts 19:1-6. Thus, the synthesis of Romans 1:11 with the previously mentioned scriptural passages confirm that Paul's model of the impartation of the gifts to believers is consistent with the theology of both the OT and NT.

Although Paul establishes that gifts are to be imparted to believers and subsequently compiles a list of gifts (Rom 1:6-7; 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:1-11; Eph 4:1-12), it is also clear that unbelievers are recipients of impartations such as salvation, healing, mercy, exhortation and/or other blessings (Cranfield 1975:78-79; Hodge 1947:25-26). These come sovereignly from God or from benefactors who have already been imparted with spiritual gifts. This truth is brought out by Paul in Romans 6:23: 'For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord'. Paul uses the Greek word χάρισμα to describe the free grace gift 'eternal life' that is imparted to man (Newell 2009:171). In other words, and as explained by Gause (1986:85), 'The life that is offered is eternal life, not simply the restoration or perpetuation of mortality'. It is life that is provided in and imparted through Jesus Christ.

That unbelievers are the recipients of impartations is also found in other scriptural passages, for example, of blessing in Matthew 5:44 and 1 Peter 3:8-9. Jesus said 'bless those who curse you' and Peter encourages believers to 'be courteous, not returning evil for evil or reviling for reviling, but on the contrary blessing'. The Greek ἀποδιδόντες (returning) means 'giving back in return' a blessing (Stibbs 1981:130). Paul issues an identical injunction both in Romans 12:17 and 1 Thessalonians 5:15. Thus, the Scripture considers persons such as haters and revilers to be worthy of impartations of blessing through spoken words and/or kind deeds being done to them.²⁶⁸ Another example is the impartation of healing to Naaman who was not a follower of God prior to his healing, as the Syrian leader's words seem to indicate: "Indeed I said to myself, 'He will surely come out to me, and stand and call on the name of the Lord his God and wave his hand over the place, and heal the leprosy' (2 Kgs 5:11). It is quite evident that the Lord God is not the God of Naaman but he is healed nevertheless (Dilday 1987:306-307).

Bittlinger (1967:36) finds evidence of unbelievers being imparted with healing in Acts 3:6, 14:8-10 and 28:8. Marshall (1986:88) agrees, and in reference to the lame man receiving his healing, says that it is his physical healing that is referred to rather than his spiritual salvation. One more example will suffice to support the argument that unbelievers receive impartations. It is found in impartations that involve such gifts as prophecy, teaching, mercy, giving, and exhortation (1 Kgs 17:8-16; 2 Kgs 4:8-11; Luke 3:11; Rom 12:6-8; Eph 4:28; 1 Thess 2:8). A person who considers these texts will find it difficult to sustain the suggestion that only believers are benefactors of these gifts.

We now turn to a list of possible gifts that may have been imparted to believers by Paul.

²⁶⁸ Stibbs (1981:130) points out that the Greek word ἀποδιδόντες meaning to 'give back in return, to render as due' was obviously a regular part of the ethical instruction given to converts, and was based upon instruction that Jesus Himself had taught (Matt 28:18-19). Wuest (1973, 2:86) similarly remarks that ἀποδιδόντες literally means 'giving back'. The accompanying word 'blessing' used by Peter is not a noun, but a participle which means 'be constantly blessing'.

5. Biblical Gifts Imparted by Paul

It was stated in the summary of the study of Romans 1:11 that Paul provided no description of the gifts he had in mind to impart to the Roman believers. However, a closer look at the letter and Paul's other writings reveals a theological model that includes a number of diverse gifts that he might have imparted to the Roman believers. Although not all inclusive, the following are examples of 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' gifts that may be considered as possibilities. First, in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 several *pneumatika* gifts are listed: a word of wisdom, word of knowledge, faith, gifts of healing, working of miracles, discernings of spirits, prophecy, tongues and interpretation of tongues. Second, in Romans 12:6-8 Paul provides a list of *charismata*: prophecy, teaching, giving, exhorting, and showing mercy.²⁶⁹ Third, in Ephesians 4:8-11 Paul delineates a list of *domata* gifts: apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers and pastors. It may therefore be inferred that one or more of any of these gifts could have been in the mind of Paul (cf. Cranfield 1975:78-79; Morris 1988:60; Wuest 1973, 1:21-22).

6. Diversity in the Operation of Gifts

Paul's theology and presentation of gifts reveals at least two truths. First, God is a God of diversity, and second, a proper theoretical model for impartation is based on the imparting of diverse gifts to believers through the discretionary power of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 12:4-11). Gordon Fee (1987:583), commenting on 1 Corinthians 12:4-11, states that 'diversity within unity belongs to the character of God Himself (vv. 4-11). Although there is but one Spirit, one Lord, and one God, a great variety of gifts and ministries characterizes each of the divine Persons'. It is not surprising then, that a semblance of the same diversity and unified purpose of the

²⁶⁹ The gift of προφητεία (prophecy) in Romans 12:6 and 1 Corinthians 12:10 is viewed as having both 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' function. Being placed twice in Paul's list of gifts speaks to its importance in function (Flynn 1974:53). Gause (1986:171-172) and Lowery (1997:52) contend that while prophesying can be a special message that brings edification to the church body, in its 'extraordinary' function the gift manifests in predictive and/or correctional prophesy. Functionaries predicting future events were called 'prophets' in the early church (Acts 13:1; 11:27-28; 21:9).

gifts throughout Paul's theology is found also in the Old Testament and other New Testament Scriptures.

6.1 Similarities of gifts in the Old and New Testaments

Although there are many passages in Scripture that challenge a believers' understanding of spiritual gifts, the similarities between the ways in which God manifests His power through spiritual gifts is not one of those. Even the casual reader is able to quickly comprehend that an understanding of spiritual gifts are not limited to the writings of Paul, but are manifestations of God throughout the entirety of Scripture.

6.2 The *pneumatika* in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11

Gifts similar to the *pneumatika* listed by Paul 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 are found in the impartation of the Spirit to the seventy elders in Numbers 11:16-25. Their impartation was accompanied by ecstatic utterance similar to the gift of tongues and/or prophecy in 1 Corinthians 12-14 (Marshall 1986:73).²⁷⁰ There is also Joshua in Deuteronomy 34:9 who, through the laying on of hands, was endowed with the 'spirit of wisdom' much like the gift of the 'word of wisdom' in 1 Corinthians 12:8.²⁷¹ Although there is no biblical record naming the particular gift/gifts that Elisha received in 2 Kings 2:9-15, his ministry involves miraculous abilities that mirror Paul's gifts of healing and working of miracles in 1 Corinthians 12:9-10 (Mohr 2019:112).²⁷² The spiritual abilities associated

²⁷⁰ It is notable that the experience of ecstatic utterance accompanying the impartation of the Spirit to the elders is not one of perpetuity (Num 11:25). Although their prophesying was a legitimate experience, this may have been God's way of arousing their focus to the power of the Spirit rather than the manifestation of the Spirit, similar to Paul's instructions in 1 Corinthians 12-14.

²⁷¹ Fee (1987:592) defines the gift of a 'word of wisdom' as 'a message/utterance full of wisdom' or 'an utterance characterized by wisdom', and contrasts the gift to the problem addressed in 1 Corinthians 1:17-2:16. Bittlinger (1967:29) observes, 'In a difficult or dangerous situation a word of wisdom may be given which resolves the difficulty or silences the opponent'. In other words, the gift is divinely imparted intelligence and the practical action that goes with it (Triplett 1970:75). Wisdom in this way was of great value to Joshua as well as the Roman believers.

²⁷² An in-depth discussion of the spiritual abilities that God conferred upon Elisha far exceeds the scope of this study. However, his ministry reflects enablements comparable to Paul's 'word of wisdom' (2 Kgs 3), 'word of knowledge' (2 Kgs 2:19-22; 4:38-41), prophecy (2 Kgs 7:1-20) and discerning of spirits (2 Kgs 5:20-27).

with these gifts are reflected in the impartation of healing given to the Shunammite's son and Naaman the Syrian (2 Kgs 4:8-37; 5:1-19).

There are also New Testament examples besides those mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11. Three exemplars that confirm 'different kinds of tongues' are the baptism in the Holy Spirit given to the early church in Acts 2:1-4, the Gentiles in Acts 10:44-47, and the Ephesian disciples in Acts 19:1-6 (Flynn 1974:180). Representative of the gifts of a 'word of wisdom' and 'word of knowledge' is the example of Peter who through the Spirit discloses the deceptive lies of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11; Lombard and Daffe 2008:143; Lowery 1997:75). Yet another gift is that of the 'discerning of spirits'. While often associated with the judging of prophecies, this gift is also exemplified in Peter's discernment and response to Simon who is judged for his evil heart (Acts 8:14-24; Bittlinger 1967:46; Fee 1987:596-597; Mohr 2019:110).²⁷³ The gift of the 'working of miracles' finds expression in the story of Dorcas being brought back to life after prayer by Peter (Acts 9:40; 1 Cor 12:10). Added to all these examples is the call for elders by the sick (Jas 5:14-15); and while it appears that in Mark 6:13, the disciples were endowed with healing *charisma* that aided their anointing of others with oil and prayer for the sick, the same does not appear to be the case in James 5:14-15 (Kelsey 1976:116; Tasker 1982:130).²⁷⁴ Thus, while there is no requirement for the elders to be endowed with the 'the gift of faith' or 'gifts of healing', according to Lombard and Daffe (2008:152) 'The "prayer of faith" that brings healing can be separate from or associated with the gift of faith and/or the gifts of healing'.

²⁷³ Bittlinger (1967:46) contends that in the post-apostolic era 'the church was dependent on the gift of discerning spirits in distinguishing true from false prophets'. To Fee (1987:596-597) the gift means, 'the ability to discern what is truly of the Spirit of God and what comes from other spirits'.

²⁷⁴ Kelsey (1976:116) views James 5:14-16 as establishing that no *charisma* is needed to anoint with oil and to heal the sick. Healing in this way is no longer limited to a special gift or to certain individuals. In contrast, Tasker (1982:130) implies that the elders are commissioned with the same miraculous ability but incorrectly argues that James 5:14-16 'cannot be appealed to as evidence that the Lord has committed to His Church *for all time* the power of miraculous healing'.

In sum, these scriptural examples are demonstrable proofs that gifts identical or comparative to the *pneumatika* in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 were imparted to all people who believe in God's power to do so, in both the Old and New Testaments.

6.3 The *charismata* in Romans 12:6-8

Interestingly, Paul does not restrict the impartation of gifts to *pneumatika* or 'extraordinary gifts'. He also includes for impartation *charismata* or 'ordinary gifts', most of which have some semblance elsewhere in the Old and New Testaments. One example, and at the forefront of Paul's list, is the gift of 'prophecy'. Although this gift involves fore-telling and forth-telling, Paul's statement 'let us prophesy in proportion to our faith' seemingly places the gift in an encouraging, edifying or comforting role rather than that of predicting future events (1 Cor 14:3; Arrington 2003:335; Flynn 1974:48-55).²⁷⁵ Placed in its general or 'ordinary' role, prophesying is most often a spontaneous utterance that is given to persons through the inspiration of the Spirit (Grudem 2000:289). Prophetic utterances of this nature can be found in the form of imparted blessings such as those spoken by Isaac over his family (Gen 27:21-41; 48:1-20; 49:1-27), Aaron over the congregation of Israel (Num 6:22-27) and Jesus over His disciples (Luke 24:50-51). Prophecy can also take the form of general ecstatic utterances which was seemingly the experience of the seventy elders along with Eldad and Medad (Num 11:25-26). Viewed in contrast to the unique prophetic role of Moses who spoke directly with and for God on an ongoing basis, the elders' ecstatic display before the people was only momentary and accompanied by various utterances (Noordtzi 1983:103; Olson 1996:67). Prophesying of this kind is also reflected in the experience of Saul when he was anointed to be king of Israel (1 Sam 10:6-11). However, as Ashley (1993:214) points out,

²⁷⁵Although the gift of prophecy may involve incidental fore-telling, its primary function in Romans 12:6 is most likely the Spirit-given ability to deliver words of encouragement, comfort, instruction and correction to the church body (Arrington 2003:335; Flynn 1974:48-49; Wuest 1973, 1:211). When used broadly the gift of prophecy according to Paul applies to any believer whom the Spirit moves upon to prophesy to the church body (1 Cor 14:3, 31; Arrington 2003:290; Lowery 1997:121).

the disadvantage we have in the textual examples of the elders, Eldad, Medad and Saul is the absence of any specific message or word from Yahweh that is derived from this prophesying. Rather, their prophecies were extemporaneous and given in a more general way to those persons who were listening. Similar prophecies offering encouragement, comfort or instruction appear to be what Paul had in mind in his message to the Corinthian believers: 'For you can all prophesy one by one, that all may learn and all may be encouraged' (1 Cor 14:31). Moreover, Paul's emphasis on the learning and encouragement that is to accompany prophecy pinpoints the value of the gift and makes necessary its impartation to believers for the benefit of others.

In addition to the gift of prophecy which has prominent representation in both the Old and New Testaments, are the gifts of 'ministering', 'giving' and showing 'mercy' (Rom 12:7-8). The gift of 'ministering', which is viewed to be the same as the gift of 'helps' in 1 Corinthians 12:28, refer to believers rendering service to others (Arrington 2003:323-324; Lowery 1997:144-145). It is not unreasonable to surmise that Elisha was imparted with the gift of 'ministering' which resulted in his completing such tasks as pouring water on the hands of Elijah.²⁷⁶ However, the impartation of this gift is more convincing in the example of the seven deacons who, in Acts 6:1-6, were commissioned by the laying on of hands to serve the neglected widows of the church (Flynn 1974:101).²⁷⁷

Manifestations of the imparted gift of 'giving' and the gift of showing 'mercy' are found in other texts as well. Paul uses the Greek word *metadidomi* to emphasize the 'ordinary' gift of 'giving' which means the God-given capacity (willingness) to share one's earthly possessions with others (Arrington 2003:325; Wuest 1973, 1:212). Such giving is without

²⁷⁶ The picturesque phrase 'who poured water on the hands of Elijah' is used to identify a servant who held the jar of water while his master washed his hands. Dilday (1987:278) states, 'It means that Elisha was known as the servant of the great prophet Elijah, and therefore, "the word of the Lord is with him"'.
²⁷⁷ Gause (1986:172) remarks that the word *διακονεῖν* (ministering) in Romans 12:7 is the same word used for those appointed to 'serve' tables in Acts 6:2 and generally means ministering to the temporal needs of people (Acts 6:2; 11:29; 19:22). Lombard and Daffe (2008:182) suggest that the gift could involve benevolent actions such as preparing meals for the sick or assisting the poor.

reluctance and without false pre-tense and can often operate in tandem with the gift of 'mercy' inasmuch as the latter is a word of action and predicated upon relieving the misery of those who are in need (Gause 1986:174; Newell 2009:326). Indication of the gifts of 'giving' and 'mercy' is found in the stories of the widow at Zarephath (1 Kgs 17:8-16) who sacrificially imparted food to Elijah and the Shunammite woman who imparted the gift of food and lodging to Elisha (2 Kgs 4:8-11). In the NT, Barnabas sells his land and gives the proceeds to the church in order to provide for the needy (Acts 4:32-37), and Dorcas gives assistance to widows and the poor through her 'good works and charitable deeds' (Acts 9:36).²⁷⁸ It is evident that those to whom God imparts the gift of 'giving' and 'mercy' approach persons in need with a message that is the opposite of what the apostle says in James 2:15-16. Rather, as Paul explains, they do their good works with cheerfulness (Rom 12:8).

Another important gift in Paul's list of *charismata* in Romans 12:6-8 is the gift of 'teaching'. In Greek culture, διδάσκων (teaching) involves causing someone to accept something. The Hebrew notion is to teach someone how to live (Wegenast 1978:759-765). In other words, as Flynn (1974:77) says, 'the gift of teaching should involve more than impartation of information; it should lead to involvement of the individual'. The gift of 'teaching' as implied by Paul is similar to the teaching/mentoring relationship between Moses and Joshua, and Elijah and Elisha (Exod 24:13; Deut 3:28; 2 Kgs 2:1-12; Lowery 2004:159-164). This relational aspect of imparting information through teaching and mentoring is also found in the NT examples of Aquila and Priscilla who provided to Apollos a better understanding of the Christian faith, and Paul's teaching which shaped the lives of those in Antioch and Thessalonica (Acts 11:26; 1 Thess 2:8-10; Chung 2009:170-172; Wagner 1979:129).

²⁷⁸ Dorcas had become commonly known for her acts of Christian charity which is made evident in Acts 9:39. 'And all the widows stood by him weeping, showing the tunics and garments which Dorcas had made while she was with them'. Bruce (1981:212) and Marshall (1986:179) contend that the middle voice ἐπιδεικνύμεναι (showing) most likely means that the widows were not only the recipients of the garments that Dorcas had made but that they were actually wearing them.

Finally, and just as important in Paul's naming of *charismata*, is the gift of 'exhortation'. This gift, according to Arrington (2003:324), 'is a special ability given by the Holy Spirit to certain believers, which enables them to minister words of comfort and encouragement to other believers'. Apparently, those whom the Spirit empowers with this gift are able to impart words that undergird the grieving, console and offer reassurance to the weak (Lombard and Daffe 2008:182). The most prominent NT example is Barnabas, called 'son of encouragement' (Acts 4:36; Wagner 1979:154). It was Barnabas that befriended and ministered to Paul in Jerusalem when others feared him and doubted his conversion (Acts 9:26-27); it was Barnabas that stood with and encouraged a chagrined John Mark after he had defected from a missionary tour to Pamphylia (Acts 15:36-39); and it was Barnabas who in spite of Mark's earlier defection and amidst the tempestuous disapproval of Paul, was willing to take the risk of inviting the young man on another missionary journey (Marshall 1986:257).²⁷⁹ In essence, Barnabas saw in Mark the potential for future ministry which otherwise might have been wasted had it not been for the display of the gift of 'exhortation' (Flynn 1974:88).

In sum, the *charismata* in Romans 12:6-8 are those gifts that become the means whereby the Holy Spirit ministers spiritually, emotionally and physically to persons who are in need or that God otherwise wishes to bless. Informing and developing texts have been given that resonate with the Spirit of the *charismata* which are meant to be manifested in the body of Christ. But, most importantly, there is reason to believe that the same *charismata* remain available for impartation so that believers may serve others. However, Paul does not end with the *charismata*, for he includes a third list of ministry gifts that are intended for impartation to believers.

²⁷⁹ Bruce (1981:318) and Marshall (256-257) remind us that the story of the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas is not one that makes for pleasant reading. Tension swells when Paul refuses to take John Mark on a second ministry tour to Cyprus and Asia Minor. The refusal of Barnabas to relinquish what he thinks is a good idea and his eventual separation from Paul due to their disagreement demonstrates the impact that the imparted gift of 'exhortation' had upon his life.

6.4 The *domata* in Ephesians 4:8-11

The *domata* listed in Ephesians 4:11 are considered to be ‘gifts of grace’ and are apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. Although the term *domata* does not appear in 1 Corinthians 12:4 or Romans 12:6, the gifts are ‘appropriately described as “gifts of the Holy Spirit” and “gifts of grace”’ (Arrington 2003:239).²⁸⁰ Saucy (1996:101-102) recognizes that while the common term for spiritual gifts, *charisma*, is not applied to these gifted individuals, it is clearly implied in Paul’s statement that this ‘grace was given according to the measure of Christ’s gift’ (Eph 4:7). Saucy (1996:101-102) also contends that since each person is given a measure of grace, one can surely conclude that ‘each one has his own spiritual gift (*charisma*) for ministry’. Paul begins his list of *domata* by naming the ministry of apostles.

The word ἀποστόλους means ‘the sent one’ and applies to a messenger who is sent on a special mission. In a primary sense this NT word speaks of the twelve apostles. However, ‘secondarily apostles’ refer to messengers or delegates sent out by churches to do the work of ministry (Arrington 2003:286; Wuest 1973, 1:100). The gift of apostle may manifest in various ways, such as being a travelling missionary, founding and establishing churches (Acts 11:19-26; Rom 16:7), or through oversight and remarkable leadership given to a church or group of churches (Acts 15; 2 Cor 11:28; Wagner 1979:2008). Viewed strictly, the gift of apostle is not an office, meaning the designation refers to function rather than status (Arrington 2003:287; Ruthven 2008:138). Interestingly, there are similarities to the gift of apostle in the OT such as the assignments given to Abraham, Joseph and Moses (Gen 12:1-4; 45:1-7; Ex 3:1-10). The difference being, the former were sent by God, whereas

²⁸⁰ Wuest (1973, 1:97-98) emphasizes that the term used for gifts in Ephesians 4:7 is not the *charisma* (extraordinary powers such as special gifts) but *charis* (grace gifts). *Charis* in this sense are special gifts for service, not the grace for daily living. He states, ‘The former is limited, and is adjusted to the kind of gift and the extent to which the Holy Spirit desires to use that gift in the believer’s service. The latter is unlimited and subject only to the limitations which the believer puts upon it by a lack of yieldedness to the Spirit’. Ruthven (2008:135) points out as well that the gifted persons listed by Paul are less likely to be offices but should be considered more as regular ministries like the prophets/teachers of 1 Corinthians 12:28 and the overseers/deacons of Philippians 1:1.

the apostles of the NT were commissioned by Christ (Grudem 2000:27; Katz 2000:7-15). Epaphroditus (Phil 2:25), Judas and Silas (Acts 15:22) and Paul (Rom 15:14-16) are examples of apostles assigned with the task of completing the faith of believers.

Next on Paul's list of *domata* are prophets. Generally, the word προφήτας refers to one whom the Spirit moves upon in order to prophesy (Acts 2:17; 1 Cor 14:31). When used in a more narrow sense, the gift relates to a distinct group of believers who deliver prophecies to the church as a group (1 Cor 14:29-33; Arrington 2003:290; Flynn 1974:53). Moreover, προφήτας in the Greek basically means to 'speak for another' (Wagner 1979:228) or 'one who predicts the future' (Grudem 2000:34; 1 Kgs 17:1; Mal 3:1-7; Acts 11:28-29; 20:23; 21:10-11).²⁸¹ Regardless of how one views the distinct manifestations of the gift, it is a gift for the edification, comfort, instruction and unity of the church (1 Cor 14; Eph 4:12-16). Given the fact that Paul was well acquainted with the prophetic ministry of Moses and Elijah, and having his own experience with Agabus (Acts 11:27-30, 21:10-11) and other believers who prophesied in the churches, it is understandable why he would view προφήτας as being a beneficial gift to impart comfort to believers.

Paul also saw the gift of 'evangelist' as being important for impartation in the church. The Greek word εὐαγγελιστάς appears three times in the New Testament (Acts 21:8; Eph 4:11; 2 Tim 4:5), and the literal meaning of the Greek word is 'one who proclaims the gospel' (Arrington 2003:298). In a way, God has called every Christian to be an evangelist, for every believer is to 'Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature' (Mark 16:15). However, there are those whom the Holy Spirit gives the gift of εὐαγγελιστάς, who are anointed to share the gospel in such a persuasive way that people believe in Christ as their Saviour.

²⁸¹ The gift of προφήτας has been given extensive treatment in the writings of Grudem (2000). He establishes and rightly so that the words of the original apostles are the words of God and are not to be added to. In the everyday use in the Greek-speaking world, the word 'prophet' would not suggest 'one who speaks with absolute divine authority' or 'one who speaks the very words of God' (2000:34-35).

Phillip is considered to be the basic model of an evangelist (Lombard and Daffe 2008:112), for he was instrumental in taking the gospel with great success to the people in Samaria, the Ethiopian in Gaza and to persons in the regions of Azotus and Caesarea (Acts 8:4-13, 26-40). Generally speaking, 'evangelists' are itinerant ministers whose main concern is to preach to the unconverted. However, they can also be effective in promoting doctrinal fidelity within the church (Cheung 2014:83; O'Brien 1995:299).²⁸² Although there is minimal mention of the term 'evangelist' in Scripture, there are multiple passages that imply the gift (1 Kgs 18:20-39; Jon 3:1-10; John 3:1-3; Acts 6:8-10; 13:4-49; 19:11-20). The evangelistic passion throughout the NT also seems to be concomitant with the missional mandate given to the church, which makes it inconceivable that the gift of 'evangelist' would not be a necessary gift for the impartation of gifts to believers and unbelievers alike.

Two final gifts comprising Paul's list of *domata* are 'pastors and teachers', and are linked by a single definite article. Vincent (1972:858) notes that 'The omission of the article from *teachers* seems to indicate that pastors and teachers are included under one class'.²⁸³ In other words, as Cheung (2014:83) and Lincoln (1990:250) imply, Paul has only one group of ministers in mind, or at least an overlapping of functions. However, the appositional placement of the gifts has little importance in comparison to understanding what pastors and teachers do. On the one hand, within the purview of these gifts is the idea that ποιμένας (pastors) are imparted with the ability to lead, feed, and protect those persons whom God has given

²⁸² O'Brien (1995:299) explains the role of the 'evangelist' thus: 'The admonition to Timothy to "do the work of an "evangelist" is set within the context of a settled congregation, which is presumably meant a ministry to believers and unbelievers alike, while the cognate verb, rendered "preach the gospel," covers a range of activities from primary evangelism and the planting of churches to the ongoing building of Christians and the establishment of settled congregations (cf. Rom 1:11-15). Here in Ephesians 4 evangelists are given by the ascended Christ for the purpose of building his body, and this included both intensive and extensive growth'.

²⁸³ A definite article is found before each of the gifted ministers in Ephesians 4:11 with the exception of 'teachers'. This has caused some to question if 'pastors' and 'teachers' are the same person (Cheung 2014:83; Lombard and Daffe 2008:116). Vincent (1972:858) most adamantly states, 'The two belong together. No man is fit to be a pastor who cannot also teach and the teacher needs the knowledge which pastoral experience teaches'. Noteworthy as well, the word pastor is usually considered synonymous with the words bishop and elder (Flynn 1974:67).

them to shepherd (John 10:11-18; 1 Pet 5:2). On the other hand, in order for pastors to effectively shepherd their flock, there is also the idea that they are διδασκάλους (teachers) who have been imparted with the ability to transmit biblically and thoroughly the principles of the Christian faith (Arrington 2003:295). In essence, then, for the church to be doctrinally sound and properly led it must have gifted teachers. For Flynn (1974:80), it is 'The *sine qua non* of Christian leadership'. Hence, it can be reasonably concluded that the gifts of 'pastors and teachers' are of the utmost importance to the body of Christ and that those leaders are most effective in preaching and teaching under the power of the Holy Spirit (Saucy 1996:141).

Representing those who had received imparted gifts similar to 'pastors and teachers' in the OT are Moses and Joshua. Both had a genuine concern for the children of Israel and routinely delivered messages from God to them (Ex 12:1-20; 13:1-10; 20:1-17; 32:1-13; Josh 1:1-9; 8:30-35), including leadership and instruction. However, comparable impartations are also found in the New Testament, for example, Timothy and Titus. Although Scripture does not identify the means through which Titus received his gifts, Timothy received his impartation of gifts through the laying on of hands (1 Tim 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6). The responsibilities of 'pastors and teachers' are stressed routinely throughout Scripture and especially in regards to Timothy and Titus (Ezek 34:15-16; Jer 23:4; Acts 20:28-30; 1 Pet 5:2-4). Paul instructs the latter two of them to preach and teach sound doctrine and to guard their flocks from those who attempt to preach and teach things contrary to the gospel (1 Tim 1:1-7; 4:11; 6:2-3; 2 Tim 2:2; 4:2; Tit 1:10-11; 2:4).²⁸⁴

In sum, our theological synthesis of scriptural teaching indicates that both the informing text and developing texts validate the practice of

²⁸⁴ Lombard and Daffe (2008:117) point out that while the pastor must be a teacher the teacher must be pastoral in teaching. 'A good example is the Rabbi who did not give verbal lessons only. He daily lived out what He taught and led the students in discovering truth'. Paul used this rabbinic model with the Thessalonians (1 Thess 2:1-12; Chung 2009:299-300). Teaching sound doctrine in this way enabled believers to offer an effective defense for their beliefs (Arrington 2003:295).

impartation. Also, the synthesis has provided a scriptural model for the kinds of impartations that Paul taught to believers. The next section focuses on the methods of impartation represented in Scripture.

7. Biblical Methods Used in Impartation

The study of the anchor text did not help to determine the particular method or methods that Paul would have used to impart gifts to the Roman believers. However, the theological synthesis of Romans 1:11 together with the informing and developing texts indicates a variety of scriptural means that have been used and remain apropos for the practice of impartation. Although there are numerous examples, only minimal discussion is required to illustrate the various methodologies that are represented in the Old and New Testaments.

7.1 Impartations and the sovereignty of God

Impartations are, as we have seen, sovereignly distributed by God and illustrated in multiple examples throughout Scripture. This was the case with, for instance, the impartation of the Spirit to the seventy elders, and Elijah and Elisha. God also, without human intermediary assistance, imparts the believers in the 'upper room' and the household of Cornelius with the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, God has determined to impart spiritual gifts to all believers who believe in Christ through grace (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 1:7; 12:1-11; Eph 4:7-13).²⁸⁵

7.2 Impartations through spoken words

Spoken words (blessings) can be one of the means of impartation (Gen 12:1-3), for example, Aaron blessing the children of Israel (Num 6:22-27), and Isaac and Jacob blessing their children and grandchildren (Gen 27:21-41). Spoken blessings have also been uttered by Jesus over children and His disciples (Mark 10:13-16; Luke 24:50-51). Such blessings seem to procure healing for the children or, in respect to the

²⁸⁵ The eschatological import in 1 Corinthians 1:7 signifies the continuation of imparted gifts.

disciples, God's efficacious grace (Calvin 1996:246-247; Sauer (1981:27-50). Scripture thus provides support for this practice in the contemporary church (Matt 5:44; Rom 12:14; 1 Pet 3:9; Jas 3:8-10).

Spoken words were also used for the impartation of healing (Ps 107:20; Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10; John 4:46-54; 11:1-14; Acts 3:1-8; 14:8-10). However, unlike Jesus whose words held creative power, ministers and believers impart healing through the power of the preached word or through proclamations spoken in the name of Jesus that invoke the sovereign healing power of God (Bruce 1981:85).

7.3 Impartations through the laying on of hands

Another reoccurring method of impartation found in our theological synthesis is the laying on of hands, for instance Moses at the ordination of Joshua (Num 27:18-23; Deut 34:9), the deacons in Acts 6:6, Saul and Barnabas in Acts 13:3, young Timothy in 2 Timothy 1:6 and a host of others (Gen 48:1-20). Yet, the broader use of the laying on of hands is seemingly found in the impartation of healing and the baptism in the Holy Spirit, such as Jesus regularly touching or laying His hands on someone, and the examples of Peter and Paul.²⁸⁶ These examples suffice to confirm that impartations of blessing, healing, gifts and the baptism in the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands were a practice in Scripture.

7.4 Impartation through acts of service

Romans 12:6-8 provides a list of spiritual gifts that may be referred to as gifts of service which is contrasted with the extraordinary gifts listed in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11. However, it is a contrast not of origin but of functionality. Paul distinctly states that *pneumatika* manifest by the will of the Spirit 'who works all these things' (v. 11). Descriptively put, 'the gifts,

²⁸⁶ Multiple scriptural passages mention the laying on of hands and touching as being involved in impartation. Both terms are used indiscriminately to indicate physical contact in the impartation of blessing and healing (Robinson 2008:88-89; Tipei 2009:109-110). Thus, Scripture references for both touching and the laying on of hands have been included (Matt 8:14-15; Mark 1:40-42; 5:25-26; 6:12-13; 6:53-56; 7:33; Luke 10:34; Acts 3:1-8; 5:12; 8:14-17; 9:17-18; 14:3; 19:1-6; 28:8; Jas 5:14-15).

even though they are “given” to “each person,” are ultimately expressions of the Spirit’s own sovereign action in the life of the believer and the community as a whole’ (Fee 1987:599).

Although, Paul recognises that the Holy Spirit alone distributes gifts (1 Cor 1:11), his repetition of ‘let us use them’ or ‘he who exhorts, in exhortation; he who gives, with liberality; he who leads, with diligence, he who shows mercy, with cheerfulness’ (Rom 12:6-8), implies an aspect of volitional impartation. In other words, divinely imparted *charismata* such as giving, leadership, or mercy are under the volition of the person who has the gift (Arrington 2003:324; Lombard and Daffe 2008:182; 2 Kgs 4:8-10; Luke 3:11).

In sum, while there are diverse methods in Scripture that illustrate their use in the practice of impartation, all of them are commonly united by a common purpose: service. Each method demonstrates God’s sovereign ability and will to impart both ‘ordinary’ and ‘extraordinary’ gifts of grace and blessings upon believers. Even more importantly, each represent God’s intent to use His people to bring glory to His name and to edify the body of Christ. Thus, the methods of impartation used by leaders such as Moses and Elijah in the OT as well as Jesus and apostles in the NT are representative of a scriptural and theoretical model that can be used for the practice of impartation in both the Church of God and other pentecostal denominations.

8. The Biblical Model of Impartation in the Church of God: Consistencies and Inconsistencies

The theological synthesis of Romans 1:11 and a selection of other texts provide several concepts that, together, comprise the biblical model of impartation. It is therefore vital to discuss whether or not this model is biblically consistent with the practice of impartation in the Church of God. We begin by discussing the biblical basis on which the Church of God formulates its doctrine and practice of impartation. The same informing and developing theology based on the biblical accounts of impartation

that set the context for Paul's practice of impartation is also the one that influenced the practice of impartation within the Church of God.

Leaders have studied the impartation of gifts and blessings that are found in the examples of Jacob, Joshua, Elisha, the Early Church, Paul and Timothy (Gen 48:1-20; Num 27:12-23; 2 Kgs 9:9-15; Acts 2:1-4; 9:17; 1 Tim 1:6) and believe that these examples set a biblical precedent for the doctrine of impartation. Denominational leaders have also relied on the practices of Paul to validate their desire to impart spiritual gifts to their churches (Conn 1986:26-34; Hill 2014; Lowery 1997:11-23).

There is also consistency between the theological and theoretical model of Paul and that of the Church of God in relation to the spiritual gifts that may be imparted to believers. Paul's list of *pneumatika* (1 Cor 12:1-11), *charismata* (Rom 12:6-8) and *domata* (Eph 4:8-11) are gifts believed to be apropos for effective ministry in the Church. Gause (1986:170-171) argues that believers must recognize the diversity of gifts and know that they are essential if the body of Christ is to minister effectively. Richie (2020:106) states that 'spiritual gifts should operate in the assembly with both freedom and order'. But most appropriate and representative of the Church of God's view are the thoughts of Lombard and Daffe (2008). According to them, God has created human beings with the ability to be creative and to accomplish amazing things. However, when considering the spiritual challenges facing the church, they say, 'we need spiritual gifts in addition to what we can contribute' (p. 124). Simply stated by Richie (2020:188-189), and reflective of the view of Pentecostalism, is that all of the gifts listed in the NT by Paul are 'relevant and active today' for the Church of God, including their impartation.

However, at least two inconsistencies exist between Paul's model and that of the Church of God. First, unlike Paul, a much greater emphasis is placed upon the impartation of the 'extraordinary' over that of 'ordinary' gifts. This inconsistency is reflected in literary form as well as in church

meetings.²⁸⁷ It suffices to say, in worship services there are multiple opportunities for the impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, healing and miracles as opposed to gifts such as giving, exhortation and mercy. In order to remain scriptural in practice, the Church of God must have a biblical and theoretical model that provides equal opportunity for the impartation of both 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' gifts and other spiritual blessings.

Second, inconsistency is found in the erroneous view that spiritual gifts are the permanent possession of believers and can therefore be imparted to other believers at will as how and when they see fit. Several authors noted the error and offered a biblical rebuttal to that belief and practice (Bay and Martinez (n.d.); Conn 1986:55-56; Hughes 1986:174). What they emphasise is that Ephesians 4:7-11 and 1 Corinthians 12:7, 11 teach that spiritual gifts are the φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος (manifestation of the Spirit) and sovereignly distributed by God.²⁸⁸

What the Church of God believes about the methods of impartation is, however, also consistent with the theological and theoretical model represented in Scripture. Leaders resolutely affirm and teach that God sovereignly imparts gifts and blessings without the intermediary human action (Tipei 2009:183), and that spoken words are a means of imparting blessings and healing (Hill 2016; Tipei 2009:18-20, 176-178). However, there is strong resistance to the unscriptural idea that believers create blessings or healings through their own creative ability in the use of words. No evidence was found in our theological synthesis to support this

²⁸⁷ To avoid repetitive documentation, the basis for this argument is included in a footnote in chapter 3 on the anchor text (i.e., Rom 1:11).

²⁸⁸ Conn (1996:105) and Lowery (2004:187-189) contend that spiritual gifts are not permanently invested in believers but are given to the church and therefore cannot be imparted from one person to another. In contrast, while Arrington (2015) agrees on the argument of imparting gifts to other persons, he argues that 'The Bible clearly teaches that *charismata* are given to Christians. "But to *each one* is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good" (1 Cor 12:7-10)... to one is given a word of knowledge, to another a word of wisdom, to another faith, to another the gifts of healing. This kind of language teaches that gifts are given to individuals; but individual believers and the church are the same'... For individuals to receive gifts means that the Holy Spirit bestows gifts on the church'. But possession of gifts cannot mean that believers can say 'I own, I control, I operate, I manipulate' my gift whenever he or she so wishes (pp. 243-244).

view. In contrast, believers activate God's power through invoking the name of Jesus in conjunction with proclamations of Scripture or words spoken that are consistent with the clear teachings of Scripture. Such was the case in the example of Peter imparting healing to the cripple in Acts 3:6. In other words, as argued by Morris (2012), although believers may speak words of blessing or healing in faith, the broader context of Scripture always 'places the emphasis not on the ability of the believer, but on the capacity of God' (p. 172).

The Church of God's doctrine of impartation is also consistent with the theological and theoretical model of impartation in Scripture in the following respect: gifts and blessings may be imparted to believers through the laying on of hands (Arrington 2008:300; Tipei 2009:217; Tomberlin 2010:225-237). Nevertheless, two inconsistencies require attention. First, it is unscriptural to think that gifts and blessings can be imparted volitionally by believers with the laying on of hands. The informing and developing texts neither state nor imply a theological model for that belief. Simply put, while God may use believers in the impartation process, He alone is the initiator and imparter of spiritual gifts and blessings (Lombard and Daffe 2008:197; Triplett 1970:131). Second, and in contrast with the teachings of Scripture, is the attempt to equate impartations of the Holy Spirit with certain preconceived emotional experiences. Neither the informing nor developing texts present the idea that one must go through some emotional catharsis as a way to confirm an impartation of gifts or blessings (Gause 2009:124-126; Hughes 1986:171). There is therefore no scriptural mandate to encourage the repetition of words or manipulation of others in an attempt to replicate the experience of speaking in tongues as the initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

Finally, the beliefs of the Church of God are also consistent with the theological model of impartation in Scripture, namely, impartation through acts of service. Leaders are not reticent to mention the gifts listed by Paul in Romans 12:6-8. Lowery (1997:142-143) views Paul's list as 'motivational gifts' that move us to serve one another better. Arrington

(2003:323) views Paul's list of service gifts as important in Christian service and exceeding that which is accomplished through natural talents and abilities. However, there is an inconsistency in the attitude of Church of God leaders towards the gifts of mercy, exhortation, teaching and giving and that of Paul. The unfortunate consequence is that believers view these gifts as being so ordinary that some may not even realize that they are gifts of God (Lombard and Daffe 2008:180).

In short, the impartation of these gifts are vitally important if the Church of God wishes to remain consistent with the scriptural model of impartation and if leaders wish to effectively impart gifts to others through mentorship, material goods, comfort and/or mercy (Luke 3:11; Romans 12:8; Eph 4:28; 1 Thess 2:8). Greater emphasis on rendering service in this way will allow the Church of God to provide holistic care to the body of Christ.

9. Summary and Concluding Remarks

This chapter has focused on the fifth subsidiary objective: to use the theoretical understanding of the doctrine of impartation to change the practice of impartation throughout the Church of God denomination. An examination of a set of key ideas or beliefs was conducted in order to formulate a theological synthesis of scriptural teaching and the current practice of impartation in the Church of God. A study of Paul's theology in Romans 1:11 and his promise to *metadidomi* a gift to his followers in Rome served as a basis for the synthesis and the discovery of a biblical model for the practice of impartation. The following conclusions are drawn from the synthesis.

First, Paul found biblical precedent and validation for his impartational theology in his personal experiences and knowledge of the Scripture. From these two sources he was able to formulate a scriptural model of impartation that he used to impart a gift or gifts to the believers in Rome. Second, the scriptural and theoretical model utilized by Paul involved the impartation of diverse gifts considered to be spiritually equal in nature but

'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' in manifestation. Third, the theological model of impartation in Scripture supports the imparting of gifts and blessings to believers as a sovereign act of God with or without intermediary human assistance, and through methods such as spoken words/blessings, the laying on of hands, and acts of service.

It has also been determined that, while the Church of God's theoretical practice of impartation is largely consistent with the teachings of Scripture, some inconsistencies exist that require correction. Firstly, equal emphasis and opportunity must be placed on the impartation of every spiritual gift listed in the NT. Secondly, the erroneous idea that believers can volitionally impart gifts and anointings to other persons must be uprooted. Thirdly, the view that believers may initiate healings and blessings at will must be deemed unscriptural. Fourthly, any attempt to equate impartations with resultant preconceived emotional experiences must be strongly resisted. Finally, believers must be taught to desire the impartation of both 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' spiritual gifts since the manifestation of each comprises a special service to the body of Christ. Consequently, making these necessary corrections may be a first step to help the Church of God to formulate a theological and theoretical model of impartation that is more appropriately aligned with the model derived from Scripture.

The next chapter will offer an analysis of the contemporary significance of the study conducted thus far. The purpose is to determine whether impartation can be practiced in accordance with biblical teaching. If so, then doctrinal and practical suggestions will be proposed that will serve as a guideline for the practice of impartation in the Church of God.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE CONTEMPORARY SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

1. Introduction

Part of the goal of this study has been to examine and compare the doctrine and practice of impartation in the Church of God with that of the teachings of Scripture. Although it was determined that impartation is a valid practice in both the Old and New Testaments, one final task remains which can be expressed in the words of Kevin Smith (2008:194): 'The task of theology is not complete, in our opinion, until its significance for today's church and its believers is considered'. Thus, in order to complete our systematic assessment, this chapter will offer an analysis of the contemporary significance of our study with the aim of determining whether impartation can be practiced in the Church of God in accordance with biblical teaching. If so, then doctrinal and practical suggestions will be proposed that could serve as a doctrinal position statement for the Church of God. Several questions will guide the proposal such as the following: What is spiritual impartation? What are the scriptural guidelines that serve as the basis for practice in the church or assembly? What biblical impartations are valid for practice and how are they to be understood? How should believers understand the meaning of impartations in their life? And what steps could be taken to discourage abuse of the doctrine of impartation?

2. An Argument for the Contemporary Practice of Impartation

Our analysis of the contemporary significance of impartation begins with an assessment of God's view of the doctrine and practice in Scripture. A thorough reading of the Scripture reveals a common thread that provides support of the view that God imparts gifts and blessings to His people. The thread begins its woven path in the OT: 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath

of life; and man became a living soul' (Gen 2:7). God imparted life to Adam's body, including moral, intellectual, relational and spiritual capacities (Constable 2019a:62). As such, 'Man as natural being was able to live in tune with the earth, but as spiritual being was equipped to live in touch with heaven' (Briscoe 1987:48). God continued to weave this thread of impartation throughout the OT by imparting blessings, anointing, and healing upon persons such as Abram, Elisha, Naaman and the Shunammite's son, as we have noted before. The same impartational thread is found in the NT. However, while these examples provide evidence of imparted gifts and blessings, they do not necessarily confirm that the practice of impartation has contemporary significance. The argument for continuance is based on additional passages of Scripture.

With this in mind, one of the main objectives for sustaining a doctrinal practice has to do with the purpose of impartation: Is there a justifiable biblical reason for the doctrine of impartation? The answer to this question comes through allowing Scripture to interpret Scripture. There are several biblical reasons to believe that the practice of impartation is both purposeful and of significance for contemporary practice.

2.1 The contemporary significance of Holy Spirit baptism

At first glance it becomes evident that Jesus taught often on pneumatology. And while all of the Gospels place emphasis on Jesus' teachings, it is John who seems to focus more on the purpose of the impartation of the Holy Spirit. In a very distinctive way John explains that those who are imparted with the Spirit will enjoy the benefit of His being a παράκλητον (helper) to them (John 14:16). As Helper, the Spirit will also teach and guide believers, enabling them to discern right from wrong and defend the truth against error (John 14:26; 16:13; Arrington 2003:297).²⁸⁹ In essence, the imparted Spirit will instruct believers invisibly in the same

²⁸⁹ Sims (1984:121) notes: 'Through the Holy Spirit God illuminates and confirms in our hearts (that is, our understanding) what He has revealed outwardly and objectively in the form of Scripture... The mysteries of the Word always lie beyond our rational comprehension. But what the Holy Spirit illuminates, the mind can grasp'. In essence, through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, the believer's mind is convinced beyond its own understanding.

manner that Jesus had done physically (Menziez and Horton 1993:72). Jesus also emphasized that the imparted Spirit would provide power to the believer: 'But you shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you' (Acts 1:8). Bruce (1981:38-39) puts it this way: 'As Jesus Himself had been anointed at His baptism with the Holy Spirit and power, so His followers were now similarly anointed and enabled to carry on His work'. The word for 'power' (*dunamis*) means 'to be able' or 'to have strength' to be identified with and perform service as a believer in Christ. The word witness (*martus*) is 'one who testifies' which, according to Arrington (2008:60) and Sims (1995:117), encompasses sharing Christ through one's testimony and the working of miracles and miraculous signs.

If it is from the Spirit that the believer finds everything he or she needs for being part of the body of Christ, then it would be unreasonable to claim that the impartation of the baptism in the Spirit lacks contemporary significance (Matt 28:18-19; Mark 16: 15-20; Acts 2). As Richie (2020:2-3) and Sims (1995:188-189) state the same truth, for Christians the imparted Spirit is the paradigmatic power of the present and the future, as well as the past (Acts 2:39).

2.2 The contemporary significance of spiritual gifts

Although Scripture is replete with stories of men and women who were gifted by the Spirit, the best support for the contemporary practice of impartation of spiritual gifts is found in the writings of Paul (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12-14; Eph 4:7-12). Paul also provides the purpose for their operation: spiritual gifts are essential to the life and growth of the church; and people who are equipped with gifts are to serve, edify and contribute to the spiritual maturity of fellow believers (1 Cor 14; Eph 4:11-15). It explains Romans 1:11 and Paul's longing to see the Roman believers so that he may impart a gift to them. His purpose is, simply stated, 'that you may be established'. That they must remain firm in the faith is also in Paul's wish to impart to the Thessalonian believers: 'we were well pleased to impart to you not only the gospel of God, but also our own lives...[in

order] to establish you and encourage you concerning your faith' (1 Thess 2:8; 3:3). Since there is nothing in Scripture that indicates that the church has progressed beyond the need for edification, the contribution of the *charismata* remains relevant for believers today.²⁹⁰ In other words, contemporary believers need the same impartations of gifts in order that they may be strengthened, established and perfected in their faith.

2.3 The contemporary significance of healing

Our earlier analysis has shown that God established Himself as divine Healer. It is without question that He enables the body to heal naturally and through use of 'medicine' (1 Tim 5:23). However, that does not diminish the fact that God continues to heal miraculously through gifts of healing. As Bonnke (1994) contends, we do not get the suggestion in Scripture that God has withdrawn the healing *charismata* from the church: 'On the contrary, every statement assumes Christ never changes, that He continues the work He began' (pp. 142-143; cf. Acts 3:1-10; 1 Cor 12:9, 28; Phil 2:25-30; Jas 5:15).²⁹¹

Although there are multiple reasons for the contemporary practice of healing the sick, two will suffice for the sake of argument. First, God is a God of hope. Therefore, the Christian practice of impartational healing offers hope to the infirmed and the distressed (Mark 5:27-28; Acts 5:12-

²⁹⁰ Deere (1993:135-136) argues that since edification is the primary purpose of spiritual gifts, 'how can anyone conclude that they have been taken away from the church... The Bible's own statements about the purpose of spiritual gifts force us to conclude that they were meant to continue until the Lord returns'. Storms (1996:205-206) argues the same and states that spiritual gifts are essential and no less important or needful than they were at the birth of the church. He offers three texts as proof. 'First Corinthians 1:4-9 implies that the gifts of the Spirit are operative until "our Lord Jesus Christ [is] revealed" (v. 7). Ephesians 4:11-13 explicitly dates the duration of the gifts: They are required "Until we all reach the unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the fullness of Christ" (v.13)... 1 Corinthians 13:8-13 dates the cessation of the *charismata* at the perfection of the eternal state, consequent upon Christ's return'. Offering the same reasoning is Oss (1996:274-276).

²⁹¹ As was pointed out in chapter five, there is no indication given in Scripture and more specifically James 5:13-18 that anointing with oil and praying for the sick to be healed requires believers to be endowed with the spiritual gifts of healing. Although God does heal miraculously through the manifestation of spiritual gifts, He in a mutual way heals as a result of prayers that are prayed in faith (Hodges 1994:116; McCartney 2009:253; Thomas 2012:21-23; Tipei 2009:148).

15; Rom 15:13; Jas 5:13-18). Tomberlin (2010:225-258) proposes that 'the prayers and anointed touch of the elders is sacramental—a means of grace—to the suffering' (cf. Tipei 2009:147-151).²⁹² It is for this reason that healing from God bears contemporary significance.

Second, the impartation of healing remains a significant practice for believers because of its missional purpose. This is confirmed by Jesus in Mark 16:15-20. Divine healing, among other miraculous signs, is viewed as confirming the truth and validity of the gospel which calls attention to the missiological purpose of the church (Richie 2020:160). This missiological theme has been witnessed firsthand in Acts (3:1-10; 9:32-35). However, the close association of 'signs and wonders, various miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit' together with the message of salvation is also emphasized in Hebrews 2:4.²⁹³ In essence, Mark 16:15-20 and Hebrews 2:1-4 remind believers of the spiritual gifts they have received, as they serve as irrefutable evidence of God's presence among the community of believers (Oss 1996:276).

2.4 The contemporary significance of blessing

It is obvious that the theme of blessing appears throughout the Bible, as we have seen, and the fact that these blessings were prodigiously meaningful. However, the question is whether or not spoken blessings have any contemporary impartational significance. The answer is yes, and for at least the following reasons. First, imparted blessings are a form of prayer that procures God's goodness for one's self and others. The priestly blessing spoken over the congregation of Israel in Numbers 6:22-

²⁹² Tomberlin (2010:225-258) uses the term sacramental to emphasize the embodied spirituality of Pentecostalism which he explains thus: 'This sacramental practice involves fellowship with the Spirit and the church, and the interaction between that which is of the Spirit and that which is physical'. Hence, the practice of anointing with oil and the laying on of hands is a sacramental rite through which the sick encounters 'the anointed touch' of the 'Anointed One' in healing.

²⁹³ It is assumed that since miraculous healing is mentioned in Mark 16:18 and gifts of healing are included by Paul as imparted gifts in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11, that the author of Hebrews would have in mind to include the impartation of healing in his listing of signs, wonders and miracles. Arrington (2003:331) agrees. 'The term *miracles* (*dunamis*, powers) refer to extraordinary manifestations and can include healings'. Oss (1996:170-171) and Saucy (1996:110-111) assume the same.

26 serves as an example. It contains three clauses which, according to Budd (1984:77), 'gives expression to God's commitment to Israel—a commitment which promises earthly security, prosperity, and general well-being'. Similar provisions comparable to the Aaronic blessing are included in the prayer Jesus instructed believers to pray (Matt 6:9-13). In this prayer believers are blessed with the potential of having daily provision, deliverance from temptation and protection from the 'evil one'. Also, two of the main elements in Aaron's oracle are 'grace and peace' which is similarly used in the salutation and epilogue that Paul offers in his letters (Eph 1:2; 6:24; Phil 1:2; 4:23; Col 1:2; 4:18; Constable 2019b:36).²⁹⁴ There is therefore biblical justification for believers to follow the practice of imparting blessings through spoken words and prayers to family members, congregants, and others who stand in need of God's beneficence.

Second, the practice of imparting blessings is also suited to demonstrate spiritual maturity and demeanor. The argument is taken from what is taught in Matthew 5:44, 1 Peter 3:9 and James 3:8-10, all of which speak of controlling the tongue. Believers are instructed to 'bless those who curse' them' (Matt 5:44); to refuse to return 'evil for evil or reviling for reviling' (1 Pet 3:9); and to bless and refuse to curse men (Jas 3:8-10).²⁹⁵ Such behaviour is exactly what Paul is addressing in Romans 12:9-14: 'Let love be without hypocrisy. Abhor what is evil, Cling to what is good...Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse'. Thus, imparting blessings to others remains a contemporary and significant biblical practice for the church.

In sum, ample evidence has been given to conclude that the doctrine of impartation has contemporary significance and can be practiced in accordance with biblical teaching. God continues to manifest His grace

²⁹⁴ Constable (2019b:36) believes that 'it is probable that the Apostle Paul based his salutations on this [Aaron's] oracle'. Although it is not known for certain, Constable's view is logically possible,

²⁹⁵ The Greek word εὐλογοῦντες (blessing) used in 1 Peter 3:9 is not a noun but a participle, which according to Wuest (1973, 2:86) means 'be constantly blessing'. Paul uses the cognate εὐλογεῖτε (bless) in Romans 12:14 in order to emphasize the same attitude of blessing those who are unkind.

and remains faithful in the giving of gifts 'so that you [believers] come short in no gift, eagerly waiting for the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1 Cor 1:7).

The study will now turn to doctrinal and practical suggestions for the biblical practice of impartation in Pentecostalism and Church of God along the way of a number of questions.

3. What is Spiritual Impartation?

Since the theological doctrine of impartation is commonly practiced in Pentecostalism and more specifically the Church of God it is not unusual for members to be given the opportunity to receive impartations through prayer and the laying on of hands during church services and conferences. However, many leaders seem confused about the practice or are reticent to mention what spiritual impartation is. It therefore raises the following question: What is spiritual impartation?

The Greek word for impartation, as we have seen, is *metadidomi*, which means to 'give over' or 'to give a share' (Vine 1952:149). When the five NT passages in which the word appears (Luke 3:11; Rom 1:11; 12:8; Eph 4:28; 1 Thess 2:8) are analysed, it becomes evident that impartation implies the 'giving over' or 'sharing' of 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' gifts.²⁹⁶ On the one hand, impartation means 'giving' or 'sharing' with others gifts such as a coat, a meal, an act of mercy, the sacrifice of one's time, or a biblical teaching (Lombard and Daffe 2008:181-184; Lowery 1997:141-149). On the other hand, impartation is understood as the 'giving' or 'sharing' of the spiritual gifts listed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 and Romans 12:6.

²⁹⁶ The terms 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' are not meant to suggest that some gifts are more important than others. Rather, the terms are used for classification purposes. 'Ordinary' gifts can be those shared in the physical such as a coat, food or a monetary gift. But the term is also used in reference to spiritual gifts such as salvation, mercy, giving, pastor, teaching, and evangelist. The 'extraordinary' are those gifts listed in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11 and Romans 12:6 (Budiselic 2011:250; Cranfield 1975:78-79; Morris 1988:60; Stitzinger 2003:174; Wuest 1973, 1:21-22).

Although there is a general consensus among pentecostals, charismatics and other believers on the definition of impartation, there is also a general disagreement among pentecostals about how the definition of impartation is to be applied.²⁹⁷ *Metadidomi*, in their mind, means the ‘transference of the anointing’ (Clark 1013:16), the transfer of grace from one party to another (Anyasi 2003:295), or the ability to transfer to others that which God has given sovereignly to a particular individual (Francis 2015). Defined in this way, *metadidomi* for many in Pentecostalism is the ability to transfer from themselves to other believers a special anointing or gifts of the Spirit. However, this understanding of *metadidomi* is problematic. Pentecostals seems to distort the true biblical meaning of spiritual impartation; it is incorrectly viewed as being ‘shared’ or imparted at the discretion of the human person rather than by the will of God (Arrington 2016; Bay and Martinez 2015). As a consequence many pentecostals are practicing an unscriptural view of spiritual impartation which will be challenged next. For now the following proposal is offered in an attempt to capture the scriptural meaning of impartation: ‘Spiritual impartation is the giving to or sharing of God’s grace with the lives of His people by way blessings, spiritual gifts or material goods in answer to their physical, emotional, and spiritual needs’.

4. What are the Scriptural Guidelines for the Practice of Impartation?

A casual reading of what Scripture teaches about spiritual gifts leads to the conclusion that God is a God of procedure and order. Generally speaking, in church meetings, ‘all things [have to] be done decently and in order’ (1 Cor 14:40). In other words, the omnipotent imparter demands that spiritual things be handled with ‘propriety’ and in a ‘fitting’ way (Fee 1987:713). It therefore raises the next question: What are the scriptural guidelines for the practice of impartation?

²⁹⁷ The use of Pentecostalism is not intended to imply that everyone referenced is associated with the Church of God or that they are classical pentecostals. Rather the term is used to imply that they believe in the experience of the baptism in Holy Spirit and spiritual gifts.

4.1 The recipients of impartations

Two concepts are relevant to the recipients of spiritual impartations, especially of the baptism in the Spirit and the gifts categorized as *pneumatika*, *charismata* and *domata*. First, recipients are persons who have a relationship with Christ (Acts 2:38; 10:15-17; 19:1-6; Rom 1:11; 12:1-8; 1 Cor 12:1-11). In other words, these are endowments conferred on believers by the Spirit for Christian service (Arrington 2003:234; Gause 2009:114, 126). Second, since the term μεταδιδωμι is thought to include gifts such as salvation, healing, mercy, exhortation and/or other blessings, unbelievers may be the recipients of these kinds of impartations (Cranfield 1975:78-79; Hodge 1947:25-26). Confirmation of this second concept is found in Paul's use of χάρισμα in Romans 6:23 and his reference to the free grace gift of 'eternal life that is imparted to the unbeliever'. Additional scriptural references also confirm that unbelievers receive impartations (2 Kgs 5:11; Matt 5:44; Luke 3:11; 1 Pet 3:8-9; Acts 3:6; 28:8).

Of equal importance to knowing the recipients of impartations is the means through which impartations are given.

4.2 The means of impartations

One of the predominant problems Jesus had with 'formalized religion' was the cumbersome and unnecessary criteria that was to be adhered to in order to receive blessings and gifts from God (Mark 7:1-16; John 5:1-15). The Pharisees' strict and misinformed adherence to the Sabbath, their practice of dietary laws as well as their rituals for purification were seen by Jesus to be obstacles to receiving God's spiritual benefits. It is arguably the case that it remains a problem among pentecostals who like to restrict spiritual impartations according to unalterable legalistic rituals. However, the multitudinous ways God chose to impart healing and blessings in Scripture and the nature of the gifts militates against such a notion. Believers are therefore unwise to limit God's impartations to a particular location, means, ritual or regimented form of worship.

In response to these shortcomings, the following four ways are proposed as acceptable biblical means through which God imparts healing, blessings, the baptism in the Spirit or spiritual gifts to believers.²⁹⁸

4.2.1 Impartation and congregational worship

The Church of God has viewed lively church services, praying at the altar, and ecstatic forms of worship as being conducive for receiving benefits from God. Richie (2020) is representative of this attitude. He states that 'a dynamic atmosphere is more conducive for the demonstration of God's living presence than a static format' (p. 124). Conducive as well is the pentecostal ethos of worship at the altar which Tomberlin (2010:18, 27-28) regards as transformative and normative for the exercise of spiritual gifts and the impartation of the baptism of the Spirit and fire.²⁹⁹ Thus, at the altar believers regularly receive impartations as a corollary of human responsiveness in the form of ecstatic praying, the lifting of the hands, and repetitions of words such as 'Thank you Lord, glory' and 'hallelujah' (Lombard and Daffe 2005:211-219; Lowery 1997:29).

4.2.2 Impartation and the laying on of hands

Although impartations are routinely received in a dynamic spiritual atmosphere and in consequence to tarrying prayer and acclamations of worship (Vanoy 2006:6-7; Walker 1933), believers may also receive through the laying on of hands which is arguably the most prominent method through which believers receive impartations (Robinson 2008; Tipei 2009). On occasion the impartation of gifts may be accompanied by a manifestation of prophecy. However, prophecies in this manner are used to confirm the action of the Spirit rather than to designate the

²⁹⁸ Although these gifts are representative of those most prominently imparted in Scripture, it is not the intention to imply that these gifts along with others listed in Scripture (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:1-11; Eph 4:1-12) are inclusive of every impartation available to believers.

²⁹⁹ Richie (2020:113-131) and Tomberlin (2010:1-29) give more than casual attention to the altar and its significance in pentecostal theology. Tomberlin in particular raises the concern 'that some Pentecostals have lost the initial ethos of the movement' by their lack of emphasis on directing persons to the altar for salvific encounters and the baptism in the Spirit.

particular gift or gifts that are to be imparted (Arrington 1982:103-104; Fee 1994:774).

Although the aforementioned examples are representative of the ways in which the laying on of hands is used in the practice of impartation, they are not inclusive of every impartation that may be received in this manner. Moreover, it should be understood that although God uses humans to impart spiritual gifts, healing and the baptism in the Spirit, the ability to distribute these blessings resides in God's power (Luke 11:13; 1 Cor 12:1-11). Or, as explained by Hughes (1986:174), 'the act of laying on of hands is to invoke God's blessing and does not mean that the person exercising this right has some supernatural power in his hand which he imparts to others'. Rather, as Fee (1994:774) points out, the laying on of hands by believers and ministers is secondary to the work of God.

4.2.3 Impartations through spoken words

God's blessings and gifts are also imparted through spoken words. Pastors in this way impart blessings to their congregations similar to the way Joshua in Numbers 6:22-27 and Jesus in Luke 24:50-52 did. Most often blessings of this magnitude are imparted in the form of a prayer (3 John 2).³⁰⁰ According to Matthew 5:44 and Romans 12:14, believers may also use spoken words to impart blessings of good will upon their enemies.

Spoken words may also be used for healing through proclamation of the gospel (Ps 107:20; Luke 7:14; John 5:8; Acts 14:8-10; Heb 2:1-4). However, the sovereign power of God is made effective only when believers make proclamations in the name of or through the authority of Jesus (Mark 16:15-18; John 14:12-14; 16:23-24).³⁰¹ In other words, as

³⁰⁰ Proponents of the Word of Faith doctrine or prosperity gospel use Mark 11:24, Romans 4:17 and 3 John 2 to teach that through confession every believer can live in total health, free from sickness and disease and can be materially prosperous. McConnell (1995) and Morris (2012) offer a biblical critique of the Word of Faith teaching.

³⁰¹ Arrington (2008:97-98, 303) points out that as in Acts 2:38 'name' signifies the authority and power of Jesus, thus identifying the source of Peter's power and authority to heal the lame man. The vital importance of using the name of Jesus and being under His authority when attempting to impart healing and deliverance is brought to light in the

Arrington (2008:303) explains, 'the name of Jesus is powerful only when it is pronounced on His authority and with faith in Him'.

In sum, while believers are able to impart blessings and healing through spoken words, it is God's power that meets a human need. By implication, it is not the words of believers that are creative in and of themselves. As Kilpatrick (1995:58-73) points out spoken blessings can have a profound impact. However, it must be stated that the believer does not create health and wealth when blessings of healing and prosperity are spoken over other persons or family members (cf. Morris 2012:114,169). In essence, what sets the Christian blessing apart from any other kind is that it is a divinely initiated experience through an invocation of God.

4.2.4 Impartation through ministry service

Pentecostalism is very familiar with impartations through or as a result of ecstatic worship, prayer at the altar, the laying on of hands and spoken proclamations. These impartations are predominantly associated with the 'extraordinary' gifts. However, as defined earlier, *metadidomi* means to 'give a share' or to 'give over' which mean the giving or conveyance of both 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' gifts. The conceptual and contextual application of *metadidomi* in Scripture must therefore be understood to mean that all of the gifts are beneficial and to be imparted, received and manifested throughout the body of Christ (Oss 1996:278; Stott 1994:326). The following are representative of the means through which impartations associated with the 'ordinary' gifts are experienced.

First, 'ordinary' as well as 'extraordinary' gifts are sovereignly distributed by God without the mediation of any human act, which indicates that they are not of human but divine origin (Conn 1986:55; Lombard and Daffe 2008:53; Oss 1996:278). Second, 'ordinary' gifts, like 'extraordinary' gifts, may be imparted through ecstatic worship, altar prayers or the laying on

example of the seven sons of Sceva (Acts 19:11-17). Bruce (1981:390-391) remarks that the name of Jesus was potent when being used by Paul: 'But when they [the sons of Sceva] tried to use it, like an unfamiliar weapon wrongly handled it exploded in their hands'.

of hands. Third, although 'ordinary' ministry gifts such as the gift of teaching, preaching, exhortation, mercy and giving are sovereignly imparted by the Spirit to believers, there is an element of human volition involved in how, when and where these gifts are manifested in acts of service. It is evident in the words Paul uses, for instance, 'let us use them', 'he who gives' or 'he who leads' (Rom 12:6-8). Jesus suggested the same point: 'He who has two tunics, let him give to him who has none' (Luke 3:11). Said differently, believers are sovereignly imparted with the spiritual gift of 'giving' but are at liberty to choose the place, the person and time of its manifestation.³⁰²

A few final observations with regard to the means or guidelines through which impartations are given will be in order. First, while it can be said that impartations are received during congregational worship, the laying on of hands, spoken words and acts of ministry service, none of these modalities in and of themselves are mandated as criteria for receiving impartations. Rather, God may choose to sovereignly impart a blessing, gift or healing to someone in a totally different way than through any of the aforementioned means that have been discussed. Second, while God often uses human intermediaries, the Holy Spirit never abdicates His responsibility in such a way that humans are given the latitude to volitionally impart healing, the baptism in the Holy Spirit or spiritual gifts; nor is any believer given the latitude to transfer a spiritual gift or anointing to another at will (Hughes 1986:172-174; Lombard and Daffe 2008:196-200). Furthermore, God is sovereign and therefore may wish to impart a gift or blessing to another person when the believer or leader does not feel they should. Third, although religiosity may be characterised by pre-established rituals intended to assist persons in receiving impartations, it is God's desire that impartation be a simple rather than complex

³⁰² Arrington (2003:325) shares that 'giving' in Romans 12:8 may involve possessions such as money, food, clothing or providing shelter for the benefit of others. Such gifts are to be given 'with liberality' (*aplotēs*), generously, without any motive or human gain. Put differently, 'The person with the gift of giving will give with singleness of mind. No ulterior motive will ruffle the cloth of his mind to make a fold or two in it. He will not give to salve a conscience uneasy because of the way he earned his money. Nor will he give to gain something in return' (Flynn (1974:118).

practice.³⁰³ The instructions to recipients may therefore be summarised as follows: (1) eagerly ask and desire to be imparted with spiritual gifts (Matt 7:11; Luke 11:13; 1 Cor 12:31; 14:1);³⁰⁴ (2) be obedient to the Spirit (Acts 5:32);³⁰⁵ and (3) yield to or be ready in faith to receive from the Spirit (Rom 12:3-8; 1 Cor 12:11).³⁰⁶

5. Which Biblical Impartations are Valid for Continual Practice and How are They to be Understood?

Although the study has thus far established that impartation is a biblically supported practice and one that holds contemporary significance for the church, there remains the question about which impartations are valid for practice today and how they are to be understood. Admittedly, trying to list every impartation that may be available to believers would be an insurmountable task. Yet, the following are representative of those that are considered to be the most significant in the Church of God and Pentecostalism.³⁰⁷

5.1 The baptism in the Holy Spirit

Arguably one of the most predominant impartations mentioned in the Bible is that of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. And although the Spirit is mentioned throughout Scripture, one of the strongest arguments for the contemporary practice of imparting Spirit baptism to believers is found in

³⁰³ Gause (1976:113-116; 2009:124-129) and Hughes (1986:168-175) discuss several issues that are problematic and relative to Pentecostalism and the impartation of the Holy Spirit and His gifts.

³⁰⁴ Storms (1996:184-185) finds in Luke 11:13 a principle of persistence that carries over from Luke 11:1, meaning '*we are repeatedly and persistently and on every needful occasion to keep on asking, seeking, and knocking for fresh impartations of the Spirit's power*' (emphasis in original).

³⁰⁵ Obedience is understood as walking in faith and obeying the will of God, especially concerning the Holy Spirit and His gifts (Arrington 2003:216; 2008:126; Conn 1986:34; Lowery 1997:27).

³⁰⁶ Yielding concerns the idea that believers, although having a propensity towards a gift, are not given the responsibility of choosing that particular gift for themselves. Rather with yieldedness believers necessarily acquiesce to the Spirit's personality who imparts the gift that best meets the needs and capacities of each person (Morris 1981:173; Oss 1996:137-138; Storms 1996:223).

³⁰⁷ Arrington (2003); Bittlinger (1967); Bonnke (1994); Bullinger (1953); Flynn (1974); Gee (1972); Lim (1991); Lombard and Daffe (2008); Lowery (1997); Triplett (1970). See also Wagner (1979).

the words of the prophet Joel (2:28-29). Several significant points are of interest in Joel's prophecy. First, he confirms that there will be an eschatological outpouring of God's Spirit. The word 'afterword' signifies that the Spirit's outpouring will begin with the messianic age and will continue until the second coming of Christ (Arrington 2003:159; Bickle 2009:101; Bruce 1981:68). Second, Joel indicates that this diffusion of the Spirit will be universally charismatic and imparted to believers regardless of their age, gender, or social status, thus fulfilling Moses' desire that the Spirit's revelatory activity be democratized among God's people (Num 11:29; Oss 1996:248; Storms 1996:74; Treier 1997:16). Third, Joel's mention of the Spirit being poured out upon 'all flesh' and 'sons and daughters' signifies that the impartation of the Spirit is unceasingly apropos for generations to come (Menzies and Horton 1993:125-126).

Joel's thematic prophecy was also emphasized by Jesus and initially fulfilled when the Spirit came with great power upon the believers in the upper room in Jerusalem (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8; 2:1-4). Consequently, the residual effect of the impartation was once again chronicled in the words of Luke in Acts 2:1-39. Peter reinforces Joel's contemporary paradigm by making the promise perpetual. In other words, as argued by Storms (1996:74), 'Nothing in Peter's language suggests that he envisioned the experience and behavior of the 120 to be temporally restricted or unavailable to others'. On the contrary, the impartation of the Spirit is confirmed as being contemporaneously suited for all believers. Thus, Church of God leaders believe that the Scripture teaches that believers should continue to be imparted with the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

However, while pentecostals believe that the baptism in the Spirit is available and should be imparted to every believer, there is the general view that the impartation should be appropriately understood. First, most believe that the impartation of the baptism in the Spirit is subsequent to conversion (Acts 8:14-17; 19:1-6; Richie 2020:169; Sims 1995:112-

114).³⁰⁸ Second, it is generally accepted that a spirit of worship and obedience are prefatory to receiving the imparted Spirit (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:14; Gause 2009:127; Menzies and Horton 1993:130). Third, it is understood that speaking in tongues may initially but not necessarily immediately accompany the impartation of the Spirit (Acts 2:4; 8:14-17). And, while speaking in tongues is evidence of the imparted Spirit it is not the only evidence (Conn 1986:35). Fourth, it is rightly considered that the impartation of the Spirit is not a climactic experience, but only an open door to a growing relationship with the Spirit (Menzies and Horton 1993:127). Thus, the believer's passion should not be merely for evidentiary tongues but for the fullness of the Spirit and a deeper relationship with God (Arrington 2003:173). Fifth, as iterated by Sims (1995:115-119), the imparted Spirit is understood to have missional significance: 'Being filled with the Spirit is the believer's spiritual equipment for taking up Christ's vocation in power'. In other words, the imparted Spirit empowers believers to continue Christ's work in the world (John 14:12; Mark 16:15-20; Acts 1:8). Finally, it is believed that the impartation of the Spirit places the Spirit in the life of the believer as 'Helper' (John 16:5-15). As 'Helper' the Spirit becomes the relevant illuminated answer to human need (John 5-15).³⁰⁹ As the 'Spirit of truth', He imparts not new truth, but through illumination makes the truth we already have through the Word alive, operational and understandable (Sims 1995:115).

5.2 Pneumatika, charismata, and domata

God has appointed a diversity of gifts in the church, and if there is to be health, harmony, and efficiency in the body of Christ, the biblical practice of impartation of spiritual gifts must be made available to all believers

³⁰⁸ Richie (2020:169) notably explains that 'the doctrine of subsequence articulates a logical distinction rather than a necessary temporal differentiation'. Sims (1995:112-114) in view of Acts 10:44-48 similarly remarks that although it is evident that Spirit baptism is a gift distinct from and subsequent to conversion, 'this does not mean it has to be a chronologically separate experience'.

³⁰⁹ The Greek word παράκλητος is translated as 'Helper'. The two words 'παρά' (come to the side of) and 'κλητος' (call or summons) mean 'one called to help, aid, or advise (Sims 1984:139).

(Gause 1986:171). This means, that equal emphasis must be placed upon the impartation of every spiritual gift, because they all work together to build up the church and to help believers serve in one way or another for the common good (Lowery 1997:143; 1 Pet 4:10). Thus, in order to be biblically balanced, Church of God leaders must allow an opportunity to their members to be imparted with every spiritual gift and members should be encouraged to pray for the manifestation of their imparted gift or gifts. The gifts considered valid for impartation today are those referred to in 1 Corinthians 12:1-11, Romans 12:6-8 and Ephesians 4:8-11.

However, the aforementioned gifts are understood to be spiritual in origin and nature (1 Cor 12:1-11; Conn 1986:55; Oss 1996:278). Thus, they are distributed by God and stand in contrast to natural human abilities (Flynn 1974:22; Lombard and Daffe 2008:43-53). As stated by Gee (1963:24), 'they are a continual "manifestation of the Spirit," an abiding and inspiring reminder of His presence and power'. These gifts also serve at least three primary purposes: their manifestation serves to edify and disciple the body of Christ (1 Cor 14; Rom 12:3-8; 1 Thess 2:1-12; Eph 4:7-13); they help to confirm the truth of the gospel (Mark 16:14-20; Heb 2:1-4); and they demonstrate the way God places every believer in a position to contribute effectively, benevolently and spiritually to others (Rom 12:3-21; Flynn 1974:12-17).

5.3 Divine healing

The impartation of healing has historically been a benchmark for the manifestation of God's power in the church, and pentecostals have continuously drawn on the words of Exodus 15:26 and Psalms 103:3 in support of the fact. They have also found in Mark 16:15-18, James 5:13-16 and 1 Peter 2:24 a valid reason to continue the practice of imparting healing to the sick (Tomberlin 2010:47-48). As explained by Richie (2020:126), 'The laying on of hands, anointing with oil, and use of prayer cloths are most commonly integrated into the altar service'. It is in this tangible expression, the combining of the physical and the spiritual, that believers see signs of divine presence (Thomas 2016:111). However, if

the impartation of healing is to be a biblically sound practice in the Church of God, then it must be correctly understood.

First and foremost, while believers may anoint with oil, pray, lay hands on the sick and believe, it is God who imparts healing to the infirmed. In other words, as insisted by Seymour (1906:4) and Tomberlin (2010:251), believers are no more divine healers than divine saviours. In Mark 16:20 it is stated that the disciples preached everywhere but it was Jesus who worked with them 'confirming the word through accompanying signs'. Second, although 'gifts of healing' are often involved, believers can be used to impart healing to the sick with or without being endowed with these gifts (Jas 5:13-16). Third, believers may pray and lay hands on the sick, but as Lombard and Daffe (2008:153) reveal, 'God alone, however, determines whether, how, and when healing takes place' (Phil 2:25-27; 2 Tim 4:20; cf. Cross 2001:200; Flynn 1974:170-171). Fourth, imparted healing is to be offered without prejudice to all--the rich, the poor, the sinner and the saint (Jas 2:9; 5:15-16; Bonnke 1994:154-155).³¹⁰ Fifth, if the practice of imparting healing to the sick is to be effective, it must be a channel of God's grace to the hurting and the infirmed and offered to bring glory to God who is the Healer (Luke 5:25-26; John 11:4).

5.4 Blessing

The mention of imparted blessings throughout the Scripture and the specific instructions given in Matthew 5:44, Romans 12:14 and 1 Peter 3:9 is reason to believe that imparted blessings are still valid for the church (Garborg 2003:31-40; Kilpatrick 1995:58-73). The impartation of blessing is understood as the sharing or receiving of spoken proclamations similar to that of the Aaronic blessing in Numbers 6:22-26 which offer perpetual health, protection, prosperity and peace to recipients. Blessing is also understood to be spiritual in nature and therefore not a human ability. However, when blessings are spoken in the

³¹⁰ Bonnke (1994:154-155) rightfully points out that Jesus ministered to all strata of society and especially to the disenfranchised who stood outside the commonwealth of Israel (Mark 7:24-30).

name of Jesus, an imparted blessing must be seen as a manifestation of God's power and His unlimited resources.³¹¹

6. The Meaning of Impartations for the Believer

Concomitant with the concern of which impartations are valid for believers and how they should be understood is the challenge to understand the meaning of impartations for the believer. Pentecostals are convinced that God wants to impart His blessings and gifts to them, but how are those impartations to be understood? The first step is for the believer to make his or her desire for a blessing or gift known to God. Recipients receive in response to asking, pursuing or desiring impartations from God (Luke 11:13; 1 Cor 12:31; 14:1; Jas 5:13-15). Of equal importance is the believer's attitude towards God: believers may desire a specific spiritual gift, blessing or healing but they should bear in mind that it is He who sovereignly determines when and how the impartation is received. The attitude of recipients may therefore be described as trust in God's choosing what is best for them (Lombard and Daffe 2008:45).³¹² Paul's statement that the Spirit gives 'to each one individually as He wills' is a reminder that God deals with us as individuals (Morris 1981:173).

It should also be understood that impartations are given as a result of God's grace (Rom 12:6). They are imparted freely and, consequently, cannot be attained through things such as the practice of tithing and giving (Acts 8:14-23), adherence to preconceived styles of worship characterised by the manifestation of emotions or the doing of good works (cf. Gause 2009:124-126). Although believers may engage in one or all of these practices, these are not elements of a biblical theology of impartation.

³¹¹ Although James 3:1-12 and 1 Peter 3:9 reveal that spoken blessings are significant, meaningful and have impact, the practice of imparting blessings as understood in this study is not that of 'Word of Faith' or 'prosperity gospel' theology.

³¹² Cross (2001:178-231), Alexander (2006), Richie (2020:158-162), Thomas (2012), Tipei (2009:110-171) and Tomberlin (2010:225-258) are representative of the Church of God and more generally Pentecostalism.

Furthermore, believers should accept that impartations are very much relevant to their lives. As stated earlier, imparted healings and blessings serve as confirmation of the gospel (Mark 16:15-20; Heb 2:1-4) and are means through which God is glorified (Luke 5:25-26; John 11:4). In addition, it is to be understood that believers are placed in a unique participatory role with God when being imparted with gifts. Simply put, 'Your gift is not for your sake' (Flynn 1974:15); they are for the body of Christ. When this is understood and applied then the intent of the Spirit becomes very much evident (Gee 1972:28).

In sum, believers who have a proper understanding of their imparted gifts, healing and blessings are likely to experience greater effectiveness in the body of Christ.

7. Steps to Discourage the Abuse of the Doctrine of Impartation

One of the problems that caused Pentecostalism to be misunderstood by and misrepresented to non-pentecostals concerns the abuse of the doctrine of impartation. Aberrant manifestations and theological error have led many outside Pentecostalism to see them as heretics. In order to correct this picture and to ensure that the practice of impartation within the Church of God is congruent with biblical teaching, the first important step would be to discourage abuse of the doctrine of impartation, and especially of faulty teachings inherited from the past.

Based on the information in the previous sections, four predominant themes are noteworthy. Sound biblical instruction is necessary because 'No church is worthy to exercise that in which it refuses to be instructed' (Triplett 1970:86). Thus, it is incumbent upon leaders to understand the biblical concept of impartation, which comprises knowledge of (1) what spiritual impartation means and entails, (2) which biblical gifts and blessings are relevant to the church for impartation, (3) what the scriptural guidelines are for the practice of impartation, and (4) the relevance of impartations to believers' lives. A thorough exposition of these themes as

they relate to problematic practices in the assembly would be beyond the scope of this study. Instead, an attempt will be made to offer a brief 'positional statement' for practice.

7.1 Impartation of blessings and gifts are a legitimate biblical practice.

7.2 Texts such as Acts 8:14-17 and 19:1-6, Romans 1:11, 1 Corinthians 12:1-11, Ephesians 4:7-13 and James 5:13-15 allow leaders to identify, describe and explain the gifts that are relevant to believers. Moreover, Matthew 7:11, Acts 5:32 and Romans 12:1-8 explain what is required of the believer in order to receive those impartations.³¹³ Furthermore, Mark 16:17-18 and Hebrews 2:4 indicate that believers who are imparted with gifts and blessings will experience the manifestation of those impartations in their lives as a sign of their reception. Hence, a correct theoretical and theological view on impartation that expunges heresy can only come through sound biblical instruction.

7.3 Imparted gifts are not natural human abilities, but are acquired abilities through the power of the Spirit and are to be used for the benefit of the body of Christ.³¹⁴ Consequently, then, believers should desire to know God's will when utilising their gifts and imparting to others.

7.4 False teaching about impartation must be uprooted. Paul urged Timothy to 'Preach the word! Be ready in season and out of

³¹³ Triplett (1970:85-87) says this on the merit of instruction: 'The disuse of the gifts can be traced to our failure in teaching their proper use'. He likens a church that exercises spiritual gifts without proper understanding to workers rushing to operate powerful equipment without reading the manual of instructions. Triplett believes instruction is a must because, 'gifts are not playthings for inexperienced children' (ibid). Constable (2017b:63) states that 'Gifts are not toys to play with. They are tools to build with'.

³¹⁴ Philippians 2:5-6 is sometimes used to support the view that humans can become 'little gods', and believers are urged to confess 'I have equality with God' or to 'command God' to do certain things, which is a gross misrepresentation of Isaiah 45:11 and refuted by Scripture (Isa 43:10; 44:6; John 1:18; Hanegraaff 2009:48-51; Morris 2012:24-25, 147).

season. Convince, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching' (2 Tim 4:3-4). In other words, when dealing with questionable doctrinal practices, 'The best way to test what is spiritual is to ask if it is scriptural' (Triplett 1970:86). Just as important is the willingness of leaders to intervene biblically when heretical views on impartation are being propagated or practiced. When open rebuke is not appropriate, then reproof must be dealt with privately and expeditiously (Matt 18:15-17). Correction can also be made in the form of written documents such as doctrinal position papers.³¹⁵ Other effective means are disciplinary boards of inquiry that hold leaders accountable for what they teach and their integrity.³¹⁶

- 7.5 Gifts, especially prophecies with an impartational purpose, ought to be properly judged in the light of the teaching and authority of Scripture. Those that are misused or found wanting need to be rectified. Leaders or other believers who use their gifts to deceive and/or manipulate others in order to benefit themselves should be removed from all and every leadership positions.

By way of summary, the aim of this chapter has been to assess the contemporary relevance and significance of the doctrine of impartation for Pentecostalism and the Church of God and to determine whether impartation can be practiced in accordance with biblical teaching. The assessment focused primarily on the baptism in the Holy Spirit, spiritual gifts, healing, and blessings. It was determined that Scripture lends ample

³¹⁵ The Church of God's Doctrine and Polity Committee regularly presents position papers on issues related to doctrinal fidelity. The papers are made available via the denomination's official monthly magazine the Church of God *Evangel* and the church's official website www.churchofgod.org.

³¹⁶ Disciplinary Boards of Inquiry are used within the Church of God when there are accusations of ministerial misconduct and doctrinal infidelity. The accused are required to meet with a panel comprised of their peers and accusatory witnesses to answer questions regarding any misconduct.

evidence that the doctrine of impartation is still valid for Pentecostalism and the Church of God.

Several questions were addressed as a way to formulate a more concise theoretical and practical understanding of the doctrine as well as a biblically sound position statement for the Church of God. First, a definition of spiritual impartation was offered along with scriptural guidelines that are to be followed in the practice of impartation. It is not our claim that the list is any way exhaustive. Second, the means by which gifts and blessings are imparted have been identified: congregational worship, the laying on of hands, spoken words and acts of ministry service. Third, the biblical impartations identified comprise both 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary gifts. Finally, the reasons for impartations and steps that can be taken to discourage the abuse of the doctrine and practice of impartation have also been identified. Taken together, the answers to the questions provide much needed theological clarity in order to minimize misunderstanding and/or abuse of the doctrine in practice, if not Pentecostalism as a whole, then at least for leaders of the Church of God.

8. Overview and Summary of the Study

The theological doctrine of impartation and its practice is a common belief among pentecostal believers and synonymous with Pentecostalism. However, although spiritual impartation is commonly practiced in pentecostal church services and conferences, research reveals that leaders in Pentecostalism have been reticent in providing a well-formulated statement or positional argument explaining either the doctrine or practice. As a result, theological beliefs and practices related to the doctrine have emerged that are incongruent with the teachings of Scripture. Thus, it has been the intent of this study to examine and analyse the theological beliefs and practices of impartation in the Church of God in order to present a more biblically sound view of the doctrine that may, hopefully, have some impact on Pentecostalism more generally.

The aim of the first chapter was to provide a background for the study and to identify the main problems that needed to be addressed. What followed next were the research objectives, the methodology that would guide the systematic research and the chapter divisions.

The aim of the next chapter 2 was to focus on the first subsidiary research objective: to determine the need to formulate a doctrinal position on impartation for the Church of God denomination that is theologically sound. A critical evaluation of the understanding of the doctrine of impartation as it has evolved in the Church of God denomination was conducted. The critical findings determined that the doctrine and practice was adopted early in the church's existence due largely to a group of believers who grew weary with the routine creeds and traditions that had stifled spiritual vitality in the churches. In different words, the doctrine of impartation involved questionable practices that threatened the unity of the church right from the beginning of Pentecostalism as a movement. Yet, in time the Church of God was able to establish theological stability through a compilation of doctrinal beliefs. However, although a codified list of beliefs was eventually generated to assist with doctrinal clarity, the study determined that the doctrine of impartation has not been adequately defined or theologically understood within the Church of God. This fact became evident in the anomalous ways denominational leaders, educators, and pastors provided personal comments and definitions on questions related to spiritual impartation. What was unquestionably clear, however, is that they agree wholeheartedly that impartations such as the baptism in the Spirit, healing, spiritual gifts and blessing do occur through prayer and the laying on of hands. The critical analysis revealed the need to assess the Church of God's understanding of the doctrine of impartation from a historical and biblical-theological perspective.

The aim of the next chapter 3 was to focus on the second subsidiary research objective: to establish a biblical foundation for *metadidomi* and how personal experience in the gifts of the Spirit contributes to an understanding of the concept of impartation. It was shown that the anchor text (Rom 1:11) had a decisive influence on the theology of

Pentecostalism and the Church of God. Paul's usage of the term *metadidomi* has been used as primary support for the denomination's doctrine of impartation. The exegetical and hermeneutical analysis of *metadidomi* in the anchor text helped to explore possible answers to concerns such as who among the Romans would have been imparted with a gift, the method Paul would have used, to identify the gift or gifts he could have had in mind, and why Paul has a desire to impart gifts. It was subsequently determined that Paul intended to impart gifts to believers and that those gifts would be either 'ordinary' or 'extraordinary' in nature.

While the result of the analysis of the anchor text confirm the Church of God's doctrine and practice of impartation, a study of the denomination's hermeneutical understanding of *metadidomi* also became necessary. Doctrinally, although leaders believe that Paul wanted to 'impart' gifts to the Roman believers, it is also understood that Paul will impart those gifts through the agency of the Holy Spirit. In other words, the understanding is that God may use a human intermediary to impart to believers together with the belief that only our sovereign God has the authority to bestow spiritual impartations. The problem is that the border between human initiation and God's sovereignty became blurred.

A comparison of Romans 1:11 with supporting or developing texts was therefore conducted to address a major weakness in the Church of God's understanding of impartation. A related problematic was identified, namely, the overemphasis in the Church of God on the impartation of 'extraordinary gifts' to the neglect of so-called 'ordinary' gifts. A discussion of alternative scriptural passages that contain the term *metadidomi* confirmed that, in order to have a biblically sound doctrine of impartation, the Church of God must encourage a desire for and impartation of all spiritual gifts.

Chapter 4 focused on the third subsidiary research objective: to conduct a critical review of the current theological and doctrinal views on impartation. The critical review took into consideration the current

theological and doctrinal views of pastors, itinerant ministers and Christian organizational leaders who are proponents of the doctrine of impartation. Although all those whose writings were reviewed showed uniformity in their belief in impartation, the same cannot be said as it relates to doctrinal practice. A wide variety of different theoretical ideas on who should be imparted, how and when those impartations exist were revealed despite the fact that all believe in the baptism in the Spirit, healing, spiritual gifts, blessing, and blessings through prayer and the laying on of hands. Some of the problems that have been identified are the following: the belief that impartations come as a result of being an associate with an important leader or following someone who is a 'spiritual father'; the claim that impartations are the result of tithing and giving to those in the five-fold ministry; the claim that only those in the so-called five-fold ministry have the power to impart gifts; the belief that impartations are received through 'correct perception' of the gifts or anointings; and the idea that leaders are able to impart their gifts and anointing to others at will. It has been shown why these are misconceptions or misunderstandings of impartation and, together, they serve to solidify the need to have a sound biblical understanding of the doctrine of impartation in specifically the Church of God and Pentecostalism more generally.

The focus in chapter 5 was the fourth subsidiary research objective: to complete an inductive study of specific biblical texts that will inform a contemporary understanding and practice of impartation in the Church of God. It consists of a gathering and exploration of pertinent biblical texts relating to impartation. Part of the objective was to ascertain the contextual meaning of the texts, deduct and analyse the key ideas associated with impartational theology and to identify the methodology and the practice of impartation in context. It revealed multiple examples of persons being imparted with anointings, spiritual gifts, blessing, healing and the baptism in the Spirit. It was found that every impartation came in response to God's sovereign action, whether directly or His indirect initiation, without exception, thus dispelling the notion that humans are

granted the freedom or right to impart God's gifts and blessing at will or on one's own initiative. Moreover, there is ample evidence that confirm that persons were imparted with the Spirit, gifts, healing and blessings through the methodology of prayer, anointing with oil, the laying on of hands and spoken words on the basis of God's authority. So, while the inductive study did not validate every theoretical view and practice of impartation in the Church of God, the study did reveal principles that conclusively coincide with Paul's theology in Romans 1:11 as well as the doctrine and practice of impartation in the Church of God.

What followed in the next chapter 6 was a theological synthesis of biblical texts. The aim was to look at the biblical texts pertaining to impartation that have been assessed in order to focus on the fifth subsidiary research objective: to use the theoretical understanding of the doctrine to change the practice of impartation throughout the Church of God denomination. Emphasis was placed upon the key biblical ideas that were identified in previous sections, which eventually led to the formulation of a few biblical guidelines for the practice of impartation. At the forefront was Paul's theology of impartation in Romans 1:11 and his intent to impart gifts to the Roman believers. The emerging discussion targeted the biblical precedent that guided and undergirds Paul's impartational theology, the spiritual qualities of the receivers of impartations, and the gifts that Paul deemed valid for impartation. It was found that Paul received direction from Scripture, that he considered impartations to be primarily for believers but did not altogether limit them to believers only, and that he accepted a very wide diversity of gifts available for impartation. As with the OT, Paul accepted that impartations occur through God's sovereign action alone, through spoken words, the laying on of hands and acts of service.

The derived impartational model comprising the synthesis of Romans 1:11 with informing and developing texts were then compared with the doctrine and practice of impartation in the Church of God. It was found that leaders use Scripture as their warrant for their practice of impartation, just as Paul does. It was also shown that there exists similarities between

the theological and theoretical model of impartation among Church of God leaders and the methods and gifts Paul used to impart. However, despite those similarities, a number of inconsistencies were identified, and were addressed with scriptural and theoretical rebuttal. Consequently, it was determined that making necessary theological corrections would result in the Church of God having a theoretical and practical model of impartation that aligns more adequately with that of Scripture.

The aim of the final chapter was to assess and determine if the doctrine of impartation has contemporary significance for believers and whether impartation can be practiced in the Church of God and more generally Pentecostalism in accordance with biblical teaching. It began with an argument for the contemporary practice of impartation. What followed next was a scriptural and scholarly review of the contemporary significance and impartation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, spiritual gifts, healing, and blessing. It concluded that Scripture supports the significance and relevance of the contemporary practice of impartation together with a few guidelines relative to the biblical practice of impartation in the Church of God and Pentecostalism. The proposed guidelines included the fact that God imparts gifts, including the need for an adequate understanding of spiritual impartation, the qualities of receivers, the means of impartation, the relevance to a believer's life, and steps that can be taken to discourage the abuse of the doctrine of impartation.

Although not every positive or negative theological issue related to the doctrine and practice of impartation have been discussed in this study, the hope is that the ones that have been addressed will add greater knowledge to the Church of God and a deeper appreciation of the doctrine of impartation within Pentecostalism.

9. Suggested Future Research

A real problem related to the doctrine of impartation has been identified during the study and is suggested for further research. Although it is true that God never relinquishes His sovereign will to humans in the impartation of gifts and blessings to others, further study is required on the interplay of God's will and that of humans in the act of impartation. Some relevant questions are, for example, when and how is a believer to know when God wishes to impart a blessing or any other gift? How would the believer be able to distinguish between God's sovereign will and his or her own? And how would believers know that God now wishes to impart a particular gift or blessing when they do not necessarily feel or believe that they should?

The fact of the matter is, as noted before in this study, Christians are often not able to distinguish between the voice of God, their own and that of demons (Joubert and Maartens 2018). If that is problematic, then research on how believers may distinguish between God's sovereign will and their own will substantially enrich the current understanding of impartation in the Church of God and pentecostals. Paul in Romans 12:6-8 states, 'let us use [our gifts] in our ministering', and believers do what they feel is good and right. However, knowledge of what is the right or good thing to do does not guarantee that they will do what is good and right. Determining God's sovereign will, acquiescing to it and being wise in the good and right use of the gifts seems to be one of the implications of what Paul writes in Romans 16:19: 'Be wise in what is good'. In a word, research in this area would provide further insight into the doctrine of impartation; it is an issue which scholarship has ignored for far too long.

Bibliography

- Aberbach M 1967. The relations between master and disciple in the Talmudic Age. In HJ Zimmels and J Rabbinowitz and I Finestein (eds), *Essays presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, 1-24. London, UK: Jews' College Publications: The Soncino Press Limited.
- Acts-celerate 2016. Kenneth Copeland imparts TL Lowery's 'mantle' to Stephen Lowery. Online sermon. Accessed from <http://www.Actscelerate.com/viewtopic.php?p=737081&sid=69c5e8c724f9a22c26d93a87144af3b0>, 31- 3- 2016.
- Alexander K 2006. *Pentecostal healing: Models in theology and practice*. Dorset, UK: Deo Publishing.
- Alley JK 2002. *The apostolic revelation*. Rockhampton, AU: Peace Publishing.
- Anyasi C 2003. *The divine powers of the east*. Camarillo, CA: Xulon press.
- Anderson AH 2013. *An introduction to Pentecostalism: Global charismatic Christianity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Andrews ME 1934. Paul, Philo, and the Intellectuals. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 53 (2):150-166.
- Aquinas T 1981. *Summa theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics.
- _____ 2016. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Translated by FR Larcher. Albany, NY: Magi Books. Electronic edition: <http://dhsprory.org/Thomas/SSHebrews.htm#62>.
- Archer KJ 2009. *A pentecostal hermeneutic: Spirit, Scripture, and community*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press.

- _____2011. Biblical images of the Holy Spirit. *The Church of God Evangel* 101(8):18-19.
- _____2012. Pentecostal Biblical interpretation, In KR Whitt and FL Arrington (eds) 2012. *Issues in contemporary Pentecostalism*, 167-184. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- Arnold NW 1987. The high priestly blessing. *Exegesis and Exposition* 2:1:50.
- Arrington FL 1977. *Paul's aeon theology in I Corinthians*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- _____1982. *Maintaining the foundations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- _____1985. *Divine order in the church: A study of First Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- _____1993. *Christian doctrine: a pentecostal perspective*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____1994. The use of the Bible by pentecostals. *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* (16):101-107.
- _____2003. *Encountering the Holy Spirit*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____2008. *The Spirit-anointed church*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____2012a. Pentecostal identity and interpretation of the Bible. In KR Whitt and FL Arrington (eds), *Issues in contemporary Pentecostalism*, 11-20. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- _____2012b. *The greatest letter ever written*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- Arndt WF and Gingrich W 2000. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Arnold BT 2009. *Genesis*. The new Cambridge Bible commentary 1. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ash JL 1976. The decline of ecstatic prophecy in the early church. *Theological Studies* 37 (6):227-252.
- Ashley TR 1993. *The book of Numbers*. The new international commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Asmis E 2004. Epicurean Economics. In JT Fitzgerald and D Obbink and GS Holland (eds), *Philodemus and the New Testament world*, 133-176. Leiden, NL: Brill Publishers.
- Assemblies of God. *Gifts: Imparting of spiritual gifts* (n.d.). Online article. Accessed from, http://ag.org/top/beliefs/topics/sptlissues_imparting_spiritual_gifts.cfm, 30-12- 2015.
- _____ 2016. *Endtime revival—Spirit-led-and Spirit-controlled, a response paper to resolution 16*. Online article. Accessed from, http://ag.org/top/Beliefs/PositionPapers/ppdownloads/pp_endtime_revival.pdf, 30-8-2016.
- Augustine SA 1844. *Sermons on selected lessons of the New Testament*. Oxford, ENG: Baxter Printers.
- Austin P 2016. Romans 1:11-15 Commentary. Electronic edition. Accessed from, http://www.preceptaustin.org/romans_111-17#1:11, 8-6- 2018.
- Baeq DS 2010. Contextualizing religious form and meaning: A missiological interpretation of Naaman's petitions (2 Kings 5:15-19). *International Journal of Frontier Missiology* 27(4):197-207.
- Baker R 2013. *Toward a biblical "strategy" pf mission: The effects of the five Christian "core values" of Iris Global*. Unpublished dissertation. United Theological Seminary. Available at: <http://www.irisglobal.org/pdf/Roll-and-Toward-a-Biblical-Strategy-of-Mission.pdf>, 23-6-2016.

- Bandura A 1986. *Social foundation of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bare HL 1993. *They call me pentecostal*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- Barrett CK 1963. *The pastoral Epistles*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- _____ 1991. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing.
- _____ 1994. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. The International critical commentary 1. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark.
- _____ 1998. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. The International Critical Commentary 2. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark.
- Barnett J 2008. Stir up the flame. *The Church of God evangel*, 98 (2):8-9.
- Bauer W and Arndt WF and Gingrich FW and Danker FW 1979. *A greek-english lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Press.
- Bay L and Martinez RD (n.d.). *Impartations, anointing and manifestation*. Online article. Accessed from, <http://www.spiritwatch.org/fireimpart.htm>, 22-7- 2015.
- Beck P 2007. *Heart of an apostle*. Garden City, NY: Master Press.
- Becking B 1996. Touch for health...Magic in II Reg 4,31-37 with a remark on the history of Yahwism. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (108):34-54.

- Becker M 2004. A tenet under examination: Reflections on the pentecostal hermeneutical approach. *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 24(1):30–48.
- Bede V 2016. *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Translated by Jane's 1903 Temple Classics Translation. Electronic edition: <http://www.heroofcamelot.com/>, 31-12-2016.
- Bennett D 1990. *Seasons of adulthood: A model for adult development*. Doctoral dissertation. Ashland, KY. Ashland Theological Seminary.
- Bentivengna J 1989. The Witness of St Augustine on the Action of the Holy Spirit in the Church and the Praxis of the Charismata in his Times. In A Livingstone, (ed.) *Studia Patristica*. Oxford, UK: Peeters Press.
- Berry GR 1982. *Interlinear Greek-English New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.
- Best E 1988. *Paul and his converts*. Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark.
- _____ 1997. *Essays on Ephesians*. Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark.
- Bickle M 2008. *Growing in the prophetic: A practical, biblical guide to dreams, visions, and spiritual gifts*. Boca Raton, FL: Charisma House.
- _____ 2009. *Studies in Joel*. Kansas City, MO: Forerunner Publishing.
- Bittlinger A 1967. *Gifts and graces*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Black D 1988. (9 May). How would I know I have a word of prophecy? *The Church of God Evangel*, 20-21.
- Blomberg CL and Kamell MJ 2008. *James*. Exegetical commentary on the New Testament 16. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

- Boa KD and Anders M and Kruidenier WM 2000. *Romans*. Holman New Testament commentary 6. New York, NY: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Bock DL 2007. *Acts*. Baker exegetical commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Bodner K 2013. *Elisha's profile in the book of Kings: The double agent*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Boice JM 1991. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Bonnke R 1994. *Mighty manifestations*. Orlando, FL: Creation House.
- Bray G 1998. *Ancient Christian commentary on Scripture: Romans*. Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Briscoe S 1982. *Romans*. The communicator's commentary 6. Waco, TX: Word books.
- _____ 1987. *Genesis*. The communicator's commentary 1. Waco, TX: Word books.
- Britt B 2002. Prophetic concealment in a biblical type scene. *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 64(1):37-58.
- Brown C 1984. *Miracles and the critical mind*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Brown ML 1997. *Let no one deceive you*. Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image.
- Brown M and Kilpatrick J 2015. *The fire that never sleeps: Keys to sustaining personal revival*. Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image.
- Brown R 2002. *The message of Numbers: Journey to the Promised Land*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Bruce FF 1975. *Epistle to the Romans (Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing Co.

_____ 1981. *The book of the Acts*. New international commentary on the New Testament 5. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____ 1982a. *Commentary on Galatians*. New international Greek Testament commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

_____ 1982b. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. Word biblical commentary 45. Waco, TX: Word Books.

Brueggemann W 2000. *1 & 2 Kings*. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys.

Brumbach C 1947. *What meaneth this? A pentecostal answer to a pentecostal question*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House.

Bruner FD 1970. *A theology of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

_____ 1987. *The Churchbook: Matthew 1-12*. Waco, TX: Word Books.

Budd PJ 1984. *Numbers*. Word Biblical Commentary 5. Waco, TX: Word Books.

Budiselic E 2011. The impartation of the gifts of the Spirit in Paul's theology. *KAIROS - Evangelical Journal of Theology*, 5(2):245–270.

Bullinger EW 1953. *The giver and His gifts*. London, UK: The Lamp Press.

Burgess SM and GB McGee (eds) 1988. *Dictionary of pentecostal and charismatic movements*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Burk A 2003. *Relentless generational blessings*. Whittier, CA: Plumline Ministries.

- Byrd J 1993. Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutical Theory and Pentecostal Proclamation. *Pneuma* 15(2):205.
- Calvin J 1996. *Commentaries on the four last books of Moses 2*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- _____2019. *Commentary on Genesis – volume 1*. Translated by J King. Grand Rapids MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.
- Cashwell GB 1906. (December). Came 3,000 miles for his Pentecost. *The Apostolic Faith* 3.
- Cates JC 2017. An exegesis of 1 Kings 17:17-24. Academic paper, Reformed Theological Seminary. Marietta, GA. Accessed from, https://www.academia.edu/36112462/An_Exegesis_of_1_Kings_17_17-24, 22 -10-2019.
- Chadwick H 1966. St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria. *Bulletin for the John Rylands library* 48 (2):286-307.
- Chan S 1999. Evidential glossolalia and the doctrine of subsequence. *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 2(2):195-211.
- Chand S 2017. *Bigger faster leadership*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Chavda M and Chavda B. 2008. *Storm warrior: A believer's strategy for victory*. Grand Rapids, MI: Chosen Books.
- Cheddie D 2001. The laying on of hands. Online article. Accessed from, https://www.bibleissues.org/laying_hands1.html, 11-12-2016.
- Cheung V 2008. *Commentary on 1 & 2 Thessalonians*. Electronic books, <https://www.vincentcheung.com/library/>, 16-8-2018.
- _____2010. *Systematic theology*. Electronic books, www.Lulu.com, 2-1-2016.

- _____ 2012. *Biblical healing*. Electronic books, <https://www.vincentcheung.com/books/Biblical%20Healing.pdf>, 31-10-2019.
- _____ 2014. *Commentary on Ephesians*. Electronic books, <https://www.vincentcheung.com/books/Commentary%20on%20Ephesians.pdf>, 21-12-2019.
- Choy L 1990. *Powerlines*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications.
- Chung E 2014. The focus of Elisha's ministry on atypical, faithful individuals. Master's thesis, Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary. Available at <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1333&context=masters>, 13-7-2019.
- Chung M 2009. Paul's understanding of spiritual formation: Christian formation and impartation. Doctoral dissertation, University of Nottingham. Available at <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/id/eprint/10971>, 28-8-2015.
- Clark EC 1943. (27 November). The baptism of the Holy Ghost. *Church of God Evangel*, 6-7.
- Clark P 2008. The gifts of the Spirit—The importance of impartation. *Penn Clark Com*. Online article. Accessed from, [http://penn-clark.com/Word smith /Gifts/OldPages/studies/A8.htm](http://penn-clark.com/Word%20smith/Gifts/OldPages/studies/A8.htm), 13-7-2018.
- Clark R 2004. *Ministry team training manual*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Global Awakening.
- _____ 2009. *Deliverance, disbelief, and deception*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Global Awakening.
- _____ 2010. Bless you in Jesus name. Online sermon. Accessed from, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=78705WMDIGM>, 13-9-2018.
- _____ 2013. *There is more! The secret to experiencing God's power to change your life*. Bloomington, MN: Chosen Books.

- _____2015. *Power to heal*. Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image Publishers.
- _____2018. Just prayers and blessings. Online sermon. Accessed from, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G-sLP_PpCa0, 13-9-2018.
- Cohen SJD 1999. The Rabbi in second-century Jewish society. In W Horbury and WD Davies and J Sturdy (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism Volume Three: The early Roman Empire, 922-990*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohn RL 2000. *2 Kings*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.
- Cole DR 2000. *Numbers*. The New American Commentary 3b. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Conn CW 1958. *The evangel reader: Selections from the Church of God Evangel, 1910-1958*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- _____1963. The dynamics of spiritual gifts. *The Foursquare Magazine* 36(10):11-12.
- _____1979. *Pillars of pentecost*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- _____1986. Glossolalia and the Scriptures. In WH Horton (ed.) *Glossolalia phenomenon*, 23-65. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Books.
- _____1996. *A balanced church*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- _____2008. *Like a mighty army: A history of the Church of God*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- Constable T 2017a. *Constable's notes on the Bible*. Hurst, TX: Tyndale Seminary Press.
- _____2017b. *Notes on Ephesians*. Sonic Light. Electronic books, <http://www.soniclight.com/>, 22-11-2018.

- _____2017c. *Notes on Philippians*. Sonic Light. Electronic books, <http://www.soniclight.com/>, 22-11-2018.
- _____2019a. *Notes on Genesis*. Sonic Light. Electronic books, <https://planobiblechapel.org/tcon/notes/pdf/genesis.pdf>, 19-7-2019.
- _____2019b. *Notes on Numbers*. Sonic Light. Electronic books, <https://planobiblechapel.org/tcon/notes/pdf/1kings.pdf>, 21-10-2019.
- _____2019c. *Notes on 1 Kings*. Sonic Light. Electronic books, <https://planobiblechapel.org/tcon/notes/pdf/1kings.pdf>, 21-10-2019.
- Conzelmann H 1974. Charisma, charismata, In F Gerhard (ed.) *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Vol. 9). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Copan VA 2007. *Saint Paul as spiritual director*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.
- Copeland K 1974. *The laws of prosperity*. Fort Worth, TX: Kenneth Copeland Ministries.
- Copeland K 2016. Impartation. Online funeral service. Accessed from, <https://www.facebook.com/ginger.smith.507/posts/10208597160425826>, 31-3- 2016.
- Coppens J 1925. *L' imposition des mains et les rites connexes dans le Nouveau Testament et dans l' église ancienne*. Paris: Gabalda.
- Cortez M 2014. The growth of global Pentecostalism. Electronic books, <http://marccortez.com/2014/04/16/growth-global-pentecostalism-wheaton-theology-conference-4/>, 23-12-2016.
- Cox H 1995. *Fire from heaven: The rise of pentecostal spirituality and the reshaping of religion in the twenty-first century*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Cranfield CEB and Emerton JA 1975. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. New York: T&T Clark International.

_____ 1979. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Romans: Volume 2*. Edinburgh: Continuum.

Cross J 1986. Glossolalia: Its value to the church. In WH Horton (ed.) *Glossolalia phenomenon*, 181-213. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Books.

Cross T 2001. *Transforming power: Dimensions of the gospel*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.

Crowder J 2005. Wells of Wales are being restored. *Sons of Thunder.org*. Online sermon, Accessed from, <http://injesus.com/messages/content/113082>, 29-5-2018.

Cutshall B 2018. *The power of a blessing*. Online sermon. Accessed from, <https://bryancutshall.com/product/the-power-of-a-blessing-dvd/>, 24-9-2018.

Cutten G 1927. *Speaking with tongues*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dana HE and Mantey J 1927. *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Toronto, CA: Macmillan.

Daube D 1956. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. Jordan Lectures, University of London. London, UK: Athlone Press.

Dauids PH 1982. *The Epistle of James: A commentary on the Greek text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Davidson R 1979. *Genesis 12-15*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Dayton DW 1987. *Theological roots of Pentecostalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury Press.
- Deere JS 2008. *The beginner's guide to the gift of prophecy*. Ventura, CA: Regal.
- _____ 1993. *Surprised by the power of the Spirit: A former Dallas Seminary professor discovers that God speaks and heals today*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Demarest B 2003. *Soul guide: Following Jesus as spiritual director*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Demarest GW 1984. *1, 2 Thessalonians, 1,2 Timothy, Titus*. The communicator's commentary 9. Waco, TX: Word books.
- Deming W 1995. A diatribe pattern in 1 Cor. 7:21-22: A new perspective on Paul's direction to slaves. *Novum Testamentum* 37:130-137.
- Denney J 1900. *The expositor's Greek Testament*. New York, NY: Dodd, Mead & Co.
- De Vries SJ 2003. *1 Kings*. Word biblical commentary 12. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- DeWelt D 1975. *Leviticus*. Joplin, MO: College Press.
- Dibelius M 1976. *A commentary of the Epistle of James*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.
- Dilday R 1987. *1, 2 Kings*. The communicator's commentary 9. Waco, TX: Word books.
- Doty BL 1973. *Numbers*. Joplin, MO: College Press.
- Dunn J 1970. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A re-examination of the New Testament teaching on the gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism today*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.

_____ 1979. Spirit, Holy Spirit. In C Brown (ed.) *The new international dictionary of New Testament theology*. Grand Rapids: The Zondervan Corporation.

_____ 1988. *Word biblical commentary: Romans 1-8*. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

_____ 1996. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Narrative Commentaries. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity.

_____ 2003. *The Cambridge companion to Paul*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dunn RE 2012. The relationship between the use of the spiritual gifts and the spiritual maturity of members of a United Methodist Congregation. Doctoral dissertation, Asbury Theological Seminary. Available at: <https://place.asburyseminary.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1796&context=ecommonsatsdissertations>, 25-8-2018.

Ehrensperger K 2007. *Paul and the dynamics of power: Communication and interaction in the early Christ-movement*. London, UK: T&T Clark.

Ehrhardt A 1954. Jewish and Christian Ordination. *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5:138.

Ellingworth P 1993. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A commentary on the Greek text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Ellis JB 1985. Blazing the gospel trail. In J Cross (ed.) *A treasury of pentecostal classics*, 53-98. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.

Elbert P 1985. *Essays on apostolic themes*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Enns P 1989. *The Moody handbook of theology*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

- Enroth R 1992. *Churches that abuse*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Ervin HM 1968. *These are not drunk as ye suppose*. Plainfield, NJ: Logos.
- Evans LH 1985. *Hebrews*. The communicator's commentary 10. Waco, TX: Word books.
- Fairman RG 1986. An exegesis of filling: Texts which refer to the doctrine of filling. Th.D. dissertation. Grace Theological Seminary. Available at www.uh-ir.tdl.org, 23-11-2019.
- Fanning D 2009. Pentecostal and Charismatic movements. Liberty University. Online article. Accessed from, http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgm_missions, 27-12-2016.
- Farnell FD 2003. The Montanist crisis: A key to refuting Third-Wave concepts of NT prophecy. *The Master's Seminary Journal* 14/2:235-262.
- Fee GD 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- _____1991. *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament hermeneutics*. 3rd ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- _____1994. *God's empowering presence: The Holy Spirit in the letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- _____1996. *Paul, the Spirit, and the people of God*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- _____2004. Why pentecostals read their Bibles poorly - and some suggested cures. *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 24(1):4-15.
- Fields W 1969. *Philippians-Colossians-Philemon*. Joplin, MO: College Press.

- Finley TJ 1990. *Joel, Amos, Obadiah*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Fishbane M 1983. Form and reformulation of the biblical priestly blessing. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103(1):115-121.
- Fisher MC 1980. 'נָתַן (*nitan*) give'. In RL Harris (ed.) *Theological workbook of the Old Testament*, 608-609.
- Fisher R 1996. Evaluating Spiritual Manifestations. *Church of God Evangel*. Holy Spirit Centennial Edition (1896-1996):52-54.
- Fitzmyer JA 1993. *Romans*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Flynn LB 1974. *19 gifts of the Spirit*. Wheaton, ILL. Victor Books.
- Fortosis S 1992. A development model for stages of growth. *Religious Education* (87):283-298.
- Foster R 1998. *Celebration of discipline*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Frame JE 1912. *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*. ICC. Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark.
- France RT 1985. *The gospel according to Matthew*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Francis RW 2015. The Ministry of impartation. *Personal Communication Ministries*. Online article. Accessed from, <http://personalcommunication.net.nz/impartation.htm>, 24-7-2015.
- Frangipane F [2015]. The power of impartation and how it affects YOU. Online article. Accessed from, <http://www.angelfire.com/ca2/PrayerNotes/Prophecy/ThePowerOfImpartation.html>, 1-8-2015.
- Friberg B and Friberg T (eds) 1981. *Analytical Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Friesen G 2004. *Decision making and the will of God*. Colorado Springs, CO: Multnomah Books.

- Gaffin RB Jr 1996. A cessationist view. In WA Grudem (ed.), *Are miraculous gifts for today? Four views*, 25-64. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub.
- _____ 1979. *Perspectives on Pentecost*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.
- Garborg R 2003. *The family blessing*. Lakeland, FL: White Stone Books.
- Gause RH 1976. Issues in Pentecostalism. In RP Spittler (ed.), *Perspectives on the new Pentecostalism*, 106-116. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing Group.
- _____ 1986. *The preaching of Paul: A study of Romans*. Cleveland, TN: Church of God, Department of General Education.
- _____ 2009. *Living in the Spirit*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press.
- Gee D 1963. *Spiritual gifts in the work of ministry today*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House.
- _____ 1967. *Wind and flame*. Croydon, UK: Assemblies of God Publishing House.
- Gertel E 2002a. Moses, Elisha and transferred Spirit: The height of biblical prophecy? Part I. *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 30(2):73-79.
- _____ 2002b. Moses, Elisha and transferred Spirit: The height of biblical prophecy? Part 2. *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 30(3):171-177.
- Gibbs E 1981. *I believe in church growth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Giles JA 1844. *The Venerable Bede, In Acta Apostolorum Expositio, Works*. London, UK: Whittaker and Co.
- _____ 1849. *Ecclesiastical History of England*. London, ENG: Henry G. Bohn.

- Glad CE 1995. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and early Christian psychagogy*. Leiden, NL: Brill Publishers.
- Godet LF 1977. *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications.
- Goff RG 1988. *Fields white unto harvest: Charles F. Parham and the missionary origins of Pentecostalism*. Fayetteville, AR: The University of Arkansas Press.
- Gonzalez JL 1983. *A history of Christian thought*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Gorman MJ 2004. *Apostle of the crucified Lord*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Goulet PM (n.d.). *The Power of impartation*. Nagpur, India: RTM.
- _____2007. *The five powers of God*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Grady L 2018a. The most ridiculous charismatic doctrine we ever created. Faith News Network. Internet article. Accessed from, <https://www.Faithnews.cc/?p=27113>, 11-8-2018.
- _____2018b. The missing ingredient in true apostolic anointing. Faith News Network. Online article. Accessed from, <https://www.Faithnews.cc/?p=27183>, 26-8-2018.
- Graves CS 2016. *Anointing or apostasy? The Latter Rain legacy*. Electronic book, www.banner.org.uk/res/latterrain.pdf, 28-11-2016.
- Gray GB 1965. *Numbers*. The International Critical Commentary 4, New York, NY: T & T Clark.
- Gray J 1963. *1 and 2 Kings: A commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.

- Gross E 1990. *Miracles, Demons, and Spiritual Warfare*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Grudem WA 1994. *Systematic theology: An introduction to Biblical doctrine*. Leicester, England: Zondervan.
- _____ 1996. *Are miraculous gifts for today? Four views*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- _____ 2000. *The gift of prophecy in the New Testament and today*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Gundry RH 1993. *Mark: A commentary of his apology for the cross*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Guthrie D 1973. *New Testament Introduction*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Hagner DA 1990. *Hebrews*. NIBC. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Hagy P 2006. Holy Ghost Baptism. *Church of God Evangel* 96(8):10-11.
- Hagee J 2004. *The seven secrets*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House.
- Hall JG 1949. (1 October). Gifts, administrations, and operations. *The Church of God Evangel*, 3-4.
- Hall F 2016. *Atomic power with God through fasting and prayer*. Mansfield, CT: Martino Publishing.
- Hamilton P 1975. *The Charismatic Movement*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Hamilton V 1990. *The book of Genesis*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

- Hamon B 1987. *Prophets and personal prophecy*. Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image.
- Han SE.2007. Baptism with the Holy Spirit: The purity and power of Divine love. *The Church of God Evangel*, 97(5):6-7.
- Hanegraaff H 2001. *Counterfeit revival: Looking for God in all the wrong places*. Nashville, TN: Word Publishing.
- _____2009. *Christianity in crisis: The 21st century*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Harper M 1970a. *Walk in the Spirit*. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International.
- _____1970b. *Prophecy: A gift for the body of Christ*. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International.
- Harrelson WJ 1962. Blessing and Cursings. In *The interpreter's dictionary of the Bible*, 446. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Harrison RK 1990. *Numbers*. The Wycliffe exegetical commentary 4, Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Hawtin E 1949. (August) How this revival began. *The Sharon Star*, 3.
- Hayden D 1981. Calling elders to pray. *Bibliotheca sacra* (138):258-265.
- Hayford J 1992. *The beauty of spiritual language: My journey toward the heart of God*. Dallas, TX: Word Press.
- Hedrick CW 1981. Paul's conversion/call: A comparative analysis of the three reports in Acts. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100(3):415-32.
- Hendriksen W 1981. *NTC. Exposition of Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Henry M 1960. *Matthew Henry's commentary in one volume*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

- Hewitt T 1982. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 15. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Hill T 2014. *The Amos paradigm*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____ 2016. (May). Holy fire. *The Church of God Evangel*, 14-15.
- Hobbs TR 1985. *2 Kings*. Word Biblical Commentary 13. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Hodge C 1947. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Hodges Z 1994. *The epistle of James*. Irving, TX: Grace Evangelical Society.
- Hoehner H 2002. *Ephesians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Hogue R 2010. *Tongues: A theological history of Christian glossolalia*. New York, NY: Tate Publishing & Enterprises.
- Hollenweger WJ 1997. *Pentecostalism*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Horak Nela W 1999. *Grčki jezik Novog Zavjeta*. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost.
- Horton SM 2001. *Acts*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House.
- Horton WH 1972. *Pentecost yesterday and today*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____ (ed.) 1986. *Glossolalia phenomenon*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- Hubbard DA 1989. *Joel and Amos: An introduction and commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Hughes RK 1991. *Romans: Righteousness from heaven*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.

- Hughes PE 1977. *A commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Hughes R 1963. *What is Pentecost?* Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____ 1976. The new Pentecostalism: Perspective of a classical pentecostal administrator. In RP Spittler (ed.) *Perspectives on the new Pentecostalism*, 166-180. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing Group.
- _____ 1986. Glossolalia in contemporary times. In WH Horton (ed.) *Glossolalia phenomenon*, 141-177. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Books.
- Hunter H 2009. *Spirit baptism*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Ice TD 1994. In WR Willis and JR Master (eds), *Issues in dispensationalism*, 41. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- _____ 2016. The Latter Rain Movement. Online article. Accessed from, https://www.pre-trib.org/consistent-biblical-futurism/message/the-latter-rain-revival-movement/read_6-12-2016.
- Irenaeus 1885. Against heresies. In AC Coxe (ed.) *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, 309-568. New York, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.
- Jeffrey G 2002. *Unveiling Mysteries of the Bible*. Toronto, ON: Frontier Research Publications.
- Jewett R 2007. *Romans*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Johnson B [2016a]. Bethel Church soaking up the “anointing” of dead men, or grave sucking. Online video. Accessed from, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LrHPTs8cLIs>, 7-11-2016.

- _____[2016b]. Grave sucking Bill Johnson. Online article. Accessed from, <https://walthope.wordpress.com/2014/02/21/grave-sucking-bill-johnson/> 7-11-2016.
- Johnston AE 1911. The laying on of hands: Its origin and meaning. *The Irish Church Quarterly* 4(16):312–323.
- Jones GH 1984. *1 and 2 Kings*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Josephus F 1987. *The works of Josephus: Complete and unabridged: New updated ed.* Translated by William Whiston. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Joubert C and Maartens N 2017. The use of the Bible as a source of divine guidance on matters which it does not directly address: Is it Scriptural? *Conspectus* (24):106-132.
- _____. 2018. Hearing God's voice: Evaluating some popular teachings on the subject. *Conspectus* (25):38-55.
- _____. 2018. Genesis 4:8: Why did Cain murder his brother? *Conspectus* (26):99-113.
- Joyner R 1989. *The Harvest*. Pineville, NC: Morningstar.
- Juillerat LH (ed.) 1922. *Book of Minutes, General Assemblies, Churches of God*. Cleveland, TN: Church of God Publishing House.
- Kaiser WC Jr 1983. In M Inch and R Youngblood (eds), *The living and active Word of God: Studies in honor of S. J. Schultz*, 119. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Kanamori H 1986. A study on the laying on of hands. Master's thesis, Covenant Theological Seminary. Lookout Mountain, Georgia.
- Kapic K 2005. Receiving Christ's priestly benediction: A biblical, historical, and theological exploration of Luke 24:50-53. *Westminster Theological Journal* (67):247-260.

- Katz A 2000. *Apostolic foundations*. Santa Rosa, CA: Burning Bush Publications.
- Kalland ES 1992. *Deuteronomy*. Expositor's Bible Commentary 3, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Käsemann E 1980. *Commentary on Romans*. Trans. G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Kay W 2004. Pentecostals and the Bible. *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 24(1):71–83.
- _____ 2011. *Pentecostalism: A very short introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Keil CF 1950. *The Books of Kings*. In CF Keil and F Delitzsch (eds), *The Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Kelsey M 1976. *Healing and Christianity: In ancient thought and modern times*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Kendall RT 1999. *The anointing yesterday, today, and tomorrow*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Kessler J 2015. *The identity and role of the gift-giving Spirit in numbers 11*. Master's thesis. Andrews University. Available at <http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1101&context=honors>, 2-7-2016.
- Kilpatrick J 1995. *Feast of fire: The remarkable story of revival in Pensacola*. London, UK: Marshall Pickering.
- _____ 2017. Mystery and power of a blessing. Online sermon. Accessed from, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uAkVp1QG8qc>, 13-9-2018.

- Kinder D 1975. *Psalms 73-150*. Tyndale Old Testament commentaries 14b. London, UK: InterVarsity Press.
- King JH 1921. History of the Fire-Baptized Holiness Church. *The Pentecostal Holiness Advocate* 3(24):4.
- Kirby P 2016. The second apology of Justin for the Christians. Online article. Accessed from, <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/justinmartyr-secondapology.html>, 26-12-2016.
- Klien R 2012. *2 Chronicles*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Knox RA 1950. *Enthusiasm*. Oxford, ENG: The University Press.
- Konstan D and Clay D and Glad CE and Thom JC and Ware J 1998. *Philodemus: On frank criticism*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Kostenberger AJ and Croteau DA 2006. Will a man rob God? (Malachi 3:8): a study of tithing in the Old and New Testaments. *Bulletin for biblical research*. Available at: DigitalCommons@Liberty University, (16.1):53-77.
- _____ 2006b. Reconstructing a biblical model for giving: A discussion of relevant systematic issues and New Testament principles. *Bulletin for biblical research*. Available at: DigitalCommons@Liberty University, (16.2):237-260.
- Kuecker AJ 2008. The Spirit and the 'other': Social identity, ethnicity, and intergroup reconciliation in Luke-Acts. Doctoral dissertation. University of St. Andrews. Available at: <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>, 11-9-2019.
- Kurz WS 2013. *Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Lampe GW 1951. *The seal of the Spirit*. London, UK: Longmans.

- Land SJ 2010. *Pentecostal spirituality: A passion for the kingdom*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Larson B 1983. *Luke*. The communicator's commentary 3. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Laws S 1980. *The Epistle of James*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Latourette K 1953. *A history of Christianity*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Lean G 1983. *Strangely warmed: The amazing life of John Wesley*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House.
- Lerner MB and Gottlieb I (eds) 1983. *The world of the sages: Unit 1 the study of Torah*. Tel-Aviv, Israel: Everyman's University Publishing House.
- Lederle HL 2008. Initial evidence and the charismatic movement: an ecumenical appraisal. In GB McGee (ed.) *Initial evidence: Historical and Biblical perspectives on the pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism*. Berkeley, CA: Wipf & Stock Publishers.
- Leedy D 1993. *Practical research: Planning and design*. New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Lenning LG 1980. *Blessing in mosque and mission*. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.
- Lenski RCH 1964. *The interpretation of St. Mark's gospel*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Lightner RP 1965. *Speaking in tongues & divine healing*. Houston, TX: Regular Baptist Press.
- Lim D 1991. *Spiritual gifts: A fresh look*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing.

- Lincoln AT 1990. *Ephesians*. Word biblical commentary 42. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Lindsell H 1983. *The Holy Spirit in the latter days*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Lindstrom HG 1996. *Wesley and sanctification: A study in the doctrine of salvation*. Nappanee, IN: Francis Asbury Press.
- Lipscomb D 1959. *The Gospel by John*. Nashville, TN: Gospel Advocate Company.
- Llewellyn JS 1925 (27 June). *The Church of God Evangel*, 3.
- Lockwood GJ 2000. *1 Corinthians*. St Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing.
- Lombard J and Daffe J 2005. *Speaking in tongues: Initial evidence of Spirit baptism?* Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____2007 (June). A language from heaven. *Church of God Evangel*, 6-7.
- _____2008. *Spiritual gifts*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- _____2014. (May). Wrong ideas about spiritual gifts. *Church of God Evangel*, 21.
- Long BO 1991. *2 Kings*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Longenecker R 2016. *The epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Lovelace R 1979. *Dynamics of spiritual life*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Lovett L 1979. *Black Holiness –Pentecostalism: Implications for ethics and social transformation*. Doctoral dissertation. Emory University. Atlanta, Georgia.
- Lowery TL 1997. *Gifted to serve*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.

- _____. 2004. *Apostles and prophets (reclaiming the Biblical gifts)*.
Cleveland, TN: T. L. Lowery Ministries International.
- Luther M 1915. *Works of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia, PA: A. J. Holman
Company.
- _____. 2004. *About table talk*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics
Ethereal Library, <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/luther/tabletalk.html>.
- MacArthur JF 1992. *Charismatic chaos*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan
Publishing House.
- _____. 1994. *Romans*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.
- Macchia FD 2006. *Baptized in the Spirit: A global pentecostal theology*.
Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Macchia S 2004. *Becoming a healthy disciple, ten traits of a vital
Christian*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- MacDonald WG 1976. Pentecostal theology: A classical viewpoint. In RP
Spittler (ed.) *Perspectives on the new Pentecostalism* 58-75.
Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing Group.
- Maier PL 1999. *Eusebius: The church history*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel
Publications.
- Malherbe AJ 1987. *Paul and the Thessalonians*. Philadelphia, PA:
Fortress Press.
- Martin M 1999. Example and Imitation in the Thessalonian
Correspondence, *Southwestern Journal of Theology* (42):39-49.
- Martin J 2006 (May). Pentecostal power or selfish sorcery? *The Church
of God Evangel*, 10-11.
- Martin LR 2011. *Biblical hermeneutics*. Miami, FL: Gospel Press.

- Martin R 1988. *James*. Word biblical commentary 48. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Martyr J 1885. The first apology. In AC Coxe (ed.) *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, 159-303. New York, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.
- Marshall IH 1973. The meaning of the verb 'to baptize'. *Evangelical Quarterly* (45):130-140.
- _____ 1978. *Commentary on Luke*. The new international Greek Testament commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- _____ 1983. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. New century Bible commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- _____ 1986. *Acts*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- _____ 1999. *The pastoral Epistles*. International critical commentary. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark.
- Mason AJ 1893. *The relation of confirmation to baptism*. London, UK: Longmans Green and Company.
- Masters P 1988. *The healing epidemic*. London, UK: The Wakeman Trust.
- Mattingly K 1997. The laying on of hands on Joshua: An exegetical study of Numbers 27:12-23 and Deuteronomy 34:9. Doctoral dissertation. Andrews University. Available at: <https://digitalcommons.Andrews.edu/dissertations/91/>, 26-6-2019.
- _____ 2001. The significance of Joshua's reception of the laying on of hands in Numbers 27:12-23. *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39(2):191-208.

- _____2002. Joshua's reception of the laying on of hands, part 2: Deuteronomy 34:7 and conclusion. *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40(1):89-103.
- Mayhue RL 2003. Cessationism, "The gifts of healings," and divine healing. *The Master's Seminary Journal* 14(2):263-286.
- McCartney DG 2009. *James*. Baker exegetical commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- McClung LG 1986. *Azusa Street and beyond: Pentecostal missions and church growth in the twentieth century*. Plainfield, NJ: Bridge Publishing.
- McConnell DR 1995. *A different gospel: Biblical and historical insights into the word of faith movement*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- McCune RD 1976. A biblical study of tongues and miracles. *Central Bible Quarterly* 19(3):15.
- McDougall DG 2003. Cessationism in 1 Cor 13:8-12. *The Master's Seminary Journal* 14 (2):177-213.
- McGee GB (ed.) 2008. *Initial evidence: Historical and biblical perspectives on the pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism*. Berkeley, CA: Wipf & Stock Publishers.
- Menzies WW and Horton SH 1993. *Bible doctrines: A pentecostal perspective*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House.
- _____1994. *Empowered for witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield. UK: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Metzger BM 1971. *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament*. New York, NY: United Bible Societies.

- _____ 1972. *Lexical aids for students of the NT Greek*. Princeton, NJ: Theological Book Agency.
- _____ 1994. *Empowered for witness the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Milgrom J 1990. *Numbers= [Ba-midbar]: The traditional Hebrew text with the New JPS Translation*. New York: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Minutes of the 5th general assembly of the Church of God* 1910. Cleveland, TN. Pathway.
- _____ 1912. Cleveland, TN. Pathway.
- _____ 1948. Cleveland, TN. Pathway.
- _____ 2014. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____ 2018. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- Mitchell CW 1987. *The meaning of brk "to bless" in the Old Testament*. Society of biblical literature dissertation series 95. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Mohr G 2019. *Flowing in the supernatural*. Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image Publishers.
- Moltmann J 2001. *The Spirit of Life*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Moo DJ 1996. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- _____ 2000. *James*. Tyndale New Testament commentaries 16. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Morris HM 1976. *The Genesis record*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Morris L 1981. *The first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. Tyndale New Testament commentaries 7. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

_____1988. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Pillar New Testament commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

_____1999. *The pastoral epistles*. In J Emerton and C Cranfield and G Stanton (eds). *The international critical commentary*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark, LTD.

Morris R 2004. *The blessed life*. Raleigh, NC: Regal Books.

_____2017. The principle of priority. Online sermon. Accessed from <http://gatewaypeople.com/ministries/life/events/relat10nship-finding-relationship-through-god%E2%80%99s-top-10/session/2017/03/04/the>, 25-10-2018.

Morris RA 2012. *A biblical and theological analysis of specific tenets of word of faith theology: Pastoral implications for the Church of God*. Doctoral dissertation. South African Theological Seminary. Available at: www.sats.edu.za/research-resources, 1-6-2015.

Motyer A 1985. *The message of James: The tests of faith*. Bible speaks today. Leicester, England. InterVarsity Press.

Mounce WD 2000. *Pastoral epistles*. Word biblical commentary 46. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Mulenburg J 1961. The linguistic and rhetorical usages of the particle kî in the Old Testament. *Hebrew Union College Annual* (32):135-160.

_____1965. Abraham and the nations: Blessing and world history. *Interpretation* 19(4):387-398.

Nelson RD 1987. *First and Second Kings*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press.

Newell WR 2009. *Romans verse by verse*. Grand Rapids MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library.

Nolland J 1989. *Luke 1-9:20*. Word biblical commentary 35A. Dallas, TX: Word Books Publisher.

- Noordtjiz A 1983. *Numbers*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Noth M 1968. *Numbers*. Translated by J Martin. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.
- O'Brien MA 1998. The portrayal of prophets in 2 Kings 2. *Australian Biblical Review* 46:1-16.
- O'Brien PT 1993. Letters, letter forms. In Hawthorne G and Martin R and Reid D (eds) *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, 550-553. Downers Grove: IL: InterVarsity Press.
- _____ 1995. *Gospel and mission in the writings of Paul: Exegetical and Theological analysis*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic Press.
- Olson DT 1996. *Numbers*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.
- Oman D and Thoresen CE 2003. Spiritual modeling: A key to spiritual and religious growth? *International journal for the psychology of religion* (13):149-165.
- Origen A 1885. In AC Coxe (ed.) *Fathers of the third century*. New York, NY: Christian Literature Publishing.
- Osborne G 1991. *The hermeneutical spiral*. Downers Grove: IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Oss DA 1996. A pentecostal/charismatic view. In WA Grudem (ed.), *Are miraculous gifts for today? Four views*, 239-283. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Palmer EF 1982. *1, 2, 3, John, Revelation*. The communicator's commentary 12. Waco, TX: Word books.
- Parham C 1911. *The everlasting gospel*. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College.
- Parham SF 1969. *The life of Charles F. Parham: Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement*. Joplin, MO: Hunter Printing Company.

- Park N 2017. (October). A word from the Lord. *The Church of God Evangel*, 10-11.
- Parker J 1978. *Preaching through the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Parratt JK 1967. Romans 1:11 and Galatians 3:5—Pauline evidence for the laying on of hands. *EXPT*, (79).
- Parsons MC 2008. *Acts*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Pawson JD 1999. Believing in Christ and receiving the Spirit: A response to Max Turner. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* (15):33-48.
- Pedersen J 1926. *Israel, its life and culture 1* London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Peppler CL 2012. The Christocentric principle: a Jesus-centred hermeneutic. *Conspectus* 13:117-135.
- Pervo RI 2009. *Acts*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Peterson DG 2009. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Phillips J 1981. *Exploring Romans*. Chicago, IL. Moody Press.
- Phillips WH 2014. *Quest to restore God's house*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press.
- Piazza GH 2006. *1-2 Kings*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Piepkorn AC 1971. Charisma in the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers. *Concordia Theological Monthly* 42:369-396.
- Pliny 1963. *Pliny: Natural history*. Translated by WHS Jones. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Plummer A 1951. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*. Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark.

- _____. 2009. *A commentary on St. Paul's first epistle to the Thessalonians*. Charleston, SC: BiblioLife Publishing.
- Polaski SH 1999. *Paul and the discourse of power*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Potter T 2014. Blessed to build God's kingdom: The blessing of Abraham (Gen. 12:1-3) in light of the primeval history. Master's Thesis. Concordia University. Montreal, Quebec, CA. Available at https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/979583/1/Potter_MA_S2015.pdf, 11-9-2019.
- Powe RZ 2016. *The history of the Glossolalia*. Raleigh, NC: Lulu.com.
- Powers E 1988 (11 April). Healing through the ministry of 'laying on of hands'. *The Church of God Evangel*, 10.
- Pratte D 2018. *Commentary on the Gospel of John: Bible study notes and comments*. Morrisville, NC: Lulu.com.
- Rice G 2007. Elijah's requirement for prophetic leadership (2 Kings 2:1-18). *Journal of Religious Thought* (59):1-12.
- Rich P 2007. *The laws of impartation*. Oklahoma City, OK: Ekklisia Ministries, Inc.
- Richie T 2011. *Speaking by the Spirit: A pentecostal model for interreligious dialogue*. Lexington, KY: Emeth Press.
- _____. 2020. *Essentials of pentecostal theology*. Eugene, OR: Resource Publications.
- Riggans W 1983. *Numbers*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.
- Riss R 1982. The Latter Rain Movement of 1948. *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 4(1):32-45.
- _____. 1987. *Latter Rain*. Mississauga, Ontario: Honeycomb Visual Productions Ltd.

Robertson AT 1930. *Word pictures in the New Testament I*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

_____ 1931. *Word pictures in the New Testament IV*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

_____ 1932. *Word pictures in the New Testament V*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

_____ 1933. *Word pictures in the New Testament VI*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Robbins VK 1983. Pronouncement stories and Jesus' blessing of the children: A rhetorical approach. *Semeia* (29):43-74.

Robinson CD 2008. *The laying on of hands with special reference to the reception of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament*. Doctoral dissertation. Fuller Theological Seminary. Pasadena, CA. Available at www.proquest.com, 9-11-2016.

Rogers ET 2006. *The power of impartation*. Greenwell Springs, LA: McDougal & Associates.

Rogers CL Jr and Rogers CL III 1998. *The new linguistic and exegetical key to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Ruthven J 2008. *On the cessation of the charismata: A critique of the protestant polemic on postbiblical miracles*. London, UK: Continuum International Publishing Group - Sheffield.

Sakenfeld KD 1995. *Journeying with God: A commentary on the Book of Numbers*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Samra J 2003. A Biblical view of discipleship. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160 (638):219-234.

_____ 2006. *Being conformed to Christ in community*. London, UK: T&T Clark.

- Sarna N M 1989. *Genesis*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Saucy RL 1996. An open but cautious view. In WA Grudem (ed.), *Are miraculous gifts for today? Four views*, 97-148. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Sauer J 1981. Der ursprüngliche 'Sitz im Leben' von Mark 10:13-16. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (72):27-50.
- Saunders SP 2002. Learning Christ: Eschatology and spiritual formation in New Testament Christianity. *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* (56):155-167.
- Schaff P 1890. *St Augustin's city of God and Christian doctrine*. New York, NY: The Christian Literature Publishing. Electronic edition: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf102.html>.
- Schmidgall P 2013. *European Pentecostalism*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press.
- Schreiner TR 1998. *Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Scott BM 2012. *Making sense of contemporary charismatic apostolates: An historical and theological appraisal*. Doctoral dissertation. King's College London. Available at [https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/files/13082524/Studentthesis-Benjamin McNair, 22-7-2015](https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/files/13082524/Studentthesis-Benjamin%20McNair,%2022-7-2015).
- Seland T 2002. Saul of Tarsus and Early Zealotism: Reading Gal 1.13-14 in light of Philo's Writings. *Biblica* (83):449-471.
- Selman MJ 1994. *2 Chronicles*. Tyndale Old Testament commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Seymour W (ed.) 1906-1908. *The apostolic faith*. Los Angeles, CA: The Pacific Apostolic Faith Movement.

- Shaw G 1983. *The cost of authority: Manipulation and freedom in the New Testament*. London, UK: SCM.
- Shepherd WH 1994. *The narrative function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Silva M 2005. *Philippians*. Baker exegetical commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Simanullang G 2011. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A phenomenological and theological study*. Doctoral dissertation. Melbourne College of Divinity. Available at: https://repository.divinity.edu.au/931/1/2012Th%28MinStuds%29_Simanullang%2CG_Baptism_in_the_Holy_Spirit_2011.GONTI_SIM.pdf, 11-9-2018.
- Sims J 1984. *Power with purpose*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- _____ 1995. *Our pentecostal heritage: Reclaiming the priority of the Holy Spirit*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____ 2017. *Following Jesus: Essentials of Christian discipleship*. Cleveland, TN: Church of God Adult Discipleship.
- Simmons W 1999. *Galatians*. In F Arrington and R Stronstad (eds), *Full life Bible commentary to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Simpson EK 1975. *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Slay J 1963. *This we believe*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____ 1986. Glossolalia: Its value to the individual. In WH Horton (ed.) *Glossolalia phenomenon*, 217-243. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Books.
- Smith HP 1913. The laying-on of hands. *The American Journal of Theology* 17(1):47–62.

- Smith K 2008. *Academic writing and theological research: A guide for students*. Johannesburg, South Africa: South African Theological Seminary Press.
- _____ 2012. The Christocentric principle: Promise, pitfalls, and proposal. *Conspectus* 13:157–170.
- _____ 2013. *Integrated theology: Discerning God's will in our world*. Johannesburg, South Africa: South African Theological Seminary Press.
- Snoeberger MA 2000. The pre-mosaic tithe: Issues and implications. *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* (5):71-95.
- Spain CR 2008. The evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. *The Church of God Evangel* 98(6):8-10.
- Speiser EA 1964. *Genesis: Introduction, translation, and notes*. The Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven, CT: Yale.
- Spittler RP 1976. *Perspectives on the new Pentecostalism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing Group.
- Stephens RJ 2016. *Assessing the roots of Pentecostalism*. Online article. Accessed from, are.as.wvu.edu/pentroot.htm, 21-12-2016.
- Stephenson CA 2009. *Pentecostal theology according to the theologians: An introduction to the theological methods of pentecostal systematic theologians*. Doctoral dissertation. Marquette University. Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Available at: http://edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=dissertations_mu, 2-1-2016.
- Stibbs M 1981. *The first Epistle general of Peter*. Tyndale New Testament commentaries 17. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Stitzinger JF 2003. Spiritual gifts: Definitions and kinds. *The Master's Seminary Journal* 14(2):143–176.

- Stott J 1990. *The message of Acts: The Spirit, the church & the world*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- _____ 1994. *The message of Romans*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Storms CS 1996. A pentecostal/charismatic view. In WA Grudem (ed.), *Are miraculous gifts for today? Four views*, 175-223. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan
- Stowers SK 1981. *The diatribe and Paul's letter to the Romans*. The Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series. Chicago: Scholars Press.
- Straube R 2010. *Foundational discipling principle*. Maitland, FL: Xulon Press.
- Street AE 1914. What is Pentecost? *Church of God Evangel* 5(30):6-7.
- Stronstad R 1984. *The charismatic theology of St. Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- _____ 1992. Pentecostal experience and hermeneutics. *Paraclete* 26 (1):14-30.
- Stubbs DL 2009. *Numbers*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press.
- Synan V 1997. *The holiness-pentecostal tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- _____ 2001. *The century of the Holy Spirit: 100 years of pentecostal and charismatic renewal*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Tasker RVG 1982. *The general Epistle of James*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Taylor GF 1907. *The Spirit and the bride*. Online article. Accessed from, http://pctii.org/arc/taylor_bk.html, 10-8-2017.

- Taylor W [2018]. Impartation. Online article. Accessed from, <https://wade.taylor.org/impartation/>, 2-6-2018.
- Tenney M 1982. *New Testament survey*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Tharp ZC 1986. Annual address. In LJ Willis (ed.), *Sermons that guided the church*, 109-114. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- The Holy Bible*. 1999. The New King James Version. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Thielman F 2010. *Ephesians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Thiselton AC 2016. *Discovering Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Thomas J 1994. Women, pentecostals and the Bible. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* (5):41-56.
- _____ 1996. *Ministry and theology: Studies for the church and its leaders*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.
- _____ 2005. *The Spirit of the New Testament*. Blandford Forum, UK: Deo- Publishing.
- _____ 2012. *The devil, disease, and deliverance*. Cleveland, TN: CPT.
- _____ 2016. In LR Martin (ed.), *Toward a pentecostal theology of worship*, 89-112. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press.
- Thomas RL 2003. The hermeneutics of noncessationism. *The master's Seminary Journal* 14(2):287-310.
- Thurston BB and Ryan JM 2005. *Philippians and Philemon*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Tillin T 2018. The new thing. Online article. Accessed from, <http://www.banner.org.uk/res/newthin2.html>, 20-7-2018.

- Tipei JF 2000. The function of the laying on of hands in the New Testament. *Journal of the European theological association* (20):93-115.
- _____2009. *The laying on of hands in the New Testament: Its significance, techniques, and effects*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Tomlinson AJ 1910a. (1 December). Healing in the atonement. *The Evening Light and Church of God Evangel*, 1-4.
- _____1910b. (1 March). Rebuking. *The Evening Light and Church of God Evangel*, 4.
- _____1910c. (15 April). Pentecostal experience accompanied with the tongues. *The Evening Light and Church of God Evangel*, 1.
- _____1922. A brief history of the Church of God. In H Juillerat (ed.), *Book of Minutes*. Cleveland, TN: Church of God Publishing House.
- _____1921. (8 January). Let the fire and glory keep rolling in your souls. *The Evening Light and Church of God Evangel*, 1.
- Torrance FT 1998. *Space, time, and resurrection*. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark.
- Torrey RA 1933. *What the Bible teaches*. New York, NY: Fleming H. Revell Company.
- Tov E 1989. *Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Treier DJ 1997. The fulfilment of Joel 2:28-32: A multiple-lens approach. *Journal of the evangelical theological society* 40(1):13-26).
- Triplett B 1970. *A contemporary study of the Holy Spirit*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway.

- Turner M 1996. *Power from on high: The Spirit in Israel's restoration and witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____ 1999. Receiving Christ and receiving the Spirit: In dialogue with David Pawson. *Journal of pentecostal theology* (15):3-31.
- Utley B 2014. *The Exodus of Israel from Egypt: God fulfils His promise to Abraham*. Marshall, TX: Bible Lessons International.
- Vallotton K 2005. *Basic training for the prophetic ministry*. Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image Publishers.
- Vang P 1999. Sanctification in Thessalonians. *Southwestern journal of theology* (42):50-65.
- Vanoy DL 2006. Tarrying for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. *Church of God Evangel*, 96(5):6-7.
- Vincent MR 1972. *Word studies in the New Testament*. Wilmington, DE: Associated Publishers and Authors.
- Vine WE 1952. *An expository dictionary of New Testament words*. Uhrichsville, OH: Barbour Publishing.
- Viola F and Barna G 2008. *Pagan Christianity? Exploring the roots of our church practices*. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers.
- Vogels W 1982. The Spirit in Joshua and the Laying on of Hands by Moses. *Laval théologique et philosophique* (38):3-7.
- Wagner PC 1979. *Your spiritual gifts can help your church grow: How to find your gift and use it*. Glendale, CA: Regal.
- _____ 2006. *Apostles today: Biblical government for biblical power*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books.
- Walker DM 1996. Abusing the gifts of the Spirit. *The Church of God Evangel*, 24-26.

- Walker PH 1933. (11 November). The baptism with the Holy Ghost and the evidence. *The Church of God Evangel* 24(36):3-14.
- Waltke BK 2001. *Genesis a commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Walvoord JF 1958. *The Holy Spirit*. Findlay, OH: Dunham.
- Warfield BB 1918. *Counterfeit miracles*. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth.
- Webster 1913. Invoke. Online dictionary. Accessed from, <http://www.webster-dictionary.org/definition/invoke>, 2018-19-3.
- Wegenast K 1978. Teach. In C Brown (ed.), *The new international dictionary of New Testament theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Welchel T 2013. *True stories of the miracles of Azusa Street and beyond*. Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image.
- Wenham G 1987. *Genesis*. Word biblical commentary 1. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- _____1981. *Numbers*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 4. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Westermann C 1968. *Blessing in the Bible and the life of the church*. Translated by Keith Crim. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.
- _____1978. *Genesis 1-11*. Translated by JJ Scullion. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- _____1985. *Genesis 12-36*. Translated by JJ Scullion. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Whitt KR and Arrington FL (eds) 2012. *Issues in contemporary Pentecostalism*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press.
- Willard C and Sheppard J 2012. *Contagious Generosity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

- Williams DJ 1990. *Acts*. New international biblical commentary on the New Testament 5. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Williams ES 1949. (16 April). Spiritual gifts. *The Pentecostal Evangel*, 5-13.
- Williams PW 1990. *America's religions: Traditions and cultures*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Williams JR 1971. *The era of the Spirit*. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International.
- _____ 1976. Pentecostal theology: A Neo-pentecostal viewpoint. In RP Spittler (ed.), *Perspectives on the new Pentecostalism*, 76-85. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing Group.
- _____ 1996. *Renewal theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Williams RJ 1976. *Hebrew syntax: An outline*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Willis LJ 1986. Glossolalia in perspective. In Horton WH (ed.), *Glossolalia phenomenon*, 247-284. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Books.
- Winter B 1997. *Philo and Paul among the Sophists*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiseman D 1993. *1 & 2 Kings*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Witherington B 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles: A socio-rhetorical commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Wood LJ 1976. *The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Wright DP 1984. The disposal of impurity in the priestly writings of the Bible with reference to similar phenomena in Hittite and Mesopotamian cultures. Doctoral dissertation, University of California. Berkeley, California.

Wuest KS 1973. *Word studies in the Greek New Testament* (4 vols).
Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Ysebaert J 1962. *Greek baptismal terminology: Its origins and early development*. Groecitas christianorum primoeva. Nijmegen, AN:
Dekker & Van de Vegt.

Yun KD 2003. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: An ecumenical theology of Spirit baptism*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.