

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Dissertations (1934 -)

Dissertations, Theses, and Professional
Projects

Voices in Concert: Communication Ethnography of Pentecostal Worship

Bruce C. Coats
Marquette University

Follow this and additional works at: https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu



Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Coats, Bruce C., "Voices in Concert: Communication Ethnography of Pentecostal Worship" (2012).
Dissertations (1934 -). 224.
https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/224

VOICES IN CONCERT: COMMUNICATION ETHNOGRAPHY
OF PENTECOSTAL WORSHIP

by

Bruce C. Coats

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
In partial fulfillment of the Requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

December 2012

ABSTRACT
VOICES IN CONCERT: COMMUNICATION ETHNOGRAPHY
OF PENTECOSTAL WORSHIP

Bruce C. Coats

Marquette University, 2010

We know little about communication in Pentecostal worship service outside of the practice of tongues-speech. Pentecostals uniquely interpret communicative activity as distinctive factors in their identity; yet no research identifies the unique national speech codes operating with the Pentecostal churches. This study applied decreased that knowledge gap using Philipsen's Speech Codes Theory to analyzing the structure and interpretation of Pentecostal worship services, analyzing individual congregations in relationship with local culture and situated within the national Pentecostal movement. Fisher's narrative paradigm was applied to worship services to describe the narrative of a worship service as it extended in the everyday lives of worshipers. The Pentecostal speech community, a subculture within Christianity, has worship services marked by a free flowing structure and the nine charismatic gifts of the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12). Another dimension of Pentecostal services is the flexibility to adapt to local culture producing a strong relation to the local culture. The study explores the relationship between the speech codes within Pentecostalism and the local cultural milieu. The seminal study defines the speech codes of the Pentecostal subculture within the United States, considering regional and local factors that produce diversity within the subculture. The study discovered that worshippers extend the experience from the worship service into everyday life through the narration provided by worship.

The study used the ethnographic methods of participant observation and interviews to discover the meaning attributed to various worship activity as well as the significance for communication. An interdisciplinary approach was followed allowing the research to be built on both communication research and theological reflection.

DEDICATION

To Rev. Dallas Coats
Dad, Pentecostal Pastor, friend

To Rev. Dr. Harold Carpenter
Father-in-law, passionate Pentecostal missionary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUE	1
Pentecostal Research.....	8
More than Defining Tongues-Speech	9
Inside the Pentecostal World	12
Issues Impacting Research.....	13
Theology	14
The Field	16
Research Positioning.....	17
Interdisciplinary Approach	20
Insider Research.....	24
Introduce the Pentecostal Writer.....	29
A Look Forward.....	31
CHAPTER 1. WORSHIP AS COMMUNICATIVE COMPLEXITY	33
The Main Voice of Communication	33
Research Questions.....	36
Operationalization.....	37
Nature of Communication.....	39
Narration	41
Religious Communication	44
Pentecostal Communication.....	49
Worship as Communication.....	56
Worship Narrative.....	62

Pentecostal Worship.....	63
Theories of Worship Experience	63
Worship as Embodiment.....	65
Pentecostal Worship Narrative	67
CHAPTER 2. VOICES IN SPEECH COMMUNITIES.....	71
Speech Codes Theory	73
Speech Communities Integrated Across Culture	80
Element of Culture.....	81
Element of Communication	83
Element of Pentecostal Faith	84
Theology and the Speech Community.....	85
Summary	87
CHAPTER 3. METHODS.....	88
Participant Observation.....	89
Depth Interviews.....	93
Analysis Methods.....	97
Sampling	98
The Limitations of Ethnography.....	99
Summary	100
CHAPTER 4. HISTORY OF PENTECOSTAL CHURCHES	101
Funding Pentecostalism	101
Founding Pentecostalism	103
Developing Worship Practices.....	105

Formalizing Pentecostal Institutions	107
Tension From Maturity	109
CHAPTER 5. PENTECOSTAL THEOLOGICAL NARRATIVE	112
Theological Narrative	113
The Narrative Source	114
Jesus as Savior	121
Jesus as Sanctifier	124
Jesus as Spirit Baptizer	126
Metaphor for Living in Spiritual Power.....	128
Evidential Tongues	131
Supernatural Intervention.....	132
Pentecostal Theology and Communication	134
Jesus as Healer	139
Jesus as Soon Coming King.....	145
Summary	151
CHAPTER 6. EVEN THE BISHOP DANCED!.....	154
SERVICE CONTOURS AND WORSHIP TEXTURE	154
Valuing Spontaneity.....	155
Evolving Paradigms of Spontaneity.....	159
Contouring Services.....	164
Attitudes	165
Authenticity.....	171
Actions	174

Infrequent Contours	193
Textures, Themes, and Observations	196
Complexity of Tongues-speech	197
Miracles.....	199
Silencing the Recorder	201
Preachers and the Sermons They Preach	202
Message Driven	203
God's Voice	204
Prophetic	206
Summary	209
CHAPTER 7. "EXPRESSING" VITALITY FROM WITHIN	211
Expressions	212
Expressing Worship: From Their Own Words	215
Expressing a Definition of Worship	215
Expressing Activity in Worship.....	217
Expressing Other Forms of Worship	220
Expressing as Cultural Interaction	223
Expression as Liturgical Activity.....	224
Expressing as a Form of Spirituality.....	225
Expressing Relationship or Ritualizing Religion.....	228
Ordering Embodied Spirituality.....	234
Expression as Psychology of the Speech Community	239
Theory Development	241

Summary	243
CHAPTER 8. WORSHIP AS NARRATION.....	245
Narrative Melody Line.....	247
Spiritual Desire	247
Expressed Celebration	249
Intimate Presence	250
Life Transformation	252
Nurture	253
Direction	254
Reliance.....	255
Harmonious Combination.....	257
Structuring Everyday Life.....	259
Bible-Readers and Spirit-Listeners Living the Narrative	261
Authority in Social Drama	262
Settling Social Drama	264
Dramatic Worship That Resolves Social Drama	267
Co-Authorship is Everything	270
Co-Authored Worship.....	271
Co-Authored Sermons	273
Summary	276
CHAPTER 9. CAN WE GET A SANDWICH FOR YOU? :	278
GENEROUS LIVING (CULTURE), HOSPITALITY (CHURCH), AND	278
COMMUNICATIVE GIVING (GOSPEL)	278

Biblical Giving.....	278
Giving as Habitus.....	280
Giving as Communication	289
Giving Worship.....	292
Giving interfacing with culture	295
Holiness as Relational Giving.....	299
As Compassion	304
Crisis of Generosity	305
Crisis of Generosity and Expression.....	306
Summary	309
THEOLOGICAL EXCURSUS ON TONGUES-SPEECH.....	312
CHAPTER 10. TIGHTLY WOVEN FABRIC.....	315
Deeply Woven	317
Processes of Witness Worship	323
Conflicts of Witness and other Communicative Activity	326
Summary	327
CHAPTER 11. REFLECTIONS.....	329
Research Questions Revisited.....	329
Pentecostal Communication Reflections	332
Reflections on Premises in Pentecostal Worship.....	332
Rules for Communication	333
Rules for the Relationship of Church, Message, and Surrounding Milieu	334

Speech Codes Theory Reflections	336
Call for Further Study	336
Theological Reflections	338
BIBLIOGRAPHY AND WORKS CITED	343
APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PASTORS	366
APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONGREGANTS	370
APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW CODES	374
APPENDIX D. CHURCHES VISITED	383

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Bruce C. Coats

First and foremost I wish to acknowledge the strength and insight which I believe came directly from God. I offer this project as a gift to His church in honor of His wonderful love, grace, and sustaining power in the darkest hours of research.

A special thank you is in order for my wife Sheryl and her infinite patience and support while I completed course work and the final project. To my children Brittany, Rachel, and Ben, thank you for your support and patience as I took time away from you for research. I am glad I slowed down my process to enjoy fireworks, watching movies, and walking through the mall. Let's get some tea together!

The very special editing crew deserves my love and thanks. A special thanks to my sister Rev. Erlene Johnson who did a great job editing. Bryan Darrell's (fellow adjunct faculty member at the School of Urban Missions) comments were very helpful and much appreciated. My daughter and pastoral intern in college ministry at Wichita State University, Brittany E. Wells helpfully edited early editions.

Thank you to Portview Church who allowed me to research while also serving as an Associate Pastor. Thank you Pastor Mark Larson and Suzanne for your friendship. The support of Pastor Paul Welch, Pastor Mitch Lueck, Tracy Nickodem, Lori Drake, and Darlene Garay meant a lot. And the support of my Wednesday night Bible study group continuously overwhelmed me. Thank you John Love for continuous prayer.

Without the mentorship, guidance, and encouraging support of Dr. William Thorn, my project would have remained a dream. Your guidance as committee chair

continuously strengthened me. While we worship in different traditions, we both add our voices in the Spirit's concert! Thank you Dr. Ana Garner for your mentorship and difficult questions; it is what makes you special and unique! Thank you Dr. John Pauly for your advice and direction. Thank you Dr. Ralph Del Colle who served on my committee until his untimely death. Fr. Thomas Hughson, while our traditions vary, we both deeply love the same Spirit; my respect for you soars. I appreciate your commitment to God and to interdisciplinary research. Dr. Deirdre Dempsey willingly filled the committee vacancy, joining the project in the last couple of months and I could never thank her enough! Dr. Martin Mittelstadt of Evangel University deserves appreciation and thanks for providing content feedback to the committee.

Thank you to the Graduate School staff, especially Mr. Craig Pierce, for assistance, support, and your time. The dissertation boot camps were a God-send! The library staff at Marquette, especially the Interlibrary Loan Department, supported research in so many ways.

While the list runs long, it would not be complete without thanking the fifty people who gave of their time to help with the research. The pastors are my heroes. In some cases, they pastor small churches in humble circumstances, yet their passion equaled those from the mega churches. In God's eyes, we all stand on level ground at the foot of His throne as fellow worshippers.

Last, to professors who through the years inspired me to new heights, a very special thank you. Dr. Gerry Flokstra my undergraduate advisor remains a continued source of encouragement and joy. We knew Doc Flok loved Jesus and loved us. Dr. Daryl Eldridge's time and support was greatly appreciated; as the Rockbridge Seminary

President he took time to have coffee with a student; may I learn such servanthood!

Thank you Dr. Bob Griffin at Marquette University for your confidence in my ability to accomplish this task.

VOICES IN CONCERT:
COMMUNICATION ETHNOGRAPHY OF PENTECOSTAL WORSHIP

INTRODUCTION: DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUE

The worship of Pentecostal Christians uniquely provides avenues for exploration of religious communication because of their strong emphasis on communicative activity. Pentecostals are Christians who seek direct connections with God so that He may fill their soul, resulting in the manifestation of supernatural power through divinely energized communication such as tongues-speech and charismatic gifts. I attended their services and conducted interviews to uncover phenomenological meanings behind their practices and begin with a narrative description of one service to orient the reader to their practices. Initially I will follow Albrecht's definition of worship as "the human expressions directed to God, expressions that signify appreciation, reverence, devotion, profound love and other affections that believers deem appropriate (and authentic) in response to their understanding of divine revelation" (Albrecht 2004, 71). Voices of interviewees will emerge in later chapters to add their own definitions of worship.

When I entered the main meeting room at Red Mountain Christian Center in Mesa, Arizona, the lights were already dimmed and my eyes quickly adjusted from the bright Arizona sun in late July. The black ceiling and black stage added to the adjustment. Spotlights illuminated the stage, suspended from the ceiling and from a metal structure tastefully created for that purpose. Loud rock music played in the background, music that I recognized as the latest Christian worship music from Australia. The entire setting resembled a concert venue far more than a church. The stage was full of

instruments, multiple guitars, drums enclosed in a plexiglas cage (to control sound no doubt), bongo drums, and a grand piano slightly off center stage. Announcements scrolled on two screens each set off on either side of the stage, with flash effects and lots of colorful design.

Two minutes before the service began, all the lights went out, and a video started to play. A woman's voice welcomed everyone to the service, saying she wanted to take a few minutes to acquaint us with their building. She gave directions to the restrooms, the kids service, instructions about the childcare for infants, information about the church's café which was in an adjoining building right outside the front doors, and briefly introduced the worship style for those not used to what they were about to encounter. While many churches used videos in their worship services, even video produced by their own church, this introductory video was truly unique. I had only been in Arizona a few hours and it was my first time at Red Mountain Christian Center so there was something settling and welcoming about the video.

As soon as the video ended, the stage lights came up and revealed the worship band in place ready to lead the congregation in singing. The music began, just as loud as the pre-service music. Again I recognized the song as the latest in contemporary worship music played very aggressively. When the first song was over, a young man succinctly described water baptism, reading a scripture from Romans 6. He talked about water baptism as a celebration symbolic of the "old us" being gone and the "new us" coming into existence. He quickly prayed, thanking God for "bringing new life into us, that we don't have to live in this muck and darkness anymore but we can have the life of Christ in

our life.”¹ The band then led the congregation in singing a new song, which was an old hymn with a new melody as recorded by a contemporary Christian music group.

As the song played, a light shown on an area at the back of the stage. An older lady appeared in that area, clearly the person going to be baptized. She was baptized while the congregation sang, “Living he loved me, dying he saved me, buried he carried my sins far away. Rising he justified, freely forever. One day he’s coming, oh glorious day.” The theatre of the moment enhanced the drama of baptism, emphatically assuring the congregation of the importance of the event for the identity of the baptismal candidate and the congregation. When it was over, the congregation applauded and cheered in a joyous celebration, even while the song continued to play. The celebration was controlled and polite, fitting for a suburban community, but a celebration none-the-less. The people clapped at the end of the hymn, but after the baptismal celebration it was twice as long and significantly more vigorous. The people were actively engaged in what was happening.

Some women were in skirts or dresses but many were in shorts. Everyone looked like they had cleaned up after a hot Saturday in the Arizona sun, but most were dressed very casual. The people greeted friends upon entering the sanctuary, even if they came in after the service started. Some waved to others in another seating section while many hugged friends. They were friendly with each other. As the service engaged, I reflected on the fact that no one shook my hand yet. The greeters outside the building and inside the entryway both greeted me but no one else spoke to me as I took my place in the back

¹ Quotes from all services are taken from a combination of field notes and transcriptions from recordings of services for verification of details.

row in the far left of the four seating sections of padded chairs. A man had entered before service, shook many hands, and waved to me from the edge of my seating section. He had a pleasant smile and everyone responded favorably to him. As the service progressed, I would learn that he was the senior pastor. In spite of no one having spoken to me yet, I felt welcomed rather than left out.

When the third song was over, the worship bandleader led in vocal praise, a moment when the congregation verbally expresses their praise to God as each person sees fit according to their comfort level. For Red Mountain Christian Center, the comfort level was a murmur that could be heard throughout the congregation. The verbal praise became a prayer led by a man up front, which started thanking God for salvation, for Christ paying “our massive debt” and “justifying us.” Each new spoken section of the service included a few sentences which taught theology, nothing long or detailed but with enough weight to reinforce (or introduce) doctrinal ideas to the congregation. The prayer shifted to concerns of people present because “there may be many needs here ... coming through this door,” a phrase which served as both inclusion of the congregation and words expressed to deity. As the piano continued to play in the background, the worship leader prayed for “many needs” such as “sickness, maybe relational needs, people that ... need to come to you.” It concluded with the request for, “God to be God in these situations. We give them to you.” While the prayer was primarily focused on needs, it maintained a positive tone, focusing on God’s “ultimate plan” in difficult situations. It concluded with requests for people in close relationships with those in the congregation “who do not know you ... people we care deeply about, people who we do not know where their

eternity lies. God we place them in your hands right now. God you're the one who has to change their heart. You're the one who has to draw them to you."

Immediately after the prayer, the congregation was asked to turn and greet someone around them. People put down the super-sized sodas so they could shake hands with people around them. They hugged friends and warmly greeted new acquaintances. Several people turned around to greet me as I stood in the back row. No one overwhelmed me with effusive greetings but welcomed me and included me gently.

The service was very orderly with people standing when they were invited to stand but only a handful stood spontaneously. Over the course of the singing portions of the service, at least fifty percent of the congregation raised their hands in the air, a now familiar characteristic of Pentecostal churches. The sermon was conversational and engaging with the pastor sitting down on a tall stool for much of the sermon, using a portable music stand for a pulpit to hold some notes for his sermon. He spoke in a quiet manner but engaged the congregation who readily laughed at his jokes. It was announced that the sermon notes were available on youversion.com (an application for mobile devices) and printed in the bulletin, which resembled a CD cover and opened up with detailed notes inside.

After twenty-six minutes, thirty seconds, the pastor started a prayer to conclude the sermon and the piano player started playing softly in the background. After one minute and twelve seconds, the pastor turned his attention from speaking to God to speaking to the congregation, to those who "were presented with some information ... and more than that, there's something going on spiritually in your life. Maybe you're really drawn to the ways of Jesus." He then briefly explained his understanding of what

might be happening inside such a person, with God's love reaching down to them, trying to bring them into a relationship with God. He said that it was good news that people could trust God and he described the resurrection of Jesus. He mixed old metaphors with new, old symbolism with new symbols, some phrases came right from the Bible, and some were the invention of a specialized, Pentecostal vocabulary, yet all with the appearance of being carefully chosen for the moment because of the deliberate manner in which he spoke. The message to those people lasted slightly under two minutes when the pastor gave a sample prayer for such people to pray if they were interested in "coming to a relationship with God."

Before concluding the service, at exactly one hour after the first song began, the pastor invited people to come to the front of the church to pray, or turn and kneel where they were and pray. They could also go to the front of the room to either side of the stage and receive the Lord's Supper, forming two separate lines to receive at tables in the front. Many went forward in spite of it being the first time Red Mountain Christian Center had ever distributed the Lord's Supper in that manner, voluntarily, informally, and individually at the end of the service. When that segment had lasted about ten minutes, the band played a rousing song and the entire congregation spontaneously joined them in the singing. One person stood up spontaneously, then a dozen joined in, before an avalanche of people stood to sing and worship. Their eyes were closed and many raised their hands. A few jumped up and down, quite a few more swayed back and forth. Only the elderly and pregnant did not stand up, with a significant representation of both groups present. The service was over in less than an hour and fifteen minutes.

Welcome to today's Pentecostal worship service. The venues look significantly different from those previously described in literature (Albrecht 1999), now more closely resembling concert halls or hotel banquet rooms. The picture is not the same as yesterday's Pentecostal world and does not necessarily reflect what ethnographers will find ten years from now. The venues will change, as will the lighting, technology, and even communication methods; however, the values and narrative are likely to remain the same. As a church affiliated with the Assemblies of God, Red Mountain Christian Center reflects the current trends for Pentecostal churches across the nation, including encouraging a personal and direct encounter with God's presence through spontaneous, expressive worship, challenging sermons and instruction on living the Christian life in everyday situations.

How does the approach to surrounding cultural milieu impact communication values in Red Mountain Christian center? Will it be different from the Pentecostal faith communities in the Midwest, the South, or New England? Does the message reframing in the service at Red Mountain adapt to surrounding culture? How does the message reframing for cultural adaptation impact rituals and speech codes, faith, and practice? If Red Mountain Christian Center's communication differs from other Pentecostal faith communities, how does the variety of expressions impact socialization within the congregation? How do the encounters with the divine presence define the daily narratives of congregants outside worship services at Red Mountain Christian Center? To answer these questions and more, I will analyze Pentecostal worship services in more detail. (Chapter 1 contains a formal restatement of research questions.)

Pentecostal Research

Pentecostals are the fastest growing branch of Christianity, numbering hundreds of millions of people worldwide and the second largest tradition within Christianity (Jenkins 2002). The sect is recognized by their commitment to speaking in unknown languages (tongues-speech), which is using languages in prayer they have not previously learned (Hollenweger 2004). Their services are marked by spontaneous prophecy from congregants and other phenomena, often verbal. Even though they are unique in their practice and belief in communication, little research has been done from a communication perspective outside of tongues-speech. Their unique perspective on communication in worship and their historic tendency to withdraw from surrounding culture (R. M. Anderson 1979) make Pentecostals unique for a study of communication and surrounding milieu's impact upon their speech codes, those values that guide communicative acts. Through the years, many have studied the Pentecostal phenomena of tongues-speech, even using ethnographic methods (Goodman 1972; Dillon 1998); however, the fixation in academic literature on just one phenomenon of a group presses beyond curiosity to something less healthy for both the academy and the Pentecostal tradition. Other interesting communicative phenomena occur in nearly every worship service. A handful of other studies have considered various aspects of Pentecostal communication mostly on rhetoric (Shoaps 2002) or using quantitative data (Gilbert 2009). Quite a few have looked at ritual development within the Pentecostal movement (for a sample see Albrecht 1999, 2002; Robbins 2011; Lindhardt 2011a). One study offered an initial foray into the foundational codes that guide communication (Youngblood and Winn 2004). Will their findings based on research in one African

American church in the Deep South be upheld by a more regionally and ethnically comprehensive study?

More than Defining Tongues-Speech

Defining Pentecostalism presented a bit of a problem. The possibilities run the gamut from snake handlers to groups centered on prophecy, from evangelicals who speak in tongues to street missions, from non-Trinitarian oneness groups to health/wealth churches. Traditionally the definition included speaking in tongues (Hollenweger 2004). Speaking in tongues happens when a believer speaks in a language he/she has not previously learned; such power is ascribed to the infilling of the Holy Spirit.² Often tongues-speech is considered evidence that a believer has been baptized in the Holy Spirit (Chan 2001), synonymously called Spirit possession in social research or the infilling of the Spirit in theology.³ However, there were many resemblances between Pentecostal groups and those groups that do not consider tongues-speech evidence of being baptized in the Holy Spirit. Further, there were many shared characteristics between Pentecostals and groups that do not practice tongues-speech in public worship (A. Anderson 2010b). Essentially, tongues-speech often defined Pentecostals but did not completely set the standard. A solution of greater dexterity must guide the definition.

² I will continue the Pentecostal theological tradition of referring to all three members of the Trinity with capital letters and referring to the Holy Spirit with capitalized personal pronouns based on Ralph Riggs book *The Spirit Himself* (1943).

³ The term “social research” is used in many places to mean all forms of study of humanity including psychology, anthropology sociology, and communication. Where appropriate, the term “social science” will be used with the same intention, bringing together all forms of study of humankind whether that study is done with interpretative methods or empirical data.

Many solutions have been proposed to navigate this conundrum. Lofstedt (2009) gallantly navigates the delicate issue as it pertains to Pentecostalism in Russia, suggesting ultimately that if a group claims they are Pentecostal, they should be included. Methodologically this offers many advantages because of the subsequent reduction of confusion in research. What presents itself as a reduction in confusion, however, may lead to more confusion. Certainly, researchers ought to respect local nomenclature but also must critically seek helpful definitions. Allan Anderson (2010b) suggests using a family resemblance method for determining inclusion in the grouping of Pentecostalism. Stated simply, if a group resembles Pentecostalism in key facets, that group ought to be included. The best that can arise is a general guide to define Pentecostals. From that perspective, Pentecostals are Christians who believe in a supernatural and transcendent God who personally seeks direct connections based on forgiveness through Jesus with individuals and fills those individuals in such a way that the supernatural power is manifested through communication in charismatic gifts.⁴

As a working definition, it will include both classical Pentecostals and their cousins the Charismatics. There is a growing research tradition (Albrecht 1999; Lindhardt 2011a) that includes both groups in a combined term such as “Pentecostal-Charismatic” (Lindhardt 2011a). I will follow Smith (2010) who acknowledges the presence of both groups while still using the term “Pentecostal” to avoid confusion. By the term Pentecostal, I mean to include those in Charismatic churches but also exclude those

⁴ For Pentecostals, charismatic gifts are manifestations of a divine interruption expressed through prophecy, messages of situational wisdom or situational knowledge, miracles, healing, messages in tongues, interpretation of tongues, supernatural and situational faith, and distinguishing between good and evil spirits (see 1 Cor 12:8-10).

Charismatics who worship in denominations of fixed liturgy such as the Roman Catholic Church (Csordas 1997). Further, the singular word maintains the research emphasis on the Pentecostal worship service.⁵ Other groups such as snake handlers were not included because they represent a miniscule portion of the total population of Pentecostals.⁶ Nontrinitarian groups were also not included for clarity of beliefs.⁷

The infilling of the Spirit impacts research in very real ways throughout worship services and prayer meetings as the researcher tries to discover the ramifications of Spirit infilling. The filling of each believer with the Holy Spirit quickly delves into rich theological nuances (for a theological overview see Macchia 2006). The emphasis on supernatural transcendence shapes the essence of a Pentecostal view of reality and is the subject of the next section.

⁵ Interviewees from Vineyard Churches were comfortable calling themselves Charismatics, they did not consider themselves Pentecostals. However, for analysis the unhyphenated term of “Pentecostal” avoids confusion in places where Charismatic Christians maintain strong affiliations with other worshipping traditions.

⁶ Snake handling groups willingly take up poisonous snakes during worship. They base their practices on a literal reading of the last few verses of Mark 16. “And he said to them, ‘Go into all the world and proclaim the gospel to the whole creation. . . . And these signs will accompany those who believe: in my name they will cast out demons; they will speak in new tongues; they will pick up serpents with their hands; and if they drink any deadly poison, it will not hurt them; they will lay their hands on the sick, and they will recover.’” They take those words to as a programmatic imperative.

⁷ They are often called “Oneness” or “Jesus Only” by other Pentecostals because of their belief that all three members of the trinity are contained within Jesus. Their practices typically resemble other Pentecostals and they are included in various Pentecostal research groups and societies. For a discussion see Vondey (2010, Ch. 3).

Inside the Pentecostal World

Pentecostals believe in a supernatural, transcendent God who personally intervenes in the natural order from time to time. These supernatural interventions often come in the form of physical or spiritual healing (Huber and Huber 2010). Pentecostals emphasize the in-breaking of God's supernatural power throughout all of their theology and practice in such a way that it challenges "the way things are" and may "usher in the new" (Karkkainen 2010). Their belief in a supernatural, transcendent God influences day-to-day life from family health decisions to the way they respond in interpersonal conflict. The pervasive nature of their belief in the supernatural makes it not only a major theme but also *the dominant* theme for which a researcher must account because this particular belief is the central aspect of a Pentecostal identity. The multiple forms of Pentecostal churches all rely on a belief in an infinitely powerful, supernatural, transcendent, and personal God.

The implications spread across the fields of social research and natural sciences, creating upheaval everywhere no matter which lane one chooses for driving on the Pentecostal highway. There are significant research implications for psychology because Pentecostal's unwavering commitment to the supernatural sometimes causes researchers to consider Pentecostals from an abnormal psychology perspective (Huber and Huber 2010). Huber and Huber (2010) reflected on them from a psychology of religion perspective borrowing a multi-dimensional model of religiosity from Stark and Glock (1968). Huber and Huber specified the five dimensions as intellectual, experiential, ideological, private practice, and public practice. Within the five dimensional model, Huber and Huber found several dimensions sorely under researched for Pentecostals as

well as finding one which may not apply to the Pentecostal view of reality as originally articulated by Stark and Glock because the ideological dimension fundamentally rejected a belief in the supernatural, thus the ideological dimension may not fit with Pentecostals.

The supernatural belief of Pentecostals fits well with a dualistic view of the world (Meyer 2010). In the dualistic view that Meyer diagnosed, Pentecostals adamantly believe in both a material world seen with the eyes and a spirit world experienced with the spirit of a person. In many global regions, the dualistic worldview is more pronounced because it is part of the taken-for-granted-world of the culture around them. In Western countries where Rationalism has long ruled the day, dualism uniquely describes most Pentecostals. Berger and Zijderveld (2009) asserted that the world has come over to a more dualistic view of supernatural beings and cited the rise of Pentecostalism as evidence. Whatever the case for the numbers throughout society, the researcher must be aware of the dualistic worldview, account for it, and accept it as part of the fundamental identity of many United States American Pentecostals. Philosophical theologian Smith takes a philosophical definition of dualism where matter is evil and spirit is good and concludes that the Pentecostal view of the world does not include dualism because of the view that the Spirit inhabits human bodies (Smith 2010a, 2010b), a philosophical view rather than a view from the social sciences.

Issues Impacting Research

The dualistic worldview (that both matter and spirit exist) causes problems for researchers who may not believe in a spirit realm. To discard or ignore the Pentecostal belief in spirits fundamentally shifts research on Pentecostals away from their actual identity. The researcher must accept this aspect of Pentecostalism worldview with

respect. Toulis (1997) found that Pentecostal identity was more about the other world than about the material world, more about belief than about ethnicity. For example, as with any worldview with which a researcher might interact, one need not endorse the worldview to respect it and offer thoughtful, critical reflection on how that worldview influences the particular question being researched.

In a detailed exploration of identity among Jamaican immigrants to England in a Pentecostal church, Toulis explored many possibilities for identity including ethnicity (Toulis 1997). After exploring the possibility of many other factors, Toulis concluded that *belief* was the major factor in the identity of church people she studied and superseded any other factors. Her findings were consistent with other reports that Pentecostals tend to be quite devout and have a strong allegiance to their beliefs (Cox 2001; Robbins 2011). Researchers who explored a secular rationale for Pentecostals' sacred commitments were likely to miss a significant aspect of their identity. While race did play a role in identity in Toulis' study, that role was marginal in comparison to the role of belief. Researchers who have not accounted for a strong belief structure have started with research questions about why a person would join a Pentecostal church. While that may be fascinating on some level, Gooren (2010) explored Pentecostal conversion narratives that ultimately suggest people join a Pentecostal church because they believed. Ignoring a believing identity may result in misdirected research questions or misguided theory application.

Theology

While the theological arena poses many issues, several particularly influence social research. Certainly, theological issues ought to be considered when studying a

religious group (Brodwin 2003). If religious groups are a mixture of rituals and beliefs as Durkheim suggested (1915), then both practices and theology form essential considerations. For some research interests, theology will live in the background. In other research, theology will take center stage. The research question will determine how much and what kind of theology must be studied.

Pentecostal theology presents itself as a moving target because of diversity and flexibility. Diversity issues require that a researcher start by attempting to define what type of Pentecostalism will be studied. The full range of possible manifestations makes definition and theological reading a difficult task. The flexibility of Pentecostalism arises from a reliance on the Holy Spirit for direction, as previously noted. The flexibility extends throughout the Pentecostal structure and organization. Pentecostalism is noted for not having a vast organization or a charismatic leader (Robbins 2010). In the absence of central leadership, a flexible structure flourishes. The flexible structure allows for diversity nationally as well as locally. It also makes some forms of study difficult because organizational flexibility requires the researcher to sift through a variety of archives for prevalent historical research (van der Laan 2010). Some sociological research will require more layers of research because of the flexible structure. Martin (1990) observed that researchers would have to dig through power structures without preconceived ideas in order to sift through the exact nature of the structure under consideration. Throughout international relationships for Pentecostals, structures often work through networks and partnerships that are not always held together by theological commonalities or organizational ties but based on common goals (Robbins 2010).

The Field

Pentecostal research is a relatively new field. Over the past twenty years, there have been many seminal offerings in the literature because the field is so young. Before 1990, only a handful of research projects considered Pentecostals. After that time, an explosion of research across various fields included theology and the various fields of social research. Therefore, a researcher may only find scant help in a literature review without a lot of directly correlative assistance. For example, the dearth of communication literature on Pentecostals (outside of studies on tongues-speech) makes just about any communication research a seminal study. Some linguistic research has been done. A researcher will find much more literature assistance in anthropological studies, especially in ethnographies. Sociologists have considered the influence of poverty on Pentecostalism, especially within Latin America. Within this context, theory based research on Pentecostal worship is truly seminal.

When researchers attempted to tackle the task of doing seminal research with Pentecostals, the research sometimes found insufficient categories. In sociology of religion, for example, traditional categories of sacred and profane hardly registered for a typical Pentecostal ethos (Robbins 2011). Ideally, Pentecostals seek to take their faith into every area of life, making everything potentially sacred (Robbins 2011). Meyer (2010) pointed to media as an example of an opportunity to spread the message; therefore, media may potentially be blessed by the Spirit's presence. The categories of the sociological fathers in Marx, Durkheim, and Weber do not always fit Pentecostals. Durkheim's assertion that religion was a combination of beliefs and rituals does not totally account for Pentecostalism's emphasis on a lived day-to-day experience of the

divine presence (Robbins 2011). Ritual studies typically situate ritual expressions within a group, yet Pentecostal ritual so often saturates the day-to-day experience in the believer's life (Robbins 2010). If a researcher expects only group manifestations of ritual her/his explanations wither from trying to draw from a dry well.

Variation from church to church or even from service to service has caused research issues. One service taken on its own may not reflect a particular congregation at all. When Harvey Cox set out to research Pentecostals, he found himself in Kansas City one Sunday evening attending a large Pentecostal church with a solid reputation (Cox 2001). Upon arriving, Cox discovered that a guest missionary was scheduled to preach that evening. A little discouraged because the church's renowned pastor would not be preaching, he settled in to enjoy the service. In writing about the event, Cox sounded a clear note of disappointment with the evening because the preaching sounded rehearsed as though the missionary had preached the sermon over and over again. Cox rightly situated that visit within the broader context of Pentecostalism, seeing it as a trend within some churches. Researchers must either choose to visit one congregation repeatedly or must choose to account for the potential variation with grace, realizing that free-form worship sometimes draws from wells infrequently visited.

Research Positioning

Psychology of religion was one of the first fields to research Pentecostals; however early research often came from abnormal psychology (Huber and Huber 2010). Throughout the years of research, the field demonstrated that Pentecostalism did not present some sort of pathology or abnormal psychology. On the contrary, Huber and Huber (2010) amalgamated a series of studies demonstrating that in almost every respect

Pentecostals displayed greater (or at least the same) psychological health than the general population. The methodological concerns rising from this observation are twofold. First, research questions often come from the experience of a researcher. When the research questions lead to an abnormal psychological research framework, it may well have arisen from a clash of worldviews where a researcher could not imagine psychologically healthy individuals participating in a religious experience like Pentecostalism (Kildahl 1972). Robins (2010) suggested “changing the question from ‘Why convert to Pentecostalism?’ to ‘How do people live with Pentecostalism after they have converted to it? What is it like to live in a culture in which the production of discontinuity is a goal and the existence of cultural tensions is taken for granted and actively embraced?’” Changing research questions in this way presents Pentecostalism as a lived religion and seeks to explore the nature of living the religious experiences associated with it.

Through research questions, research methods, and written conclusions, researchers studying Pentecostals may well impose their own worldview upon the situation. R. M. Anderson (1979) reductionistically described early Pentecostalism and then imposed a Marxist worldview to describe the sociological situation of early Pentecostals. McLoughlin (1979) completely ignored the Pentecostal awakening when describing America’s Great Awakenings throughout history. There will always be some imposition of a researcher’s worldview on a research project. A research project often says more about the researcher than the research subjects. Even the paradoxes, tensions, or contradictions that a researcher reports may rise from a clash of worldviews more than from actual tensions inside the research subject’s community. Cox (2001) observed several paradoxes within Pentecostalism that can all be accounted for by understanding

that Pentecostals give preeminence to those things they believe arise directly from the Bible.

Gender issues also impact methodological concerns. Brodwin (2003) observed that being a single male researcher probably impacted his ability to interview some women (see fn. 7). Some of the skepticism may well have been cultural, but Brodwin went on to cite gender issues as evidence of “the sacred significance of domestic obligations that apply, after all, to men as well as women.” Gender expectations impacted his interviewing and the ability for a researcher to be alone with a member of the opposite gender in private circumstances. A researcher must learn gender role expectations within the Pentecostal community he/she will research and observe those expectations. While some issues can be overcome with trust and rapport, gender expectation must be accommodated rather than skirted for a research relationship to continue. Austin-Broos (1997) discussed gender issues as it related to her research, noting that she typically wore a hat and dress to church to fulfill Jamaican Pentecostal gender expectations. Since the research discussing gender issues originates among people with Caribbean heritage, it most likely represents specific, broader socio-culture issues. Little research has been done on gender issues within U.S American Pentecostals, with one analyzing female pastors (Lawless 1988). Women were among those ministers ordained at the first General Council of the Assemblies of God in 1913.

One way through the worldview minefield was for the researcher metaphorically to take a position with respect to God. Droogers (2010) suggested three possible approaches: theism, agnosticism, or atheism. These three approaches led to acceptance, abstention, or rejection respectively of the worldview of the research subject. Rejecting

the worldview of Pentecostals potentially leads to rejecting those things that they hold most dear and potentially pushing the researcher away from a fair and critical approach. Poloma and Hood (2008) suggested research agnosticism so that a researcher may approach the Pentecostal view of reality without taking a position on whether or not God really did speak to a person. Both Poloma and Hood have researched Pentecostal practices for many years and found this method valuable. Through research agnosticism, the researcher may capture the essence of what it means to be Pentecostal without needing to believe. My own position inevitably leans toward theistic research because I am a life-long Pentecostal.

Interdisciplinary Approach

Another issue in research for my project was the interdisciplinary work that brings together studying cultural communication and theology wrestles with the nature of God and the nature of the world. Because theology reflects on the nature of God and studies God as the primary subject, necessarily theology receives a vaunted position as in the work of Stanley Hauerwas or John Milbank. The vaunted position of theology rests on the transcendence and magnificence of God. For some theologians, nothing should be allowed to weaken our view of God or our worship and devotion to Him. Within that framework, the vaunted view of God positions theology above other research methods and social research principles; therefore, social research does not interface with theology unless it is from theological research. Those researchers believe that theology always gives something away when it combines with social research. Other researchers bring disciplines together in such a way that both theology and social research may respect the unique attributes of other disciplines. Theologians Plantinga (2002) and Mouw (2002)

both reflected on the role of grace and see God's general grace applying to all fields of study.

One theologian bridging the gap used the notion of categories. Lonergan (1979) and expanded in Doran (2005) said categories might be either general or specific. General categories are universally true across cultures and in all people groups. General categories are not specific to theology, and therefore open to research. Some categories are specific to theology and require theological methods. Lonergan's project of discovering a universal method for knowledge required reliance on the role of categories because those categories must be cross cultural and true (useful) in all situations to be truly universal. Lonergan admitted that categories will receive different treatment in different cultures, but the actual categories will hold true across cultures. Because general categories are universal, those categories give rise to research through social scientific methods within specific disciplines. Expanding on Lonergan, Doran comments that it is irresponsible theology to ignore social research.

Sound social science research respects the categories inherent within subjects. Glaser and Strauss (1967) urged researchers to begin research with direct observation in the field so that categories inherent to the subjects may arise. After such categories arise, then a researcher may move toward some sort of theory with respect to the subjects under research. Only through respect for the existing categories may theory truly be grounded in experience, according to Glaser and Strauss. While some social researchers do not adhere to such strict structures, they ignore existing categories at the risk of misunderstanding their subjects. Consequently, their research may not explain some aspects of the subjects, a view which will suffer malnutrition as a research project.

The validity of an interdisciplinary approach moves the research toward a unified outcome that rests on the ability of the researcher to advance a method adhering to the principles of both disciplines when brought together. Varieties of schools of thought exist for the methods of achieving validity within social research when combined with theology. The framework for those schools of thought primarily rests on two factors: situatedness and gravity. The situatedness of one discipline toward the other exists either as integrated, segregated, or exclusive. In an integrated approach, the research combines the disciplines in some fashion for integrated research. Segregated research allows for multiple disciplines but does not combine those disciplines for research. In the exclusive approach, one discipline attempts to explain the phenomena that otherwise might be explained by multiple disciplines. The second factor of gravity presents three possibilities as well: preferred, equal, or diminished. When theology is given preference, usually it is because of a vaunted view of theology. Theology may be given equal gravity for achieving validity. In some research, theology is diminished in favor of secular reason. These two factors and their three expressions provide a taxonomy of nine possible schools of thought: preferred-exclusive, preferred-segregated, preferred-integrated, equal-integrated, equal-segregated, equal with dynamic tension, diminished-integrated, diminished-segregated, and diminished-exclusive.

Table 1.2. Taxonomy for Theological Interdisciplinary Study

Preferred-integrated	Preferred-segregated	Preferred-exclusive
Equal-integrated	Equal-segregated	Dynamically Equal
Diminished-integrated	Diminished-equal	Diminished-exclusive

Julie Thompson Klein wrote extensively about interdisciplinary research. She identified one possibility for research as “multi-disciplinary” (Thompson Klein 1990, 57-63). While it was not her preferred school of thought, she admitted that sometimes it was necessary. The multidisciplinary approach treats both disciplines as equal, preferring neither one over the other, but does not integrate the disciplines in research. Thompson Klein’s preferred method is something more interdisciplinary (Thompson Klein 1996). It often takes the form of research teams when multiple researchers or professionals gathered in a team tackle a particular problem. In the university this gives rise to classes like Urban Problems, which in turn gives rise to new disciplines such as Urban Studies. Some Pentecostal theologians are arriving at this position as well. Smith and Yong (2010) edited the book of essays called *The Spirit and Science*. A collection of Pentecostal scholars attempted to bring Pentecostalism from the preferred-exclusive approach to a more balanced approach. The results were mixed, but the project was new. Nothing of its kind would have gained a hearing twenty years ago amongst Pentecostal scholars.

Another approach is to hold the two disciplines in dynamic tension, sometimes giving preference to one and sometimes the other, as the situation dictates. Walter Brueggemann exemplified such an approach, for even though he insists that researchers must stick with the Biblical (1993), yet he draws from anthropology (1997), communication (2010), psychology (1982), and sociology (1988). His hermeneutic drew from rhetorical studies and sociology while still staying true to the Biblical text (1993). He seeks to keep all the disciplines in view and use them as much as possible while still giving preeminence to theology (and God).

My research held cultural-communication research and theology in a dynamic tension that reflexively builds on both disciplines using ethnography to explain what took place within worship. Yet theology spoke loudly to that theory and refused to allow a mere functionalism to take over. The categories and priorities of research arose within the values of the theological belief system of the research subjects, which was sound social science research and yet maintained God's preeminence. Some areas of research only see the light of day through theological reflection because the category inherently rises from theology. The preeminence of God requires that a researcher in the social sciences always approach interdisciplinary research with theology respecting both fields, not desiring research that rests only on theological methods, nor excludes theology but holds those two in dynamic tension with respect to God as the chief subject of research.

Insider Research

As a lifelong Pentecostal, I searched for a way through the insider/outsider research conundrum and I came across Ahern (1999) who chose Peter Berger as a dialogue partner to find a way forward for researchers who are believers yet choose to research religion. Ahern found in Berger the metaphor of citizenship that allows a way forward for a researcher. The researcher is a citizen of the academic world where standards and expectations are known yet may also inhabit a world of belief that freely plays by different standards. As a dual citizen, the researcher inhabits two worlds at one time without denying either essential part of his/her identity. A researcher who sees the role as a dual citizen understands that there are expectations brought on by the citizenship of academia. Simultaneously, a dual-citizen researcher lives by standards of faith in God also. Since a researcher cannot think about the research subject independent of his/her

own situatedness in time and place, dual citizenship allows a researcher to maintain views as an individual which then inform how he/she proceeds as a citizen of the academic world.

Yet a question remains about dual citizenship. Which world wins out in a research conflict between worlds? If a research plan sets out to prove the researcher's views as a citizen of a believing community one is likely to find what she/he set out to find. Such a journey is probably a spiritual quest rather than an informed academic pursuit. If a researcher finds things that call into question his/her faith, honest reporting may well serve to explain evidence in greater detail through reflexive processes. The resultant struggle likely will inform the research process with powerful results (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007).

Anthropologists talk about "native researchers," sometimes with disdain, in spite of the discussion about whether or not Margaret Mead was misled as an outsider. The traditional view polarizes "native researchers" from "real anthropologists" believing that an outsider alone possesses the ability to objectively observe and analyze field data (Narayan 1993). In the postmodern turn, "it is more profitable to focus on shifting identities in relationship with the people and issues an anthropologist seeks to represent" (Narayan 1993). In other words, there are more helpful ways of looking at the situatedness of the researcher than an "insider" versus "outsider" schema. Narayan argued that all anthropologists, and by extension all researchers, should depict a bicultural position of simultaneously belonging to "the world of engaged scholarship and the world of everyday life." Without using the same terminology, Narayan argued for an honest evaluation of one's dual-citizenship and found much value in examining the ways

that dual citizenship underplays research. Cerroni-Long said, “It remains to be seen ... what precisely is ‘home’ for people with multiple identities” (1995). Ryang (1997) articulated a significant wrinkle in conceptualizing the problem as a situation of outsider versus insider:

When someone like myself, a Japan-born Korean who grew up as bilingual in Japanese and Korean and received her anthropological training in English in a British University, studies Koreans in Japan, using Korean and/or Japanese, their first languages, as the language for the fieldwork, and writes about them in English, which neither myself nor they regard as their first language, my anthropological study of them is not in any sense the same as an English person studying English society and writing about it in English, expecting the English readers to read it in English.

In an age of globalization where boundaries were continuously blurred, the contention may no longer hold as much weight. With increased globalization, nonwestern cultures adopted Western education strategies and categories and more “native” population groups interacted with ethnographic reports and began critiquing those reports (E. N. Anderson 1993). Ohnuki-Tierney hung onto the notion of ethnographic research as a journey “out from and back to our collective self” (1984) and found the journey even longer for native researchers to create enough distance for research. Insiders have the task of finding that distance between the research subjects and the researcher, both intellectually and emotionally. Ohnuki-Tierney added, however, “If native anthropologists can gain enough distance between their personal selves and their collective selves – their cultures – they can make an important contribution to anthropology because of their access to intimate knowledge of their own culture.” Other researchers in “native” situations have used other strategies to work through the barrier. Ceja-Zamarripa (2007) observed that neither native nor outsider status keeps a researcher from tense interview moments, the need to conduct valid and ethical research, and the

responsibility to “protect the community that has entrusted you with cultural treasures” (2007).

Hayano (1970) observed several advantages to insider researcher. First, the prior knowledge of the language is a major issue, especially in research amongst those speaking a different language. However, it is not limited to that. Jacobs-Huey (2002) recognized that her audience would not recognize many of the terms of talking used by her African American research subjects so she provided copious definitions. Hayano also pointed to the feelings of empathy and emotions which insiders share from knowing their subjects’ situations on a deeper level. Nelson found that being an insider is not a guarantee that one will automatically relate well to every research subject (L. W. Nelson 1996). Even though personality differences exist, and the possibility of saying the wrong thing at the wrong time always exists in human interaction as Nelson pointed out, the ability to navigate those situations requires cultural tools insiders possess and outsiders must learn. Hayano pointed to a third advantage that familiarity tends to mitigate the problems of environmental change and culture shock on the researcher. Hayano went on to say that familiarity also presented limitations. One person’s position is not an unchallengeable picture because it presents only one perspective.

The world of an insider is never experienced the same for all people because some people experience being an insider differently than others. The researcher is likely to find that even in perceived “native situations” there are still differences in the way a person experiences the shared native world. For example, I am a Pentecostal pastor but do not often participate in worship services from the same vantage point as other worshippers. They are interested in encountering God, but as a pastor I often concerned myself with a

microphone problem and then a problem with the video projection system. I have heard more sermons from myself than other preachers in the last twenty years. Even as a native of the Pentecostal world, I do not experience it the same way as many others. Further, I am well aware of potential explanations I might give an inquirer about why certain things happen. However, that perspective comes from someone who has been trained in a Pentecostal ministry training college and not from a person who works as a mortgage banker for ten hours (plus) a day five days a week and worships on Sunday in a Pentecostal church. I may be an insider, but I experience the Pentecostal world differently than most other insiders because of my life as a pastor.

Narayan (1993) focused on shifting identities retold through personal narratives from research. As it applies to my situation, there were moments when I was cast as a fellow Pentecostal (insider) and other moments when I am cast as an expert advisor. Given long-standing Pentecostal proclivities against academia (see Nanez 2005), I was sometimes treated as an outsider, a citizen of the academic world studying at a Jesuit Catholic university. The way people assigned roles and subsequently interacted came closer to defining my resulting position than an insider/outsider paradigm. Having researched Pentecostal churches I will never look at one the same way even as a worshipper. It will be impossible to “turn off” being a citizen of the academic world. At the same time, the citizenship of my everyday commitment to live in the Spirit cannot be stripped away in academic settings. Both Narayan (1993) and Ahern (1999) affirm that such citizenship renouncement is not possible, nor desirable. The only option for me is to affirm my perpetual citizenship in both a heavenly Kingdom expressed in Pentecostal spirituality and an earthly world bound in academic research.

Introduce the Pentecostal Writer

As I previously stated, I am a life-long Pentecostal. Because of the implications of insider ethnographic research, it is important I take the extraordinary step of providing germane background details. My Mother grew up as the daughter of an ordained Assemblies of God (Pentecostal) minister. My Grandfather pastored small Pentecostal churches in Iowa, Wyoming, and South Dakota. He once told me that there were church choirs larger than any church he ever pastored. Grandpa Turner often lamented his lack of an education from a Bible college. My Father grew up as the son of a sawmill owner in rural Illinois. After long work weeks, Grandpa Coats taught Sunday School at the local Assembly of God church on Sunday mornings. Grandma Coats told me stories about her uncles who had come into a Pentecostal experience in 1906 while studying at the Moody Bible Institute and were promptly asked to leave the institution for speaking in tongues. Such a heritage challenges hope of objectivity when studying Pentecostals.

I grew up as a pastor's kid. Dad pastored Assemblies of God churches in Minnesota, Indiana, and Wisconsin. Both of my parents have a degree from a leading, respected Pentecostal Bible college. There is an old one-line joke among people who spent a lot of time in church. "Every time the doors were open we were in church." As a pastor's kid, I always believed that needed amending because I was in church even when the doors were not open and often opened them myself.⁸ I graduated from a Pentecostal

⁸ As a small child, we lived in an apartment above the church and my sisters and I often played in the sanctuary during the week. I prayed to receive Christ as my savior, while "playing church" in that building. When I got a little older and our family lived in a different setting, I knew where the key was hidden and sometimes opened the church myself. As a middle teen, Dad would give me the key to the local city hall so that I could

ministry training college with a bachelor's degree and almost immediately entered vocational church ministry. The Assemblies of God ordained me in 1995, an ordination that I still maintain. God blessed me with the opportunity to serve as a youth pastor in both Missouri and Texas, as a senior pastor in Milwaukee's central city, as a church planter in Milwaukee's suburbs, and as an associate pastor at a church just beyond the northern suburbs of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. As one who has planned and led worship services, attending worship services as a researcher engaged in participant observation challenged any sense of objectivity. Over the years, I have taught Bible courses and theology courses at ministry training schools in urban environments, always from a Pentecostal perspective. Because the research subjects for this project were also Pentecostals, separating the theology/Bible teacher, Pentecostal pastor, and social science researcher delicately walked a fine line. My research journey zigzagged across that fine line once or twice.

In so many other ways, however, the inherent weaknesses created from native research uniquely prepared me for the research task. Is it more difficult to learn the unique expressions of a faith community trying to understand what is happening or to explain those same expressions that familiarity embeds into the researcher's everyday experience? In many ways, my preparation did not just begin with the first day of doctoral classes but my preparation for researching Pentecostals began at birth.

Researching Pentecostals for me is not a momentary research fascination but a life-long

set up our makeshift church meeting space on Sundays. As a late teen, I led the Saturday evening prayer meeting.

pursuit of clarifying self-identity and self-development, clarification within the Pentecostal sub-culture, as well as expanding knowledge throughout the academy.

A Look Forward

In the first three chapters, I will lay out the framework for the study. In Chapter 1, I will formally state the research questions and describe the problem. I will review the literature on communication, including religious and Pentecostal literature. Since much of the unique communicative activity takes place within worship, I will show how communication and Pentecostal worship fit together. Chapter 2 delineates the theories used in research and infers necessary analytical structures based on those theories. Chapter 3 builds on the theoretical implications in the previous chapter; consequently, I will build on those inferences and describe the ethnographic methods used in the study. Chapter 4 will describe historical developments, particularly looking at the development of both cultural aspects and distinct worship practices of Pentecostals. I will provide an overview of salient theological issues in Chapter 5. Data from research will be presented in Chapter 6 considering the ways various churches follow a paradigm of spontaneity. I will use Speech Codes Theory analytical methods in Chapter 7 to begin defining communication in Pentecostal worship based on the repetition of the word “expressing” as a term used for communicative activity. In Chapter 8, I use a narrative analysis following Fisher’s (1987) narrative paradigm to describe ways that Pentecostal worship narrates the everyday lives of worshippers. Chapter 9 uses Speech Codes Theory analytical methods again, describing the attitude and atmosphere created in worship services by generosity and giving. In chapter 10, I will show how the practice of

evangelism (proselytization) is interwoven throughout the entirety of Pentecostal communicative practices.

CHAPTER 1. WORSHIP AS COMMUNICATIVE COMPLEXITY

A Pentecostal worship service is a complex communicative act that narrates everyday life for congregants, with variations from one congregation to another. The answers to the research questions have important implications for understanding the Pentecostal movement and assisting Pentecostals with continued vitality and growth. This study will consider the liturgical narrative of each service as it celebrates the story of redemption within both individual lives of congregants and the Church.

The Pentecostal Christian community can be seen as a unique speech community, to follow Philipsen's term (1997), with unique vocabulary, nomenclature, speech rules, and a unique style; yet there should be local variations as each congregation reflects the surrounding milieu in which people live every day. There are communication tendencies within the Pentecostal subculture throughout the nation as well as regional and local diversity. Since some branches of Pentecostalism have adopted ways of the surrounding culture and others resist as a counter-culture in nearly every way, a cultural framework is essential for understanding each congregation. From the beginning of the study, it was believed that the interplay between culture, church, and the gospel (Driscoll 2008) influenced the speech codes of each local church. The local milieu in which a local church is embedded might shape the liturgical narration because of local issues, particularly in the sermon.

The Main Voice of Communication

Communication holds Pentecostal worshipping communities together in a vital way because communication encompasses the essence of social life. Of course, every

worshipping community can assert the same thing; therefore, the Pentecostal distinctive rests not in the reliance on communicative activity. Communication scholars consistently assert the impossibility of not communicating. While stated awkwardly, the double negative best describes the status of communication within human affairs including theological situations because it magnifies the absolute quality of communication by forcing one to make an honest attempt at not communicating even though such an attempt becomes an exchange of symbolic, nonverbal communication. Liturgical theologian Marie Louis Chauvet (1995) took the absolute nature of communication a step further stating that communication is the essence of being human. Chauvet relied exclusively on this link in his imposing theological treatise on liturgy. While the situation of people with communicative disabilities may ultimately prove to be problematic for Chauvet's conceptualization of humanity, it emphasized the essentiality of communication within humanity in all aspects of the social self.

The necessity of communication in human affairs leaves no doubt of the necessity of communication within the theological dialogue of any worshipping tradition, including the world religions. Therefore, in Pentecostal theological discourse communication ought to be foundational for theological method because of the necessity of communication in human affairs. A theological method must account for communication to maintain a position of relevance, whether it is communication of the Word to the church, witness to culture, or worship to Christ. If being Pentecostal means anything, it means believing in the possibility of the supernatural power of God invading the natural element of human experience and manifesting itself in communicative activity. From the charismatic gifts of the Spirit to tongues-speech in personal prayer, from dancing in public worship to

prophetic witness in the marketplace, communicative activity is on center stage in Pentecostal communication.

In his classic work, Holdcroft (1979, 202-209) spent a significant section on the ways the individual believer might offend the Spirit. Holdcroft drew the church's attention to stifling the work of the Spirit with Biblical categories for human activity like quenching, blaspheming, lying to, insulting, resisting, and grieving. In some way, each of these pejorative terms involves communicative activity; albeit, the negative ways humans interact with the Holy Spirit often (if not always) involve communicative activity. Communicative activity not only vitally negotiates the relationship within humanity, meaningful interaction between humanity and God through the Holy Spirit most often involves communicative activity, either in positive or negative interaction.

In summary, Pentecostal theology must include communication as an essential element because it involves human activity inferred on the essence of humanity. Communication is the road upon which social and theological relationships travel. Therefore, theological method must account for communication to maintain a position of relevance concerning the word, witness, and worship. Meaningful interaction between humanity and God involves communication. Space within the Pentecostal theological dialogue must account for approaches to communication because of distinctive communication uses in the Pentecostal tradition. Spirit baptism brings an empowerment available to all believers for witness to culture, the word to the church, and worship to Christ.

Research Questions

The combination of influences and issues from the locality of particular worshipping tradition combine to influence communication within local churches. Yet even as the entirety of the U.S American Pentecostal speech community shares a common narrative, one that might be framed differently from church to church. The local adaption of the narrative holds the local community together. The common narrative would be inextricably woven into the fabric of the collective identity right alongside the values (speech codes) that guide their communication, each pointing to the other dialogically. An ethnographic approach to this issue can prove fruitful in discovering that narrative and resultant speech codes help answer the following research question:

RQ1: How do diverse approaches to surrounding cultural milieu (local and regional influences) impact speech codes in Pentecostal faith communities and in turn faith and practice of congregants?

Pentecostals have a well-developed understanding of communication through ritual, speech, and other symbolic acts, even though most of these conceptualizations are passed down through an oral tradition (Chan 2001). Even though there is unity in perspective on some rituals within Pentecostalism, differences abound in responses to surrounding culture producing differing effects on local faith communities:

RQ2: How does the message reframing for cultural adaptation impact rituals and speech codes, faith, and practice?

With a consistent emphasis on speech acts produced by an encounter with God and leading toward further divine encounters (Kraft 1992), Pentecostals have a unique understanding of the complexity of religious communication; therefore:

RQ3: How do the variety of speech codes from congregation to congregation within the Pentecostal speech community with a variety of expressions impact socialization within each congregation?

Faith practices of Pentecostals find embodiment in communicative acts and define the essence of their worldview because speech is central to what makes them distinct. As noted, Pentecostal spirituality builds on divine encounters that lead to distinctive speech acts. Therefore:

RQ4: How do existential encounters with the divine presence define the daily narratives outside worship services for Pentecostals? How is this evident through speech codes?

Each congregant is unique and brings an individual contribution to his/her congregation. This makes each congregation slightly different in its culture. Yet each Pentecostal congregation is uniquely impacted by what it means to be a Pentecostal in U.S. America.

RQ5: How do the many speech codes within each particular Pentecostal congregation comprise the speech codes of U.S American Pentecostalism?

Operationalization

The difficulty of defining Pentecostal churches extends to a theological definition. The definition that I used for the study is an interdisciplinary definition I developed:

Pentecostal are Christians who believe in a supernatural and transcendent God who personally seeks direct connections based on individual forgiveness through Jesus and fills those individuals in such a way that the supernatural power is manifested through communication in charismatic gifts.⁹

Operationalizing the definition must reduce its scope to consider representative exemplar churches from four different networks of churches that claim to be either Pentecostal or Charismatic: Assemblies of God, Church of God in Christ, The Vineyard,

⁹ The definition makes space for Oneness Pentecostals (non-Trinitarian) though no churches of that variety included in the study because of the limitations of time and geography.

and the Church of God with headquarters in Cleveland, TN. I attended at least one service in each church as an observer, interviewed the pastor and congregation members. The churches represented major geographical areas including six churches from the Midwest, one from the South, one from the Great Plains, and four from the Southwest. Two churches were predominantly African American and two other churches held separate weekly services in Spanish, with one additional church translating their services into Spanish through headphones. Poloma (private correspondence) suggested a variety of types of Pentecostal churches: traditional Pentecostal, seeker-sensitive/purpose-driven, revivalist/third-wave, evangelical-Pentecostal, emergent, and ethnic churches.¹⁰ While I attempted to sample from each kind of church, I found it challenging to know the difference based on web sites and one or two questions of the pastor. In several cases, I opted for finding willing participants in churches representing rural, mid-size cities, suburban, and urban environments. Interviews were conducted with the pastors as well as congregation members. Additionally, thirteen pastors were interviewed from churches I did not attend to examine the services.

The worship service was identified as any main service for the worshipping community in a given week. Often Pentecostal churches have several services throughout

¹⁰ The categories have semiotic meanings commonly understood among pastors. Ethnic churches maintain the spirituality and ethnic roots of their worship practices. Seeker-sensitive/purpose-driven churches attempt to make every aspect of the service, especially vocabulary, accessible to outsiders. Revivalistic churches feature old-time religion practices such as singing typical Pentecostal hymns, sermons featuring the theme of revival, and extended prayer times after services. Traditional Pentecostal churches use contemporary music and have spontaneous expressions (defined in Chapters 6 and 7) but function within locally well-defined boundaries. Emergent churches use post-modern philosophy as a guide and often include nontraditional worship practices like the inclusion of artistic creations within the service as an act of worship.

the week each different from the other services. The main service(s) is “at the heart of the [Pentecostal] spirituality and with its attending rites and practices constitutes the most central ritual of Pentecostalism” (Albrecht 1999). Because of its important, I attended worship services at a variety of times as an observer, taking careful field notes in each service.

Nature of Communication

Communication involves the negotiation of meaning between people. West and Turner define communication as “a social process in which individuals employ symbols to establish and interpret meaning in their environment” (West and Turner 2010, 5). By situating the process in the social realm, communication becomes the property of groups of people who agree together what each symbol will mean (Grenz and Franke 2001). Groups change their interpretation of a symbol either over time through natural incremental evolution or through a crisis revolution event. Because the interpretation of a symbol may change in a particular direction in one group while changing in a different direction in a second group, symbol interpretation is the property of groups, or what Hymes calls speech communities (Hymes 1962).

West and Turner (2010) further delineated communication through the tension of whether or not the deployment of symbols must be intentional or if it may happen at a level of unintentional processes. If communication is seen in unintended actions, such as not arriving at a party to which one was invited, then communication encompasses all behavior. The overlap of communication and behavior makes it almost impossible to study either behavior or communication because the subject matter becomes so large in any particular instance that a researcher will struggle to grasp the entirety of

communication. West and Turner concluded that it was better for researchers to limit the boundaries of communication or find that the very subject matter they were attempting to study disappeared into all other disciplines (2010). For the sake of limiting the boundaries, I considered communication as only those things that were either intentional or which were reasonable to conclude had some intentionality.

“The study of communication should take us beyond the ordinary in life to ultimate matters of life and death” (Schultze 2000, 14). Communication moves beyond the transmission of information for Schultze, creating something new even if the new creation exists for only a brief moment. Through creation, we cocreate cultures and a way of life (2000, 18), something which lasts much longer than a brief moment. The ability to create culture through communication is a gift from God according to Schultze, an act of God’s grace. Anytime communication is seen as anything less than the cocreation of a way of life, spirituality and grace are squeezed from communication; therefore, the study of communication should preserve the mysterious transmission of shalom, grace, and life protecting mystery (2000, 14).

Schultze followed Carey (2009) in seeing communication as cultural activity, both creating culture and maintaining culture. Communication happens within communities who interpret the symbols. When communication happens between communities, there is always the risk of symbolic confusion, which is assigning meaning from one community to a particular symbol communicated under the rules of a different symbolic order. For example, when groups of Christians talk about receiving the presence of God, they do not necessarily mean the same thing that Pentecostal Christians mean by an unmediated reception of God’s presence in a way that transforms the consciousness.

Therefore, communication is more than just the form and structure of words. Speaking and other forms of communication are interwoven into the human tapestry along with attendant practices, culture, values, premises, rules, and symbols (Philipsen, Coutu and Covarru 2005, 58). Communication and culture are threads in the tapestry of identity; therefore, changing what an individual values in communication requires a fundamental shift in those threads of identity just as transplanting an individual from one culture to another produces shock as the immersion unravels the threads of life's tapestry.

Cultural proclivities, values, structures, and symbols are seen in narratives produced in cultures (Hymes 2004, Ch. 6). Hymes demonstrated how narrative structure influenced the education of children (2004). In so doing, he also demonstrated that narrative structures might change between cultures as do values and symbols within narrative. Not only do varying speech communities tell different stories as a symbol of their culture's most revered values, speech communities also structure their narratives to reflect their values, beliefs, and practices.

Narration

Many philosophers and theorists have written on narrative as a communication form such as Fisher (1987) who theorized about "narration" as communication. Fisher defined narration as, "symbolic actions – words and/or deeds – that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them" (58). He combined Burke's assertion that "man is a symbol making animal" and MacIntyre's adage, "Man is in his actions and practice, as well as in his fictions, essentially a storytelling animal" (Fisher 1987, 58, quoting Alasdair MacIntyre). Philipsen claimed that speaking is inextricably woven into the fabric of culture and speech codes are woven into speaking but it could

also be claimed that narration is “inextricably woven into the fabric” of human communication, because Philipsen said cultural myths were one of the locations of speech codes (Philipsen 1997).

Fisher focused on narrative as a paradigm that he juxtaposed against what he called the “rational paradigm.” The rational paradigm follows traditional Western thinking in a linear fashion, following rules of linear logic. Fisher notes that the rational world paradigm “permits, if not requires, participation of qualified persons in public decision making” (60). The rational-world paradigm automatically creates the potential for hegemonic influences to control discourse, including elite voices and excluding marginalized voices. Fisher proposes, however, that the narration paradigm does not require any form of society and includes all people because it only requires the rationality of the story, which “within this perspective invokes principles of narrative probability and narrative fidelity” (66). While Fisher clearly privileges the narration paradigm, both paradigms seem useful for rhetoric, theology, and communication in general. It is no easier to conceive of a world with just the narration paradigm (rendering this sentence impossible) than it is to conceive of a world with only the rational paradigm (rendering the retelling involved in this paragraph impossible).

Fisher posited that the narrative paradigm operates by five basic principles (1987, 64-65). First, human beings are essentially storytellers. Having quickly established the first principle, Fisher moved to the second principle that was based on decision-making. Humans make decisions based on “good reasons” that appear in different forms “among situations, genres, and media of communication.” Third, producing good reasons is governed by matters of “history, biography, culture, and character” along with other

forces of language and action. Therefore, the production of good reasons are matters which rely on the human capacity to engage in story producing situations, file those situations in a systematic process cognitively, and recall them through narrative processes. Fourth, rationality within the narrative paradigm is “determined by the nature of persons as narrative beings – their inherent awareness of *narrative probability*, what constitutes a coherent story, and their constant habit of testing *narrative fidelity*” (emphasis original, 65). Therefore, a reason is not a “good reason” in narrative communication if it does not ring true with the listener. Within narrative, the narrator and listener negotiate the meaning and accuracy of the story based on the experience of those involved. The obvious perspectival nature of the story allows the listener to receive one perspective on events recalled, understanding the possibility of competing narratives with the same militia portrayed as either rebels or freedom fighters. Fifth, humans inhabit a world that demands a set of stories that require choices in order for us to live. The creation and re-creation of culture depends on such a narrative quality, as does good reason and good decision-making. Humans “realize their nature as reasoning-valuing animals” only when the values and good reasons combine in an inextricable link (65).

Narration presents universal opportunities in communication, since every event becomes a story, even the production of rational-world paradigm style discourse. Preaching theorist Lowry (2001) pointed out that everything has a story; even those areas of the Bible that do not present as narrative still have a narrative background and can be retold in story-form. The very production of discourse in a rational-world paradigm becomes a story awaiting narration as soon as the discourse is produced. As soon as a politician finishes a major speech, the production of that speech sets up a string of

narrations offered by the politician and his/her allies, commentators, and competing politicians. Fisher (1987) reasoned that even the argumentation of the politician may have generated from narrative as was the case for President Reagan.

Fisher (1987) found it obvious that some stories are better than others because of coherence and being true to the way people exist in the world. Stories cross time and culture easily. That is, some stories are better than others because the narrator pays attention to the logic of good reasons, the reasoning and valuing process. A person will relate better to those stories found to fit the internal structures of the person including the symbols, rituals, values, and taken-for-granted world. When the listener and the narrator align in those key areas, the story unites the two. When stories that unite are repeated, they either create or reinforce cultural values. Narration influences every form of communication, even that which has thrived in communication in the rational-paradigm such as religious settings, because religious precepts are usually premised on narrative action.

Religious Communication

Communication in religious settings presents communicative nuances not seen in most other situations because “the effort to know and interact with an otherworld tends to demand highly marked uses of linguistic resources” (Keanne 1997). Religious language presents more than distinctive speech situations, but also unique interactions, textual patterns, tonal qualities, and ubiquitous rituals. Religious communication is complicated by who is participating, what counts as the relevant context of time and space, and who the main audience is (Keanne 1997). In multiple religious situations, the audience traverses the line of demarcation between the spirit world, natural world, and humanity,

sometimes speaking to trees, sometimes chanting to spirits, and sometimes addressing humans.

In everyday conversation at the supermarket or over the office cubical wall, even in professional settings communication seldom wrestles with communicative issues in the same way as religious communication. In the context of fifty interviews related to the current study, at many times the interviewees appealed to the authority of the Bible, including one pastor who used significant references to original Biblical languages and one who offered a correction of an interview question based on the authority of scripture (more will be presented on Scripture in Chapter 5). Yet at no time during the interviews did any person claim to be speaking on behalf of deity (agency), nor speaking under the power of the Holy Spirit (co-agency). Therefore, even when discussing religious issues, communication presented fewer challenges than in the course of a worship service. When communicating in inherently religious settings, authority is an issue if the participants appeal to some sort of authority for decision making as in a Quaker business meeting (Molina-Markam 2011), life direction through sermons (Shoaps 2002), future predictions for the entire group as in a prophecy at a Catholic Charismatic meeting (Csordas 1997), embodiment through character before providing a Christian witness (Kraft 1991), empowerment for Christian witness (Carpenter 1989), and many other situations proposed by theologians (for a sample see Lonergan 1979; Chauvet 1995; Macchia 1998; Stronstad 1999).

Communication in religious settings is also influenced by the form and substance of texts. Keane (1997) addressed texts through a dialectical process of contextualization and entextualization. Contextualization keeps texts in the original context of the ritual,

event, or textualization process. “Entextualization means that context is not the court of final appeal for any analysis, or something residual that must only be taken into account” (Keanne 1997). Entextualization tends to decenter the event prompting Laurence’s strong warning against extracting liturgical ritual from the original narrative lest it never be rejoined again (Laurence 1999; adapting Bell 1992, 1997). A text is one option for words in the dialectical relationship of both entextualization and contextualization. Through “(re)contextualization” a text may be (re)inserted in a context, taking the form of “reading aloud, reciting formulaic verse, or quoting another’s words” (Keanne 1997).

Textualization requires form and structure, which raises the question of whether the form of words in religious settings implies a divine source. In many situations, “performance permits a distinction between text and context to remain perceptible” (Keanne 1997). It was through the performative nature of language (Austin 1962) that Ladriere saw liturgical language and texts at their finest (1973). Through “symbolic expression” liturgy performs the intended task of sacramentality using language through which it “has its most profoundly actualizing effect” (Ladriere 1973, 61). Ladriere added, “of course mere linguistic analysis does not suffice to reveal this kind of performativity” (61). Only through faith and discernment may the efficacy of the Eucharistic mystery be revealed just as it was originally to the Apostles. On the foundation of faith and discernment, the performance of the liturgy through its symbolic nature, allows participants to re-enter the original story and participate in the story’s efficacy all over again (Chauvet 1995).

In practice of ritual and worship, the divine becomes “entangled” with concrete human communicative activity (Keane 1997). Chauvet (1995) gets around the issue

through what he calls the “symbolic order.” Through symbolic logic (which gives birth to symbolic speech) and the logic of gift giving, humans are able to interact with God, though not directly. Through the symbolism of sacramentality, humans engage in worship through the performance of ritual acts. However, Chauvet’s symbolic order is strained by groups like Pentecostals because they believe that God interacts directly with them, not through sacraments or symbols. However, the overlap between Chauvet and Pentecostal writers on worship is at its best when they rely heavily on the embodiment of worship (Martin 1990; Csordas 1994; Sequeira 1994; Austin-Broos 1997; Csordas 1997; Albrecht 1999; Coleman and Collins 2000; Brodwin 2003; Albrecht 2004; Smith 2009; Coleman 2011; Csordas 2011; Lindhardt 2011a, 2011b; Ryle 2011). Through embodiment of communication, the exteriority of language connects with the interiority of speakers, overcoming a challenge identified by Keanne (1997).

In religious communication, Keanne (1997) observed, a transcendent being will interface with ordinary beings. Even to engage in prayer, the participant must believe that the transcendent being will hear the simple words of an ordinary being. If the communication flows in both directions, then somehow the divine must get entangled in “concrete human” affairs (Keanne 1997). The many options of religious language (textualization, entextualization, embodiment of a speaker, symbolic expression) are the means by which God interfaces with humans, or more importantly, humans interface with God. However, it gives rise to the conundrum of whether the spirits speak through human communicative activity or if the human speaks from some other source.

The transference of direct attribution for speaking from the spirit-world to a human raises issues of agency, which gives rise to intention and responsibility (Keane

1997; Shoaps 2002). Agency and animation are both issues of concern in Pentecostal communication and worship as identified by Shoaps (2002). Agency generally refers to those who are present in a communicative situation. The author is the one who composes the communication, “the formulator of the speech” (Shoaps 2002, 44). Authorship gives rise to the question of whether or not the speaker communicates on behalf of the spirit world or through human volition. The animator is the person who utters the words. Fisher added the co-authorship of the audience who negotiates the meaning as they hear the story.

Through these issues, responsibility of the speaker becomes known. If a human speaks but it is really the spirit world speaking through the human without the speaker’s control, then responsibility is transferred (Keane 1997). When that transference takes place, the speaker is free to say things that otherwise might create tension, especially when the speaker is a resident pastor or priest not free to emote and say whatever comes to mind (Craddock 2003; Brueggemann 2010). Craddock (2003) suggested a local pastor/priest use indirect communication which makes use of stories or parables without engaging in direct application to the local audience, allowing the congregation to make sense of what was said and subsequently make decisions about applying the message. Brueggemann (2006, 2010) followed a similar path out of the predicament by suggesting that a pastor/priest build messages around the text of the prophets and stick close to the text, putting the message on the lips of the prophet so that responsibility falls back on the Biblical prophet speaking through the text.

Second, the issues of agency, animation, and authorship give rise to the issue of intention of the speaker (Du Bois 1992; Keane 1997). What does the speaker intend to

say? Is the intention of the speaker important? Many have suggested that intention is vital in worship/liturgical settings, especially in light of the performative speech theory of Austin (1962) with improvements by Searle (1969, 1982) who proposed that much speech performs activity by its very utterance as in the proclamation of a sentence for a defendant in a court of law. Du Bois (1992) has demonstrated that intentionality is not always clear or necessary in ritualistic situations. If a drunken pastor/priest performs a marriage without clear intention, the pronouncement is still in force because the authority of the pastor/priest performs the action, not the intention. Keane (1997) added, “At one extreme, if words are compulsively effective in themselves, then anyone would be able to use them, regardless of the speaker’s personal character or intentions, and without consequences for personal status.” At the other extreme, the speaker assumes considerable risk and responsibility if the words originate from within the speaker. The issue of intention suffers with the Pentecostal practice of tongues-speech. The speakers claim no volition in the process but claim that God is present through the Holy Spirit who speaks through the individual by sounds authored by the Holy Spirit.

Pentecostal Communication

In Pentecostal situations, many studies have focused on tongues-speech. When tongues-speech has been a major consideration, it has swept the research deck of concern for any other communicative activity, even though other communicative activity may well be just as important to the speech community (or more important). The fascinating nature of tongues-speech in the socially scientific research, combined with the theological controversy surrounding tongues (both outside and inside the Pentecostal community) will always force the subject matter to dominate the conversation (for a sample see

Sequeira 1994). Tongues-speech is difficult to study from the cultural communication perspective because of the belief that one prays with their spirit and not with their mind in tongues-speech. Sometimes the research on tongues-speech has not always been very flattering for Pentecostals since it often focused on abnormal psychological factors (Kildahl 1972). Other researchers pursued the phenomena with little knowledge of customary practices such as Wright (2003) who interpreted behavior surrounding its public usage. Wright saw several episodes where African American women publically spoke in tongues in a church with an all-white pastoral staff. Several times two different women were stopped publically. Wright then interpreted the situation as a racial episode because of the racial differences between the pastors and the ladies. However, further research and interviews may well have provided a different interpretation of the episodes.¹¹ Sequeira (1994) was quick to point out the orderly nature that is required by the speech community in Pentecostal situations concerning public usage of tongues. In order to avoid some of those potential problems, Dillon (1998) used ethnographic methods to ascertain what role congregants assigned to speaking in tongues. He continued the socially scientific claim “that glossolalia is a learned behavior that may help to legitimize the Pentecostal message, also that it operates as a catharsis, and that it reinforces commitment to the movement” (79). In spite of such claims, Pentecostals

¹¹ In my first-hand experience including voluminous conversations with other Pentecostal pastors, it is extremely rare in contemporary Pentecostalism for such an episode to occur. Given the hesitancy of pastors to stop public tongues speech, it would either be an overt act of extreme racism or an attempt to address a private character issue within the speaker. Since Dillon’s bibliography did not list any Pentecostal theologians or major research on speaking in tongues, perhaps the issue side-tracked a researcher who lacked the background knowledge to interpret the phenomena and know the astounding rarity of stopping someone in those circumstances.

maintain that genuine tongues-speech is not learned behavior, but is authored by the Holy Spirit dwelling inside the believer (Macchia 1992, 1998a, 1998b, 2006; Menzies and Menzies 2000).

Pentecostal theologian Macchia points to tongues-speech as a method of prayer best used when something inside the believer defies human capacity to articulate the inside situation in words (Macchia 1992, 1998b). In this way, tongues-speech allows for communication when affective responses supercede cognitive processes. Samarin researched tongues-speech in a way that was sympathetic toward the practice (Samarin 1972). He found that it was an expressive practice “used to express emotions or feelings” (205). Theologian Suurmond takes tongues-speech a step beyond, contending that it has no purpose, even affective (Suurmond 1995). Suurmond relies on the fact that tongues-speech has no meaning by definition; therefore, it must also have no purpose. In contrast, Yong (1998) found rich meaning through the symbolic nature of tongues-speech by relying on the religious symbolism theory of Neville (1996). As a “distinctive” doctrine, tongues-speech symbolizes many aspects of the speech community’s theological agenda and spirituality. Some researchers pointed to activity as a sign of the quality of one’s relationship with God (Csordas 2011). Others pointed to tongues-speech as the proof that the Spirit’s presence inhabited the believer (Austin-Broos 1997).

Meaning is also negotiated through the give and take of prayer. Pentecostals believe that God speaks back to them in prayer (Luhrmann 2007, 2012). The communicative interaction with divinity is not without problems both for researchers and worshippers. However, it essentially informs the communicative practice with the worshipping community far more than previous research considers. It will be shown how

hearing from God pervades rhetoric and other communicative acts as well as forming the raw material available to participants for everyday life informing every aspect of living.

When compared with many other Christian traditions, Pentecostal worship relies less on the fixity of liturgical texts than most others. Hollenweger famously said that Pentecostal worship is an oral liturgy (Hollenweger 1997). Albrecht followed Hollenweger in the orality paradigm, emphasizing the characteristics of orality as it pertains to worship (Albrecht 2004). Albrecht also noted that orality helped make liturgy accessible globally. In an essay on communication in Latin American Pentecostalism, Schultze also found orality as a major characteristic of their liturgy and overall communication (Schultze 1994). The difference between orality and literacy as it pertains to liturgy is the difference between fixed or flexible worship, playful or serious tones, culturally adaptable or culturally specific. Another way of saying it relies on two metaphors. “Oral culture is an organism, whereas more literate culture is an *organization*,” seeing each as ideal types, not “immutable laws of social life” (emphasis original, Schultze 1994, 73). The fixed nature of texts brings in the question of objectification (Coleman 1996). If Pentecostal liturgy and other forms of communication are oral by nature, it creates less of a sense of objectification. Even when relying on other texts, the tendency for Pentecostal communication is to rely on a method that Shoaps called transposition rather than entextualization (Shoaps 2002). By transposition, Shoaps meant it “highlights the situatedness of the text in a particular performance and as emanating from a particular speaker” (2002). Thus, the communication within worship is personal by nature for individuals, giving them a greater opportunity to relate and associate with the language and ritual forms.

While the liturgy may have oral qualities, it has never been strictly oral in the United States. As Ong pointed out (2002), few groups are strictly oral and few strictly literate. Some want to describe Pentecostal worship as post-literate. Ten of the eleven churches I visited used some form of computer generated projection technology for words to songs. Of the twenty-four interviews conducted with pastors, every pastor said their church either currently used computer generated projection or had immediate plans to do so. Twenty-two of the pastors used a video at least once in a while in the service. Three of the churches even produced videos in-house with paid staff. Pentecostal liturgy today makes use of video, audience participation and interaction, spoken word, printed text, and other symbolic activity. It is truly a complex and eclectic communicative act. Rather than framing analysis in orality/literacy, it is more helpful to return to the notion that orality makes liturgy more accessible globally. Since most people in U.S America are literate, it is more helpful to look at the modality of communication through the lens of accessibility, ascertaining how it is made accessible and why that is a cultural value.

Is orality a useful concept for explaining communication or worship in U.S American Pentecostal churches? Sometimes third generation Pentecostals (or fourth, or fifth) worship side-by-side with people who were raised without a religious tradition and were atheististic just a year ago. In that environment, accessibility is more important than orality/literacy as it pertains to understanding what takes place. Worship services often are put into a fixed form like CD's, DVD's, and podcasts, which moves away from orality. From my observation, one church preprinted sermon notes and made them available on a handout. The same sermon notes were also available on a mobile application for mobile phone users. Another church launched their own app during one of

the weeks I visited. Two of the churches simultaneously broadcast their church services over the internet with one church calling it a “campus” as they moved to meeting in multiple places. In that case, the church had multiple meeting locations and used simultaneous video broadcasts at the other location. Another church was moving toward an additional campus and would launch it within months of my interview with the pastor. In a digital society, neither orality nor literacy rule the day but the power of the image takes center stage along with digital forms of communication (Sweet 2007).

Certainly the playfulness that theologian Suurmond (1995)¹² described in Pentecostal worship does not translate to a fixed source. It is difficult to describe in print the experience of worship in an African American Church of God in Christ. Of equal difficulty is capturing the energy from the same worship service by a recording, either audio or video, because of the reality that such worship is an event which Schultze (1994) described as having “powerful immediacy.” Such immediacy and playfulness are both characteristics of oral cultures (Schultze 1994; Ong 2002). In many respects, Pentecostal worship and communication contain oral properties, but in many other respects the descriptions of orality simply do not apply such that the form/structure of analysis contained in the orality/literacy binary description hinders analysis even in theological descriptions (Albrecht 2004). Accessibility more adequately characterizes the current

¹² On the point of playfulness in worship, I certainly agree with Suurmond that there are elements of play in Pentecostal worship. However, Suurmond’s theological suggestions about play theory are problematic from a communication perspective primarily for two reasons. First, to see worship as play in the same way as Suurmond, it must be without any other purpose, which excludes other traditional Pentecostal metaphors like “the latter rain” and “the anointing.” Second, because tongues speech cannot be understood by definition, its lack of semantical distinguishability points to purposelessness and, therefore, play. Such a view is communicative reductionism because communication includes more than semantics.

shift. I will return to accessibility later to more fully develop the concept; for now, suffice it to say that differences in communicative patterns between descriptions already mentioned and those observed in this study may be described as a shift from playfulness with oral characteristics to providing accessibility. The best course was charted by Keane's observation that research has "shifted from formal patterns to the emergence and negotiation of meanings over the course of interaction" (Keanne 1997).

Pentecostal worship is more appropriately understood as embodied narrative, almost like a drama. Seeing worship as drama follows a long line of established interpretation (Rogers 1975; Lardner 1979; Tuttle 1982; Webber 1999, 2008; Schultze 2004) and especially interpretation of Pentecostal worship (Austin-Broos 1997; Albrecht 1999, 2009; Cox 2001; Macchia 2006; Land 2010; Lindhardt 2011a; Lindhardt 2011b). Land explicitly understood worship as a drama because of the experiential nature of Pentecostal worship. "The point of Pentecostal spirituality was not to have an experience or several experiences, though they spoke of discrete experiences. The point was to experience life as part of a biblical drama of participation in God's history" (Land 2010).

The dynamic of narratives provides meaning negotiation within Pentecostal liturgy (Lindhardt 2009). Narrative may take the form of narrative sermons, narratives used in the sermons, or narrative testimonies from congregation members. Narrative sermons are structured and styled from beginning to end as a narrative, whereas many other sermons make use of narratives within the sermon. Lindhardt (2009) and many others focus on the importance of personal testimonies within the worship service, especially in Latin American Pentecostal churches. In U.S American churches personal testimonies are less pronounced with many pastors hesitating to allow spontaneous testimonies. In

conservative venues where women's voices may not otherwise be heard, Lawless (1988) described how ladies, preachers and lay people, found their voice even amongst people who often questioned the propriety of women in ministry. She found that communicative roles empowered women, especially in personal testimonies.

Worship as Communication

The Bible includes a significant guide to worship in the Old Testament book of Psalms with one hundred fifty different chapters of worship content. Rather than describe or prescribe worship, the Psalms demonstrate worship and allow the reader to participate. Of the many insightful truths from Psalms, the genre certainly brings a great deal of insight with one hundred fifty different worship segments in poetry. The ancient poetry often included narrative written in Hebrew parallelism as well as other poetic devices and styles. The richness of poetry allows for an affective expression as the individual gave his/her heart in worship to the Creator of heaven and earth. Much of the poetry remembers the past or narrates the present situation in light of God entering the situation.

As Schultze moved through a cultural view of communication, he quoted a graduate student with a traditional view of worship and then observed that worship, like all human communication, should be powerfully rich and vibrant (2000, 40). The view that Christian worship is human communication thunders with great implications, calling worship and communication scholarship to a joint effort. When congregations gather for worship activity, they create a cultural community through communication in which the meaning of symbolic activity is generated and shared through the community.

The cultural-creation approach to communication shows great respect for culture creation, allowing for cultural theories of communication to come to the forefront.

Further, the cultural view captures the interdependence of communication and community that always intertwine in a dialogical manner with neither leading nor following. Communication is essential for a community and community is essential for communication for it is impossible to imagine either without the other. Authentic communication builds community and genuine community only exists through communication. The emphasis on community is essential for Schultze (2000) in the communication process because it grounds communication in a communal foundation and offers a means to interpret the symbolic nature of communication.

The symbolic nature of communication received considerable emphasis from Schultze (2000). He gave a great deal of thought to symbolic ambiguity, the reality that the meaning of symbols has wiggle room, capturing what it means to be human. Symbolic ambiguity enters the religious realm as such ambiguity plagues ecumenical dialogue because symbols mean the same thing to the same group in the dialogue, but something slightly different to other members of the dialogue.¹³ The differences in interpreting symbols and knowing what is meant through symbolic interaction impede ecumenical dialogue as well as inter-faith dialogue between the world's religions.¹⁴ Yet within one particular religious community, the symbolic expression enjoys greater clarity. Symbols are only interpreted within a cultural community (Grenz and Franke 2001). The same object or action may hold completely different symbolic meaning within two

¹³ For an example, see Karkkainen (2007) who first established common meaning of symbols and terms for a better dialogue between European Lutherans and Pentecostals.

¹⁴ For an example of bridging symbolic gaps to find common ground, see Volf (2011).

diverse symbolic interpretation systems. The ability to decipher-at-will symbolic expression happens only within a cultural community. Members of a culture do not require extensive explanations of important symbols within the culture because such meanings are readily accessible, part of what Berger and Luckman (1967) called the taken-for-granted world, that part of a world that needs no explanation or interpretation to those with shared cultural bonds.

As communicative activity turns toward church activity and worship, another salient issue emerged from Schultze's work (2000) delineating a difference between the priestly and prophetic functions of communication. Prophets use communication to "truthfully challenge a culture's beliefs" (Schultze 2000, 131). The priestly function of communication is about community building rather than community changing. Through communication, those in a priestly function "perform secular rituals that affirm a tribe's beliefs" (Schultze 2000, 127). Woods and Patton (2010) built on Schultze's dual function of communication. The prophetic function entails challenging the dominant cultural view as well as prophetically offering an alternative view, replacing old symbols with new and old stories with new ones. For Woods and Patton, the alternative primarily provides Christians with a vision of a different means to experience reality rather than challenging unbelievers to a different worldview.

Communities are built by transmitting their symbols to new members with regularity, usually without any intentional training process. Children learn the importance of prayer by continuous training from parents insisting that children bow their heads, close their eyes, and fold their hands. Adults new to a worshipping community learn the place of sacred texts within the community by watching the responses of others. As such,

communities perpetuate the symbolic expression and subsequent interpretation of those symbols for all in the cultural community.

A prophetic vision offers a new narrative, giving Christians a vision of a different reality from the mainstream culture (Brueggemann 2001). Theologian Walter Brueggemann (2001a) employed the term “rescripting” for the process of replacing an old narrative with a new one centered on God. Through the rescripting process an individual changes the narrative of one’s life from one script to another, much the same as the prophetic process of replacing old ineffective symbols with new symbols offering fresh meaning. In the Christian community, worship offers a new way of scripting the world for those worshippers present so that a new life-narrative emerges. The new narration offered in worship presents new possibilities for both transcendent moments within the worship environment as well as new possibilities in everyday life. Such a view requires that worship be seen as a transformative activity presenting new possibilities to the worshipper, through both replacing old scripts with new ones in the prophetic function, as well as maintaining the script and symbol set of the worshipping community in the prophetic function.

The existence of a symbol set within a worshipping community points to it being a speech community. Worship therefore, is a social interaction that qualifies as communication. As a communicative act, worship is “subject to the same constraints” of other communicative activity (Lardner 1979, 35). “Communication through liturgy, then, is far more than the transfer of meaning as a ‘content’ which is ‘contained’ in the symbols. Communication refers to the whole set of behavioral events which influence each other through their patterned interaction” (Lardner 1979, 22). For Lardner, the

importance of communication in the liturgy is the patterned interaction of behavior and the interaction of the symbols with that behavior. An elevated view of semiotics resonates more in a liturgical tradition that relies heavily on symbolism. Some less symbolic systems rely more on a direct connection with God such as Pentecostals (B. Martin 2003). However, in those systems, semiotics and pragmatics are still important, as the symbolism of bodily movement is also a “patterned interaction” which results in “a genuine union or communion” (Lardner 1979, 22).

Worshipping communities are necessarily communicating communities that co-create new possibilities for individuals as well as new cultural realities for the community by bringing individuals into alignment with the community’s symbolic meanings and metanarrative. As the particular worlds of individuals are aligned, liturgy of the worshipping community reinforces the new alignment around the narrative presented within the worshipping moment. Rogers (1975) has considered communication an interaction between two people that brings a connection between the two, forming a world between them and pressing beyond a mere interchange of information. The complication of worship as communication for Rogers is that worship involves a communicative exchange with an entity that cannot be seen, heard, or experienced through sensory activity.

Tuttle (1982) tied theology to worship through a communicative framework by relying on Fishburn whom he cited as writing: “Christianity is a storytelling and story-living religion ... [in worship we] retell and rehearse our common biography and history as the people of God” (as cited in Tuttle 1982, 7). He added, “In our attempt to get the story straight, to get the story in, and to get the story out, we need an intentional method

to use” (7). The story nature of worship is a significant contribution, making worship a narrative of some type, a narrative of God’s interaction with His people throughout the history of those people. For Tuttle (and Fishburn) worship is not just God’s story as asserted by Webber (2008), but worship is also our story as it interfaces with God. “There is a sequel being written. Worship is also our response to God’s story that is being lived. Christians gather to hear the word, and scatter to be the Word of God. The sequel to revelation is response” (Tuttle 1982, 97). To strengthen the assertion that worship is communication, Tuttle relied on Marshall McLuhan’s (2010) phrase “electronic man,” which Tuttle noted significantly influences worship through communication technologies (1982, 47).

Throughout McLuhan’s collection of essays (McLuhan 2010), the Roman Catholic liturgy was treated as communication. The liturgy was subject to rules of communication with a microphone just as all other communication. The liturgy is subject to the psychological effects of the electronic age, according to McLuhan (2010, 114). McLuhan noted the impacts of the shift from Latin after Vatican II, pointing out that Latin allowed the priest to mutter along and take some time (2010, 112).

I have shown how worship is a communicative activity and, therefore, how worshipping communities are necessarily speech communities. I have also shown how worship is best understood as embodied narrative, similar to drama but authentic, portable, and flexible as it pertains to the audience. The next move requires considering the nature of that embodied narrative. If worship is a narrative, what is the narrative plot? In what sense is worship embodied?

Worship Narrative

Christians participate in God's narrative during worship according to Webber (2008). He emphasized the need to proclaim and participate in the full narrative of God's involvement in the world, not just part of God's narrative. Webber brought his vast knowledge of worship theology and history to bear on the subject through an examination of past and present worship strategies and structures throughout the whole of Christianity, comparing those structures and strategies against the full narrative approach. "In both worship and spirituality we join God's story and find ourselves and the whole world under God's narrative. Neither worship nor spirituality has a life outside of God's narrative" (Webber 2008, 24). Worship should not be separated from God's narrative or it loses the qualities that make it worship, according to Webber. Since narrative is how we make meaning of the world and form our identity, the narrative qualities of worship introduce life-shaping factors (Fisher 1987; Hauerwas 2001). Through an emphasis on the narrative aspects of worship, God brings us "into his story, his grace, his redeeming work in all of history" (Webber 2008, 24).

Webber proposes two main factors around which worship should revolve for narrative participation. The ministry of the Word and the ministry of the table (the Lord's Supper) are vital for God's narrative, according to Webber. Through the ministry of the word, the church emphasizes truth. It is not just telling God's story but enacting God's story within the congregation. "The ancient church captured how worship does truth in the phrase *lex orandi; lex credenda*" or the law of prayer is the law of belief (Webber 2008, 104). The ministry of the Word allows for a great deal of local shaping from one place to another. The ministry of the table also takes the forefront for Webber (2008). He

is much aware of the lack of celebration of the Lord's Supper among some churches. He discusses churches who celebrate the Lord's Supper once a month and churches who celebrate less frequently. The emphasis for Webber was on celebrating the Lord's Supper every week during worship as a way to both look back and look ahead, as a way to participate in Christ's offering of himself as well as a memorial.

Pentecostal Worship

Pentecostal worship is embodied narration that intends to provide worshippers with the raw materials to enjoy their spirituality in everyday life. Through narrative aspects, worship provides people with stories from which to choose while making everyday decisions. The embodied aspect helps "train" the whole person to remember God's stories as patterns for living.

Theories of Worship Experience

Several researchers pointed to the theory of optimal experience (Csikszentmihalyi 1990) for explaining the phenomena of Pentecostal worship (Steven 2002; Wright 2003; Lindhardt 2012). Csikszentmihalyi identified the theory of optimal experience and ultimately named the theory of "flow." It was developed through interviews with people who were at the top of their field, typically in athletics (tennis), activities (rock climbing), or games (chess). He found that people reached a point of consciousness when everything else was shut out and there was complete focus on the task at hand that led to reaching a high level of achievement. The theory of optimal experience "developed ... based on the concept of flow—the state in which people are so involved in an activity that nothing else seems to matter; the experience itself is so enjoyable that people will do it even at great

cost, for the sheer sake of doing it” (Csikszentmihalyi 1990, Ch. 1). Csikszentmihalyi went on to elaborate on the necessity of optimal experiencing depending on one’s “ability to control what happens in consciousness moment by moment” so that “each person has to achieve it on the basis of his own individual efforts and creativity” as one flows from moment to moment (Csikszentmihalyi 1990, Ch. 1).

Neitz and Spickard (1990) elaborated on the flow theory to develop a sociological theory of religious experience, noting that Csikszentmihalyi’s articulation of flow was quite individualistic. They combined it with Shutz’s theory of a “mutual tuning-in relationship” first related to musical performance where a performer tunes-in to the composer and to the audience, simultaneously allowing the audience the experience of tuning-in through a social connection. The feeling of “we-ness,” as Neitz and Spickard term it, allows for a collective consciousness through a performance.

When Cox (2001) set out to describe Pentecostal worship, he chose a metaphor, likening Pentecostal worship to jazz music. He developed the historical connections between the development of both jazz music and the development of Pentecostalism because both grew out of late nineteenth century African American folk culture. There were some connections between the two based on personalities and performers of the time that were further developed by Jones (2002). The primary value of Cox’s observation was not in the actual connections, but the value was in the metaphorical inferences for the contours and texture of worship when compared to jazz music. Jazz music provides structure for the musicians to play harmoniously together but allows musical flexibility so that each musician expresses individual talent in developing a cohesive whole. The structure comes from playing the same key signature and genre

while the flexibility allows individual instrumentalists to advance the melody by repetition of what was already played, by augmenting what was already played, or by developing the direction based on what was already played. The structure also allows individual musicians to harmonize all together while one individual plays the melody.

Worship as Embodiment

In *Desiring the Kingdom*, Pentecostal theologian James K. A. Smith (2009) postulated that people learn and establish identity through actual practices rather than just intellectual development. Consequently, any intention to mold and shape Christians through intellectual means alone will fall short of the desired goal. Christian education in universities, colleges, and local churches must account for the actual practice of Christians. Smith further interpreted the bulk of Christian practices through the Sunday (or whenever) worship moment of Christianity (p. 34). Smith (2009) expanded the argument through considering the concept of worldview that he believed relies too strongly on intellectual development (the head) rather than affective development (the gut). An intellectual approach to worldview, according to Smith (2009), compromises the embodied nature of humanity (p. 32). By concentrating on more than just the head and centering the locus of humanity in the heart, Smith (2009) then envisioned humanity as defined primarily by love rather than intellectual thought (32-33). Smith also juxtaposes Christian liturgy against what he calls cultural liturgies, experiences in culture which promise deep meaning (p. 24). Thus, Smith adds to the triadic movement seen in Brueggemann (2001) and Woods and Patton (2010) from vision through narrative to community shaping by noting the necessity of worship for training and molding worshippers' views of the world through the practices of worship.

Through the practices of worship, Christians are formed for a unique life perspective, according to Smith (2009, 35). Echoing Goffman (1967), Smith (2009) maintained that rituals broadly encompass actions that are repetitive and provide meaning. Practices are a subset of ritual for Smith (2009, 87), important because practices point to an embodiment which reflects an adequate theory of anthropology. An intellectual emphasis on worldview treats communication like an exchange of information, as though it floated “out there” instead of being embodied “in here.” Communication, even in worship, is an embodied exchange between two beings like a gift (Chauvet 1995). Christian worship forms the individual by operating at multiple levels of consciousness and the subconscious, training the spirit to act and react in different ways. Practices in worship work much the same as various cultural liturgies. For Smith, liturgies were “rituals of ultimate concern” (2009, 86). Smith opened the book with the ritual of mall shopping as a cultural liturgy and explicates how mall shopping encompasses deep concerns but promises more than it can deliver. Worship, on the other hand, trains humans the same way as the mall, only delivering everything it promises, touching ultimate concerns and desires of humans. It is a social experience with formative power.

Smith’s (2009) argument pointed to the crucial aspect of love. Humans are affective, loving and desiring creatures more than thinking creatures, doing things based on desire and “love” according to Smith (46). More than thinking or believing humans are defined by what they desire and crave. Therefore, the view of humanity necessary for development is not information but formation, one that includes the heart (gut) as well as the head. People go to the mall out of desire rather than a rational pursuit or an

intellectual assent. Practices focus the desires and point in a particular because desire must be directed, not educated.

Liturgical theologian Chauvet (1995) makes much of worship as embodied communication. For Chauvet, the embodied communication of worship enacts a gift transaction of symbols between humanity and divinity. For Smith (2009), worship is embodied communication also because of the practices that accompany worship, engaging the whole of the self through sight, singing, dancing, seeing, hearing, etc. Both Smith and Chauvet emphasized the sacramental nature of worship, the use of objects to transact meaning between the self and God, ordinary things like bread and wine. The practice of the Eucharist stands as an example of embodied communication as the participants through their body partake symbols worshipfully that elevate an interaction between the self and God.

It will be seen that Pentecostal worship uniquely embodies the dominant narrative of its unique worshipping tradition. The dominant narrative framework works dialectically with embodiment for Pentecostal worship as Smith argued (2009) because embodiment further implants the narrative within an individual and the narrative serves to guide the embodiment. For example, the most common sign of Pentecostal worship, raising one's hands in the air, embodies the narrative (re)telling the narrative every time one engages in the activity and expressing commitment physically. Dialectically raising one's hands tells the narrative and trains the soul to live out the narrative.

Pentecostal Worship Narrative

The full narrative of Pentecostal worship, according to Pentecostal theologians (Macchia 2006; Karkkainen 2007; Archer 2010) encompasses a five fold vision of Jesus.

The Five-fold Gospel narrative dates back to the earliest days of the Pentecostal movement (Dayton 1987). The Five-fold gospel centers on Jesus as the enactor of important spiritual works within an individual: Jesus as the savior of people previously not living life God's way, Jesus as the healer of bodily diseases, Jesus as the sanctifier or one who sets people apart for right living, Jesus as the baptizer in the Holy Spirit, and Jesus as the returning King in the future consummation of the ages. (see Chapter 5) These various aspects of Jesus typically find expression in Pentecostal worship services according to theologians. Whether or not that stands up to the scrutiny of field observation will unfold in the analysis. (see Chapter 8)

Pentecostal worship has been characterized by narrative themes of an adventurous journey (Percy 2011) or a theme of romance. Percy based his narrative themes on "participant observation and thematic analysis" and found that "charismatic Christians and revivalists configure their lives and meaning through a primarily romantic genre" (166). Percy saw the romance as configuring worldview and adventure as the primary motif for worship (167). The romantic worldview follows spiritual adventure as the context in which strength for the romantic relationship with God is "discovered, tested, and refined" (167). Percy found that a threefold sequence unfolding in a cyclical movement for believers, "leaving the present life and its conventionality; encountering the new world; returning home and transforming the homeland to which one has come with the tales of the new world" (168).

Other writers have also proposed narrative themes and progressions. Luhrmann (2004) emphasizes romantic elements of worship, particularly as it relates to research in Vineyard churches. Steven researched charismatic Anglicans in England as well as other

Charismatics and proposed a threefold ritual structure to include invitation, proclamation, and adoration (J. Steven 2009), following a progression of a call to worship, engagement, exaltation, adoration, and intimacy. Others have proposed a progression traveling through the ancient (Old Testament) Temple on a journey through the outer courts (praise), to the inner courts to the Holy of Holies where there is an encounter with the Glory of God (Steven 2009, citing Stibbe). Following a narrative of encounter, the progression would move from search to encounter to transformation (Cartledge 2006). Pentecostal theologian Hayford developed a narrative of worship as fulfilling the activity of God's kingdom (Hayford 1987). The diversity of narrative progressions has demonstrated the flexibility of Pentecostal worship while the overlap has shown that all require some sort of interaction with God.

Worship points to spirituality for Pentecostals more than other worshipping traditions. Worship provides new ways of seeing the world and places new possibilities in the taken-for-granted-world. In societies where male dominance narrates everyday life, researchers have found that Pentecostal spirituality modifies the situation. Toulis (1997) and others found that it modifies gender roles not always by reducing male dominance (Lawless 1988) but by reducing male machismo (Brusco 1995), by reducing harmful habits of men like drinking (Gill 1990), and by developing a more nurturing role within the family (Cucchiari 1990). The narrative of spirituality points the way. Pentecostals practice spirituality in the everyday world based on orthodoxy (right beliefs), orthopraxy (right actions), and orthopathy (right affections) according to Land (2010). The orthopathy aligns the affections, sometimes making men more affectively sensitive to situations around them.

This study will consider the impact of the unique embodied worship narrative upon the community, the worshippers, and outsiders freshly entering the community. In explicating Pentecostal worship as communication, it is important to progress based on communication theory to discipline research and situate it within the broad research field. As already observed, cultural communication necessarily informs worship. Further, the uniqueness of the worshipping tradition under consideration suggests that a cultural view that considers a worshipping tradition as cultural co-creation will best inform the research process.

CHAPTER 2. VOICES IN SPEECH COMMUNITIES

Romaine (2000) posited that those who share a set of norms and rules for the use of language form a speech community. A speech community shares a pattern of social interaction with common ideas about how language and communication as a whole evokes stability or instability. While early use of the term focused on speech communities as those who shared a common language (Hudson 2007), later research asserted that a speech community might transcend language barriers (Romaine 2000). It is equally true that many speech communities share English as a common language because language is not deterministic for cultural proclivities, rules, and norms for such values are the property of culture not language. A fully socialized individual instinctively knows the rules and norms of the speech community. Such a person is said to have “communicative competence” (Romaine 2000). Children born into a particular speech community learn the rules, norms, and proclivities of the speech community through a natural process. When a person comes into a speech community later in life, those rules and norms must be learned in a more deliberate fashion. Learning the rules and norms for speaking may require extensive time and energy.

The notion of speech communities dates back to the 1930’s but existed in literature for many years before becoming the subject of disciplined study. With Hymes’ call for ethnographic research on communication in specific times and places (Hymes 1962), speech communities as a subject of research greatly increased in popularity so that twenty-five years later more than two hundred fifty research projects had focused on communication within speech communities (Philipsen and Carbaugh 1986). A little more than a decade later, Philipsen answered Hymes’ call for ethnographic studies of

communication but went a step beyond to formulate a specific theory for use in speech communities, Speech Codes Theory (Philipsen 1997).

I have shown how various researchers of Pentecostal Christianity approach communication. Many of those researches treat Pentecostals as a speech community, a unique group connected by norms and rules rather than within a language. In commenting on his research among Latin America Pentecostals, Schultze said, “Pentecostalism in particular makes faith meaningful and relevant to the people of this largely oral culture, establishing an alternative community of vision” (Schultze 1994, 82). Both social scientists such as Csordas (1997) and theologians such as Macchia (2006) asserted that the Pentecostal community was created by the charismatic gifts, language manifestations believed to be supernatural in nature where the deity speaks through individuals to the community. Theologians Grenz and Franke (2001) added that symbols are interpreted in communities; therefore, the charismatic gifts as symbols are interpreted in the community of Pentecostals.

As a unique speech community, Pentecostals approach communication differently and have their own unique worldview nationally, with local and regional variations (Cox 2001). They are a unique speech community, defined as a group with “their own system of socially constructed symbols and meanings, premises, and rules, pertaining to communicative conduct” (Philipsen 1997). While there is overlap between Pentecostalism and the surrounding milieu, Pentecostals still have unique codes, proclivities, and rules for speaking. Speech Codes Theory will be employed to study them, along with a narrative analysis of worship services.

A combination of two theories will be engaged for this study to accommodate its complexity. Primary reliance comes from Speech Codes Theory (SCT) that is mostly associated with Gerry Philipsen and his associates at the University of Washington (2009). Because SCT is an ethnographic theory, a secondary theory will explain culture as it relates to church and communication.

Speech Codes Theory

Religious groups are worthy of consideration as subcultures because they can live side by side within the larger milieu, yet have diverse views of reality. Berger (1969) pointed out that religion constitutes part of the taken-for-granted world of a group. For example, in India Hindus and Muslims often live side by side but have very different perspectives. When Muslims first came into the Bengali region and tried to translate their documents into the native language, there were many issues related to culture (Stewart 2001). As time progressed, Hindu and Muslim stories developed containing competing saints as both religions competed fiercely with the other (Green 2004). Evidence also suggested that birth rates, number of children wanted, and attitude toward contraception were strongly correlated with one's religion (Dharmalingam and Morgan 2004). Kraft pointed out similar issues for Christians attempting to penetrate a new culture, as surrounding culture impacted local speech codes, making Bible translation a more difficult task (Kraft 1973). Shaw, Van Engen, and Sanneh (2003) discussed the necessity of translating the gospel message into a local community for the message to have legitimacy and deep meaning. Hunter (1992) found that successful pastors have a unique manner of articulating the gospel within their given slice of society. A worshipping

tradition is likely to have its own codes that guide communication, but it will be expressed through local influences as well.

In any study using SCT, it is imperative to allow the rules of the particular local congregation (speech community) to emerge and set the categories and terminology used to define interlocutors meaning so that analysis is grounded in the experience of the group (Glaser and Strauss 1967). The terms, rules, and premises of their speech are woven into speaking inextricably, often in ways the group does not fully recognize because it is just their “way of being in the world” (Carbaugh, Berry, and Nurmikari-Berry, 2006). Speech code theory proposes that speech reveals the community’s ultimate values and priorities.

There are several advantages to using SCT for this project. First, the Pentecostal community can be considered as a whole; even though there are differences based on a variety of taxonomies, the similarities bind them together in definition. Second, there is strong emphasis in Christian literature on the impact surrounding milieu has upon the church. Using SCT allows us to consider the interplay between the gospel, surrounding milieu, and the church (Driscoll 2004). Third, the Pentecostal community is diverse and interacts with culture differently, with various streams within the Pentecostal community relating to culture differently (for options, see Carter, 2006; Carson, 2008). These differences impact faith and practice; SCT allows these differences to be teased out along with their impact on communication.

Pentecostals approach communication differently than many other religious groups (Lindhardt 2011b) as a unique speech community with their own unique worldview and physical practices nationally, regionally, and locally (Cox 2001). They are

a unique speech community, with “their own system of socially constructed symbols and meanings, premises, and rules, pertaining to communicative conduct” (Philipsen 1997). A speech community is a particular people in a particular time (Aoki 2000) sharing common forms of communication where “the members also understand the norms that help them interpret their communicative activities” (Youngblood and Winn 2004). Each local congregation acts as a speech community within the broader Pentecostal speech community scattered throughout the nation. Closely related to the definition of a speech community was the definition of culture guiding this research project. Philipsen relies on Geertz for a definition of culture (surrounding milieu) worth using here. It refers “to a socially constructed and historically transmitted pattern of symbols, meanings, practices, and rules” (emphasis original, Philipsen 1992). It can be further defined by adding Berger and Luckmann’s term (1969), the “taken-for-granted-world.”

The most comprehensive delineation of SCT comes from Philipsen, Coutu, and Covarru (2005) who suggested six propositions. These propositions form the backbone of the theory, describing the essence of the relationship between communication and a cultural group. Originally, Philipsen proposed SCT with four propositions grounded in field research (Philipsen 1992). As the theory evolved, two more propositions were added to account more accurately for the interplay between culture and communication. Part of the ongoing difficulty is the nomenclature involved. A cultural group or a sub-culture is seen as a speech community with distinct rules governing how and when particular methods of communication ought to be used. Those rules are unwritten rules, codes of conduct, shared values of the convergent speech community. A code is not, therefore a one-to-one relationship but a reliance on a core value to determine how and when a

particular kind of speech is required or suggested (Philipsen, Coutu and Covarru 2005).

In a religious setting of worship, a speech code would be a particular shared central value that socialized members of the worshipping group (speech community) understands. The central value would guide when prayer was the right thing to do, for example, determining who should pray, how they should pray, to whom they should pray, for whom they should pray.

The propositions of SCT are grounded in Philipsen's research (Philipsen 1992), developed, refined and expanded by Philipsen, Coutu, and Covarru (2005) as follows:

Proposition 1. Wherever there is a distinctive culture, there is to be found a distinctive speech code.

Proposition 2. In any given speech community, multiple speech codes are deployed.

Proposition 3. A speech code implicates a culturally distinctive psychology, sociology, and rhetoric.

Proposition 4. The significance of speaking is contingent upon the speech codes used by interlocutors to constitute the meanings of communicative acts.

Proposition 5. The terms, rules, and premises of a speech code are inextricably woven into speaking itself.

Proposition 6. The artful use of a shared speech code is a sufficient condition for predicting, explaining, and controlling the form of discourse about the intelligibility, prudence, and morality of a communicative conduct.

SCT has been used in a variety of ways, showing remarkable flexibility. The studies typically identified different terms a group used for talking (Carbaugh 1989),

terms that identify the psychology and rhetorical value attached to speech communication. The flexibility of the theory was demonstrated by those terms for talking since Carbaugh found fifty different terms for talking (1989). Philipsen studied a blue-collar neighborhood on the south side of Chicago detailing the way to “speak like a man” in honor which meant it was better to hit a misbehaving child than to talk about the issue (Philipsen 1975). Carbaugh (1988) studied communication patterns on the Donahue show, one of the early talk-format television shows. The discrepancy between definitions of words in the rhetoric leading up to the Vietnam War was revealed through SCT (Coutu 1996). Berry, Carbaugh, and Nurmikari-Berry (2004) considered the way quietude helped define Finnish society. Two complementary speech codes were explicated in academic institutions, finding the phenomena of “talking things through” and “putting it in writing” uniquely defined an academic institution (Baxter 1993). SCT was used in a study on Israeli “dugri” speech, or plain speech that operates as a face saving mechanism (Katriel 1983). It was used for explicating talking like a nano-technology scientist (Bassett 2009) with stunning conclusions about cultural assumptions, speech codes, and failing to consider ethical issues among scientists.

Other studies used SCT to study religious groups. Akkoor (2011) studied Afghan Hindus who migrated to Germany within the last decade. The study combined existing theory on immigrants’ up-rootedness and their ways of making connections within new surroundings. Akkoor found that the Temple shifted from only an object of worship to become a socialization center, a symbol of hanging onto cultural traditions and identity. The primary speech code identified was what Akkoor called “bikharna” which means

“scattering” but can also mean that something has disappeared. Akkoor explicated many ways in which the word aptly described the immigrants’ experience of reality.

Ward studied Christian Fundamentalists primarily in Independent Baptist churches represented by Bob Jones University and the Pensacola Christian College reporting both ethnography (Ward 2010) and rhetoric (Ward 2008). Ward combined SCT and Turner’s social drama theory (Turner 1974). He found that “Fundamentalists cannot deny the Bible because to do so would vitiate the one dominant symbol that coheres their culture” (2010). The dominant symbol in a Fundamentalist building was the Bible, usually displayed on a table in the front of the worship space. It was more prominent than the cross, which was often not displayed. In fact, Ward found that typically the only symbols in the worship space were the Bible, an American flag, and a Christian flag. There were three different types of communication with separate expectations: communication with other believers, with God, and with outsiders who were typically labeled “unbelievers.”

In a formal study of the Quaker speech codes, Molina-Markham (2011) relied on SCT and a framework from Coordinated Management of Meaning. She offered a sophisticated and detailed analysis of public gatherings as well as a group business session and interviews. She found several ways of speaking, particularly the use of intentional silence as 1) a means of discerning God’s desires for a situation; 2) a means of connecting with God in larger meetings; 3) a mechanism for decision making which emphasizes unity rather than majority-rules-voting. Molina-Markham demonstrated how analysis of repeated words and phrases in worship gatherings successfully informs analysis of speech codes.

In a nascent SCT study, Martinson (1994) relied on Hymes (1962, 1974) as well as constructionist ideas from Berger and Luckmann (1967) and Berger (1969) for communication research in a Wesleyan Methodist church. The term “nascent” is used because Martinson does not use the name of the theory or cite Philipsen as an author. The clearest initial delineation of SCT (Philipsen 1997) appeared after Martinson’s work (1994). He based his research on the theological belief of the Wesleyan tradition that every person needs to live a transformed life and found that the speech codes were accessed primarily in the Sunday School as it pertained to the worshippers themselves. The primary code was “sharing.” It was realized through individuals sharing their experiences of the week as well as testimonials of things they attributed to God’s answering their prayers, affecting the transformation of group members as they shared and re-shared their stories. The group constructed their identity repeatedly through “sharing talk,” as Martinson said. “It became increasingly clear how the collective testimony that God answers prayer was more the result of great effort than of unbridled spontaneity and inspiration” (146).

At first glance, the report by Youngblood and Winn (2004) offered the most helpful background for Pentecostal speech codes because the research was done in an African-American Pentecostal church. However, Youngblood and Winn focused on racial exclusion from outsiders as a speech code, something that I did not witness. Their secondary speech code was that of inclusion within the church for those who desired to belong, which they analyzed as a counter-code to the exclusionary code. Attempts at inclusion came in many different ways including making health care more accessible through transportation, programs for adolescents to resist peer pressure, assisting and

mentoring young people, and offering a welcoming church environment. Someone new to the group was welcomed but gained full access as a group member through participating in “the shout,” or the practice of exuberance in worship, either responding to God generally or to the directive of the leader particularly. I will return to inclusion in Chapter 9.

Most of the studies using SCT studies in religious situations tie speech codes to the overall belief structure of the faith tradition, where a belief structure is what the group believes, either formal or informally, about transcendence. A belief structure includes what Smart (1998) calls dimensions of religion: ritual, experiential and emotional, narrative, doctrinal, ethical, social and institutional, and material. Ward insisted, “How speech and ritual function *spiritually* is not the province of ethnography, but how they function *communally* is a proper object of study” (emphasis original, 2010). The distinction builds a wall between sacred and secular interpretations of what takes place in religious moments. I will contend that speech in religious speech communities is governed by the available belief structure, plausibility structure, and relevance structure of a group.

Speech Communities Integrated Across Culture

Speech communities thrive as a tapestry joining together side-by-side, often with overlapping norms and values. Said differently, speech communities are multiple harmonies within a broader concert, sometimes joining in the melody and other times with harmony. Speech communities within U.S America are not isolated entities but are influenced by the rules and norms of the larger culture, interacting with other speech communities, sometimes preserving their identity and sometimes adapting.

As cultural issues have come to the forefront in academia, Christian writings have also examined the issue of culture, particularly in relationship to the Church's approach to surrounding culture (for a sample see Volf 1994; Henderson 1998; Wilson 2004; Carter 2006; Carson 2008). When American culture shifted in the postmodern turn, it became more and more necessary for the Church to consider the impact of this shift on the Church's work (Henderson 1998). Varieties of responses have been suggested for adjusting to the cultural shift, all of which have a primary impact on communication.

Driscoll (2004) pointed to a triad consisting of culture, gospel narrative (message content), and the church. He saw these three existing in equilibrium that he represented with an equilateral triangle. While he prescribed a preferred balance and did not develop this idea much beyond an initial offering, it is worth consideration in this study because it proposed interplay between the three important aspects of the study. Some configuration of these three domains (church, communication content, and culture) accounts for most variance between local Pentecostal communities. While SCT proposes an intertwined relationship between culture, communication, and unique human ways-of-being, each domain brings something unique to the relationship.

Element of Culture

A surrounding milieu influences religious communities just as religion influences surrounding culture, sometimes deeply. Many factors contribute to this mutually beneficial relationship. Literature on SCT reveals numerous contributions on issues related to values, identity, and worldview, issues interwoven through the fabric of communication.

Christians have a unique worldview, which is further refined by Pentecostals as a way of experiencing God through encounters with the Holy Spirit in each worship service (Kraft 1992). Kraft postulated that this defines their speech patterns, though he developed this theologically, not through field research. Even though various streams run into the Pentecostal river, each shares this sense of encounter as part of their defining worldview. *Through uncovering the speech codes of the Pentecostal community, their values will be clarified and a set of priorities aligned through observing their codes of communication.*

The Pentecostal speech community uses unique rituals to express their identity (Albrecht 1999). Rituals define identity, color worldview, and express priorities in a religious community. Similarly, Hindu rituals are considered as an explanation for speech codes in Asian Indian “self-suppression” (Hastings 2000). Hastings found that the influences of taboo, definitions of blasphemy, and ritual all contributed to the willingness of Asian Indians to self-suppress their expression in a variety of situations. This further complicates the picture, however, because it implies that religion influenced the cultural norm, which impacted the speech code. In fact, culture affects religion and religion affects culture (Vanhoozer, Anderson and Sleasman 2007). This study looks at the impact of culture upon speech codes and speech codes shedding light on faith and practice with theological reflection on this interplay.

As previously noted, Pentecostalism is growing throughout the world, and throughout the country. With such growth comes new members and a need to pass along faith and practices. By willingly accepting (seeking) new members, Pentecostalism has opened itself up to allow its culture to be molded and shaped by people with no previous allegiance from within its midst. In order to preserve identity, it is necessary to pass along

culture and speech codes to new members. Such processes are similar to other socialization processes in which people adopt new speech codes as part of a socialization process (Bangeni and Kapp 2007). Cox (2001) noted situations from Africa where new people flood Pentecostal churches at such a rapid rate that theology is impacted by the influx of new people resulting in conflict between more established Pentecostals and newer believers, commonly known as syncretism in theology. Parker (1996) noted that some Pentecostals do not allow new people to participate in spontaneous prophecy (messages believed to be from God), interpreting tongues (giving meaning to a special message spoken in tongues, believed to be from God), or other special communication codes. While this is far from a universal rule, it clearly demonstrated some of the problems in maintaining unique speech codes with the Pentecostal culture.

Element of Communication

SCT suggests that a culture, or subculture, has its own speech codes that uniquely apply to the cultural delineation. In as much as American Christian Pentecostalism qualifies as a subculture, it will have its own unique speech codes. It will make use of specific methods, understood codes, unspecified but understood rules for communication. Each congregation approaches unique communicative acts in a slightly different way, helping to form the culture of that local church. My study compared the cultures of various local Pentecostal churches to find both variations and similarities. Those similarities define the speech codes of the U.S American Pentecostal culture.

To understand the speech codes of a religious subculture, it was important to learn what narratives were important to them. While all narratives within a religious group's sacred writings will have importance (or they would cease to be sacred), there will be

certain narratives of more interest to a particular subculture than other narratives. The ritual dimension of religion was of particular importance also since rituals involve communication in multiple ways simultaneously. Rituals were subject to change over time but do not change easily because rituals are tied directly to the personality of a religious group. The observation and subsequent explanation of Pentecostal ritual was highly salient for this study.

Unique speech codes for Pentecostals may well be tied to their unique experiences since they are a religion of experience (Hollenweger 2004). Those experiences will be molded and shaped by communication and will be grounded in unique speech codes. Pentecostals make use of speech in a variety of ways. Perhaps the greatest expression historically has been “praying for the sick” (Wagner 1986), a typical activity in a worship service where congregation members (or clergy) put their hands on the backs or shoulders of congregation members who have some sort of illness, disease, or malady and pray for them. Prayer for the sick is a regular occurrence among Pentecostals though frequency varies from congregation to congregation. It was expected that some churches no longer practice this ritual or have changed it in a significant way, partly as an accomodation to new people who find the practice strange. It was just one potential example of changes in speech practices based on culture which changes the way people’s faith and practice is molded and shaped.

Element of Pentecostal Faith

Hollenweger (2004) described Pentecostalism as “a movement which expects manifestations of the Spirit in the normal worship service. The purpose of these gifts of the Spirit, such as healing, tongues-speech, and prophecy, is not to distinguish

Pentecostals from other Christians but to facilitate an ecumenical ministry of reconciliation.” Whether or not this is entirely agreed upon (and it is not, especially the purpose being an ecumenical ministry of reconciliation, see Chan 2001), it is clear that the differentiation between Pentecostals and other Christians is exposed communicatively. The emphasis on communication is reflected in a statement by a pastor recorded in Albrecht’s study. “We all carry the responsibility for seeking God, for our worship is highly participatory and open to the possibility that God will speak through any of us” (Albrecht 1999, 88). Even though it is just one glimpse into the values of a Pentecostal pastor, it demonstrated a connection between their speech codes and a drive to “seek God.” By “seeking God” they meant spending time in prayer expecting an existential encounter with God’s presence in a mystical union with God through the Holy Spirit (Kraft 1992). The tendency to rely on direct encounters with God creates part of the unique dynamic within Pentecostal services. I will show how these encounters relate to speech codes and a unique psychology, sociology, and spirituality.

Theology and the Speech Community

Driscoll’s triad somewhat deceptively objectifies a text as equal with two groups of people, the church, and surrounding milieu. While a text is an objectification by nature, the triad places the text somewhere in the midst of people and only by symbolism places God in the mix. For the purposes of study here, the triad helpfully includes communication content with culture and the church but one must keep in mind that it is a research construct.

Pentecostal theology always understood theologically that God through the Holy Spirit founded the church and empowered its communication on the Day of Pentecost.

The same Holy Spirit is the one who raised Jesus from the dead and He now dwells in the believer. Since the Holy Spirit dwells in the believer's inward parts, and since the Holy Spirit energizes a believer's communication, in a very real way Pentecostals believe that God through the Holy Spirit is part of their speech community and co-authors some of their communication, the Ultimate Co-author. Theologian Roger Stronstad (1984, 1999) went a step beyond, saying that God founded the church as a community of prophets, people speaking on God's behalf. He used the term "the prophethood of the believer" to inclusively define the unique identity he believed was intended for every Christian. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is not one "out there" inspiring the Bible and subsequently encountering people in worship, the Spirit is one "in here," inside the believer, and therefore inside the speech community. Through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, gospel communication takes a home inside the believer implanted by the same Spirit who subsequently energizes the believer's communication.

God as a coauthor of communication infers a particular ecclesiology (the theology of the Church) for Pentecostals. Volf (1998) saw the church as the gathering of two or more believers under a common belief structure who were blessed by the Presence of God. He saw the Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as socially structured in an equal relationship with all three functioning for a common purpose in a perfect way. As each functions they are always connected through a social relationship marked by perfect self-giving toward the other two. Volf said that the church was invited to participate in relationship with the Trinity in the same way. Macchia (2006) built on Volf's theology, adding that Spirit baptism was the term used in the Bible for God's presence entering a Christian. The resultant ecclesiology vitally informs the Pentecostal speech community

because it is believed that God is present in their worship and that God comes to dwell inside of individuals. The ethnographic implications, however, are problematic. How can a researcher gain evidence that God is actually present in a speech community? Perhaps the evidentiary problems, however, are best solved by an agnostic approach to research as explicate in the Introduction. The researcher can simply accept that the worshippers believe that God is present and determine what that means for them. While the researcher does not know if God is present, the researcher also cannot disprove God being present in the speech community. Therefore, it is better to accept that worshippers believe that He is present and explore what that means to the community members.

Summary

The methods for research flowed directly from the two theories, SCT and Driscoll's triad. The two theories combined to work out variations from church to church within a specific speech community. SCT was especially useful for the study of Pentecostals because, when combined with theology, it allows for inclusion of God within the speech community, a claim consistent with their theology and speech within worship. The methods used to uncover their speech codes were standard guidelines flowing from the theoretical implications as delineated primarily by Carbaugh (1989), the focus of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3. METHODS

The study used methods consistent with SCT, working with the implications suggested within it for methodologies to access speech codes and narrative considerations. From this theory were derived methods used for research, data collection and organization, and data analysis. It also shaped the dataset, the selection of churches, pastors interviewed, and the congregation members interviewed. The study specifically considered the differences in the pastoral population, role of the surrounding milieu, and the speech community's response to that milieu in glossolalia, music selection and style, and use of rituals. To accomplish that task, ethnographic methods were employed including interviews and participant observation.

Speech Codes Theory suggests that a community's codes may be accessed in three specific actions, particularly "totemizing rituals," social dramas, and cultural myths (Philipsen 1997). Philipsen borrowed the term "totemizing rituals" from Victor Turner who described it as a "particular type of ritual," saying it is a "structured sequence of actions the correct performance of which pays explicit homage to a sacred object of a group or culture. Thus, a *totemizing ritual* is routinized but it also is a particularly poignant (meaningful) ritual. They are infused with the expression of emotional content" (1997, 140). *Cultural myths* for Philipsen were stories told to provide hearers with the raw material to interpret their own experiences. Both the hearer and interlocutor find the cultural myth intelligible because of deep-seated speech codes embedded with a speech community's communication learned through enculturation processes. In *social dramas*, a member of a speech community challenges another member of the community based on the morality of actions. In the next step, a reply is given to the challenge, usually by the

one being challenged. Subsequently, “the reply is either honored or dishonored” and the offender negotiates ways to reintegrate with the group (Philipsen 1997, 145). Since the primary situation of my researcher was worship services, the negotiation of a social drama differs because replies are different in those situations, differences that will be uncovered throughout the coming pages.

Participant Observation

I attended at least one worship service at each exemplar church, participating in the service and observing their habits, rituals, and trends for the purposes of uncovering the community’s speech codes (Philipsen, Coutu and Covarru 2005). Since each service was considered a narrative, narrative strategies guided my field note taking. Each service was observed based on criteria developed in pre-research fieldwork in a Pentecostal church. The criteria included demographic observations, spatial observations, attitude and atmosphere tones, expressions, sermon notes, narrative configurations, and general observations of patterns. Each service was digitally recorded with items marked in field notes where special attention might be needed later. Many aspects were accessible through observation, like use of technology to help narrate the liturgical celebration, music styles of the congregation, frequency of congregation participation within the service, operation of glossolalia and spontaneous prophecy, use of altar calls. Deeper meanings ascribed to rituals and practices were only accessible through interviews.

The churches represented a diverse group in size, demographics, and geography. (Appendix D contains more information) One church was in an urban area of Milwaukee, WI and had 2,500 people in attendance on Sunday morning. A suburban church from the Milwaukee, WI area had 1,000 people in weekend services in five services and two

different campuses. I visited Saturday evening services two different times. Twice I visited a suburban church of 2,500 people in Oak Creek, WI. Three churches were in the Phoenix, AZ metro area. Red Mountain Christian Center had four services on a weekend. I attended the Saturday evening service; additionally they had two Sunday morning services and an afternoon service in Spanish. I went to a Sunday morning service in a storefront church in an urban neighborhood that had approximately 100 people in the service. Sunday evening in the Phoenix area, I went to a suburban church in a retirement community. The people in that church said they had varied attendance because of the snowbird phenomena. The range was from 500 to 1,000 depending on the time of year. I went to a Sunday morning service in a new church that met in the pastor's house on the east side of the mountains in Albuquerque, NM. It has approximately twenty-five people. A church in Wichita, Kansas had four weekend services, one on Saturday evening, two on Sunday morning, and a service in Spanish. I went to both a Saturday evening service and the early service on Sunday morning. There were approximately 1,000 people who attended that church. One church was from rural Indiana in a smaller community. That church has approximately 100 worshipers every Sunday morning. Another church was in Iowa City, IA and had two Sunday morning services with 250 people in the services. I participated in the second service. Finally, one church was in a tourist area outside Knoxville, TN. There were approximately 500 people in the church.

In taking field notes, I concentrated on lots of details but used research categories rather than other categorization to avoid preconception and hegemonic influences. Categorical development then rose from grounded theory principles as time progressed in the field, allowing categories to arise from observation within the native field (Glaser and

Strauss 1967). The methodology avoided imposition of categories superimposed upon the data, which was particularly important since I was an insider to the group. The categories that emerged through the study were categories recognizable by the research subjects rather than outside categories imposed upon the speech community.

Participant observation follows a time-tested journey beginning with Malinowski, Mead and other anthropological pioneers (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). The principles of participant observation included both participation and observation as detailed in an ethnographic study of worship by Steven (J. H. Steven 2002). Steven found it helpful to differentiate between participation and observation with a taxonomy of participant, observer, participant observer, or observer participant (42). He further explained each as follows:

- (a) The ‘complete participant’, whose sustained observer presence in the research field is concealed, for example in covert observation of groups;
- (b) The ‘participant-as-observer’, whose observer status is acknowledged and sustained over a lengthy period;
- (c) The ‘observer-as-participant’, whose contact with informants is brief, formal and openly classified as observation;
- (d) The ‘complete observer’, who is identified with an eavesdropping role who may never really get to know the informants’ views. (J. H. Steven 2002, 42)¹

Within Steven’s taxonomy, I primarily functioned as a complete observer since I attended only one or two services at each church. Further, it was important to bring some

¹ Steven attributes the basic outline to Burgess (1984) who provided an expanded delineation of the four ideal types (1984, 79-82).

separation from my previous experiences to observe Pentecostal worship in a different way. Therefore, I stood when everyone else stood, closed my eyes for prayer, participated in the Lord's Supper at one church (though not at another), sang the songs, clapped when everyone clapped, read scripture along with everyone else, and took notes during sermons. However, I did not close my eyes during singing, raise my hands in worship, dance, or participate in other kinesthetic activity. Typically, I sat in the back to gain a better perspective on the activity of the entire room. At the end of services, I would often look down during prayer but not close my eyes completely so that I could observe any responses that might occur. In several churches, I was acknowledged as an observer-participant because the pastor publically welcomed me, particularly in one new church with twenty-five people meeting in the basement of the pastor's house where I was scheduled to interview people during an all-church lunch following the morning worship service.

Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) described a reflexive process. I often reflected on the role ascribed to me as a visitor within a church service. In my field notes I documented the perspective of an observer, though in a real way I was not just an observer because of my previous experience in Pentecostal worship services. Rather than running away from my previous experience (that would be impossible) I sought to build on that experience to document things that might otherwise go unnoticed by other researchers just becoming familiar with the attitudes and atmosphere of participatory, experiential, expressive worship.

Depth Interviews

Members of the exemplar churches were interviewed to ascertain the role worship plays in the interior and exterior of everyday life. They provided insight on how Pentecostal congregants allowed their faith to interact with the surrounding milieu as well as describing the meaning of salient aspects of worship. The interviews revealed that socialized (locally acculturated) congregants make use of speech codes throughout their everyday lives. It was important to determine the extent to which congregants made use of those speech codes in other aspects of their daily lives; further, as simultaneous members of multiple speech communities I sought to uncover how the speech codes advanced in worship services interacted with other aspects of their everyday life (Philipsen, Coutu and Covarru 2005). At the beginning of the study, it was expected that congregants from churches with an approach of accommodation toward surrounding milieu would divide their speech codes more thoroughly between their church speech community and other speech communities; conversely, those who maintain a less accommodating approach would be less influenced by surrounding culture.

Information from pastors was gathered through depth interviews with a standard schedule of questions (see Appendix A). Often churches have multiple pastors on the staff of the church, I spoke to the senior pastor when possible. However, in one case the senior pastor immediately referred me to another member of the pastoral staff. In a second situation, the senior pastor was new to the congregation so he referred me to the Communication Pastor who had been at the church for several years. In a third situation, I spoke to the Fine Arts Pastor who had extensive knowledge of the planning of worship and church activities and had been on the church's staff for over ten years. The interviews

provided information about the process for developing the service, their perspective on the nature of worship that led to uncovering speech codes, and their overall understanding of the interplay between surrounding milieu and their local church.

Pastors played a significant role in Pentecostal churches. The free form style of worship often required direction, boundaries, and even interpretation. The pastor guided worship with significant influence. Even when the influence was perceived as being directed by God, it still originated in human form through pastoral leadership. The significant role of a pastor made him/her ideal for uncovering the meanings and methods of worship. Pastors cannot be observed as a group in their role of guiding a congregation, making individual interviews a stronger method and an available one. Since determining meaning ascribed to various aspects of worship was one of the goals of this study, the research design relied heavily upon interviews. While in some Christian traditions the pastor stands between God and the people, Pentecostals take the view that the pastor stands with the people as a worshipper, one who leads the people to God but a fellow worshipper nonetheless.

Pentecostal pastors were selected based on purposive sampling to gain diversity, availability, and willingness to participate. The pastors represented various geographical and sociological congregations, with urban, suburban, medium and small cities all represented. The pastors were primarily male, though one interviewed pastor was female; additionally, one church was pastored by a married couple with the wife as the primary pastor. A variety of denominations were represented in the sample including Vineyard, Church of God (Cleveland, TN), Church of God in Christ, and Assemblies of God, all organizations which self-identify as Pentecostal or Charismatic.

Additionally I interviewed thirteen pastors whose churches I did not attend. Some of the pastors were interviewed at the Assemblies of God semi-annual General Council in 2011 in Phoenix, Arizona. Pastors at the national conference were selected based on availability at random and represented diverse populations. Pastors were from a small town in Maine, a mid-size city in Ohio, suburban California, mid-size cities in Louisiana and Wisconsin, urban Pittsburgh, rural Nebraska and Iowa. Those interviews were conducted in coffee shops, restaurants, or the convention center.

For purposes of question generation, Hunter (2006) suggested questions with a record of accomplishment of revealing salient information from pastors. While most of Hunter's specific questions were not ultimately useful for content, the general structure was a valuable guide. The questions were designed as open-ended questions to allow the interviewee maximum personal freedom to say as much or little as he/she desired (Keats 2000). The three categories of gospel narrative framing, cultural influence, and church worship formed the foundation for the questions. It was determined that general questions about worship were necessary to gain an understanding of how the pastors viewed worship. The pastors were asked what they taught others about worship. "Why should we worship?" (See Appendix A for a question schedule). Specific cultural questions were asked in several different sets, with the first set of questions seeking to determine how the church impacted surrounding milieu and the second set determining how it impacted the church. "How did you happen to come to this church? How is this church different from your previous church? Please describe the slice of society in which your church ministers." Information regarding the church was gained through comparison with various other churches within the minister's experiential knowledge, both in personal

history and within the local community. There were several questions about how the pastor presented the gospel message uniquely, particularly through questions about preaching. Specific questions were asked about worship practices. “What does it mean to raise your hands in worship?” “Why would people dance in worship?” Follow-up questions were built into the question schedule and were asked based on responses to other questions or to gain additional insight (Keats 2000, ch. 5). Probe questions were also asked to explore further things that arose in the interviews (Keats 2000, ch. 4). Spontaneous questions were asked from time to time to help gain insight into specific things observed within a local congregation or the surrounding milieu.

Reflexive research made use of all information within an interview, including the personhood and subjectivity of the interviewer (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). Using this framework, even failed questions provided useful information about presuppositions within the interviewer or core values of the interviewee. Questions that did not immediately elicit answers along intended lines offered information about the subjects that challenged previously held concepts or revealed deep ideas. Reflexive interviewing also made use of the information gained through the presented identity of the interviewer. In this case, I presented myself as a fellow Pentecostal pastor so the pastors talked to me like an insider with the presuppositions of an insider and the language of an insider, using familiar slang like describing an event as a “God-thing” to describe events believed to transpire only through divine intervention.

Congregation members were also interviewed at churches I visited. Twenty-six congregation members were interviewed including ten females and sixteen males. Congregants were found primarily by local church staff members, though in one case I

interviewed someone standing in the church's café. In another situation, I was sent to a small group meeting and took volunteers (two men) for individual interviews. In one other situation, I interviewed someone through a connection of a mutual friend in order to gain a different perspective on a particular church. Congregants were asked similar questions to pastors (see Appendix B) only recognizing that congregants do not plan aspects of the worship service but function as participants. I did not inform congregation members of my status as a Pentecostal or pastor until an interview was complete. In one church, it seemed the local contact who selected the interviewees might have told the interviewees, based on off-the-record comments made by the interviewees. In one setting, I introduced myself to an individual as a pastor during the all-church lunch to which I was invited, subsequently inviting that person to be formally interviewed (documented in the interview transcript). Further, within the same metropolitan area where I live an interviewee had heard my name mentioned as a pastor previously and addressed me as pastor. Primarily I concealed my role so that interviewees did not feel they needed to provide "ideal-type" answers to a pastor but could respond in the most natural way possible. Because the questions were written in the language of the speech community so they might better relate, some interviewees inferred the role of an insider anyway.

Analysis Methods

Each of the fifty interviews was recorded and transcriptions were made. A thematic analysis was applied using a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss 1967) with codification based on themes from the transcribed data. The goal was to determine a common speech code that guided the worship service. The interview codification used MAXQDA software that required me to code every interview segment

by theme but allowed future analysis and rapid retrieval within the entire dataset. Over two-hundred fifty discrete themes arose from the data (see Appendix C) and were subcategorized using potential information for speech codes.

Carbaugh examined various cultural terms used for talking and suggested a method for ethnographic communication study (Carbaugh 1989). The researcher should examine various terms used for talk and then explore the meaning of those terms within the speech community. In his analysis cultural ways of speaking followed four levels of verbal performance: the level of act, the level of event, the level of style, the level of functional shaping of speech (98-103). The act level points toward “individual performances of communication” (98). The level of event moves beyond acts of individual performance and indicates a type of action that requires two or more speakers and is characterized by “coenactments of communication” (99). The style level refers to speech enactments where one enactment is selected over other possible choices (100). The fourth level of the functional level carries a functional claim that “terms for talk accomplish various sociocultural ends, indirectly or reflexively” (101). These four levels produce three various kinds of messages: messages about communication, messages about society, and messages about personhood, according to Carbaugh.

Sampling

I attended services at four churches in the Southwest region of the United States, one in the Great Plains, five in the Upper Midwest, and one in Appalachia. I attended the Saturday evening service in three of the churches, the Sunday evening service at two churches including two separate occasions at one of those churches, and Sunday morning services at the other churches. From interview data of pastors, Saturday evening and

Sunday morning services have a different kind of crowd but nearly identical content. Since churches were often selected from a distance, as much as possible I attempted to gain representation from a variety of styles of worship (Poloma and Green 2010) but found remarkable similarities even with the diversity.

The Limitations of Ethnography

Ethnography uncovers phenomenological truths, the experience of reality of individuals. In the field of communication, some researchers use ethnographic methods such as participation observation and interviews; typically the term cultural studies describes their research. Since I used such methods, I report things as they were found, not as things ought to be according to theological assertions. Therefore, theologians may find assistance within the project but not from my programmatic theology; rather, within the cultural communication descriptions and analysis theologians will also find descriptive theology in praxis. The last chapter will contain some programmatic theological reflections based on the analysis of research. Ethnographic methods advance research best when uncovering practices and processes that point to universal theories about humanity and not theological truths. Programmatic theology describes what ought to be, a task for which the tools of ethnography are not suited. It would be like drilling a hole with a table saw. Ethnography may well uncover ethical implications for theology (Scharen and Vigen 2011) and ethical implications may point to a wider agenda; however, that is a task for someone else. Ethnography and theology access different truths. Theology is forward looking by nature because it takes things as they are and prescribes how they should become based on eternal implications (Faupel 1996; Macchia 2010). Ethnography takes things as they are and attempts to predict how those things will

develop if the current trajectory holds steady, where theology attempts to bend that trajectory toward God or observes the degree to which it might bend toward God.

Summary

The methods of interview and observation allowed me to glimpse the rituals, cultural myths, and social dramas of the Pentecostal speech community, through which I was able to arrive at answers to the research questions. How do diverse approaches to surrounding cultural milieu (local and regional influences) impact speech codes in Pentecostal faith communities and in turn faith and practice of congregants? How does the message reframing for cultural adaptation impact rituals and speech codes, faith, and practice? How do the variety of speech codes from congregation to congregation within the Pentecostal speech community with a variety of expressions, impact socialization within each congregation? How do existential encounters with the divine presence define the daily narratives outside worship services for Pentecostals? How is this evident through speech codes? How do the many speech codes within each particular Pentecostal congregation comprise the speech codes of U.S American Pentecostalism?

I will next consider the history and doctrine of the Pentecostal speech community to provide background for subsequent data and analysis. The history and doctrine inform the intelligibility of cultural myths and explain social dramas observed in research and set the context in which the SCT data can be analyzed.

CHAPTER 4. HISTORY OF PENTECOSTAL CHURCHES

Wherever the story of Pentecostalism begins, it jumps into the middle of a conversation already partially told. The Pentecostal tradition has roots dating back to the early 1800's and the Second Great Awakening with energetic singing and wild manifestations (Stone 1853). Before that, however, the waters of the historical stream flowed into the Second Great Awakening from the First Great Awakening (McLoughlin 1979), whose waters flowed from the Puritan Awakening of the 1640's in New England (McLoughlin 1979). Before that, the Reformation molded and shaped Christian thought as a restoration movement, seeing the task as restoring specific proclivities to the Christian faith that the reformers believed were lost through the years but certainly present in the first century Christian church. Because the Pentecostal tradition predates the actual phenomena which distinctively defines it, many aspects of the tradition resemble other Christian traditions and find more things for agreement than disagreement.

Funding Pentecostalism

Many historians began describing the tradition in the mid nineteenth century (Dayton 1987; Blumhofer 1993; Wacker 2001; A. Anderson 2004); however, Sweeney (2005) envisioned a more continuous stream of Evangelical development out of which the Pentecostal experience was born, a vision that dated to the Reformation. Hyatt (1996) followed a continuous stream from the early church and traced phenomena associated with the Pentecostal movement through every major era of church history. At minimum

contemporary Pentecostalism gained something significant from each of the previous major revival movements.

The movement did not just appear on the scene suddenly but flowed from the stream of U.S American Christianity.¹ The Reformation turned Protestant churches toward the Bible in a new way, making the Bible the final rule of faith and practice. The reformers saw themselves as restorationists, bringing back the original ministry of the first century. The Puritan Awakening of the 1640's brought an emphasis to U.S American religion on the individual nature of one's religious experience, rather than a faith simply handed down generation by generation within the community. The First Great Awakening brought greater intensity to the religious experience and made the dramatic experience acceptable through the ministry of George Whitefield (Pollock 1972). The Second Great Awakening brought great manifestations as well as ushering in the tent meeting style revival. The altar call had begun under the ministry of George Whitefield in the First Great Awakening but was perfected by Charles Finney in the Second Great Awakening. Social reform flowed directly from the Second Great Awakening, including women's suffrage, the abolition movement, and prohibition. While the culmination of many of those movements did not appear until well after the end of the awakening period, the seeds were germinated in the Second Great Awakening. U.S America struggled with social reform during the mid-nineteenth century.

¹ Brumback's book *Suddenly ... From Heaven* (1961), accomplished a major task at the time of publication. Perhaps without his historical account further scholarship would not have been available. He quoted voluminous diaries and other documents where people spoke in tongues in the late nineteenth century. Yet, he simultaneously gives the impression that the Pentecostal experience appeared suddenly as a gift from heaven at the dawn of the twentieth century. Brumback helpfully situates the early movement within the broader of US American religious landscape of the early twentieth century.

After the immense struggle, another movement came into its own through the ministry of Dwight L. Moody and many others in the late nineteenth century. Their experience did not reconfigure the religious landscape as much as it refined and popularized those things already in place. The emphasis of Moody and his colleagues was on conversion-salvation, with the attendant tasks of sending missionaries around the world and evangelists across the street. The Pentecostal movement inherited something from each of those movements to become a movement characterized by being Bible centered, individually experienced, with dramatic manifestations in a wild manner, revivalistic, as well as restorational, and evangelistic.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, many in the church looked to social reform based on love and justice as a guiding light for the work of the church. Propelled by the scientific age and new biblical scholarship originating in Germany, many denominations followed a pathway leading away from a common sense reading of scripture (Archer 2004) which often meant moving away from a belief in the miraculous. As the number of churches grew who were captivated by the scientific understanding of reality, the commitment to miracles intensified by some groups in the tradition of Moody and Finney.

Founding Pentecostalism

With a firm commitment to the miraculous and a common sense reading of scripture Charles Fox Parham, the leader of a Bible college in Kansas, challenged his students to read the Bible and try to discover evidence for tongues-speech. They were to determine if tongues-speech was still valid and to determine if it was the evidence of Spirit baptism. On January 1, 1901 Agnes Ozman, one of his students, was in prayer

seeking God. She had searched scripture and had become convinced that tongues-speech was still valid. On the first day of 1901, she prayed using tongues-speech. News spread throughout the rest of the small collection of students and then throughout the region and nation. Quickly the experience of tongues-speech became associated with Spirit baptism and it became the fulfillment of prayers for a spiritual revival for many people around the country.

The evidence suggested that had it not happened at Parham's school, the Pentecostal experience might well have taken place in any number of other places soon afterward. It might have happened among the Christians at Zion, Illinois, under the leadership of John Alexander Dowie or just to the south in Chicago with the many Christians seeking something deeper from God (Faupel 1996). It might have happened in New York under the ministry of A. B. Simpson or in the Northeast through the direction of A. J. Gordon (Faupel 1996). It might have happened among the ministry of A. J. Tomlinson, whose newly formed group of churches (the Church of God) was seeking something deeper. There were ministries throughout the country experiencing an awakening of phenomena and any one of those places might have been the place God chose but Parham's school in Topeka, Kansas, was the place many credit with initiating the United States Pentecostal movement.

Parham began teaching about the new experience, traveling to various locations where he could get an audience (Faupel 1996). As news spread of the revival experience, Parham's popularity as a speaker grew quickly. In 1905, he moved his ministry to Houston, Texas where he started a short-term ministry training school. One young man was very curious and desperately wanted to sit under Parham's training; however,

William Seymour was African American and therefore unable to sit in the classroom with the other students according to culture. Rather than upset the situation, Seymour was allowed to sit outside and listen to the classes. That one event symbolized the racial division that characterized the early years. The separation allowed for the development of preferred practices in Black Pentecostalism as well as other groups of Pentecostals.

Developing Worship Practices

Seymour traveled to Los Angeles, and through a series of events, he ended up holding meetings in a stable on Azusa Street (Faupel 1996). It was at the Azusa Street gatherings that early Pentecostalism was shaped. Some researchers date the birth of the movement to the Azusa Street revival (Cox 2001) because of the enormous influence those revivals had on the movement's spirituality, worship, service (anti)structure, and emphasis on charismatic gifts. Seymour's African Spirituality roots influenced the Azusa Street revivals in a great way and subsequently influenced all of Pentecostal Christianity (Hollenweger 1997). From that influence came spontaneity primarily for most of the other phenomena have been traced to other historical developments. Hollenweger specifically traced his theory of oral liturgy to the influence of African spirituality. From the same root, various cultural differences developed even in the earliest years.

Many of the physical phenomena were traced to earlier revival movements, particularly the Cane Ridge revivals in Kentucky at the beginning of the Second Great Awakening and the Methodist revivals of the late nineteenth century (Wacker 2001, ch. 6). The Azusa street revivals became a concentration of many of those manifestations, particularly lying motionlessly on the ground for extended periods of time, which Wacker (2001) described as being like a corpse. A newspaper reporter from Bridgeport,

Connecticut reported on revival services in 1913 describing some worshippers lying on the ground motionless for hours, others shook in a motion like the tango, while still others embraced and kissed (Wacker 2001). It is no wonder theologian Fee described his early childhood in a Pentecostal church saying, “Whatever else, Pentecostal services in our younger days were not dull!” (Fee 1996, ch. 13) Leaders cultivated a sense that worship in the Holy Spirit “occurred according to divine, not mundane, rules by highlighting the supernatural signs and wonders that accompanied the event” (Wacker 2001, 103). The early worship was marked by being “fanatic,” which was not to be feared, according to Agnes Ozman (quoted in Wacker 2001, 106). Wacker commented, “Ozman had redefined the term *fanatic* so that it meant abandonment to the Holy Spirit’s superintendence, not human caprice” (emphasis original, Wacker 2001, 106).

Early meetings sometimes included “synchronized behavior” like “glory marches” that Wacker described as believers joining hands and parading around the perimeter of the meeting hall (2001, 109). Sometimes entire congregations would be required to stand and pray with their hands uplifted. Other times most of a congregation would leap and dance in perfect time, according to A. J. Tomlinson’s writings (quoted in Wacker 2001).² From the earliest days, loud and enthusiastic corporate singing typified Pentecostals with people coming just to hear the singing, according to Wacker (2001). Wacker interprets the music as a tool used by the leaders to control the intensity and emotion of the services, ratcheting up the tempo until saints “broke into ecstatic praise” or slowing down the tempo when things got too intense (Wacker 2001, 109).

² In my interview data two people from a ten-year-old congregation described forming a conga-line to celebrate their first Sunday in their new church building!

While many churches on the U.S American nineteenth century landscape worshipped in wonderful buildings, there were also plenty of places of worship that were less august gathering places, especially on the frontier. Tent meetings were not unfamiliar to evangelicals and even open air meetings were acceptable. Since the Pentecostal experience was unpopular in many places with the existing church institutions, early Pentecostals met wherever they could find a meeting house. The movement had grown in notoriety in the stable on Azusa Street and worshippers did not feel the need to meet in fancy buildings as long as they were able to experience the presence of God in their services. The buildings were not important³ because their worship was more about the drama of God's interruption of everyday life as developed by God's interruption of their services. The kinesthetic movement and drama of God's interruption took center stage and an ornate building might even distract from the center stage drama.

Formalizing Pentecostal Institutions

The Pentecostal movement grew worldwide through a missions emphasis. As word spread around the world of the revival, some missionaries traveled to Azusa Street while others stayed in their own country and sought the experience of the Spirit's fullness (A. Anderson 2004). Spickard and Cragg (1994, 401) commented that the movement spread around the world in the first ten years without any strategy or institutional support. The early days were marked by people standing up in revival services and pledging their lives to global evangelism. They would prepare and leave for a foreign country with no

³ I remember as a child worshipping in an old paint store that the Assemblies of God church purchased twenty years earlier and converted to a house of worship. The upstairs apartment served as parsonage for the pastor.

language support and little financial backing. Their zeal was typically dashed by the harsh realities of the demands of everyday life in a foreign milieu. When institutions were formed, their original purposes included forming an association to advance the missionary cause with Pentecostal missionaries.

Existing groups of churches, loosely resembling denominations, became Pentecostal and still other groups of churches formed organizations in response to the movement. The Church of God now with headquarters in Cleveland, Tennessee, became Pentecostal when leader A. J. Tomlinson received Spirit baptism (Wacker 2001). Charles Mason was the leader of the Church of God in Christ when he visited the Azusa Street revival and received Spirit baptism. That organization subsequently became Pentecostal as well. In response to a need for another organization, a meeting was called in 1914 with an open invitation to all who wished to join in Hot Springs, Arkansas. The resulting organization was the Assemblies of God with early leadership by J. Roswell Flower and E. N. Bell. Many declined special invitations to attend the organizational meeting for a new denomination.

The decade of the 1910's saw several major splits over various issues. The first issue was racial. In the earliest days, the movement claimed that it represented true unity within the church world. At Azusa Street people of all nationalities and ethnicities worshipped together for a few years, leading one preacher to say, "The color line was washed away by the blood" (Cox 2001). People from all walks of life, various ethnicities, and across the socio-economic spectrum all worshipped together at the Azusa Street revival. It did not take long, however, for the movement to split along racial lines. The racial tension separated Pentecostals organizationally until the 1990's. From the same

root came several trees separated by culture. Second, a great debate occurred between 1910 and 1915 over the doctrine of the “finished work” espoused by William Durham (Faupel 1996). The finished work doctrine was easy to understand because it simply stated that if a person accepted the work of Jesus for forgiveness, no other work was needed for sanctification (or separation from sin) and nothing else was taught by scripture. His view greatly influenced those who gathered for the formation of the Assemblies of God. Others, however, such as A. J. Tomlinson, C. H. Mason, and J. H. King, all decried the view and held to a view that came from the Wesleyan holiness movement. That view held that a second work after conversion-salvation brought holiness or perfection. In the second half of the decade, the movement would split again over whether or not God was Trinitarian in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit or if all three were represented in the figure of Jesus. All the schisms resulted in the development of multiple organizations and denominations.

Tension From Maturity

Through the years the institutions and ancillary organizations grew, formalized, and went through the cycles of institutions (Menzies 1971; Conn 1994; Alexander 2011). As the institutions grew, a tension developed within the movement between a drive for institutional growth and maintaining the earliest sensibilities of spontaneity, which characterized the movement’s worship but destroys efficacy within institutional structures. Various revival and renewals have kept the Pentecostal movement pointed toward spontaneity. For example, the healing crusades of the 1940’s and 1950’s brought great emphasis to the doctrine of healing but also stimulated the sensibility of spontaneity through exuberant celebration when a person experienced physical healing.

The Charismatic Renewal took place when members of mainline denominations such as Lutheran or Roman Catholic received Spirit baptism in the Pentecostal understanding of the experience. By all accounts, it reached popularity when students on Roman Catholic university campuses heard about the experiences of a few and started prayer meetings seeking the experience (Csordas 1997), particularly a group of students at Notre Dame University had a Pentecostal experience in a prayer meeting. The experience spread throughout the university campus and then to other universities. Some traditions like the Roman Catholic Church eventually welcomed charismatics (Csordas 1997), while other denominations rejected them completely. Confident in the vitality of their new experience, people from those denominations left and often found acceptance within Pentecostal churches. Until that time, Pentecostals had worshipped primarily in their own churches without much influence from other Christians. The Charismatic Renewal, however, greatly influenced Pentecostal churches when people from other Christian traditions came into churches but without the strict rules that marked Pentecostals, particularly concerning clothing and entertainment venues. Some worshippers did not find a new home so new churches were started to accommodate the unique proclivities of Charismatics, including the Vineyard churches.

The decade of the 1990's saw several well-chronicled revivals that impacted the Pentecostal movement, one in a Vineyard church and one in an Assemblies of God church. In Toronto at a church named the Toronto Airport Vineyard a revival with great manifestations took place in the early 1990's. The revival was marked by wild manifestations, even by historical standards, with reports of people barking like dogs or howling like animals, deep laughter (the most widely associated phenomena) leading to

the term “The Toronto Blessing.” The church no longer associates with the Vineyard association of churches but continues with ministry (Percy 2011). The second revival of the 1990’s was in the Brownsville Assembly of God church in Pensacola, Florida. It also was known for great manifestations that often included mass groups of people falling to the ground in a phenomenon known as being “slain in the Spirit.” Their services often lasted five to six hours and were conducted five nights a week for five years (A. Anderson 2004).

Many of these historical developments influence what a worshipper would see when walking into a Pentecostal church. Several more developments merit brief mention also. The rise of the mega church has been well chronicled in sociological literature and Pentecostal churches certainly enter that mix. Very large churches offer buffet style ministries with everything from support groups to jazzercise classes, large-scale productions to children’s ministries for every grade level. Many of those churches (and other size churches) are structured similarly to the five purposes in the Purpose Driven Church: fellowship, discipleship, ministry, worship, and evangelism (Warren 1995). Through the purpose driven structure, some Pentecostal churches found a way to maintain vitality while still developing institutional structure. The last development worth mentioning is the explosion of theological writing within the Pentecostal community that began in the early 1990’s and continues today. The Pentecostal theological cupboard once was filled sparsely but now overflows with helpful resources. I will next open that overflowing cupboard for a look at the doctrine of the Pentecostal speech community.

CHAPTER 5. PENTECOSTAL THEOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

Pentecostals often live in the narratives of the Bible. Those narratives shape and mold their theology in profound ways. Perhaps the inevitable result was that theological development was based on spirituality and not dogma, as Land has shown (2010). A theology based on spirituality inevitably derives from the narrative of the other's spirituality and leads to personal narrative. In spite of the debates about the role of narrative in Biblical interpretation,¹ the narratives dominate biblical interpretation for Pentecostals. The proclivity toward Biblical narrative led Archer (2004) to include narrative criticism as a major component of his hermeneutical model.² Narrative criticism is a systematized method of studying Biblical narrative.

Archer (2007) further developed the connection between spirituality and narrative by suggesting that Pentecostal theology should use narrative theology as the "manner" of theological method. By narrative, Archer means "to highlight the importance of understanding scripture as a grand meta-narrative with the Gospels and Acts as the heart of the Christian story." Narrative becomes a way "of grasping and making sense of the whole of God's inspired authoritative witness." Narrative provides a "coherent and

¹ A great debate raged throughout the last decade of the twentieth century about the role of narrative in Pentecostal hermeneutics, partially sparked by an assertion from the great New Testament scholar and Pentecostal, Gordon Fee (Fee 1991) along with Scott Stuart (Fee and Stuart 1981). They asserted that narrative had little to offer in the way of normative Christian living. There were replies in various publications such as *Pneuma* and *Paraclete*. Menzies and Menzies (2000) wrote an extensive reply specifically addressing Fee's concerns. Mittelstadt (2010) offered an engaging recitation of the debate with numerous helpful citations.

² Archer relies heavily on Powell's (1990) introductory book on narrative criticism.

cohesive structure for articulating Pentecostal theology” because of the connection between narrative and identity of a community, according to Archer. Archer further suggested that the narrative specifically center on the work of Jesus through the “Five-fold Gospel” which will be explicated throughout the chapter. For Archer, it “is not a set of quaint platitudes but deep-seated, affectionate affirmations flowing from our worship of the living God who has transformed our lives” (2010, 15).

The narratives told and retold within a community define and shape that community (Hauerwas 2001). “A people are formed by a story that places their history in the texture of the world. Such stories make the world our home by providing us with the skills to negotiate the dangers in our environment in a manner appropriate to our nature” (Hauerwas 2001, 175). For example, U.S Americans are shaped by the story of Independence as established on July 4, 1776. As that story is told and retold annually the community reaffirms its identity and commitment to perpetuate aspects of independence initially established. For another example, the story of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus defines and shapes the Christian community throughout the world in all ages. The drama of the crucifixion/resurrection is the logic of the New Testament, propelling the arguments in didactic portions as well as defining the examples in the narrative portions. The Pentecostal unique reading of that narrative is that God was making a way to dwell with His people through the drama of the crucifixion/resurrection.

Theological Narrative

Land (2010) and others see the importance of examining Pentecostalism within the first ten to fifteen years of the twentieth century for guidance. It is important to examine the roots, they claim, in order to proceed with an adequate understanding of

Pentecostalism. While there is strong merit in examining the theology and doctrinal teaching of the first generation of Pentecostals, contemporary influences from many other locations also impress upon pastors and congregants so that contemporary Pentecostal theology and practice is more full than in the earliest days. Through those influences Pentecostalism meshes with cultural experiences. More academic Pentecostal theology has been written in the last twenty-five years than in the previous eighty-five years. In spite of all the writing, updating, reconfiguring, deconstructing, and reconstructing, the framework remains much the same. The framework of the earliest Pentecostal theologians (who were pastors, evangelists, or missionaries) established a five-fold narrative of the gospel centered on the contemporary work of Jesus in His church. I will argue that it is best to approach the Five-fold Gospel as a narrative with each aspect a metaphor representing a portion of the Christian life. When seen as metaphors, the Five-fold Gospel continues to encompass most of Pentecostal theology and practice throughout U.S American churches. Before examining the five-fold metaphoric narrative, I will first examine the theological significance of the Bible in Pentecostal theology and practice.

The Narrative Source

For many years Pentecostal theology was noted for its simplicity,³ largely because it appeared mostly in doctrine books such as that published by Nelson (1934) or Pearlman (1943) which were intended to explain theology entirely based on the Bible and without

³ Macchia (2006) pointed out that much of the early theology was written in pamphlets, devotional books, and other non-academic writings. Academic Pentecostal scholarship did not appear until around 1970, a full 70 years after the initial out pouring in Kansas.

interaction with other scholars. The goal was to present a theology based entirely on the Bible without the opinion of man. In the Assemblies of God, a large Pentecostal denomination, the earliest discussions about doctrinal statements encouraged simplicity that allowed for diversity and development of thought which created a great deal of flexibility. As Pentecostals moved from nation to nation, cultural proclivity to cultural proclivity, the flexibility of doctrine became adaptable with unique understandings arising within particular cultures (Yong 2005).

The adaptability of Pentecostal theology was guided by two primary aspects, the centrality of the Bible as the authoritative guide for theology and practice, along with making allowances for the power of the Holy Spirit to operate within the community of faith. First, the Bible was considered the “authoritative rule of faith and conduct” for all matters of life and Godliness (Menzies and Horton 2004, 13). The Bible received such a vaunted treatment because U.S American Pentecostals believed that the Bible was inspired by God through a revelation process that used human beings to do the writing but the message came directly from God. Historically, the belief in the inspiration of Scripture reacted against mainline denominations who took other approaches in the late nineteenth century. For Pentecostals in the early twentieth century it led to reliance on the Bible as the textbook for learning. “Having biblical support for one’s belief and practice was a very serious matter. ‘For if it is not in the Bible Ye need not believe it, but if it is in the Word of God, Ye *must* receive it’” (Archer, 2004, p. 79).⁴ A look at the early sermons of Charles Fox Parham and Sarah Parham, the leaders of the Bible College where Agnes

⁴ Quoting R. Parham (Parham and Parham 1941) Archer’s n. 57 says the emphasis is original with Parham, page 93. It is on page 98 in the copy (Parham and Parham 1941) found at <http://apostolicfaithonline.org/SelectedSermonsOfCharlesParham152pages.pdf>.

Ozman first spoke in tongues on January 1, 1900, showed that the Parhams' only text book was the Bible and their absolute belief in the Bible was unquestioned and unquestionable (Parham and Parham 1941).

Archer (2004) chronicled the historical development of Pentecostal theology on the Bible. Pentecostals interpreted the Bible through what Archer calls the Bible Reading Method that “was a commonsensical method that relied upon inductive and deductive interpretative reasoning skills” (Archer, 2004, p. 74). One of the fundamental methods used in the Bible Reading Method was “interpreting Scripture in light of Scripture” (Archer, 2004, p. 75). It was believed that many problems one might have with interpretation could be resolved by allowing scripture to interpret itself. The Bible Reading Method, therefore, relied heavily upon reading a lot of Scripture on a particular subject and putting together understanding on that subject based on “the whole counsel of God,” appropriating a term used by the Apostle Paul (Acts 20:27). Even categories of understanding came directly from reading voluminous portions of scripture or with the help of looking up a word in a Bible concordance and finding every reference to the word in Scripture (Archer 2004, 74). The early Bible Reading Method did not rely on a different interpretative method than some other groups of the early twentieth century but relied on “a ‘*distinct narrative*’ which held the similar methods together in a coherent and cohesive interpretive manner” (emphasis original, Archer 2004, 94). The nature of the method came from a “revivalistic-restorational” attitude (Archer, 2004, 124) and had as one of the primary goals access to scripture by all people. Anyone who could read could use the interpretative method.

Contemporary Pentecostals often rely on more sophisticated methods (for example, see Yong, 2002) with a variety of options available for Biblical interpretation (Oliverio 2009). Proclivities established during the days when the Bible Reading Method dominated Pentecostal literature still lingers within both scholarly writing and everyday church life. The narrative quality of Pentecostal biblical interpretation established within the pattern remains active in its theology (Stronstad 1984, 1999). Because of that emphasis, a narrative approach to theology often provided pertinent insight. The emphasis on narrative from within the Pentecostal milieu suggested that narrative approaches to communication research uniquely suit this group and informed my decision to use narrative approaches within my study.

As the Pentecostal movement developed in the early years of the twentieth century theological differences emerged between Pentecostals and Evangelicals. While glossolalia dominated the conversation, the gospel narrative that configured the initial investigation into tongues-speech differentiated Pentecostals as well. Archer observed that “what distinguished the early Pentecostal community from the Holiness folk was not their exegetical method, nor simply the so-called unique doctrine of Spirit baptism; rather, what distinguished the Pentecostal community from other Christian communities was their distinct narrative – a particular twist on the Christian story” (Archer 2010, 20). That narrative developed through a pattern often called the Five-fold Gospel, the Four-square Gospel, or the Full Gospel. Dayton (1987) has helped to clarify the situation. Some well-known evangelists and pastors such as Aimee Semple McPherson⁵ and A. B.

⁵ McPherson founded what is now known as The International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, a Pentecostal denomination whose web site claims 66,888 churches

Simpson⁶ advocated a four-fold gospel with Jesus as the savior, baptizer in the Spirit, healer, and soon coming King. Dayton also observed that the four themes are “well-nigh universal within the movement” (Dayton 1987, 21).

Dayton (1987) detailed Pentecostal theology through the lens of the four-pointed narrative but acknowledged a five-fold pattern that adds Jesus as the sanctifier, or the one who sets believers apart for specific purposes. Contemporary theologians typically use the five-fold pattern (Archer 2004, 2010; Macchia 2006).⁷ The five-fold pattern allows for the inclusion of significant aspects of practices of their beliefs that are not available through the four-pointed narrative, such as Christian education, spiritual formation practices, and character development through mentoring, to name a few; therefore, the five-fold pattern is preferred as it pertains to the narrative structure of Pentecostal theology. Archer (2010) used the five-fold pattern as the “gospel narrative” unique to the tradition and built significant portions of theology around the narrative structure.

Before explicating the Five-fold Gospel narrative, one additional theological proclivity of the Pentecostal community is worth noting. At its inception, Pentecostalism was a restorationist movement seeking to restore the church to aspects of the Biblical

and meeting points internationally within the “family” of churches. (Our Purpose -- The Foursquare Church).

⁶ A. B. Simpson founded the denomination the Christian and Missionary Alliance. Simpson was not a Pentecostal.

⁷ The Foursquare Church still maintains the four-fold pattern, as does the Assemblies of God. The Church of God (Cleveland, TN) adheres to the five-fold pattern. During the interviews done for this research, this way of talking about the Pentecostal narrative seldom came up with direct references though clearly each element of the five-fold pattern existed in each of the churches visited and were points of agreement for each of the pastors even if the pastors chose to talk about it in different ways.

narrative that were thought lacking. As a restoration movement, the early Pentecostals believed that they were the last in-gathering of souls before the return of Jesus (R. M. Anderson 1979). Thus, they often used the metaphor of the “latter rain” to refer to what was taking place and as a source of identity (R. M. Anderson 1979).⁸ When applied metaphorically, the latter rain referred to an outpouring of the Holy Spirit before the final gathering of believers to be with Jesus in eternity. Since the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit in the early twentieth century came as the latter rain, it was important that the church of the latter outpouring of the Spirit reflect the practices of the first outpouring of the Spirit upon the first century disciples as recorded in the book of Acts (Dayton 1987). Out of a restoration proclivity arose a theology of signs and wonders (Archer 2004) that accentuated an expectancy that God would perform miracles today for people who prayed with true faith. Though I doubt that few (if any) of the congregation members interviewed for the current research project would understand the term “latter rain,” nevertheless, it is a helpful term for understanding the history of adopting of the Five-fold Gospel narrative. The five points were never intended to be a complete narrative but only a restoration of texture of first century beliefs and practices captured in narrative form. Karkkainen (2007) helpfully noted that the term “full gospel” should not be understood as meaning a fuller gospel than other Christian traditions espouse but “is rather an attempt to identify the basic elements of a biblical gospel.”

In the terms of Berger and Luckmann (1967), the plausibility structure of Pentecostals includes the supernatural in-breaking of God into the natural order of things.

⁸ The image of the latter rain is a Biblical term taken from Joel 2:23 and refers in actuality to seasonal rain patterns with the first rain coming at the beginning of the harvest cycle and the latter rain coming right before the final gathering of grain.

Pentecostals find faith in the everyday-miracle-working power of God theologically plausible to the point of expecting such miracles to take place. The relevance structure is that part of a human that informs the basic relevance of information received. The relevance structure of Pentecostalism allows people to accept the preeminence of looking for God within the everyday events of life. In writing about anthropological epistemology, Luhrmann wrote about Pentecostals. “They also look for specific images that they feel are God’s intervention. Mundane psychological experiences – thoughts, images, and feelings – are taken to be God’s participation in a dialogue with the praying person” (T. M. Luhrmann 2007, 88). The social structure of the Pentecostal community provides a forum in which events with a supernatural element may be affirmed as God’s activity in everyday life.

I will use the Five-fold Gospel as an outline to explain the salient theological points necessary to provide an orientation for the reader even though contemporary theology moves into other theological aspects. While there are many other important aspects of Pentecostal theology, for the sake of providing access to non-theological readers the theology will be presented in plain language and with mostly a basic treatment of theological truths.⁹ The presentation of the order includes the theological logic that God would never fill an unclean vessel; therefore, Jesus as Sanctifier comes before Jesus as Spirit Baptizer.

⁹ Pentecostal theology has grown up over the last decade of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first century. Readers desiring a more in-depth treatment of theological points will find many helpful resources in the bibliography, most since 1990.

Jesus as Savior

One of the unifying motifs of the Christian faith is salvation through the forgiveness of sins from the death and resurrection of Jesus. The nature of that salvation and the means of receiving that salvation vary between Christian traditions. For Pentecostals forgiveness has always come when an individual places faith in Jesus and directly asks God for forgiveness through prayer. Salvation brings release from sins previously committed marking a new beginning for the believer in a life lived according to God's plan. Anthropologists used the word "rupture" to describe the nature of salvation because of the break with the past and beginning a new life (Meyer 2010). The theological metaphors often firmly established the rupture within the Pentecostal mindset by using terms like "new life" and "born again." I will use the term "conversion-salvation" because of the required rupture.

Pentecostal theologian Land's triad in spirituality directly implicates information about salvation (Land 2010). Conversion-salvation is never the property of beliefs only but always the full completion of all three areas of spirituality. A person has not really received salvation unless it comes from the heart (the affections), lines up with a cognitive belief structure, and enacts changes in the way everyday life is lived. Ideally, each of the three aspects exists in equal balance. The emphasis in practices leaned toward orthopathy as the most important aspect of salvation because "with the heart one believes and is justified, and with the mouth one confesses and is saved" (Rom 10:10). Land defines orthopathy in relationship to the other two aspects:

The personal integrating center of orthodoxy and orthopraxy is orthopathy, those distinctive affections which are belief shaped, praxis oriented, and characteristic of a person. Affections are neither episodic, feeling states nor individualistic

sentiments. There are, of course, attendant feelings or emotions that come and go and intermingle in the affections over time. Unlike 'feelings' these affections are distinctively shaped and determined by the biblical story and evidence the marks of particular communal and historical location. (Land 2010, 34)

In some faith traditions, the theological delineation of orthodoxy, orthopraxy, and orthopathy may seem unnecessary. From that perspective, orthodoxy always implies an inner seriousness that touches the farthest reaches of cognitive processes such as imagination, intuition, moral decision making, and other areas. Orthodoxy implies an emphasis on praxis, for a person truly to engage in right beliefs, right actions will follow. A kernel of Pentecostal theology is embedded in that position for it is only unnecessary if right beliefs are understood as more than cognitive ascent on a handful (or more) positions. Orthopathy in particular not only explains the emotionalism displayed in their worship services but it also explains the process of individuals migrating from other Christian traditions to Pentecostal churches. As the interview data showed, such a migration typically comes from people who say they knew the right answers but did not apply it to their life in a way that came from their heart, a deep sense of inner conviction.

Pentecostals dwell solidly within the Evangelical theological spectrum with a belief that conversion-salvation is entirely the work of God. Humans are unable to achieve forgiveness without the work of Jesus because humanity is powerless to alleviate sin. Every person commits sin according to Pentecostal beliefs. Therefore, because everyone sins and no one is able to do anything about that sin in his or her power, humanity needs assistance from the outside. Jesus came to earth in the form of the God-man as one able to forgive because of his divinity, yet a worthy sacrifice because of his humanity.

Theologians and pastors often paint dramatic pictures of the reality of sin within humanity and direct that narrative toward the eternal consequences of sin. Those decisions made in the here and now affect existence in the hereafter, according to Pentecostal theology. Once the reality of sin is driven deep within the bedrock of the belief structure, the eternal reality comes clearly into view as eternal reward through union with Jesus or the eternal separation from Jesus in the fires of an actually existent hell (developed more fully in a subsequent section).

Against the backdrop of all the colors of the conversion-salvation picture, Pentecostals strongly advocate for evangelism as an extension of the salvation belief structure. By evangelism it is meant the communicating of their beliefs about conversion-salvation in such a way that the other may make an informed decision about receiving (or rejecting) conversion-salvation. Therefore, evangelism is not merely a sociological function of proselytization for the perpetuation of the group. The motivations for the activity involve empathy for the person who has not found forgiveness of sins, compassion for the person whose current choices will eternally separate them from God, and a desire to assist the other in coming into an experience that will bring a life transformation from old habits to new patterns. Thus the image of the blood of Jesus washing people clean plays a vital role.

Jesus as Sanctifier

Macchia (2006) has preferred to see sanctification as a metaphor for an aspect of the Christian life.¹⁰ Sanctification, as Pentecostals have so often stated, is a separation from the life of sin and to the life of Godliness (Pearlman 1943). Jenney followed the same logic when he stated that sanctification in its broadest sense, “is the process by which God is cleansing our world and its people” (Jenney 2007, 399). The metaphorical function captures both the separation aspect as well as implying that it is a “divine act of consecrating us from sin and transforming us into a living temple of praise” (Macchia 2006, 141). Some Pentecostals historically have seen sanctification taking place outside of culture while others have seen it taking place while interfacing with culture. Sanctification ties directly to everyday life through a life-style of worship.

The metaphoric aspects of sanctification imply an emphasis on individual growth in character. There is great overlap between the terms spiritual growth, sanctification, spiritual maturity, transformation, and spiritual formation. All of these terms are expressed in contemporary practices in Pentecostal churches. The everyday application of believers represents the metaphoric aspect of sanctification as much of their attention turns toward the theme of transformation. Spiritual life transformation (sanctification) is

¹⁰ Macchia (2006) followed Peter Toon who has showed that sanctification and justification are overlapping metaphors of the Christian life rather than more technical divisions. Some use theological terms concerning what Wayne Grudem (1995) has called the “Application of Salvation.” He treated justification and sanctification, as well as other application points, as separate processes that often have both an objective and subjective aspect. Macchia preferred to see justification and sanctification as overlapping metaphors with different emphases rather than through the prism of the objective/subjective divide (2006, 141). Further, by applying each as a metaphor, in my judgment, it recaptures the original intent of the first century language as well as furthering the task of narrative theology within Pentecostalism.

accomplished through Jesus and enacted in the life of the believer by the working of the Holy Spirit (for a sample see Fee 1994; Fee 1996; Macchia 2006) whether it is seen as a process or a crisis event.

The metaphor includes the ethical choices made every day; as such, for many years the Pentecostal approach to sanctification coupled with the twin word “holiness” defined a major portion of the believer’s identity. It was a negative definition of identity primarily, declaring those things to be avoided more than acceptable practices.

Pentecostal women were known for keeping their hair a particular length, wearing clothing of particular styles and length, refraining from wearing excessive jewelry (especially ear rings), and not using facial make up (Cox 2001). Pentecostal men were expected to keep their hair short and dress “like men.” All Pentecostals refrained from “worldly” entertainment that ranged from billiards to frequenting dance halls (Cox 2001).

Historically the belief of sanctification caused division within the Pentecostal churches. Even today the issue quickly divides based on expectations for external appearances. Further Pentecostal groups go in different directions about the process of sanctification as to whether or not the process is gradual over time or flows from a separate experience, a second work of grace. Macchia (2006), Jenney (2007), and others followed the life-time-process direction and represent the typical approach of the Assemblies of God and Charismatic groups. Those who see a definite event of sanctification find expression through theologians within the Church of God of Cleveland, TN such as Gause (2009). Gause has written, “The experience of sanctification ... is a crisis experience. It is an atonement based and produced experience” (Gause 2009, Kindle Loc. 2022). Since it is seen as a definite crisis event in

the same way as salvation and Spirit baptism, it can be called a third definite work of God's grace. In the same logic, each of the five narrative points are provided by the work of Jesus through his crucifixion and resurrection, thus providing the term "work of grace" and defining what is meant by being provided for by the "atonement." The atonement basis for each of the five major narrative metaphors unites most Pentecostals and Charismatics, with most understanding each metaphor as coming directly from the sacrificial work of Jesus.

Jesus as Spirit Baptizer

The experience of Spirit baptism in the Pentecostal tradition is complex with a wide variety of opinions, always sparking controversy both within the tradition and across the Christian theological spectrum. The controversy does not originate from the term itself for every Christian theological tradition recognizes the term in some fashion. Rather the disagreement originates from the distinctive twists within the Pentecostal community, largely stemming from the gospel narrative of its theology. Often the unique approach to Spirit baptism is called the "distinctive" of Pentecostals, especially in light of the connection to tongues-speech. While theologians were careful to distinguish the difference between tongues-speech and Spirit baptism, the evidence for this study will show that those lines often either are blurred or to the other extreme the connection does not exist at all. All of this led social sciences typically to focus on tongues-speech, almost exclusively until the last twenty years. Since it is seen internally as that-which-sets-apart, the theology of Spirit baptism became culturally bound to the group where changing the nature of the belief would unacceptably change the practices.

Such an important piece of the narrative puzzle fits well because it relies on a narrative interpretation of Scripture. As previously mentioned, the Bible vitally forms the foundation for Pentecostal theology, particularly when interpreted through the narrative portions. The pattern of Spirit baptism found within the biblical narrative of Acts 2 sets the stage for the contemporary understanding of the experience. While there were some who discourage the use of narrative events to establish normative patterns for Christian living based on the Bible (Fee, 1991), others pointed out the value of accepting Biblical narrative as instructive for living (Menzies and Menzies, 2000; Anderson 1994).¹¹

¹¹ Gordon Fee (1991), himself a Pentecostal (Fee 1996), offered a critique of the reliance on narrative. Menzies and Menzies (2000) succinctly summarize Fee's position. "Fee, following the lead of many Evangelicals, maintains that this line of argumentation rests on a shaky hermeneutical foundation. Its fundamental flaw is its failure to appreciate the genre of the book of Acts: This book is a description of historical events. Unless we are prepared to choose church leaders by the casting of lots or are willing to encourage church members to sell all of their possessions, we cannot simply assume that a particular historical narrative provides a basis for normative theology" (Kindle Loc. 2273-2277). Fee's (1990, 90-93) critique arises from a three-part move for interpreting Scriptural narrative: 1) Those things in the book of Acts which should be considered normative for contemporary application within the church are those things which the author intended to make normative. 2) What is incidental to the author's main narrative thread may indeed reflect the author's theology but should not have the same "didactic value" as what the narrative intended to teach. 3) To establish historical patterns from scripture as normative for today, authorial intent must first be established. Fee's second point has never been disputed within Pentecostal theology because few have believed that the sharing of goods mentioned several times, particularly in Acts 4, established a Biblical precedent for communal living or politics.

Anderson (1994) helpfully addresses historical patterns within narrative by concentrating on agency. If God is seen as the central actor within the Biblical narrative then historical episodes at least demonstrate God's dealing with his people in a particular way at least once. Anderson said that because the narratives are true accounts of what happened and not fabrications, then it is better to assume "that what God did, God does, until it is proved otherwise." Anderson further stated that putting authorial intent as the highest priority concedes too much because, "it is not necessary that an author have the intent of making any particular case when describing a situation for the description to have value in establishing theological truth." Anderson then established the last point based on "evidence" from legal testimony. The intent of the witness is of negligible

In the Acts 2 narrative, one hundred twenty believers in Jesus were gathered in an “upper room,” either a room in the temple courtyard or in someone’s house. They were in prayer before moving on to describe physical phenomena that appeared “suddenly.” They heard the sound of a rushing wind and saw some sort of fire in the shape of tongues that rested on the head of everyone. At that point, the narrative interpreted the event as each person being filled with the Holy Spirit. Then they began to speak in other languages (tongues), “as the Spirit gave them utterance” (Acts 2:4). From that event Pentecostals gain a great deal of impetus for theology upon which to base their behavior. There are other accounts throughout Acts of people experiencing similar Spirit baptisms; however, none of those accounts mentions the sound of wind or the tongues of fire so Pentecostals assume that those things are not normal in Christian experience, perhaps only happening at the first Pentecost. Since other biblical passages mention speaking in tongues, Pentecostals and Charismatics assume that such behavior is normal in Christian experience.

Metaphor for Living in Spiritual Power

Pentecostals understand the events of Acts 2 as being a separate event from salvation. The distinction within the biblical account led to the distinction between the salvation experience and the experience of Spirit baptism in the life of the believer for

value. The intent of those within the action witnessed is of prime concern. Therefore, it is helpful to conclude several interpretive principles. First, if a clear historical pattern can be demonstrated, it should be accepted as normative. Second, if no pattern exists but something happened several times in history, at least that should be informative that God sometimes deals with people in that particular way. Third, even if the witness (Biblical author) did not intend something, if intent of the actors within the narrative can be established, particularly God’s intent, it becomes authoritative. Fourth, when authorial intent can be established, it adds to the weight of evidence for a particular Biblical truth.

today. Often the primary difference between Pentecostals and Charismatics is whether the event of Spirit baptism is seen as something separate and distinct from salvation. Even among some Pentecostals such as Fee, the distinction has been questioned (Fee, 1996). Those who do not see it as a separate event emphasize that the same experience is available at salvation but some do not choose to live in that power until later moments. The power and accompanying phenomena are available at salvation, they argue, even if the believer does not choose to live in that power immediately. Menzies and Menzies (2000) counter-argue for Spirit baptism as a second event based largely on technical theological arguments.¹² Those differences imply a communicative impact for the experience of Spirit baptism where speech is spiritually empowered by the Holy Spirit's infilling. Pentecostals continue to defend vigorously Spirit baptism as a second event (Menzies and Menzies 2000; Macchia 2006).

The distinction is based largely on semiotics rather than semantics. For example, when a previously believing Roman Catholic enters a Charismatic experience, the nomenclature describing that person remains relatively irrelevant for most Pentecostals. The fundamental difference between the way Charismatics and Pentecostals would talk about such a difference is through employment of a narrative timeline.¹³ Pentecostals

¹² Menzies and Menzies argue, along with Stronstad, that Luke's pneumatology is based on charismatic gifts rather than soteriology. By positioning it with charismatic gifts several salient implications result. First, the events of Spirit baptism must be separate from salvation in kind even if not in initiating event. Second, of great importance for Stronstad's project and for the current study, the association of charismatic gifts implies a communication difference impacted by spiritual empowerment. The empowerment of the early church with a divine energy resulted in communication differences.

¹³ I can hear my undergraduate theology professor opining in her southern drawl that the nomenclature is not important but being filled with the Spirit is important.

would talk about it as experiencing an additional definite work of God's grace where Charismatics would say that the capacity for living in a charismatic experience always existed for the believer; however, some believers do not choose to live in that experience immediately at conversion but at a subsequent event thereafter.¹⁴ The experience of the Charismatic Catholic could be described many different ways without much of an objection from Pentecostal theology. What would be important for them is that the believer now lives in a new spiritual power that enables them to live differently and to communicate through divine co-authorship and energy, making healing a more dominant practice in Pentecostalism than in other Christian traditions.

The original question that Charles Parham asked his students still rouses great debate. How does a person know when he/she has received Spirit baptism? The answer was originally framed in the terminology of the day as developed by Parham (Jacobsen 2006). It was said that tongues-speech was the biblical evidence for the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Today the terminology is now "the initial physical evidence" (for a sample see Menzies and Menzies 2000; Chan 2001; Sherrill 2004; Macchia 2006; Wyckoff 2007).¹⁵ While tongues-speech is part of the taken-for-granted world of Pentecostalism, that is not necessarily the case for Charismatics.

¹⁴ As troubling as such an obfuscation of the position may be for some in either camp, the reality is that the positions merge when describing a believer who later finds a charismatic experience. Both theological positions essentially describe it as a subsequent filling of the Spirit resulting in charismatic manifestations.

¹⁵ Perusing the topics in the index of the *Paraclete* (a journal published from 1967-1995 by the Assemblies of God) showed the topic remained a consistent source of conversation as numerous theologians attempted a defense, explication, or restatement of the doctrine.

Evidential Tongues

The divisive nature of the doctrine of the additional definite work of grace has led some to characterize Pentecostals as obsessing over Spirit baptism to the exclusion of other possible aspects of the ministry of the Holy Spirit. Others urged their fellow theologians that speaking in tongues may be interesting, even important, but other aspects of Spirit baptism are important also. Menzies and Menzies (2000) spent more time talking about spiritual power than speaking in tongues. Macchia (2006) spent only a few pages talking about tongues-speech before building an impressive theological structure around the subject of Spirit baptism. Macchia's emphasis on Spirit baptism as a metaphor for a group of experiences greatly enhanced the project of moving beyond tongues-speech as the only aspect of Spirit baptism. Archer (2010) builds many theological points concerning Pentecostalism while barely mentioning tongues. Historically a careful examination of Pentecostal books on the theology of the Spirit revealed a more well-rounded theology of the Spirit.¹⁶ In fact, Pentecostalism has remained Christological (Karkkainen 2007), centered on the person and work of Jesus in the contemporary context (Klaus 2003). Theologically and practically, that always meant that Jesus actively intervenes in human affairs with supernatural means even in the contemporary structure.

¹⁶ While Spirit baptism and speaking in tongues has always been a hot-button issue for Pentecostals, a careful examination of text books used at some Pentecostal colleges through the years reveals a more well-rounded theology of the Spirit (Pearlman 1942; Riggs 1949; Horton 1976; Holdcroft 1979). Some older works demonstrate a greater focus on the supernatural interface of the Holy Spirit and humanity such as works by Smith Wigglesworth and Charles Price (Price 2008, originally published in 1940 by Charles Price Publishing).

Supernatural Intervention

Nearly every aspect of Pentecostal theology assumes that the believer ought to expect God's supernatural intervention in the world in everyday life. Just as the belief in the revelation of Scripture built the foundation for all of Pentecostal theology,¹⁷ so the belief in God's supernatural in-breaking influences *every* aspect of the Pentecostal belief structure.

The term "anointed" has been used in a variety of ways since the early days of the movement. While it sometimes meant a special choosing, as Stronstad explicated (1999), most of the time it was used synonymously with spiritual power. The phrase is Biblical with lengthy and rich history.¹⁸ Stronstad used the term to designate particular spiritual empowerment for service to God. Stronstad used two biblical events to connect empowerment to anointing, the choosing of Jesus at the beginning of his ministry and the

¹⁷ Miroslav Volf has Pentecostal roots and maintains Pentecostal proclivities according to the "Forward" he wrote for Zhand's book on forgiveness (2011). Volf's defense of Biblical use in systematic theology convincingly asserts that all systematic theology should rely on scripture (2010).

¹⁸ The term originates in Genesis 31:13 when God spoke to Jacob. "I am the God of Bethel, where you anointed a pillar and made a vow to me." In that case, the term meant smearing oil as a symbol of a sacred or chosen place. The next time the word appears it is in the context of choosing Aaron as priest in Exodus 28 and 29. In that case, it enacts God's choosing of the first High Priest for Israel. It is both symbolic of God's blessing and enacting the actual choosing. Most of the time in the Bible, the term is used as "choosing." However, in Luke 4:18 Jesus reads from Isaiah 61:1. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim liberty to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed." The anointing of Jesus was both choosing and enacting of power, as Jesus asserts.

Spirit baptism in Acts 2.¹⁹ The parallel led Stronstad to write, “Both Jesus and the disciples are anointed/baptized with the Holy Spirit to inaugurate their ministries” (Stronstad 1999, 30). While Stronstad’s development of the term may be relatively recent, such an understanding is not a new theological discovery. The British evangelist from the early twentieth century Smith Wigglesworth was revered in his generation as a great preacher and man through whom many miracles and healings were accomplished by God. He encouraged believers, “All that we do must be done under the anointing of the Spirit” (Wigglesworth 2007, 71). While the term may be used in both senses technically, when used by congregants and most pastors, the term references the supernatural power available to believers.²⁰

Because God will empower any individual who will align his/her heart with God’s heart, and within the logic of the anointing, came an expectancy that God will

¹⁹ Contemporary theologian Roger Stronstad in *The Prophethood of All Believers* (1999) asserts that the anointing of Jesus is paralleled with the anointing of the disciples in Acts 2:1-4. If that is true, and I believe it is, then the metaphors “Spirit baptism” and “anointing” are two different pictures describing the same event. Therefore, when a preacher is described as an anointed it may be said that sermon is Spirit baptized speech, chosen and empowered by God.

²⁰ Gordon Fee in *God’s Empowering Presence* (1994) uses it in either sense depending on the context. Certainly Pentecostal theologians are aware of the multiple options for the sense of the metaphor. In contemporary theology, it is less likely to be used as a metaphor for supernatural power because of the problems with tracing the Biblical origin. For example, Macchia (2006) uses the term but almost always in reference to an actual event of choosing. Inherently implied in the original application of the metaphor is a combination of the two ideas that within the original anointing (or choosing) of individuals by the Holy Spirit there is an empowerment which accompanies the event. In Menzies and Menzies (2000), the term was used with regularity, though never defined, and may refer to either choosing or empowerment, but often both aspects simultaneously. One of my systematic theology professors at a Pentecostal college, Opal Reddin used to tell us, “Where God guides, God provides,” locking together the two ideas of God’s choosing and God’s empowerment.

empower each person for service, both as a prophet and priest. Karkkainen (2007) cited Land (2010) in calling for the addition of the prophethood and priesthood of the believer as a sixth narrative point in the full gospel narrative. “In their view God was calling upon all saints to be godly witnesses in the power of the Holy Spirit. Now the prophethood of all believers could be added to the priesthood of all believers” (Land 2010, 7). While I share that sentiment, theologians have yet to explicate what such a theology would look like. To reduce confusion, the prophethood of the believer is presented here as empowered speech under the metaphor of Spirit baptism. Yet the priesthood and prophethood of all believers thoroughly symbolizes their sociology as a democratic movement (Ma 2007). Even in countries not very democratic, Pentecostalism introduced elements of democracy within the lives of converts (Robbins 2010).

Pentecostal Theology and Communication

In Stronstad’s (1999) insightful and provocative work, he postulated that the Spirit empowers every believer as a prophet. A summary runs the risk of reductionism of his rather sophisticated argument that relies on structural elements common in both the gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. Stronstad considered them one book and consistently referred to it as Luke-Acts. He compared the two sections, Luke and Acts, finding common elements and literary devices including (1) programmatic episodes; (2) *inclusio*, and; (3) parallelism (Stronstad 1999, p. 14) Through the consistent use of these three narrative devices, Stronstad demonstrated that the work of the Spirit in Jesus’ life as recorded in Luke’s gospel were subsequently applied to the Church in Luke’s historical narrative in Acts. If the parallelism theory of Stronstad accurately portrays Luke-Acts, and I believe it does, the structure gives credence to considering the prophethood of Jesus

as parallel to the prophethood of the believer. For Stronstad, Jesus was anointed as a prophet in the antecedent events leading up to Jesus' own pronouncement in Luke 4:18. Jesus' anointing precedes His ministry chronologically necessarily because Jesus must be chosen and empowered before beginning ministry. The parallel of Jesus' anointing in the church is the calling and commissioning of the disciples in Acts 1:4-8. The disciples were anointed preceding their empowerment for ministry just as Jesus was anointed and empowered.

Subsequent to the anointing, Luke portrayed Jesus as an eschatological prophet, the prophet of promise who fulfilled the eschatological prophecies of the Old Testament (Stronstad 1999, 36-39). The eschatological prophecy of Jesus parallels the Acts 2 fulfillment. Therefore, through Peter's announcement of the eschatological fulfillment of promise in Acts 2, Luke used parallelism to tie the prophetic ministry of Jesus to the prophetic ministry of the disciples. The parallelism extends to the empowerment of Jesus and the empowerment of the disciples. Stronstad added:

As we have seen, on the day of Pentecost Jesus pours out the same Spirit, who had earlier anointed him and empowered his ministry, upon his disciples to baptize them and empower their ministry as his successors. In this way, just as Jesus was the Spirit-anointed prophet, so the disciples, as heirs and successors to his prophetic ministry, become a community of Spirit-baptized prophets, the prophethood of all believers. (1999, 65-66)

The Spirit commissioned the disciples to become a new community that we call the Church and empowered them as a community defined by speech that is empowered for witness to unbelievers, direction for everyday decisions in believer's lives, and symbolized by tongues-speech. At the inauguration of the new speech community, which Stronstad calls a community of prophets, the triune God announced and celebrated the moment through equipping the disciples with speaking in tongues. By using the term

“speech community” from SCT in Philipsen, et. al. (2005) I mean to include the theological task from Stronstad.

The community of prophets was seen as a *nation* of prophets by using parallels between the initial Pentecost event and the theophany on Mt. Sinai (Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers* 1999, ch 3). Stronstad spends a chapter developing the implications of the prophethood of the believer for ministry in the speech community of prophets, the new *nation* of prophets. The ministry of the prophets was seen in both an inner and outer life (1999, ch 4). The inner life was marked by prayer, fellowship, the apostles’ teaching, and breaking bread together. The outer life was marked by the theme of “witness,” witnessing by “works of power” and “witnessing by words of power” (1999, 80-84). In the anointing and empowering of the church, the Spirit filled *all* believers present. *All* believers joined the speech community of prophets by virtue of the Spirit’s anointing and empowerment and *all* believers spoke in tongues upon the inauguration. For the sake of charity, I would allow that there are multiple understandings of these facts and multiple ways of looking at it for today. In the many embodiments of the Spirit’s working today, certainly the Spirit works in and through the Pentecostal tradition. Within that tradition, the prophethood of *all* believers sets it apart from most of Christianity through several implications.

1. The Spirit poured out on all believers means that all believers are on equal footing in the Spirit. The “all believers” significantly points to a sociology of religion perspective articulated by Fenn, which he calls the democratization of religion (Fenn 2003). The democratization is seen in the availability of

charismatic words for the church, missional witness to culture, and worship toward Christ.

2. All believers are equally capable of, though not equally open to, being used by the Spirit in charismatic gifts, signs, and wonders to communicate the message of Jesus with power and efficacy.
3. Supernatural faith may be directly accessed from the Holy Spirit to the spirit of the person. While some find meaning in sacramental worship, most Pentecostal worship is recognizable by its lack of sacramentality and characterized by the practice of a direct-connect approach, an approach that flows from the unique nature of the Spirit being poured out on all flesh.
4. Those who hold to the democratization of speech in word, witness, and worship through supernatural empowerment form a unique speech community of prophets with unique characteristics through relying on the supernatural invasion of God into the natural realm.
5. God dwells in the speech community of prophets and participates as a co-author of communication.

Prophets Empowered by the Spirit

The anointed and empowered community of prophets is recognizable by the Spirit baptized speech practiced by the believers. Macchia (2006) detailed the implications of Spirit baptism throughout the theological schemata. Macchia (2006) follows Stronstad (1999) in seeing the inauguration of the prophethood of the believer and then pushes the argument beyond Stronstad's offering to include the motifs of the kingdom, speech, and spirit baptism together with the bounty of themes found in Stronstad. Macchia sees

“Spirit baptism as an eschatological participation in the kingdom of God by faith involves Christian initiation and a release of the Spirit in life for power in witness. The broad theological framework of Spirit baptism as a divine act in inaugurating the kingdom of God involves theologically for Luke and the Pentecostals an experience of the Spirit in power for witness” (2006, Kindle Loc. 2959).

Spirit baptized speech is not just speaking in tongues. Macchia successfully connects Spirit baptism with speech by seeing the kingdom of God inaugurated at Spirit baptism with the resultant act of witness as a necessary extension of the process. Witness is not, therefore, one option on a life-choice-menu from which a disciple of Jesus may choose like ordering dinner, but a necessary result of the work of Jesus through the Spirit evidenced in all disciples. While the evidentiary nature of tongues instigates debate among Pentecostal and Charismatic theologians, broader ecumenical agreement may arise from a conceptual communicative framework that sees Christian witness (in some form) as evidence of Spirit baptism (in some form). The broad Christian community may well agree with the evidentiary nature of witness and worship. The inclusion of “word” in a charismatic sense, democratically open and directly accessible, differentiates Pentecostalism from most other traditions within Christianity.

Communication should include instruction of orthodoxy as well as telling the story for an alignment of the pathos and embodying an orthopraxis. Following the early Pentecostals, theology may be expressed through “testimonies, songs, trances, inspired preaching and dance” (Archer 2007). The holistic nature of Pentecostal spirituality minimizes the sacred/secular divide and opens the way for dynamic methods of communication, opening the way for the dramatic interruption of the Spirit holistically

(Poloma and Hood 2008, 4). When the church allows the Spirit to co-author communication, a multitude of methods open up. Options that previously were not in the theatre become part of the Spirit's dramatic interaction with humans. Spirit baptized speech dramatically unfolds with all the bluster fitting the supernatural grandeur of God. Equally important in Spirit baptized speech is the illumination of the heart through quietude. The Pentecostal tradition often has forgotten the beauty of quiet moments in the presence of God (Hayford 1996).

Macchia observed an overlap between the prophetic aspects of a believer and the doctrine of sanctification, "since the prophet in the Scriptures was separated from sin and consecrated for a holy task" (Macchia 2006, Kindle Loc. 1504). The overlap further reaches to the title of the Spirit into which the believer is baptized, the Holy Spirit, since holiness and sanctification are closely related (almost synonymous) in Pentecostal theology.

Jesus as Healer

In the middle of the nineteenth century within U.S America, divine healing became an emphasis in Evangelical gatherings (Faupel 1996). At the close of that century, dramatic stories of physical healings and other miraculous phenomena commonly emerged from the church pastored by A. B. Simpson (Tozer 1943). As many of those influenced by the teaching of divine physical healing became Pentecostal, the theology became a natural part of the Pentecostal belief structure so that physical healing is accepted as a reality (Epstein 1993). However, in the narrative structure of the Five-fold Gospel, it is also symbolic of anticipating God's ability to enact any miracle as He sees fit. Indeed it is almost to define the miraculous in a meaningful way without also

allowing room for physical healing. Miracles are God's concentration of His presence to bring his power to bear on an actual situation, disrupting what is otherwise seen as the natural order, to enact His will.²¹

In an effort to re-articulate the doctrine of healing for a new generation of Pentecostal pastors, Purdy (2007) defended the doctrine with reasons to believe in it by giving four reasons for believing in Divine Healing.

First it is found in the Bible, and the Bible, inspired as it is by the Holy Spirit, is for us today. The same Jesus Christ revealed in the Scriptures as Healer is the same Lord we serve today.

The second reason for believing in divine healing is the fact that it is in the atoning work of Christ. The Bible's teaching of healing parallels its teaching of salvation. Salvation includes healing of our lives in all aspects, and it all "issues from [the] atonement." All the "good and perfect gifts" from above are the result of the cross of Christ."

The third reason for believing in divine healing is found in the convergence of the Bible's teaching on salvation and on the nature of humankind. If a human being is not a disjointed association of body, soul, and spirit, and is in a very real way a unity, then salvation will apply to all the facets of human existence.

The last reason for commitment to the teaching of divine healing is the belief that salvation is ultimately to be understood as a restoration of the fallen world.²²

²¹ This definition of miracles flows from James K. A. Smith's chapter in *Science and the Spirit: A Pentecostal Engagement with the Sciences*, (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2010), 46. Smith builds on C. S. Lewis' and Augustine's concept of the miraculous seeing it as a concentration of the Spirit's presence in the middle of the Spirit's presence all around us which constitutes the natural order.

²² Purdy adds: "God is against human suffering, for suffering is the result not of the will of God but a consequence of the Fall." The debate over suffering has raged in Pentecostal theology since the beginning, as in other theological traditions. Purdy is correct if he means that suffering was not part of the design of the Garden of Eden. However, in the world as we know it, which is all we can theologize about, suffering has a much different role. First, suffering was not part of the original creation plan but subsequently became necessary to fulfill God's plan within a sin-corrupted will or else humanity would be trapped within a sinful world with no escape. Second, the suffering of

The power of the first century apostles was tied to the resurrection of Jesus in the biblical chronicle in Acts. “And with great power the apostles were giving their testimony to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and great grace was upon them all” (Acts 4:33). Duffield and Van Cleave (1983) commented on this verse that it “summarizes the entire early ministry of the Apostles.” Since Pentecostalism was originally a restoration movement, it was important to have the same power that worked in the first century believers working in the twentieth century believers. The emphasis remains affirmed within Pentecostal theology though with considerable explication.

The miracle working power is also tied to the work of the Holy Spirit, making it particularly important in Pentecostal theology. “If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through his Spirit who dwells in you” (Rom. 8:11). Yet the working of miracles is still through the power of the Spirit as *part of the gospel of Jesus*. “For I will not venture to speak of anything except what Christ has accomplished through me to bring the Gentiles to obedience—by word and deed, by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God ” (Rom. 15:18-19). Since miracles were part of the gospel narrative, through the years many have emphasized the need for miracles during foreign missions work and faith-sharing among neighbors, often under the term power-evangelism (Menzies and Menzies 2000).²³

Jesus was part of God’s plan. Third, God uses suffering for his own glory as seen in 2 Corinthians 12 and Genesis 32 where the Apostle Paul and Jacob respectively find greater strength because of an episode marked by suffering.

²³ The term “power evangelism” comes from Charismatic evangelists. John Wimber, the founder of the Association of Vineyard Churches, along with author Kevin

In the earliest days of the twentieth century, one of the theological conflicts pertaining to healing was how healing was made possible through Jesus. The “how” and “why” were tied together in an explanation that physical healing was provided for by the suffering of Jesus’ death and triumph of his resurrection.²⁴ Jesus provided for the physical healing of all believers because he loved them and did want them to suffer and is now enacted in the believer through the Holy Spirit’s power. Therefore, healing should be a regular part of the believer’s life, expected with great anticipation and earnestly sought through prayer on a regular basis. While the fervor for healing found in the first and second generation of Pentecostals may not exist today, prayer for physical healing remains a vital part of many worship services and emphasis remains within Pentecostal theology (for a sample see Gause, 2009; Purdy, 2007; Yong, 2005; Menzies and Menzies, 2000; Duffield and Cleave, 1983). Prayer for healing has been a staple of Pentecostal churches since the beginning of the twentieth century.²⁵ Through the years a plethora of books have been published with testimonies of healings and miracles.²⁶

Springer published a book by that name in 1991 (Wimber and Springer 1991). The term predates that writing, however. Wimber and Springer were part of an ongoing debate among Pentecostal theologians and practitioners in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s. See also (Reddin 1989).

²⁴ Theologians recognize the doctrine with the phrase “the healing is in the atonement.”

²⁵ My grandfather Rev. Sylvan Turner, himself ordained by the Assemblies of God, often told stories of praying for people to be healed, regaling his grandchildren with fantastic stories of people having the power of God flow through them so that their bodies jumped up and down while sitting on pews.

²⁶ For example, see the six volumes of *Heroes of the Faith* published by Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House. One volume features a story about my wife, Sheryl (Carpenter) Coats.

Charismatics sometimes talked about being “naturally supernatural,”²⁷ a term used by a research interviewee (Pat, Interview, 7/21/2011). The concept represented two proclivities, one theological and one mostly pastoral. Theologically it is an attempt to include the supernatural as a part of everyday life; “within the marketplace” they would say. In the normal course of everyday events, believers should respond to needs around them by praying for a miraculous response from God. In this way, it is natural to live a supernatural life, not something spectacular reserved for a select few people or special times and spaces. Pastorally it helps remove some of the “weirdness” that otherwise may attach to supernatural living.

Smith (2010) connected the miraculous with everyday living through a naturalist approach. Theologically the presence of God is everywhere throughout creation as nature is “constituted as the presence of God” holding everything together. Anytime something happens different from the “natural order of things,” it is best to see it as a concentration of God’s presence that is always around us. “A ‘miracle’ is not an event that breaks any so-called laws of nature, since nature does not have such a reified character. A miracle is a manifestation of the Spirit's presence that is ‘out of the ordinary,’ but even the ordinary is a manifestation of the Spirit's presence” (2010, 47). By combining miracles with the presence of God, a more comprehensive, unified Pentecostal theology takes shape.

Several important biblical passages provide the texture for the belief structure (Menzies and Menzies, 2000), though many more have been cited through the years. The

²⁷ There are a number of books that address the subject, written accessibly for people within congregations.

connection between the work of Jesus and physical healing begins with His defeat of Satan through the resurrection as articulated in Colossians 2:13-16.

And you, who were dead in your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses, by canceling the record of debt that stood against us with its legal demands. This he set aside, nailing it to the cross. He disarmed the rulers and authorities and put them to open shame, by triumphing over them in him.

Menzies and Menzies (2000) have leaned on two scriptures, combining one from the Old Testament and one from the New Testament, to show the intention of the New Testament writer was to apply the verses from Isaiah to the healing ministry of Jesus. “In so doing, Matthew, writing after the cross and the resurrection, bears witness to the faith of the early church” (Menzies and Menzies 2000, 167).

Surely he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we esteemed him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions; he was crushed for our iniquities; upon him was the chastisement that brought us peace, and with his stripes we are healed. (Isaiah 53:4-5)

And when Jesus entered Peter’s house, he saw his mother-in-law lying sick with a fever. He touched her hand, and the fever left her, and she rose and began to serve him. That evening they brought to him many who were oppressed by demons, and he cast out the spirits with a word and healed all who were sick. This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah: “He took our illnesses and bore our diseases.” (Matthew 8:14-17)

Another scripture often cited has been a favorite scripture for pastors and healing evangelists through the years as they urged people to request prayer for physical healing. In James 5:14 the pattern was set which is typically maintained in worship services to place a small amount of oil on the forehead of the individual requesting prayer for healing.

Is anyone among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith will save the one who is sick, and the Lord will raise him up. And if he has committed sins, he will be forgiven. Therefore, confess your sins to one another

and pray for one another, that you may be healed. The prayer of a righteous person has great power as it is working. (James 5:14-16)

Pentecostals have answered many objections to divine healing, especially as an act of the atonement of Jesus. The many objections have ranged from the suggestion that God no longer heals people today to psychological objections that physical healing through prayer is a cognitive process rather than a supernatural in-breaking into the natural order.²⁸ Additionally because death is a fact of human history and death is often caused by some sort of disease, Pentecostals through the years have offered many suggestions for the reasons why some were not healed (for a sample see Duffield and Van Cleave 1983).

Jesus as Soon Coming King

Since the earliest days, Pentecostalism oriented its worldview around a futuristic vision (R. M. Anderson, 1979; Wacker, 2001, Macchia 2007). The most obvious aspect of that vision was the expectation that Jesus had resurrected from the dead and stepped

²⁸ The objection of cessationism, that miracles and healings ceased at the end of age of the first century apostles, engaged Pentecostals for much of the twentieth century but has waned in the Pentecostal dialogue. The cessationists' objections require that all miracles and healings for 1900 years be explained as either a hoax (some sort of explainable medical phenomena) or demonic activity. None of those strikes a plausible chord given the plethora of unexplainable historical narratives throughout various Christian traditions. More recently, Menzies and Menzies (2000) engaged an opposing proposition that stated that God does heal people today but such healing is the result of sovereign choice exclusively rather than the atonement. They assert that such a view is often offered through the lens of a limited view of the atonement seeing it only as soteriological with spiritual salvation as the only activity of the atonement. In that engagement, they have provided three helpful refutations. (1) Jesus is Lord and savior by virtue of his work on the cross (Rev. 5:9). (2) The salvation provided by Jesus as Lord and savior is progressive in nature (2 Cor. 3:18). (3) The salvation provided by Jesus as lord and savior is cosmic in nature and includes physical wholeness (Rom. 8:23; 1 Cor. 15:42-54).

outside of time by ascending into heaven but would eventually reenter earthly time and space in a future moment, “the twinkling of an eye” the Pentecostal song said. Upon reentering time and space, Jesus would take all believers up to heaven with him in an unexplainable manner. “The dead in Christ will rise first. Then we who are alive, who are left, will be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so we will always be with the Lord” (1 Thes. 4:16-17). The songs, sermons, and publicized articles repeatedly talked about the “return of Jesus.” Much was made of the immediacy of the promise, the fact that it could happen any day (Higgins, Dusing and Tallman 1994, 218). The imminent return of Jesus provided hope for people whose socio-economic situation often left them without a lot of earthly hope (R. M. Anderson 1979; Wacker 2001), and it propelled them to a passionate fervency in sharing their message with other people around the world activating the most effective global evangelistic campaign ever witnessed in human history (Jenkins 2002).

Macchia (2007) has briefly charted the development of the theology of end times within Pentecostal thought. He noted that early Pentecostal theological systems relied heavily on a technical and detailed approach known as Dispensationalism.²⁹ As many

²⁹ Macchia (2007) has said Dispensationalism required a clear distinction between Israel in the Old Testament and the Church in the New Testament; therefore, it centered on very clear timeline distinctions in the history of the world. It was very much a product of the scientific age in which it was born, with a heavy emphasis on clear proofs, exacting details leading to elaborate charts, and many subdivided pieces fitting together. Dispensationalist eschatology produced detailed predictions about future events concerning the return of Jesus, detailed predictions of judgments on earth, and a high expectation that contemporary events somehow intertwined with events foretold in the Bible. Long debates marked the conversation about whether Jesus would return before a seven-year period known as the Great Tribulation, in the middle of it, or at the end of the Great Tribulation. There was a new prediction every few years about the identity of a person who would become a world leader in a one-world government, who will oppose

Pentecostal theologians moved away from Dispensationalism as a system, the residual effects left an orientation of Pentecostal theology toward eschatology (the theology of future events). As previously stated, Pentecostal theology in the first generation was built on the expectation that Jesus would return imminently and the final in-gathering of people was ushered in by the last wave of the Spirit currently washing over them. As thinking shifted, theology concerning future events shifted from predictive value to a pragmatic and positioning nature. Contemporary contributions spend little time on elaborate time lines and a great deal of time on the programmatic emphasis that arises from looking toward a future hope (Fee 1996; Faupel 1996; Macchia 2006 2007; Althouse and Waddell, 2010).

Pentecostal denominations have maintained an emphasis on several important future events.³⁰ Four are of particular interest because of widespread agreement. Those events typically unfold chronologically as an expectation of a future event where Jesus

God's will, persecute the church, and identified as *the* Anti-Christ. I have lived long enough to have heard hypotheses identifying that Anti-Christ as President Richard Nixon, or President Jimmy Carter, or President Ronald Reagan (with an impressively elaborate numerical scheme involving the number "6" and the letters of his name), President George H. W. Bush, Russian leader Mikhail Gorbachev, 1970's Iranian coup leader Ayatollah Khomeini, Iraq leader Saddam Hussein, and many others. Pentecostals who grew up in that era will remember the elaborate schemes of traveling "evangelists" as they brought their exciting side-show to church after church with stories of back room meetings with Arab sheiks, obscure newspaper articles, and wall-to-wall floor-to-ceiling charts of future events. Macchia has further stated that it was always an uneasy relationship between Pentecostalism and Dispensationalism, probably because many non-Pentecostal dispensationalists believed that speaking in tongues ended with a previous era of human history. Yet, Macchia reflected on the relationship and saw residual effects still lingering with the Pentecostal community. Some of those effects can be seen in the chapter on eschatology in (Horton 2007, 597-637).

³⁰ An overview is available in systematic theology books by Higgins, Dusing, and Tallman (1994) and Horton (2007).

comes back to receive believers unto himself, both resurrected dead and living caught up to be with Jesus in the clouds which is often called the rapture of the church.³¹ After that, there will be a one thousand year reign of Jesus on earth, a literal reign where Jesus will be King, and believers will rule with him. Pentecostals base their view of the millennial reign on a literal reading of the last four chapters Revelation. There will be a final judgment for the “wicked dead” (Menzie and Horton 2004). After the final judgment a new heavens and new earth will appear and believers will be united with Jesus eternally (Rev. 21:1-7).

Macchia has developed a theology that acknowledges these future events but moves toward a different emphasis based on the metaphor of the Kingdom of God (Macchia 2006, 2007, 2010). Within Macchia’s offering, the church today exists as a representation of the future Kingdom fully realized at the return of Jesus. Believers live out kingdom-life ethically (Macchia 2007) and receive the Spirit’s presence as Kingdom

³¹ Certainly, there are more events even in a post-Dispensational Pentecostal theology. Debate historically has centered around where the rapture fits into the timeline. All major Pentecostal groups typically see the rapture taking place before a literal one thousand year reign of Jesus on earth. In addition, most believe in a seven-year period on earth of great tribulation that will take place before the reign of Jesus. Whether the rapture comes at the beginning of the Great Tribulation, the middle, or the end, has been the subject of great debate with multiple positions accepted historically in Pentecostal circles. However, Pentecostal theology is known for believing in a pre-millennial rapture of the church. That is, before the literal and actual one thousand year reign of Jesus on earth, Jesus will come back to receive believers unto himself. Those believers will be judged based on their service to Jesus before returning to earth to reign with Jesus here.

Much is made of the details by R. M. Anderson regrettably (1979). Anderson relies on a handful of early Pentecostals to extrapolate views, some of which were even considered far-fetched when proposed. He then attributes those views to the entirety of Pentecostalism without any differentiation based on historical theological roots or current theological proclivities. The result is that Pentecostals certainly look like an odd group in Anderson’s research.

empowerment. The primary contribution of the Kingdom motif applied to the return of Jesus is an orientation in the believer's life that establishes ethical considerations for everyday decisions, situating those decisions as activity of an eternal kingdom ruled by Jesus.³² As a positioning motif, Kingdom eschatology functions to orient the other four metaphors of the five-fold gospel as it "integrates and defines Christ's saving work, Spirit baptism, and healing" (Macchia 2007, 282). Macchia points to the sobering effect of such an orientation as well as the living hope it brings (Macchia, 2007). Further Macchia points to the "other-worldly" nature that brings resistance against cultural hegemonic forces which otherwise press a believer into an identity incompatible with Jesus' vision for life. It also implies a greater sense of eternal life here and now.

Fee (1994) consistently noticed a complementary tendency in the writings of the Apostle Paul which Fee described as an "already/not yet" emphasis. In this eschatological orientation, the believer has received a taste of heaven here while not yet receiving the full meal. The Holy Spirit's indwelling presence acts as a down payment, reminding the believer of the full realization of being in God's presence in heaven one day. Every time a believer experiences God's presence in a worship service, the believer experiences a

³² Certainly, the Kingdom motif is not unique to Macchia or to Pentecostals. John Bright (1980) articulated an exquisite theology of the Kingdom encompassing the whole of Scripture. George Eldon Ladd (1974) famously articulated a theology of the Kingdom primarily from the New Testament. Ladd's theology of the kingdom can be found in nearly every publication he authored (Ladd 1999). The theology of the kingdom intersects with the traditional Pentecostal theme of preaching to the nations through missions.

piece of the heavenly reality having received God already but not yet fully receiving Him (Fee 1996).³³

If eternal truths orient Pentecostal theology as Macchia proposed (2007), then the eternal reality of union of Jesus in heaven or eternal separation also provide germane insight. Heaven and hell are considered real places by most in the Pentecostal community, real places that spark eternal consequences for decisions made on earth. While it may be an aspect of the belief structure seldom discussed in contemporary churches as the themes discovered in data analysis for this study demonstrated, the taken-for-granted world still includes agreement on heaven and hell as real places. Since salvation is considered the key to determining whether a person gains heaven or hell in eternity Pentecostal believers find motivation for telling other people the salvation story, most often called witnessing. It is seen as a compassionate act to tell others about the reality of heaven and hell.

The details surrounding future expected events certainly titillated several generations of Pentecostals; however, the new position orienting life's direction emphasizes what the doctrine means for believers today. The clear connection exists in weekly services where believers experience the presence of God knowing that they only experience God in part here and now. Further, the compulsion to share one's faith with the other partially rests on motivation of eternal realities.

³³ The connection is clear in Fee's chapter on worship (ch. 13) in *Paul, the Spirit, and the People of God* (1996). It should be noted, however, that Pentecostal theology has not yet explicated their view of what it means to experience God. To be faithful to that tradition theologically, I will not deal with discussion. It appears they mean something different from many other theologians such as either Barth or Schleiermacher.

Summary

The Five-fold Gospel narrates Pentecostal theology even for those who do not necessarily claim the historical mantle under which it was developed. When seen as metaphors each aspect allows for an event as well as a life-style generating process. Archer (2010) privileges narrative as a means for doing Pentecostal theology because it more closely matches the narrative roots historically and the narrative contour that still exists within the milieu. The narrative method allows for further development of the metaphoric nature of the Five-fold Gospel to include more than just crisis events, includes an ongoing process. While the Five-fold Gospel has not always been seen as metaphoric historically, it develops a greater capacity to describe the everyday Christian life for Pentecostals.

The entire Christian life is exemplified through the five-fold metaphoric restatement. Salvation is a rupture of the timeline in an event where a person receives forgiveness of sins through Jesus and personally commits to change life's direction. At Spirit baptism, the believer enters a life of supernatural empowerment that equips the believer for communicating God's truths as well as for living God's way. Through the working of miraculous power, the believer realizes healings of various sorts as well as other supernatural provisions for everyday living. Sanctification metaphorically represents spiritual formation, moving away from desires and practices in which an individual previously engaged, and moving toward God's ways. The Christian life is oriented toward an eternal hope of union with Jesus that is realized in part in the here-and-now.

Land (2010) privileges spiritual theology over a systematic theology as it relates to Pentecostal expression. The spirituality is a combination of narrative, symbols, and praxis (Cartledge 2006). Smith (2010) joins Land by adding, “a pentecostal worldview is not a set of doctrines or dogmas. Instead, latent, implicit theological and philosophical intuitions are embedded within, and enacted by, pentecostal rituals and practices” (Smith 2010, Kindle loc. 245). Therefore, when Land points to Pentecostal spirituality as an expression of affective, praxis, and cognitive development, it takes the shape of narrative and finds its deepest expression in worship that Land says is the “most compelling characteristic” to most observers and participants (Land 2010, 11).

The speech community of the Pentecostals is constituted in the narratives that drive their spirituality. The speech community is interpreted through the lens of the latter rain, which is then interpreted through the New Testament event of Acts 2 where the Spirit baptized believers enter into a lifestyle that realizes God’s supernatural presence. The narrative includes the inauguration of each believer as an empowered spokesperson for God, creating a community of prophets. The nature of Pentecostalism is as a story telling community of prophets who live in both crisis events and daily processes of affirming their spirituality, rather than finding new ways to articulate dogma.

The speech community, as Philipsen called it, is prophetic in nature as realized within the narrative of spirituality. Conversion-salvation constitutes the prophetic vision and acts as a replacement of an individual narrative and view of the world through a crisis event. The ongoing nature of replacing the narrative by which the new believer lives is found through the ever-ongoing process of sanctification. Spirit baptism empowers all believers as prophets, spokespersons for God in a world that struggles to give God a

hearing. Healing in all its forms, as well as all supernatural miracles, provide validation of the prophetic message. The prophetic speech community anticipates the hope of Jesus' return as it articulates a hopeful vision of eternal life through Jesus. The worship service, then, is a prophetic concert with the biblical narrative as the script for celebration, encouragement, and empowerment for everyday living. I will now turn to the worship service and the many textures and contours of Pentecostal worship.

CHAPTER 6. EVEN THE BISHOP DANCED!

SERVICE CONTOURS AND WORSHIP TEXTURE

The contours of Pentecostal worship follow one of several possible paradigms each of which I observed during research but each built on the value of spontaneity as improvisation. Preserving the value of spontaneity is necessitated by several phenomenological commitments: expressing authentic worship, giving heartfelt worship, experiencing the freedom found in God's presence, and individually renewing the individual's relationship with God. Before explicating each paradigm I observed, I will present phenomenological evidence for the reasons supporting the continual maintenance of the value of spontaneity. Subsequently, I will describe observed phenomena that form the contours of services, by which I mean the dominant characteristics of worship. Some of the various possible phenomena of a Pentecostal service have been detailed well (Wagner 1986; D. Martin 1990; Sequeira 1994; Suurmond 1995; Fee 1996; Austin-Broos 1997; Csordas 1997; Toulis 1997; Albrecht 1999, 2004; Cox 2001; Shoaps 2002; T. M. Luhrmann 2004; J. H. Steven 2004; Youngblood and Winn 2004; Cartledge 2006, 2010; Tomberlin 2006; Ma 2007; Lindhardt 2011a; Robbins 2011). However, I will add a detailed phenomenological explanation of the meaning for salient practices and themes that produce the texture of a worship service in the speech community. I will explore key phrases that advance a thematic analysis of the interviews. The primary focus will be upon data in this chapter.

Valuing Spontaneity

The jazz metaphor employed by Cox (2001) to describe Pentecostal worship, highlights spontaneity. The structure allows individual musicians to harmonize all together at the same time while one individual plays the harmony. Pentecostal worship provides a similar structure, a variety of practices from which a worshipper may choose given the “genre” and “key signature” of the service. It also allows individuals to advance the “melody” of a service or to engage in harmonious practices alongside other worshippers. Certainly, there were services that reflected the spontaneity of jazz musicians playing according to rules but spontaneously adding melodies and harmonies. There were other services that reflected the need to expand the analogy, services that moved toward an analogy of rock music. If the peculiarities of Cox’s observations (2001) were easily analyzed with the metaphor of jazz music, then the proclivities I observed require adding the metaphor of rock music. Rock music allows for some individuality of performers but follows a more planned pathway. Instead of unpredictability dominating the musical development, planned development replaces it. Spontaneity is not entirely lost but it is replaced with a stricter adherence to a script. Even the architecture of many contemporary Pentecostal church buildings reflects the metaphor of rock music with stage lighting, smoke machines, robotic lighting, video displays, musical instruments, and seating for worshippers in a concert style venue.

The value of spontaneity has been deeply seated within the speech community so that dislodging it would likely cause upheaval and a loss of identity. Even worshippers attending churches where worship details were preplanned commented on spontaneity and the free-flow of a service. Some of the atmospheres that they described as “free” and

“spontaneous” seemed highly fixed and packaged to me when compared with other worship services. Four commitments in support of spontaneity were repeated by interviewees. First, interviewees connected personal expression with authentic worship and authenticity with the core of Pentecostal identity. As previously mentioned, Land (2010) explicated the core identity of Pentecostal Christians with the triad of orthodoxy, orthopraxy, and orthopathy. Within the commitment to orthopathy, the necessity arises for worship to be authentic so it adequately reflects one’s affections. Interviewees connected authenticity to spontaneity and the free-flow of personal expression because it allows individual practices to reflect what is truly in one’s heart. More details for expressing worship will be provided in Chapter 7 and in the description of various practices essentially stabilized by “expressing” one’s own affections.

Second, spontaneity was tied to freedom found in God’s presence. This commitment unwinds through an intricate connection summed up best through the words of a worshipper:

B: What do you expect from a service?

TBT: Um, first I expect to hear from God. I expect um, I expect a freedom to just experience God the way that I want, the way I’m comfortable with.

B: How’s Believer’s Tabernacle different from other churches that you’ve attended?

TBT: I would say, I would say the freedom that we have in worship is the biggest difference that I see. Um, each of the churches I’ve gone to, growing up and once I got married and moved on, um, all of them have been great for us and our family and meaningful to us. But Believer’s Tabernacle, I would say, sensing the presence of the Holy Spirit has been the main drawing factor to us to Believer’s Tabernacle. That’s the biggest difference. (Thomas, Interview, 10/10/2011)

Interviewee after interviewee echoed similar sentiments. The word “freedom” was used in multiple ways sometimes in the same usage. It would stand for freedom of

spontaneity and simultaneously symbolize an internal freedom from various obstacles such as hurts, pain from the past, vices, habits, or sin in a more general way. One interviewee used the word repeatedly to talk about nearly every worship practice he experienced, tying the concept of freedom to everything from raising one's hands in worship to freedom from "anything in your past." In a church some off-the-record comments label "packaged," a worshipper described spontaneity in the context of freedom saying:

It's an abandonment. It's a release. It's a – you're laying yourself before God. Um, some people will raise their hands. Some people will kneel. Um, some people sway back and forth. It's just the feeling that they have in the moment. And it's an abandonment and just a release to God. (Kristiana, Interview, 10/10/2011)

The role of God's presence in worship received constant attention in interviews with an overwhelming number of interviewees referencing it. The topic will play a role in the narration analysis of worship in Chapter 8.

Third, interviewees connected giving heartfelt worship with spontaneity. While the logic closely follows the first commitment, the actions of the heart and the language are different. Within this commitment, "giving" became most important, particularly giving one's spiritual heart to God in worship. The context of giving provided the rich background for many explanations of phenomenological meaning of practices. Where "expressing worship" formed the logic behind worship, giving formed the pragmatic intention.

Fourth, individuals renew their relationship with God through personally, spontaneously giving worship during free-flowing moments of worship through music. The relational metaphor appeared over and over again in interviews, though that was anticipated. The most common way to describe how a believer corresponds to divinity

was through the language of a “personal (social) relationship,” with twelve interviewees using the term. I made use of the metaphor “relationship” several times in constructing the interview questions and it allowed me to speak the language of the speech community during interviews. Insiders would probably object to using the term metaphor because for them it is a real relationship, one with unique rules but a relationship nonetheless. Since worship services were a chance to renew the relationship, and since the relationship was highly personal, the commitment to personal expression through spontaneity was deeply valued within the speech community. To deny individual expression of the personal relationship would be a denial of the very core of Pentecostal identity.

The four commitments driving the valuation of spontaneity are at the core of Pentecostal identity. Undermining a spontaneous experience received “right now” would undermine their very identity as Christians. Interviewees volunteered information about structuring worship so it would be orderly. I observed that they freely consent to a high degree of planned worship and detailed encouragement for worship. In some churches, the spontaneity was almost subsumed by liturgical order. Yet one of the most “ordered” services was also extremely spontaneous. The liturgical order for the service at Holy Redeemer was printed in the bulletin and unfolded just as planned; however, there was room between planned events for interruptions of dancing, praying, shouting, and other spontaneous expressions germane within African American Pentecostal spirituality. In that service only, even the sermon was marked by spontaneity from the audience in a way unlike any of the other services. People often stood to raise their hands and three of four people danced down the aisles. The sermon was interrupted by several minutes of

celebration from many within the congregation. That service fits within the first paradigm of spontaneity, to which I now turn.

Evolving Paradigms of Spontaneity

Four paradigms of spontaneity shape the contours of each service in unique ways. While there was a “family resemblance” within each service, there were also divergent practices separating services. The service described at the beginning of the introduction, was planned with great detail so it would fit into an hour fifteen minutes from beginning to end, including a prayer time at the end. The service at Holy Redeemer was planned yet there were clearly no time limitations and people spontaneously celebrated in ways that seemed to follow their own choosing in an unpredictable manner. At Life Church, the service was more like a rock concert with a sermon attached to the end. The service at Vineyard Community Church was best described as a Charismatic/Evangelical service (though it was more Evangelical than Charismatic) with very few spontaneous expressions. The four spontaneity-paradigms, therefore, were an unpredictable spontaneity, accessible spontaneity, teaching-centered spontaneity, and mixed spontaneity-paradigm.

The first spontaneity-paradigm observed was marked by a high degree of unpredictability even though the liturgical order was printed in the bulletin every person received upon entering worship. The word “unpredictable” is a little problematic because it infers worship as surprise-after-surprise. In reality, every service I attended had prayer sometime in the beginning along with singing. The collection plates were passed somewhere in the middle. The sermon came in the second half of the service, often followed by a prayer time. Therefore, unpredictability and spontaneity must be

understood within the context of structure and should be understood as a micro-structural element rather than a macro-structural free-for-all. Similar to jazz music, the unpredictability allows for personal expression within established boundaries. The service at Holy Redeemer was marked by a great deal of celebration, with attendant practices such as dancing. The Elders sat on the platform as the male leaders of the church. The older women called “mothers” sat in a place of prominence in the front of the church in a section of chairs on the floor off to the left side, facing the congregation. As the music started, the mothers swayed a little, in a way that caused me to assume that they were only restrained by the limitations of age. The elders participated in singing but did not dance right away. As the service progressed, the distinguished looking elders even started to dance. The pastor of the church is a Bishop within the Church of God in Christ. When he came to the pulpit to start his part of the service the congregation was singing and even the Bishop joined in the dancing, complete with his magisterium robe. During the sermon a young man from a musical group that was seated on the platform, left the platform and started dancing in the center aisle. One man sitting close to me danced in the aisle for a few minutes and others close to me actively celebrated throughout the service. The man sitting immediately next to me showed few signs of physical movement for worship and used a tablet computer during scripture reading and sermon note taking. The diversity of the service fits the four commitments well because each person expressed their own relationship with God in a way that fit their personality and comfort level.

Several pastors during interviews reported that either their church or other churches within geographical proximity were marked by unpredictability. Several pastors

hinted that it was their understanding of history that unpredictability was the normal expectation of Pentecostal worship. Others specifically juxtaposed unpredictability with “decency and order,” a term they employed from 1 Corinthians 14. They were greatly concerned that worship should be orderly, even with personal expression; therefore, those churches usually accommodated spontaneity within the boundaries of a preplanned, structured service.

The second spontaneity-paradigm was marked by stage lighting, television cameras, high usage of video clips within the service, and special effects like smoke machines and strove for accessibility for outsiders. Their services tended to look and sound like rock concerts, though worshippers were often defensive when asked about the differences between their services and secular concerts. Their defensiveness sheds light on the style of service. When asked about the differences between worship services that looked like secular concerts and the actual concerts, answers either relied on the content of the songs being sung, the condition of the heart of the music leaders in a worship service, or the pragmatic effect on worshippers as compared to concert attenders. Several also commented the environment was intended to help people with little worship experience to access the service with greater ease. The services often made use of video clips as part of the service, clips either produced by the church or purchased from worship production companies. Since video requires preplanning, the services had the appearance of greater planning than some services that did not use video. Several long-term Pentecostal worshippers called such services “packaged” though leaders in those churches recoiled at the term and said their services were “planned” and “orderly.” One person told me in casual conversation that their church had been accused of “quenching

the Holy Spirit,” a serious charge within the speech community. The center of the tension was about spontaneity and unpredictability. A high degree of unpredictability was replaced by planning and order, which destabilized the identity of worshippers used to the traditional unpredictability. Although, worshippers newer to Pentecostal spirituality favorably commented on spontaneity within those worship environments.

I found the lights, cameras, and smoke machines distracting in one church because it seemed to be done only for the sake of using the technology. In another church, it seemed planned and employed for emphasis during songs to accent important parts of the songs and tastefully engaged the worshipper. In one case, robotic lighting was stationed at the front of the church and shone in the eyes of worshippers during the singing. People who seemed to be regular attenders based on the way they greeted other people, all seemed used to it and did not allow it to distract them. Other worshippers who came in late and did not speak to other worshippers, a sign they were still new, seemed more distracted by the robotic lighting.

The third spontaneity-paradigm was marked by subdued physical activity, high structure, and more traditional Pentecostal buildings. At Vineyard Community Church, the service was like a teaching time with some singing. A few people raised their hands in worship but only about ten percent overall. There was no dancing and no one spontaneously stood up at any point in the service. Individuals still engaged in some spontaneity during singing but not to the extent as happened in other churches. This paradigm accentuates the sermon, at least from my perspective, precisely because preliminary worship elements were more subdued. In interview narratives at Vineyard Community Church, people described spontaneity in similar ways as other churches,

talking about their own personalization of worship time. Observationally, spontaneity was still allowed but the unpredictable phenomena seen at Holy Redeemer would have been out of place.

In a fourth spontaneity-paradigm, a church combines various contours from the other paradigms in various ways. For example, Believer's Tabernacle made use of stage lighting, concert style music, robotic lighting, and worship space specially decorated for special effects; however, during a prayer time in the middle of the service many unpredictable practices occurred with people falling over backward under the power of God, vocally intense prayer, and many people raising their hands. At their Saturday evening service, the Senior Pastor gave time for people to receive conversion-salvation within the first ten minutes of the service! Yet, the service was not marked by the same degree of unpredictability that occurred at several other churches.

The four spontaneity-paradigms represent ideal types, though each is grounded in empirical research. From interview data, it seems most likely that most Pentecostal churches are different week to week and may represent one paradigm last week and a different paradigm this week. Therefore, the paradigms are not impermeable types, but fluid representations of possible ways of worshipping as a Pentecostal church. However, the data will show that local churches flow within the various spontaneity options according to local cultural constructs. As the data continues to unfold, the spontaneity-paradigms will answer the question: *How does the message reframing for cultural adaptation impact rituals and speech codes, faith, and practice?*

Contouring Services

Each service had unique contours or practices that characterized the service. The ritual practices overlapped from church to church and interview data suggested that a church might experience a variety of ritual practices week to week. Churches I attended more than once, demonstrated variety from service to service. For example, I attended a church in the Great Plains for both a Saturday night service and the first of two Sunday morning services. The Saturday evening service was casual, marked by casual dress and a less formal approach by the singing leader. The worshippers in the Sunday morning service typically dressed more formally. They were more expressive in singing. The singers on stage Sunday morning wore dress clothes color coordinated for a better visual display. The lighting effects were used with greater intention on Sunday morning. The pastor dressed more formally on Sunday morning. Though his language was often identical word-for-word in both services.

The contours of worship were shaped by practices, some of which are well known and others which are less known. The Pentecostal worship practices are not exclusionary of other forms of Christianity entirely because all Christians baptize people and all Christians celebrate the Lord's Supper. The various expressions discussed in interviews and that I observed were separated into four groups based on data about attitudes, authenticity, actions, and less frequently observed phenomena. Most of the data comes from interview transcripts.

Attitudes

Many attitudes were noted in interview data as marking Pentecostal worship, some of which comprise the narration analysis in Chapter 8. Most important are those attitudes that explain what the observer sees and without which the observer would not fully understand what was taking place. Interviewees freely talked about their attitudes toward worship and readily volunteered to me the way they approached the worship moment. Most interviewees were well established within their church, often part of the leadership structure in some capacity; therefore, they were not a representative sample of all worshippers. The goal was to find the meaning most commonly attributed to worship and communication by people who were most likely to reflect on worship because of their involvement.

Celebration

One of the most revealing interview questions was about dancing. Congregation members were asked, “If a friend came to church with you and saw people dancing and asked why people dance in worship, what would you tell them?” Nearly every interviewee responded that they would explain that it was an act of celebration. The responses of two individuals from the same church demonstrate the answers to the question. Neither age, education level, nor ethnicities were predictive of responses by interviewees.

B: If you brought someone with you to church who doesn’t usually attend church and they saw all of these things taking place, and they said, “That’s just a little bit different. Why would anybody dance or jump up and down in a church service?” What would you tell them?

MOC: Um, I would tell them, for me it’s just kind of an outgrowth of um, my relationship with the Lord. Ah, you know, just as last night I’m listening to the

Brewers game and I was very, very excited and there's times at church where emotionally I'm very, very excited. Maybe I've had a rough week or maybe one of my kids have had a break-through in their life or um, my wife and I have drawn closer together or something that is being taught or preached about or sung about just ah resonates. It just hits ah, a spot and I get excited. And so I would try to explain it that way that it's similar, I guess being excited about the Packers or the Brewers or the Badgers, um, and try to maybe explain it along those lines. (Mike, Interview, 10/8/2011)

B: If you brought a friend or a relative to church and they saw someone dancing and asked, "Why would someone do that in church?" What would you tell them?

KOC: I'd tell them exactly my experience. I said, "I did go to a church where someone danced with a ribbon and I'm like," and I would tell them, "Honestly, I freaked out." I thought it was really weird. But then when I realized, like they are just expressing their worship in a way that they feel is, you know, is just for them. It's not for you. Like it's not, she's not dancing *for you*. Like it's not as a show. It's just, it's for, it's for worship to God. And I said, "It might be strange to you. And it might be awkward but you know, it was awkward for me. So then don't look at her." (Laughter) I don't know. I mean people do weird stuff all the time out in real life and just kind of, you know. But you need to express your worship in a way that you feel comfortable and where God, you know, where you can feel like, "This is just for God. It's not for the person next to me. It's not for my parents. It's not for anybody else in the congregation." (Kristiana, Interview, 10/8/2011)

The two responses demonstrate the celebratory nature of Pentecostal worship and the reality that people new to the experience may need time to adjust to the exuberant celebration, even finding it odd, unusual, or "weird." Gender was not a predictor of whether or not a worshipper would describe dancing by pointing to an attitude of celebration; however, it was more common for men to use a sports analogy than for women. Earl (Interview, 8/1/2011) said that celebration in worship was like "cheering on God" for the many things God had done. In observation, some churches are more exuberant than other churches and some worshippers naturally express their worship externally more than others do. In expressive churches, it was just as common to see men

exuberant as women, though in less exuberant churches it tended to be women swaying to music.

One of the two interviewees from the previous exchange explains why, in her opinion, there is more physical activity and celebration in some churches than in other churches.

B: What factors do you think influence how much physical activity there is in a church?

KOC: (pause) factors that influence ... I think the, um (pause) ... what word am I trying to look for ... the community of people, the um (pause) um, the group of people have ... culture! The culture of the church impacts the physical activity completely! I, every church is like a little city, you know. It has its own dynamic. I've been to churches across the entire spectrum of, you know, what they believe and what they view as comfortable for worship. And um, I think the people make up the church. I mean definitely the denomination does, so, obviously when you go to a Catholic church you can expect certain things. When you go to a Christian Missionary Alliance church you can expect certain things. When you come to a Pentecostal church you can expect certain things. But I think even within those denominations, there's a culture of people. And the culture of people pretty much define where, what is going to happen during the service. And everybody kind of, you know – we visited a lot of different churches and we found the church where we fit in. Like we felt like fit. And, you know fit in with what we were comfortable with. So I think that's what other people do. If they aren't comfortable with the type of worship that's going, maybe they will leave and find something else. So, whether it's dancing or banner waving, or raising your hands, or not raising your hands – I've been to a Christian Missionary Alliance churches where people raise their hands and, and move to the music and clap their hands. I've been to Christian Missionary Alliance churches where nobody claps their hands. It's a church that my sister's in. And nobody claps their hands and I started clapping and then I was like, "Okay! People don't clap here." So you stop clapping. You kind of blend with the culture unless you really are feeling led to like, "I'm going to just go all out." If the culture isn't conducive to more, you know, clapping, then you aren't gonna clap. And so, just like here it's, it's more of a free worshipping experience. I can feel like I can relax, like people aren't watching me, like if I start clapping people aren't going to just go, (whispers) "Why is she clapping?" Now if I started dancing with a ribbon and went up to the front of the church, maybe people would start saying, (Whispers) "Why is she dancing with a ribbon?" But if I was at my in-laws church, you know, they wouldn't. I don't know. It's just, I think it really is defined by the people who attend and, and what everybody is comfortable with everybody else doing. (Kristiana, Interview, 10/10/2011)

Orderly

The celebratory attitude is often very spontaneous. Continuing with the sports analogy from the interviewees, however, there are rules and structure to celebration at a sporting event. At a football game, one does not celebrate the loss of a fumble by the home team but there is great celebration when the home team recovers a fumble. One does not usually celebrate without reason. At Pentecostal churches, the rules follow the intervention of God in human affairs. When God intervenes for any area of the Five-fold Gospel, there is reason for celebration. Therefore, a baptism is a celebration of conversion-salvation. A story of a miracle or healing would likely receive some level of celebration. A song about the return of Jesus as the conquering King often incites celebration. In the two Church of God in Christ churches I attended, they celebrated as an overt reminder that God has given people so many things. Even after a terrible week, celebration served as a way to refocus a worshipper's affections on God as the source of joy even in difficult times. On any Sunday, a Pentecostal worshipper could celebrate one's own conversion-salvation and express thankfulness to God for anything that took place during the week. The ongoing celebration without overt provocation is best characterized as a response to Jesus as the sanctifier, the one who brings spiritual formation to a believer.

Pastors often inferred that celebration sometimes deviates from the rules and order. Repeatedly pastors stressed the need for "order" within the service. There were varying degrees of what they meant but they understood the need for order and most volunteered the information that it was their job to make sure the order was kept. Some were very insistent and used the phrase, "I would not allow it" to refer to various

practices they deemed unacceptable within worship. Several pastors pointed to one simple rule: worshippers should not draw attention to themselves by what they do. An implication inferred from the social process included that a worshipper should not distract other worshippers. If the practices of a regular worshipper were likely to become a distraction, pastors indicated that they would privately talk to the individual, requesting either that they sit in the back to minimize distraction or that they reduce the intensity of their practices. An ancillary implication extends the role of a pastor within the speech community. They must have the courage to address issues of order in worship.

Communal

Up to this point, the description of celebration and worship may seem like personal moments. Certainly, the experiences of worshippers were deeply personal but not entirely individualistic. The narrative descriptions of some researchers elucidate an extremely personal experience that simultaneously implies individualism (for a sample see Luhmann 2004). However, interviewees commonly referenced worship as pointing to the larger community, especially during prayer times with the attendant practice of laying hands on other people during prayer. The words of both a great-grandmother and a young woman explain the position.

B: What do you expect from a weekend service?

FCG: I think probably the greatest need that's fulfilled for me in going into a church on Sunday morning is realizing that I'm a part of a bigger, a bigger thing than just me. That when I walk into church, I'm surrounded by other people who think like I do, who feel like I do, who believe what I believe. And that's an affirmation to me, that I'm a part of a bigger thing. That it's not just me out there. That there are others who are in the same battle and it's, it's a chance for me to join together with a whole group of other people that love the Lord just like I do and we can join hearts and join hands and literally, and just come before the Lord as a unified body of believers that reach ... to me, when you get together with a group of people who are worshipping and praising the Lord all together in unity,

it's like a great force. It's a spiritual force that reaches higher than what I can get just by myself. Which doesn't mean that I don't touch God by myself. But it just adds a greater dimension to my worship when I join together with others. And we are all serving the same God. That's an astonishing experience. (Carol, Interview, 8/4/2011)

B: What role does the church service play in your life?

KOC: ... And then the church service itself an opportunity to get together with other believers. Like community is so important to me. Um, you know, meeting other people and being a part of something bigger than yourself. And so that's what church services and um, going to church services is that. Um ... It's getting together with people of like faith and, you know, worshipping and learning all together and struggling together and talking and things like that. (Kristiana, Interview, 10/10/2011)

Obedience

Obedience sounds like action not attitude but presents itself also as an attitude because Pentecostal worship produces an attitude of expected-transformation. The expectancy of transformation exudes every aspect of the service. From the church that greeted me with "Welcome to Holy Redeemer where your life will never be the same," to the church that had a ten minute pageant with church members carrying pieces of cardboard describing an area of their life touched by transformation. In practices from raising one's hands in worship to going down front for an altar call, a worshipper understands the important role of receiving transformation. The service segments of prayer and sermons both build an attitude of expected personal growth through spiritual formation. Within the following explication of various practices, the triplet attitudes of obedience, transformation, and spiritual surrender will prevail as a dominant theme from interviewees.

Accessible

Much of what was seen points to the role of accessibility in worship design. Said differently, there was evidence everywhere that churches tried to make worship accessible to those new to their church and new to the Pentecostal tradition. When interviewees explained why services sometimes looked and sounded like secular concerts, the explanation included tones of accessibility. It provided an environment that helped new people relate to what was happening. Pastors often talked about providing a lot of explanation for outsiders when a verbal charismatic gift operated in a service so that everyone could understand. Some churches projected the attitude of accessibility more than others and some pastors spent a great deal of interview time talking about it. In one interview, nearly every answer the pastor gave me was pointed to making the worship service accessible, including personal background information.

Authenticity

The word “experience” noticeably highlighted the interviews, with forty people using the word to describe phenomena related to spirituality. The most common usage of the word was related to worship such as “the worship experience.” Sometimes it was used more broadly to describe the Christian life such as “have an experience with the Lord” or “the church experience” or “an experience with God” or an “experience of God as a day to day reality.” Some used it in terms of “experiencing the presence of God” or “experiencing the Holy Spirit,” sometimes interchanging those two phrases. The emphasis was on Pentecostal spirituality as something that must be experienced, not merely something that one does. Often interviewees used “experience” as part of

describing what it meant to worship. Experiences happen when an individual interacts with surroundings, with both the surroundings acting upon the subject and the subject acting upon the surroundings.

The second contour is like the first but implying more proactivity by the worshipper. “Participation” was seen as an essential element of the worship experience. In Albrecht’s work the same theme appeared (1999, 2004); however, Albrecht approached it with a tone of assumption and necessity. Within the interviewees for this study, “participation” was seen as a goal that was essential for a full experience of worship and a complete spirituality. In other words, many interviewees understood that one could have an experience without much participation but all interviewees believed that participation was essential for them to get the full impact of worship in their own life. Within the contexts of the interviews, “participation” was seen mostly as kinesthetic activity. “Participation” was seen as an ideal often fully realized but seldom fully achieved by an entire congregation.

The contour of humor happened within the course of video clips, sermons, announcements, or transitions. It served the function of bridging worship with everyday life. It also served as a contrast to churches that approach spirituality as a somber and serious event rather than a natural part of everyday existence. Several interviewees commented about how much they enjoyed funny stories in sermons. The humor was not only intended to draw a contrast with more somber liturgical events, it interacted with the affections of joy within the worshiper. A pastor described his desires for a worship service. Keith (Interview, 7/13/2011) said that when people came in struggling or suffering, “I want them to walk out rejoicing.” Through participation-observation of

sermon audiences, preachers ignore humor at their own peril because audiences pay attention far more when humor dots the sermonic landscape.

The next two contours are each a set of contrasted ideas used by the speech community to enhance the sense of authenticity. Pentecostals use the word “performance” or “show” to contrast with something that was “anointed,” or done through the power of the Holy Spirit. For example, one young woman who was part of her church’s worship band said that she did not want just to put on a show through music. Kimberlee (Interview, 8/3/2011) used the concept slightly differently saying, “That’s a, ummm, a show of my reaction to God specifically. And it’s my show, not a show for someone else.” In any usage of the term, putting on a show or performance in worship for someone other than God was considered out of order. It broke the “rules” of the speech community. While a few interviewees indicated they had seen it happen, it was always considered negative and treated as something that should not take place. One of the pastors interviewed wrote a song with a title that sums up the sentiments expressed by so many, called “Audience of One,” meaning worship is done for God only.¹

The second contrast was between the word religion and relationship. The word religion often incited negative reactions among interviewees. While no one really objected to my usage of the word, it was my assumption that interviewees were being gracious to a researcher who used the term in a technical way. For evidence on that fact, I point to the many times the word was used in a pejorative sense within interviews and worship services. The contrast was always that the Pentecostal version of Christianity

¹ Copyright Tom Sterbens.

does not rely on preset forms of religion or many socially scientific understandings; rather it relies on the vitality of a relationship with God. The differentiation may seem unnecessary and I admit that as a pastor for years I thought the differentiation probably did more harm than good for those outside the Pentecostal speech community. As a researcher, clearly the differentiation vitally informs the spirituality of many because it points to the vitality they enjoy and contrasts with something far different than what they experienced in other faith traditions.

Actions

Albrecht (1999) and others observed kinesthetic aspects to Pentecostal worship. The physically active nature of worship points to an embodiment in worship (Smith 2009). Through the various practices of worship, the spirituality of the speech community was organized and reinforced regularly. While many have observed the practices, in the next few pages I will provide a rare phenomenological glimpse into the meaning worshippers ascribed to those practices.

Lord's Supper

Most of the pastors talked about serving the Lord's Supper once a month with some referencing it as a standard among Pentecostal churches. If those pastors talked about the nature of the celebration, they talked about it as a symbolic activity, generally following a "remembrance view" where the two elements of bread and juice/wine are symbolic of Jesus blood and body and the symbols help participants remember what

Jesus did.² One of the Vineyard churches served communion every Sunday and believed that Jesus' presence was received through the ritual participation. Some of the pastors interviewed celebrated it less frequently. The most common way to celebrate it was to distribute the two elements by passing around trays, though some pastors mentioned making use of other methods like having people come forward as a family. One of the churches had both Sunday morning and evening services that were not duplicate services. Because of their time constraints on Sunday morning, they alternated every other month between the morning and evening services.

Water Baptism

All of the pastors practiced water baptism of believers by immersion rather than infant baptism. When asked how often they baptized people, the most common response was that they did it when they had people ready to be baptized. Since they believed that water baptism was for people who received conversion-salvation, they baptized people when there were enough people new to that experience to merit the celebration, though some mentioned having moments when they only baptized one person. I witnessed one baptism at a church and it was a moment of great celebration for the individual and

² Many systematic theology books delineate four views of the ritual celebration of the Lord's Supper (Eucharist), such as Grudem's explication (1995). Those views are transubstantiation, where the two elements miraculously become the blood and body of Jesus, a view held historically by the Roman Catholic Church. Consubstantiation, a view attributed to Martin Luther, contends that Jesus is above, beneath, and next to the elements but the elements do not change to become the blood and body of Jesus. The "real presence" view originated with Calvin and states that Jesus is really present. His presence is received during the celebration through symbolic representation. The remembrance view originated with Zwingli, known as the "radical reformer," and it states that the celebration is only a memorial or remembrance. Most Pentecostals hold to something very close to the remembrance view.

congregation, truly a communal moment when the entire congregation recognized the woman's conversion-salvation and joined her in celebration.

Singing

After participant observation and interviews, it would be hard to imagine a Pentecostal worship service without singing and other forms of music. In interviews, it was difficult to differentiate the use of "worship" by many congregation members because they used the word interchangeably for the singing portion of the service and a more general sense of the word. Many of the pastors made sure to differentiate the two by defining worship in a broader scope, using the term to include everything a believer does with the intention of bringing glory to God, whether in a worship service or in everyday life. Singing was often robust, typically accompanied by an electronic keyboard, drums, and guitars, though the two churches from the Church of God in Christ each included an organ, and several churches made use of an acoustic piano. Three churches had choirs on Sunday morning and at least one pastor interviewed mentioned the use of a choir. More commonly, a band with several singers and several instrumentalists led singing. It was not uncommon to see musicians in blue jeans and an untucked shirt, though choirs were in either robes or clothes with a coordinated color scheme. Johansen (1994) and others said that singing in Pentecostal churches was a form of prayer. No doubt, there is some truth to that statement; however, none of the fifty interviewees made that connection to call their singing a form of prayer. Many said that during the singing they prayed so it is entirely possible that worshippers use the words of songs as a form of prayer. They also use singing as a form of celebration and as a time for personal reflection according to interviews. It was observed that worshippers often closed their eyes while singing and

some interviewees emphasized that it helped free them from distractions. More will be said about focus and distractions in Chapter 7.

Clapping

While hand clapping was not as essential to the worship environment as singing, clapping to the beat of the music happened in nearly every service. In some churches, worshippers clapped for celebrating an event like water baptism, sometimes to affirm a major point in a sermon, or spontaneously after a song to show praise to God.³ While the contexts were different, the meaning was always the same; clapping was a form of celebration.

Standing and Kneeling

I did not ask specific questions about standing and no one mentioned it as a specific form of worship; however through observation standing was a regular part of worship practices. Sometimes in a service, people might have been asked to stand just to change the body position so people did not get too tired or bored. It was common to see people stand the entire time singing took place, probably because it allowed for other attendant physical activity more naturally, such as dancing or swaying. There was another aspect of standing seen in the middle of sermons at several churches when people would stand for a period of time, often clapping or raising their hands in what looked like a sign of special agreement with the point being made by the preacher. Another aspect of standing was seen in particularly triumphant moments of singing. If congregation

³ Though clapping at the end of a song sounds the like a concert, in several churches the leader encouraged people to “praise the Lord” or “give the Lord a clap of praise.”

members were seated at the end of a service and a triumphant song was sung, they might stand as described in the introductory narrative of Red Mountain Christian Center. It would be similar to fans at a sporting event standing when their team did something positive and exciting. For worshippers, the triumph was related to Jesus providing the means for them to overcome sin, troubles in life, Satan, or the final triumph of Jesus returning to take believers to heaven. In several churches people stood when the Bible was read as a sign of respect. In the Church of God in Christ, people would stand when the minister was introduced, or “presented” as the bulletins termed it. One pastor explained that it was a sign of respect for the position of pastor. People would also stand for prayer often.

It was more common to see people stand for prayer than to kneel, though kneeling did take place. Kneeling took place in several different ways. First, people knelt spontaneously during singing in the place where they were seated or in a nearby aisle if it was close to them. I never saw more than two or three people kneel at any one time in a service. Second, people would often kneel when they went to the front for prayer, especially at the end of a service. It was a sign of respect, reverence, and submission to God.

Dancing

The interviewees’ views on dancing not only inform the attitude of celebration and the definition of worship, they also point to a practice understood to be part of the Pentecostal worship experience even though it was used by only a few. More pastors made it clear that they did not dance during worship than those who made it clear that they did dance as part of worship. Congregation members were willing to explain

dancing, though most said they did not dance in worship. Interviewees inferred that dancing was spontaneous, seldom planned, and rarely synchronized. There was also an implication of tension on the subject of dancing because of long-standing prohibitions against going to dances in Pentecostalism. In one church some young ladies were practicing a hip hop dance on Saturday when I was in the building conducting interviews; however the leader made it clear that they called it “synchronized movement” to ease the tension that seemed mostly generational. Many congregation members and pastors alike indicated that their people might sway to the music or even move a little bit in place but dancing in an overt fashion either never happened in their church or happened only rarely from just a few worshippers. As previously mentioned, within the Church of God in Christ churches dancing was an expected practice on a weekly basis according to one pastor who traveled to various churches a lot. Younger generations may jump up and down, sometimes according to several pastors. In observation, the practice is not common but would be acceptable in almost any Pentecostal church. The interviewees from a church in a retirement community made it clear that dancing and jumping were out of the question because of age; further, I observed that older women and men in the Church of God in Christ might sway as though they were dancing but physical limitations prevented them from engaging the practice in dramatic fashion.

Raised Hands

The well-known kinesthetic worship practice for Pentecostals involves raising one’s hands in the air. From observation and interviews, the position of the hands and length of extending the arms is quite irrelevant to the ascribed meaning. In some churches, as much as seventy-five percent of the people raised their hands in worship

while in other churches as few as ten percent did; however, it happened in *every* church. Because of the frequency of the practice, the actual words of worshippers will help delineate the potential meanings of the practice. It is important to note that there were not “schools of thought” on the subject, only alternative and diverse interpretations. Because of the tone of the answers, if one of the other alternatives had been offered to worshippers they would likely have agreed with it. The combination of answers demonstrated that the commonality of the practice rests partially on the flexibility of meaning. Indeed, nearly every important theme of Pentecostal worship was encapsulated within the answers. The order of alternatives given is not intended to privilege one answer over any others because there was no way of prioritizing the answers after the first one. The first part of the meaning was that it follows the Biblical pattern described in Psalms.

I am reporting most responses to demonstrate how interviewees mixed and matched explanations and to show the scope of their answers. I am giving mostly full quotes to maintain the personality of the interviewees. In general, I asked pastors some form of the following question as dictated by the course of the conversation:

B: What do you tell people if they were to ask what it means to raise their hands in worship, somebody maybe who is new? What would you tell them?

PWM: Well, I’ve just finished a whole series on body language and what you’re body expressions mean. . . . You know we’ve talked about clapping, raising your hands, falling on your face, different expressions and what they mean. But ah, there, there’s a lot of different thoughts you know. One of those, one of the words in the Hebrew for worship means to extend or throw like to throw something. And, and, and so it’s the expression of praise and, and honor and worship by lifting your hands. You also have those, you know, that it’s a, it’s a place of submission and complete surrender to somebody, you know, to the Lordship of, of, of God. So there’s a lot of different things that lifting up hands are. (William, Interview, 8/7/2011)

PGL: Um, it’s an expression of worship. I guess nobody has really um, asked me that in such a long time. What does it mean? Um, the scripture talks about um know you raising our hands in worship. It, it talks about that being a form of

worship. I think um, you know, I think it's Psalms too. (Greg L., Interview, 9/23/2011)

PGP: We would tell that that that's a, that is a physical, physical means of, a sense of connection. Your heart tends to follow your hands. Um, we would tell them that it's a means of demonstrating our love for the Lord like we would at a football game or a basketball game or something. Just an, an expression. Ah, a sense of surrender. A sense of worship, adoration. (Gary, Interview, 8/1/2011)

PRN: Um, pretty much it's an action that designates openness of ourselves, surrender and ah also a, a way to ah, add value to or lift up the person that we're worshipping. (Ronald, Interview, 8/3,2011)

PDY: I think hand raising um, can mean several things. I don't know if it has to have one definition. Um, I definitely think if you're opening up your hands to God, um, it's an act of surrender. It can be an act of reaching out. It can simply be an act of engaging your emotions in worship, which I, I don't think there's anything wrong with engaging of the emotions in worship because we're an emotional people. We get emotional about many different things. I encourage people to engage emotionally so if that's part of hand raising, um, that's fine with me. (David, Interview, 8/5/2011)

ANON: Ah, it's our, it's a corporate expression unto God. It's a personal expression unto God that is, we would say, often a reflection of, you know, their desire for God. Though we understand that desire does not necessary connect with integrity or a, a life that is lived out entirely for God. (Interview, 8/4/2011)

ROH: (pause) First and foremost and I gue –, I think there's, there's a numerous, there could be numerous decision – not decisions – numerous directives or reasons. But first the Scripture says we should. I believe there are scriptural admonitions on how to worship. That's one of them. And worship is about pleasing Him. Worship is not ... if I, it's funny I tell our people a whole lot. If, if I, worship is blessing the heart of God. (Russell, Interview, 8/2/2011)

KMF: Well, raising of the hands is, I believe, a symbolism of surrender. When, I work for the sheriff's department. And when we walk up behind somebody and say, "Freeze! Put your hands up!" Why we doing that? Because it's a sign of surrender. And when we lift our hands before God, it's a sign of surrender. Lord, I give it all to you. And that's what I would tell them. (Keith, Interview, 7/13/2011)

PPM: I would say it's a sign of, um, surrender to God. It's a way, an ancient way of prayer. People prayed standing with their hands raised. So it's saying we're open to God and calling on Him. (Pat, Interview, 7/21/2011)

PAK: Uh, you ask a couple different people, you get a couple different answers. My wife gets asked the most because she's the most. My wife will give you a

parental answer. Which is, "It's like saying to Jesus, 'I'm your kid. Pick me up. Here am I.'" Um, I give a – I was a, grew up Lutheran and even though I had asked the Lord into my heart that freaked me out for the longest time. And I remember standing in youth group and thinking like this (lifts hands about three inches, next to body). If God wants me to raise my hands, He's the sovereign of the universe. He can go ahead and do it himself. You know? And after about a year of watching these passionate kids worship Jesus I remember thinking they just look so free. And it was that night I went (Slowly lifts hand until he shot it straight up into the air). Okay, put it up there. Yeah baby! And now I'm six foot four, I kind of have this set-the-little-man-free kind of philosophy. That sometimes when you experience freedom in God it frees other people. And they're inspired by the freedom we have in the Lord. And in that then, I point to all the Scripture verses that say, raise your holy hands, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. And I say, "Throw em up there and see what happens." Because what we do in worship echoes what we do in life. And if you're not free before God when you're in a worship service with him, you're hosed by the time you get home. Because where the problems and the difficulties and the work place and your boss and you're this and you're that. And all the frustrations. You gotta be free with God in church if you're ever going to be free him. (Al, Interview, 10/5/2011)

PAV: I say, "Did you ever have those moments something or someone so much and you don't know how to express it. And you're at a loss. And you think to yourself, 'My words can't do it. Nothing that I can say is gonna capture how much I love you, how grateful I am. I can't, can't do this with words alone?'" I just say, "That's people who have tasted the goodness of Jesus um, and they don't know any other way to do it. It's like I have to, everything has to cry out to you from my whole being not my mind, just not my spirit, not just my words. It's like, all of me. So some version of that. (Adey, Interview, 10/2/2011)

PLP: Well, um, it means surrender. Um, my wife this morning referenced that. Um, it is ah obedience. Or obedience to a response, you know, from the Bible. It says lifting up holy hands you know, without fear. And so ah, it means ah, victory. You know, if ah ... these are, these are things I've shared with our congregation. For instance, if a, um, if the Colts happen to score a touchdown tonight the guy will raise his hands. (Laughter) I so I mean you know, it's a, it's an expression of um, of overcoming, of victory, surrender. Those are, those are the two main that I really focus on. So ... (Larry, Interview, 9/25/2011)

PTT: And I tell the people this, I tell them, "Look when I worship I close my eyes most of the time. I don't want to think about anyone else. I don't want to see anything else." Uh, if I'm not with my eyes closed, I'm lookin' up usually. Um, and when I'm raisin' my hands, to me, and I tell people this too, it's an act of surrender. It's an act of drawing closer to God. It's like sayin', "here I am!" Um, um, I want whatever you want to do right now. And to me it's just a hunger and a surrender. (Todd, Interview, 9/29/2011)

PGD: Ah it's a sign of, again, of reverence to God, the Spirit of God is in the room. Ah, it's a, it's a sign of, of love toward our God. It's a sign of, "I need you." You know I've even made the analogy of just children. When we, when children come up to their parents, especially when they're small, they reach up, you know, you know, it's, it's, it's, it's that type of situation. Ah that I look at that. It's a sign of surrender. Um, it can be all of those things at one time. Ah but it is a definite sign of praise to our God, to worship where we lift our hands, even clapping of our hands. (Greg D., Interview, 8/1/2011)

I asked congregation members a similar question but more direct. Rather than making a hypothetical question, I simply asked what it meant from their perspective.

B: When people raise their hands in worship, what does that mean?

TBT: It's – a lot of times it can mean different things for different people. Um, sometimes it can be, you know, "Lord I'm surrendering myself to you." Or, "I'm reaching to you God." Um, or just, you know what? "I'm excited." We go to football games or basketball games and people express themselves all the time. Whether they're cheering for their team or whatever the case. And I believe that worship, we should be definitely cheering on God and expressing to Him. (Thomas, Interview, 10/10/2011)

HDR: I think when people, ah, raise their hands, I think number one it's a, um, a demonstration of, to the Lord that I surrender, ah, all to you. I want you to know that you know, my hands are lifted. Ah it's a, it's an expression of praise. It's an expression of reverence for you. Um, and it's, it's an expression of obedience. (Hattie, Interview, 7/21/2011)

MNM: That's lifting up, I don't know. It's like, it's like reaching up towards God and then He reaches back. Um (Pause) It's kind of like, like you don't have to get on your knees to pray but it's like a act of submission. (Jeffrey, Interview, 8/7/2011)

BLC: Um, I'm thinking that they're, you know, glorifying God. That they're um, praising and thanking Jesus Christ for what He does in their life. That they are showing him that he's number one, showing him that He's all mighty and that He deserves our, you know – hands to go upward in the air to thank Him for being, you know, Christ our savior. (Brad, Interview, 7/27/2011)

KOC: Kind of like a letting go. Like I remember growing up in our Christian Missionary Alliance church and, like raising your hands, like there was one lady in our church who raised her hands during worship and that was like "the weird lady who raised her hands during worship at church." I mean everybody knew her. It was just kind of weird. And it's just kind of like a freeing like, just letting God know like, "This is for you. It's not for me. I'm not singing because I, you know, because I love to sing." Because I'm a bad singer. But it's like just saying

like, “This is for you. Like this isn’t for me. I’m just giving it all up to you. That’s it.” (Kristiana, Interview, 10/10/2011)

FOC: Ah for me, it means that like, in this moment I’m focused on you God. That like, I am grateful for what you’ve given me that I wanna be where you are, I want to be closer with you. Like, so for it’s like, by raising my hands, like I’m letting go of everything that might be going on in my life right now. That I’m, you know, not thinking about work and this report that needs to be sent off. Or I’m not work, or thinking about my mom is like yelling at me about doing something. Like I’m here for you God, like take me, use me. (Mary, Interview, 10/10/2011)

DHT: It means that um, totally surrendering and to give God honor, glory and, and reverence His holy name. Um, (pause) it’s very spiritual to me when you raise your hands. You know how sometimes you just do stuff and you get tired and your hands go down. But when you’re really into the Spirit, you don’t even get tired. And, and I’ve noticed that when I press my way in, I don’t even get tired. My hands just could stay up for a very long time because I’m surrendering to God and I just want to give Him all glory, honor, and praise. (Debra, Interview, 8/1/2011)

LIA: Um, I think (pause) So I think it’s, it’s one expression, you know. On one level it’s just a physical expression of worship, you know it might be similar to the practice of kneeling. Um, I think can be a way of sort of reaching out to get closer to God. Um, I mean I think that, you know, it’s important to remember that people are embodied and that we can worship with our bodies as well as just with our minds and our hearts. So you know, whatever ways you can involve your body in worship, um, it’s probably going to make it a more powerful experience. You know, God will probably like it. Um, so yeah. That should be ... (Luke, Interview, 10/2/2011)

FIA: I think, I think physically prob ... what happens, I, I rarely, I rarely lift my hands but I think physically what happens for people is they just feel um, more connected because our sense as humans is that God is above us I think. So I think that’s kind of a, like, “Yes you’re up on being heightened or being lifted up by this worship and therefore I’m going to stick my hands in the, hands in the air.” I don’t know if some of it’s not even done on a conscience level. Um, cause I feel like if you would over think it you’d be like, “Should I put my hands up?” (Jennifer, Interview, 10/2/2011)

PTN: Surrender, kind of. I guess that’s what it is, surrender. And ah, honor. Surrender and honor. And free, freedom. When you raise your hands – and I’ve told this to so many people – I’ve said, and I’ve even prayed for people. Like if you were up in front of me and you were one of my friends and you had just come to the church and I knew you. I’ve done this in church. And people that I know from business background, I know what’s gone on in their life. And I’ve seen them, I’ve seen them when they’re sitting there and they’ll go like this. They’ll be going and, and suddenly they’ll shoot their hand up like this. (After gesticulating

with a slow motion of raising his hand into the air until finally it bursts quickly the last foot into the air.) And they'll go (looks around). And they cannot do it. And I've been there. And I sit there and I just go, "Go ahead. Go ahead. Free yourself. Free yourself." When you do it, when you raise your hands you free yourself. That's what you do. And that's the best. When you can free yourself, then you can become all God intends you to be. And until you, until you free yourself, you won't. Because those things that you're uncomfortable doing, ah, you won't do. When you come out of your comfort zone, that's when you become your best. (Charles, Interview, 10/29/2011)

CTN: (pause) Um (pause) Well first off is I would say, um I believe Genesis 14 I think is where (pause) where I think Abraham comes out and he, he makes covenant with God and ah, it says that he, you know, he literally lifted his hand to God and it was, ah, it, was a sign of covenant. ... And ah, and ah I think that's um, I, I think can be, that can be really, that can really effect where you're ah, how deep your worship can go, where you want to take that. Because ah, essentially just saying okay I surrender, that's a, that's a pretty general thing. But saying, okay, I'm, I'm making this covenant with you. I'm making this pact with you and it's, it's real and it's ah, and it's tangible because I lifted my hand in this sign of, of covenant and oath with you. And, and I choose, ah to lay myself down. I choose, I choose to die. And ah, I choose to, to take that as my burden. (Chad, Interview, 10/29/2011)

MRM: I would say, (pause) I mean for, I guess from my perspective it's just trying to, almost like you're reaching for God. Like a, like a little kid, like a little kid would reach up for a parent or something like that. You know it's, that's what it is for me. I don't know about, about other people. (Miguel, Interview, 8/3/2011)

KRM: Ummm, specifically for me it's praising God. And, and being silently vocal about (laughter) ... (Kimberlee, Interview, 8/3/2011)

KLC: It's an abandonment. It's a release. It's a – you're laying yourself before God. Um, some people will raise their hands. Some people will kneel. Um, some people sway back and forth. It's just the feeling that they have in the moment. And it's an abandonment and just a release to God. (Kristie, Interview, 7/27/2011)

RBT: Ah, to me, this is you know the way I've always pictured it. It's an act of surrender, like a child to their parent. You know, when you got kids and you know when your kids were little they, you know, "Hold me daddy. Hold me." Raise them hands up. That's what it is to me in my – it's like that. "Hold me daddy." You know I surrender. (Richard, Interview, 10/10/2011)

TBT: I would say that, that our expression of worship is really just an outward expression of what's going on inside of us. My own personal life I would say, I am led to lift my hands because I just can't contain myself. It's like I want, I want to reach God and touch God so much that the outward expression I have is just lifting my hands in surrender to Him. (Thomas, Interview, 10/10/2011)

LBT: I, to me personally, to me personally that is (pause) I feel closer to Him with that and I am, I, I'm just reaching for Him. Pick me up Daddy. (Lisa, Interview, 10/10/2011)

MCG : When you raise your hands in worship, it's a means of ... It actually comes out of the Old Testament, I don't know the scripture. But it's a means of ah, of expressing myself um, to the Father. It's something He requires of me to do. Um, and it's something that I do willingly. It's, it's just my way of just extending, I guess, extending the contents of my heart to God, through my hands. And it's just worshipping him. And I ah, it, it talks in the ah, in the Old Testament of ah, the different kind of offerings. And one of them that the Israelites used to do, and one is called a wave offering. And, and part of my worship is to, is to move my hands in this fashion (waves hands back and forth) to the Lord as a, as an offering, just revering him, honoring him, praising him. (Charles, Interview, 8/4/2011)

Laying On of Hands

The Pentecostal speech community is not the only Christian tradition to practice the laying on of hands; however, for them it often takes place in a wider scope that reveals the sociology of the speech community. Through attending services for research, I observed a variety of times when people lay their hands on others. It was acceptable for an average worshipper to put their hands on someone else while praying for them. The democratic nature of the practice reveals aspects of both the sociology and spirituality of the group. Typically, they would put their hands on either the back or shoulder of the other, though sometimes they put their hand on the forehead. Rarely, I saw a worshipper touch another body part; however, through interviews it was revealed that some worshippers would touch the specific body part in need of healing.

When asked what it meant, the answers fell along four distinctive aspects. The answers were not in competition but should be seen as aligned to form one whole meaning. First, a few interviewees mentioned the Biblical nature of laying their hands on someone in need of prayer. Second interviewees said that it meant that a person was in

agreement with the other for the specific need. Third, interviewees said that it was a way to demonstrate that they cared. The physical touch acted like a gentle pat on the back. For many who had been the recipient of the practice, they said it was very reassuring. Fourth, a few interviewees said it was an impartation of God's powerful energy. Some told stories of being able to feel energy pass through their own body, through the hand, and into the other person.

Verbal Activity

Many distinct types of verbal activity existed within the worship services. The first was prayer. Because of the many uses of prayer delineated by pastors and the many ways and times prayer was used in worship services, it was obvious that prayer was important to the Pentecostal speech community. Further, it was common for congregation members to talk about private prayer done individually in everyday life. Prayer was particularly used to begin and end services. It was common to have a time of prayer at the end of a service. Even if a specific time was not offered, it was acceptable for a worshipper to go forward for prayer at the end of a service. It was common to have a time of prayer in the middle of the service. In smaller churches, particularly in more rural churches, pastors talked about asking people in the congregation to mention prayer requests. In services with many worshippers, where crowd size would prohibit such a practice, people were often asked either to go forward for prayer or to step into an aisle. If they went forward, there was often a group of mature worshippers who were responsible to pray individually with people for needs. Those groups were given different names in various churches, being called prayer partners, prayer elders, prayer counselors, or deacons. Sometimes the pastor(s) participated in praying for people but often they

allowed congregation members to pray for each other, again pointing to the democratic nature of the priesthood of all believers discussed in Chapter 5.

Second, verbal praise was a common practice in many churches. After a song ended, sometimes there would be a period of time before the next song started and people were encouraged to verbalize praise to God. Sometimes that was quiet and other times it roared forth, depending on the congregation. Such times appeared spontaneous though I overheard one music group's practice and the leader told them there would be a pause after a song to allow for such moments. Even though planning spontaneity may appear to defeat the purpose, it maintains the value of spontaneity for the worshipper while allowing the musicians to plan what they will do in the moment for better musical coordination.

Verbal interjections into sermons were common in some churches, though it was very much dependent on a church-by-church practice. The practice has a long history for Pentecostals. It was best described as people agreeing with the preacher (or other speaker, though most common during the sermon). From time to time, preachers would ask people if they agreed and people would respond, "Amen." In those cases, it functioned as a form of verbal tracking to keep the congregation on task with the preacher. "Amen" was the most common verbal interjection though a wide array of words were heard, including such things as "that's right" or "preach it" or "hallelujah." There were no predicting variables for the kinds of churches engaging in the practice. It was not dependent on ethnicity, geographical region, gender, or denomination, though it was less common in the Vineyard churches.

Based on my observation, a researcher could attend Pentecostal services for many weeks and not witness verbal charismatic gifts such as prophecy, speaking in tongues, interpretation of tongues, a word of knowledge, or a word of wisdom. Indeed, I did not hear any of those charismatic gifts in any of the services I attended though the pastors told me that it happened in their services. Some of the reports of pastors suggested that such things “went in seasons.” Others said that it was a regular occurrence though it did not happen every week. Quite a few pastors responded that it did not happen as much as they would prefer. In one church, such charismatic gifts did not happen at all according to the pastor, though I heard people in tongues-speech in private worship at that church. Many people may have engaged in tongues-speech privately during worship though in some of the churches I did not hear it take place. In other churches, it was easy to hear tongues-speech. Both charismatic gifts and private tongues speech were issues of concern for the pastors.⁴ Of particular concern for the pastors was the accessibility of such activity for all worshippers, especially those with no previous knowledge. Pastors said they relied on explanations when such things may have taken place. Other pastors said they were cognizant of the value of order and structure so they wanted those kinds of things to be done in smaller group settings.

The verbal activity of a public testimony was reported with great frequency in literature related to Pentecostals internationally (Schultze 1994; Lindhardt 2009; Cartledge 2010); however, I did not witness a congregational testimony in my

⁴ Most Pentecostals differentiate between tongues-speech as a charismatic gift and as a private form of prayer. As an individual form of prayer it may happen in a variety of everyday places at various times, particularly in worship services; however as a charismatic gift it is far more common to be part of communal worship or prayer. (See Excursus at the end of Chapter 9.)

observation. From the reaction of interviewees, the practice seems to have waned a great deal in U.S American Pentecostal churches. The concern of several pastors summarizes potential reasons. One pastor said that he would not allow anyone to speak if he did not know the person and what they were going to say because he felt it was unfair to the congregation. Another pastor said that testimonies were often entertaining more than edifying. Even though those two pastors were separated by geography, age, and denomination, their combined experiences echoed the sentiments of many other pastors interviewed. The reward from allowing someone else to speak without knowing what they might say was no longer worth the risk for many pastors within the U.S American Pentecostal speech community. From interviews it would seem that pastors ignore the practice entirely over the objections of congregation members who reported enjoyment from the practice, especially when narrating the conversion-salvation of people during water baptism. Some pastors reported including testimonies by way of video or other creative means. Congregation members talked positively about testimonies but presented them as an ideal type of describing a miracle, healing, or great intervention by God in everyday life. People in smaller churches were more likely to report the regularity of testimonies. The logistical concerns make it easier for many to speak in a smaller church than a gathering of five hundred people.

Altar Times

The front space of a church between the first row of seating and the stage area was often called the altar and invitations to come and pray were sometimes called “altar

calls.”⁵ It was often empty or filled with a table used for serving the Lord’s Supper. The space was considered a space for prayer and was used quite differently from church to church. It was used for organized prayer in the middle of the service when people were invited forward either to receive prayer or to pray for someone they knew. In other cases the altar space was used for less structured times of prayer at the end of the service. In one church, I saw a practice I remembered from my days growing up where people were encouraged to find a place to pray at the end of a Sunday evening service. In the church in which I observed the practice, it lasted approximately ten to fifteen minutes. In another church, people were told they could come forward to pray but most prayed sitting in their chairs; however, people went forward individually to receive the Lord’s Supper. In yet another church the sermon was about marriage and the service ended with inviting people forward for prayer for their marriage; while few people went forward there was a time constraint and it was reported that many went forward at an earlier service that morning. In one church people went forward spontaneously during singing and knelt at the altar to pray.

In one church during the middle of August on both Saturday evening and Sunday morning, people were invited forward for prayer as happened in many other churches. On Saturday night the pastor introduced the segment by saying, “If we don’t learn to fight

⁵ As noted in Chapter 4, the practice dates back to the First Great Awakening and used earnestly in the Second Great Awakening. Typically, an altar call was for conversation-salvation; however, in Pentecostal churches it was expanded to include prayer in nearly every form. The term most often used historically was “altar call.” I did not use the term in the interviews because I was not sure the practice was still used widely. While the practice was used widely, the term was used mostly by pastors. Some congregation members used the term also but mostly clustered by congregations. When one member used the term, the other congregation members were likely to use it also.

battles in prayer we will fight them in the flesh” (Field notes). On Sunday morning he said, “Win it in the spiritual before fighting it in the natural” (Field notes). Then the children of the church were brought in for prayer, coming from their own service being conducted in another part of the building. Then the pastor asked all the teens to come forward. After that, he asked all of the people who worked with teens and children to come forward and pray with individual children or teens. The pastor said that children and teens needed extra prayer to go back to school so they would have power to “stand up” against temptation and sin, as the battle metaphor for prayer continued. The event lasted about seven minutes. In the Sunday morning service, the general prayer time preceding prayer for school attenders was marked by quite a bit of physical activity. Prayer was loud and intense. Some people being prayed for fell over backward as described in more detail in the next section.

I have attended many Pentecostal worship services and prayer meetings through the years as a part of the speech community and seen many moments like that one. However, that particular morning I remember wondering what it was like for people who had never experienced such a moment. Would they understand? Would there be confusion? Would they find the moment weird? When I asked Pastor Marty (Interview, 10/10/2011) about his experience with people who had no church background he said, “That really has surprised me” and he proceeded to talk about how many people come to their church having only previously attended church for one or two weddings. He was surprised at how many people came to church with no church background, a theme of many of the pastors. I asked specifically about the reaction of those people to some of the things I saw that Sunday morning and he said, “If it’s negative, I haven’t heard it.”

Toward the end of a sermon about the power of the Holy Spirit, he said, “you don’t have to explain a thing. ‘Cause the Lord will explain Himself. Because when it’s God’s Spirit ... almost every week I have somebody that will get ahold of me and say, ‘I don’t know what was goin’ on there but it was different. That was really good. I just really liked it. We’ll be back because, man, that was different.’ There’s something different. And a lot times it’s so cool. They can’t articulate it. And neither can I. Thank God we can’t necessarily articulate it” (Sermon, transcription, 8/14/2011). The pastor believed that there were spiritual experiences that were Spirit-driven. Some of the practices at that particular church happen less frequently within Pentecostal churches. There are other practices that also happen less frequently.

Infrequent Contours

There were several infrequently mentioned contours, actions that only one or two interviewees mentioned and I observed on only a few occasions. Shouting would be the most likely of those actions to take place, typically at more “triumphant moments” in worship. Shouting was mentioned most by interviewees from the Church of God (Cleveland, TN). In one church, I witnessed people “shaking” so I asked the pastor about it. He said that it was a common occurrence in his church and throughout the Church of God in Christ. Because no interviewee mentioned it, shaking probably is a less common contour of Pentecostal worship. Running or dancing in the aisles was observed in both churches affiliated with the Church of God in Christ and was said to be frequent within that denomination but was not witnessed in other churches and was not referenced by other interviewees. As mentioned previously, dancing near one’s seat is more of a common occurrence in various Pentecostal churches across denominational lines. One

person mentioned a foot washing ceremony, which would be more common among the Church of God (Cleveland, TN). Several interviewees mentioned lying face down on the floor in prayer and one mentioned it in the context of public worship but observations would suggest it is probably a private form of worship for individuals rather than a public practice. Several mentioned waving flags or ribbons as a form of celebration, even dancing during the practice. Interviewees from one church made it clear that one family regularly engaged in the practice. Other interviewees indicated it happened in churches they visited, usually in Charismatic churches not affiliated with a denomination.

I asked both pastors and congregation members about silence and most said their church had periods of silence from time to time but the tone of their voices typically suggested it was infrequent. The most common thing associated with silence was a charismatic gift because often silence preceded publically giving a charismatic gift. People often associated meditation with silence using words like “reflection,” “quiet prayer,” hearing a “still small voice” which references a scriptural term now associated with God speaking to an individual, and “remembrance.” However, many interviewees said that they could not recall a period of silence in worship at their church and some required a follow-up question because they did not understand the original question that other interviewees so readily answered.

In two services, I witnessed people falling over backward while someone was praying for them. Some interviewees indicated that they had experienced the phenomena. I asked Debra (Interview, 8/1/2011) to explain what happens and we had the following exchange:

B: Sometimes in Pentecostal churches when people get lost in that moment, and they're overwhelmed by God, this is widely reported, sometimes they fall over. Has that ever happened to you?

DHT: Mmhmm.

B: Can you tell me what that was like for you?

DHT: (Pause) It's almost like floating. If I could say that. It's almost like floating. Um, I have literally fallen and I don't remember falling. I don't hurt myself, I wasn't hurt, nothing um, was injured. And it's just spiritual you just feel, it's almost, you just feel such an anointing. You feel, just feel like you're out of here. It's almost like the out-of, it's not an out-of-body experience but it's an experience that allows you to shut out everything that's going on and it's just you and God. You're communicating with the Holy Spirit.

Tears were an infrequent phenomena observed though it was obvious from interviews that the raw emotional implicated from an experiential, transformative, orthopathy sometimes manifested in tears. The way interviewees talked about the emotional aspects of their spirituality inferred that tears were acceptable for either men or women. Describing their experiences in worship, three women had tears in the interview. A man who sold heavy equipment talked about the impact of his spirituality on his everyday life saying it made him more sensitive to the problems of other people. I found that the male gender role was reformed by Pentecostal worship according to their own accounts, making them better husbands, fathers, employees, and reforming substance abuse tendency, which is consistent with previous research.

One pastor reported that when people with no church background came into church, after a few weeks those people would report that they would start crying without explanation. The pastor provided an answer integrated with affective responses and cognitive dimensions of naming new phenomena.

PAV: They will, usually say, "I'm so embarrassed. It's like the eighth week I've come and I'm crying. You must think I am a total idiot. I don't know why I'm crying. I can't stop crying. We always say, "Enjoy it. It won't last forever. It's

gonna be the best part.” Um, I think when it’s during the worship, that’s because they’re encountering something they do not understand. So part of I can say is reactionary. They see this community. They love each other. They’re friends. They’re holding hands and their arms are around each other. It’s something sweet. I don’t think that’s it. Because they can go to a rock concert. Um, but I think they’re encountering something real that they haven’t named yet that’s undoing them, which I’m grateful. Um, during the teaching I think that’s a little bit different. I think it’s part of that and partly they haven’t heard truth preached. And I think it undoes them. And although today is a little more intense than usual, um, when you’re doing a relationship series –and I know that is the primary thing that everybody struggles with in our church – I’m gonna be a little bit more intense than usual, although I try to measure it, but then they’re crying because they’re like, “My marriage is crap. We haven’t blah, blah, blah in ten years. Whatever it is.” So then I think it’s they’re hearing their story named and they don’t know what to do because no one’s named it directly before. So I think it’s a good thing they’re crying. (Adey, Interview, 10/2/2011)

The frequency of tears remains unpredictable; therefore crying was included in the section on infrequent contours. There were indications that in some churches it was quite frequent while in other churches it seemed infrequent. Further study focused specifically on the affective phenomena of Pentecostal spirituality might fruitfully illuminate the frequency and predictive factors for crying as a spiritual phenomenon.

Textures, Themes, and Observations

The contours of worship services demonstrated a high probability of accuracy in Land’s spirituality triad of orthodoxy, orthopraxis, and orthopathy (Land 2010), when orthodoxy rises from both doctrinal teaching as well as providing cognitive explanations for affective practices. The previous sections demonstrated that orthopraxis was marked by an expectation of life transformation following conversion-salvation. The meaning behind many of the worship practices emphasized orthopathy, a training of the affections (Smith 2009). Some worship practices involve all three areas of Land’s triad while other practices include only one. Tongues-speech is probably the best-known communication

practice of Pentecostal worship but textures worship in one aspect of the triad, orthopathy.

Complexity of Tongues-speech

The complexity of tongues-speech has already been mentioned by interaction with theologians on the subject and I favored a symbolic approach to understanding the phenomena. Though the symbolic nature of tongues-speech aids understanding of the event, the connection between tongues speech and the worship agenda of spontaneity that once seemed clear, now breaks down with regularity. Two different churches will serve as instructive exemplars for the discussion. One pastor's stated goal was to change the Pentecostal culture within his church. He made a clear distinction between the belief structure and the cultural practices of the speech community. For that Assemblies of God church, tongues-speech was a private practice and charismatic gifts were for small groups of believers, not for public worship. I interviewed quite a few people from the church, four formally and more informally. Those with previous experience in Pentecostal churches all understood the practice of tongues-speech and knew the theological connection with Spirit baptism the denomination makes. However, those who were attending their first Pentecostal church had little understanding of Spirit baptism. One confused it with water baptism while another did not seem even to know what the term meant. Another sidestepped the term and wanted only to say he practiced biblical Christianity as a "Christ follower." A fourth had some knowledge of Spirit baptism, but along with the other three had never experienced it. Another suburban church also affiliated with the Assemblies of God had a similar demographic with many younger people new to the Pentecostal tradition. Their goal was to find ways culture could

understand the Pentecostal experience, including tongues-speech. The people I interviewed from that church all had a clear understanding of Spirit baptism, knew the connection with tongues-speech, and had experienced it personally.

In the first church, the pastor made it clear he did not want much spontaneity in the service as a local adaptation. The worship services were highly structured and planned with little room for deviation. Prayer time at the end of the service around the altar was allowed but I did not see anyone make use of the opportunity. In both churches, spontaneity was difficult because of the large number of worshippers in attendance for every service. Yet the second church did not shun spontaneity completely. They made space for it during singing and during prayer times at the altar at the end of the service. Their goal was to find ways even within a large worship context to include charismatic gifts though the associate pastor admitted it was not easy. The connection between tongues-speech and spontaneity was not absolute and more research should be done on the subject. However, when the emphasis of a church discourages spontaneity worshippers may struggle to find space for tongues-speech.

While various researchers pointed to either practices (Csordas 2011) or tongues-speech (Austin-Broos 1997) as a sign of the quality of one's relationship with God, some interviewees for my study offer a different view. One pastor said, "We understand that desire does not necessarily connect with integrity or a, a life that is lived out entirely for God. They come in and jump, jump and get jigitty and then go out and live awful" (Interview, 8/4/2011). Very often, the quality of one's spirituality and relationship with God was qualified with terms like "Christ-like" or "character" or "love." The practices were an outflow of those inner qualities that texture worship. One interviewee said, "It

should be like really apparent that I'm trying to live my life for God" (Thomas, Interview, 10/10/2011). Many interviewees in this study connected the quality of spirituality with inner traits that were revealed in social practices such as loving one's neighbor and then expressed through worship practices. For example, for interviewees kneeling was a sign of humility and humility pointed to the quality of spirituality. Said differently, inner traits compelled the narration that was subsequently embodied through worship practices.

For some, the reality of tongues speech was murky. One of the questions revealed a great deal of insight from interviewees. I asked, "Is being baptized in the Holy Spirit important for you to live in a different way?" Many responded that it brought new power and new insight for living. One young woman, however, replied that it did not make a difference but was only another way to communicate with God.

Miracles

Most Pentecostal Christians would say they believe in miracles. I asked if they had ever witnessed a miracle, as an opportunity to both determine if they believed in miracles and the prevalence of miracles within the speech community. Of the twenty-six congregation members interviewed, twelve had witnessed a miracle and twelve had not, with two not responding to that question. Quite a few qualified their negative answer by talking about the "miracle of salvation" and wanting to make sure they included conversion-salvation as a miracle. However, other forms of miracles were less prevalent, even for people who had been part of the speech community for several decades.

Several interviewees used the culturally specific vocabulary term "God thing" to refer to a situation or social drama as miraculous. The phrase inferred that a series of

circumstances could only be explained by God's intervention, at least from the narrator's perspective. Pastors were more likely to use the phrase than congregation members, perhaps because of the familiarity of speaking to someone they viewed as a colleague. One pastor's story illustrates usage of the term and an enlightening story of the attribution of events to God's miraculous provision.

PRV: And you think about, you know, the improvements, plus they had to tear down an old barn. And I'm assuming they had to pay 5,000 dollars to tear down that old barn. But anyway, bottom line is, it was a total God thing. A TOTAL GOD THING. And all through the building process, there's just been so many clear miracles of God. Um, one of them is our doors. Um, a pastor friend of mine you know, also, um did some construction stuff, and they're involved in some remodeling. And he said, I've got some doors and frames. And um, but I don't know if I'm going to have enough for you. Check out your floor plan. And um, we'd just bought the building. We were in process of doing, we'd just finalized the floor plan for the building. And um, so I said, you know. Check and see what you need and then let me know. So I went through the floor plan. We needed a total of thirty nine doors. Three metal doors. Uh, 36 wood doors. And then of the 36 wood doors we needed 24 of those to have a, you know, a light in them. And um, then, uh 12 that were solid. Um, we needed to have a set of double frames for the back of the back of the sanctuary. Uh, also for the back of the gym to the loading dock area, the kitchen. And ah, you know we also wanted a window at the back of the sanctuary. So I got back to him and said, we need 39 doors, three metal doors, 36 wood doors, 24 with a window. You know, two double frames. And he came back and says, man, he says you're not going to believe this. I've got exactly 39 doors, not a door more. Um, three metal doors, 36 wood doors, 24 with a window, 12 solid. I've got two double frames. Um, and, and he uh actually had two windows. And uh, then he also had three of the frames had a side light on the side of the frame going into the fireside room, the youth room, the office area here. You couldn't have asked for a more perfect you know thing. So anyway, to get all of those at, you know, pennies on the dollar, for, for it was incredible. That was God's doing. It was hard to miss, you know, God's hand in that. You know, it truly was a God thing with that. We had several other things as well that were really clear indications of God's hand on it. (Richard, Interview, 9/28/2011)

Most interviewees were aware that many people do not accept the validity of miracles. In the most extreme case a young lady freshly graduated from a Pentecostal university ascribed an adversarial role to me and took a defensive tone concerning miracles, healings, and the supernatural. Some interviewees talked about miracles in

hushed tones. Several answered the question of witnessing a miracle with a simple “yes.” I then probed with a follow up question to ask if they would be willing to share the story with me. They were willing to tell me but did not offer the information immediately. The pastors willingly volunteered the stories of miracles and congregation members often did not. Several explanations seem possible. Since pastors knew my identity as a Pentecostal pastor, they talked to me like a colleague and freely shared stories of miracles. Congregation members did not know my identity as an insider and they were more guarded in their explanations of miracles. Miracle narratives had a sacred tone; and from my perspective, they were not sure whom they should trust with stories of the miraculous. Congregation interviewees knew well that there were plenty of skeptics in the world and therefore guarded that which they believed skeptics found hardest to accept.

Silencing the Recorder

One of the results that surprised me the most and greatly interests me, typically came after I turned off the recorder for the interview. In research interviews, the conversation commonly continues after the recording ends with interviewees feeling greater comfort saying some things without a recording. No notes were taken and certainly, no transcripts were produced; however, general impressions from those conversations add insight to the analysis. It was at that point that many of the pastors talked about unchurched people, by which they meant people who had no previous church experience. I cannot state with validity a reason why they waited until after the recorder was silenced before they spoke about the subject; however, I conjecture that they would never want what they said to get back to those people. One of them in particular was very protective of the opinions of people in spiritually vulnerable situations. Many

that had been in ministry for a lot of years said that the increased presence of unchurched people was new to them. While they often said it did not impact their ministry much, it seemed to me that the attention to the worship environment with stage lighting, contemporary musical instruments, and casual attire all reflected the influence within the Pentecostal speech community of people who did not attend any church just a few years earlier. While it was true that people with little to no church background were enculturated into the speech community through communicative means, it also seems accurate to say that they influenced the speech community.

After the recorder was turned off, pastors often talked about situations that brought them hurt and pain, including two pastors who talked longer off the record than on the record. Anthropologists suggest that a researcher should pay attention to the role ascribed to them by interviewees (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). They seemed to ascribe to me the role of colleague and one entrusted with their stories. One side intended for me to protect the stories with caution and the other to tell the stories as needed. As a colleague, they believed we spoke the same language and used terms they expected I would understand.

Preachers and the Sermons They Preach

Every service I attended had a sermon, usually thirty to forty minutes long, though occasionally longer. The sermon occupied a place of great importance and prominence in the services judging by the amount of time, energy, and communicative effort spent on it. Church bulletins often had space for taking notes on sermons. Most of the churches recorded their sermons and made them available for download on the internet or available on CD. Even in a service that was as short as one hour fifteen

minutes, thirty minutes were set aside for the sermon. Every interviewee treated that time as special.

Message Driven

Nearly every pastor said that his/her preaching style reflected his/her personality more than the culture of their church or the surrounding milieu. They knew they were influenced by cultural forces in some of the illustrations and stories they told but considered those less significant. There was an expectation that the message would drive the sermon but it would be molded and shaped by the personality of the preacher. Though the method and “style” of preaching was seen as an extension of the pastor’s personality, it was also seen as a tool of the message. Said differently, the method of delivery was a tool considered flexible enough to change based on the circumstances or cultural shifts. The message was considered eternal and uncompromising. Repeatedly they said, “The methods change, the message does not change” and that extended across regions, gender, denominations, and ethnicity.

Pastors considered their sermons to be message driven and there was high respect for the message. If a pastor even thought I was hinting that the message changed, a strong reaction immediately followed. The message was sacred because each one of them believed their sermons were based on the Bible and the revelatory nature of scripture made the message sacred. That does not mean they exalt their own sermons to a vaunted position. One said very bluntly, “I’ve preached some pretty lousy sermons” and then both of us laughed together recognizing that as much as a preacher tries, sometimes the presentation might not be worthy of the content.

God's Voice

Since pastors believed the content of their sermons were based on the revealed message from God, does that mean that worshippers believed they were hearing from God through a sermon? After three-fourths of the interviews were completed, it became obvious that this question was relevant because worshippers kept talking about being directed by God through sermons. I asked a few interviewees that question and found some diversity in the answers. A high school English teacher and I had the following exchange:

B: Do you feel like God speaks to you through a sermon?

FIA: Yeah. Yeah. There are times where you're just like, "Oh, gosh. This feels like it was meant for me today." (Chuckles) So um, just maybe based on what was going on that week. Or maybe the trouble that I came to church worrying about and then all of a sudden I'll open ears to the sermon and I be like, "Oh yeah. That's really helpful."

B: Are you saying that a sermon might be the voice of God?

FIA: (pause) It might be. (chuckles) (Jennifer, interview, 10/2/2011)

At the same church, I interacted with a young man who said he reflected often on the worship service and read scholarly writings about the process of worship. He felt it was dangerous to say that the pastor was speaking with the same authority as God.

B: Do you find that God talks to you personally during that time?

LIA: Um, I don't. I don't ... that I've had many experiences – so I definitely have experiences of things in the teaching jumping out at me in particular or I'll notice something and maybe get something out of it that probably wasn't what the teacher was intending to talk about. So in that sense, maybe that's God drawing my attention to something that He has for me. I haven't sort of received a word or something like that during a teaching that I can think of.

B: Do you see the teacher as one who is speaking for God?

LIA: Um, ah, (pause, loud sigh) I don't know if I would want to put them on quite that level. That would seem a little bit dangerous to claim that in general they're speaking on behalf of God. Um, I think that they certainly, they're someone who is speaking with some authority from God. And who is speaking out of, you know, powerful personal experience and training and um, a deep relationship with God. (Luke, interview, 10/2/2011)

The next person to be asked those questions clarified the indirect nature of communication from God through sermons. The interviewee was given several choices and clarified her perception of a sermon in this interaction:

B: Do you believe that God speaks through a sermon?

KOC: Yes!

B: Are sermons the voice of God speaking? Or does speak God to you as the preacher is speaking?

KOC: It's, wait say that again.

B: That is, do you believe that the words of the sermons are coming directly from God? Or do you believe that God is taking the words that the preacher is saying and God is speaking to you through that?

KOC: The second one. It's more (pause) yeah. It's, it's more like the message and then God makes, takes those words and makes it real. Or you know, tells you how it is in your life. (Kristiana, Interview, 10/10/2011)

When I asked the question directly of a different interviewee, the response changed and revealed a differentiation that others made. The message came from God, but was filtered through the pastor's preparation.

B: When you hear a sermon, do you believe that you are hearing the voice of God?

FOC: Not, not the voice of God. I would say though that, it's what God spoke to the pastor like that week or whenever he was preparing. It's whatever God laid on his heart. It's um, what God told him to tell us. So I think God speaks through people and that our pastor is one of them. I mean definitely you can, God can speak to you too and that's the voice. But I don't think it's like, God's voice coming through Pastor Brooks. It's you know, God uses him to share his message. (Mary, Interview, 10/10/2011)

The last person to be asked the question went in a slightly different direction, accepting the notion that in a sermon God speaks to the congregation and that God uses the words to speak to a person.

B: Do you believe God talks to you during the sermons?

PTN: Yes.

B: Do you believe that the sermons are the, that God uses the words of the sermon or do you believe that the sermons are directly from God? In other words, do you believe that when the pastor or anyone is preaching, that that is the same as God talking? Or do you believe that when they talk, God uses that to speak to you?

PTN: Both. Yeah. I, I, I say that's kind of both. Because sometimes you can tell when the pastor's really on fire, usually that's when God's pretty much got control of him, the Holy Spirit's got him, okay. And you can tell the difference versus when they just start rambling on or, or you know. Or ... yeah ... talking the politics of the day or something. Usually when the sermons going on, most of the time, you know I feel like ah, he's the vessel. I mean it's coming right through him. He's the, he's the connection link. That he's definitely the connection link. (Charles, Interview, 10/29/2011)

Prophetic

The sermons I heard were “prophetic” in the sense intended by both theologian Stronstad (1999) and communication researcher Schultze (2000). Stronstad saw prophetic speech as speaking on behalf of God and Schultze saw prophetic speech as challenging the status quo for transformation and change. As mentioned earlier (see Chapter 1) Brueggemann added that prophetic communication seeks to provide a new picture for living, a new narrative by which an individual may live out life's drama. Each of the sermons I heard challenged the dominant view of reality as articulated in the surrounding milieu. Some narrated personal transformation and others challenged society with a view toward change.

Because the sermons were communicatively prophetic, each was message driven to accentuate the desired change. Through interviews, it was obvious that pastors were interested in the content of their sermons and took great care to study and develop the message saying things like, “I read a lot” (Ben, Interview, 8/6/2011). Another pastor said, “When I ah actually study for a sermon it is usually based on a scripture that has come to me prior to the service. It could be a week or two” (Greg, Interview, 8/1/2011). One pastor used an incredible amount of Greek in a sermon to uncover ideas from the New Testament about leadership in the church.

Message driven sermons in a Bible believing speech community potentially present a problem of contextualization. As mentioned earlier, one of the issues within religious communication is contextualization and entextualization (Keanne 1997; Shoaps 2002). I asked pastors about the “contextualization” of the message, a term I took from Shaw, Van Engen, and Sanneh (2003) who meant that the biblical message must be “translated,” not merely linguistically, but also for meaning in contemporary contexts. The term caused several pastors to stumble so I offered those interviewees a clarification something like this one taken from an interview transcript:

B: Do you think that the message should be brought in the context of your local situation? Try to understand the community and then ah, articulating the gospel in a way that really reflects how you understand the community.

The answers were mixed with some pastors immediately saying they believed it was vital to articulate the message in a way that made sense within the local community. Other pastors strained to protect the message and said that the message should stay the same no matter where it was presented. There were no predictive factors available within my study for the answers. Age was not a factor with both young and old coming down on both sides of the issue. Neither denomination nor ethnicity predicted responses. Some

pastors with progressive ministries like a café in the lobby still protected the message and a traditional pastor immediately said contextualization was vital. One pastor who was previously a professional golfer handed me a pamphlet he had written that used golf to explain the gospel message and said that he adamantly believed in making the message accessible in any way possible.

When I asked pastors to describe their style of preaching, most referred to classical terms from homiletical theory such as “expository” or “topical” or they said they did not really know how to characterize it. Each of the technical styles mentioned rose in relationship to the text of scripture and have described the way scripture was used in the sermon for generations. There are other ways of classifying sermons, however (K. Anderson 2006). The sermons I observed may be characterized using two different contrasts to present four ideal types. The rhetoric was either narration or rational, to appropriate terms from Fisher (1987). The tone of sermons was either conversational or oratorical. By oratorical I mean dramatic, usually forceful, intense, and sometimes a little imposing. When a sermon was conversational narration, it relied on a lot of stories for engaging the audience and stories moved beyond illustrative to form the logic of the sermon (Lowry 2001). The oratorical narrative sermon I heard was more forceful and relied on the stories to bring celebration to the listener, refocusing their worldview toward the perspective of the Bible (Thomas and Mitchell 1997). The most common type of sermon I heard was conversational in tone and rhetorically rational and typically made use of lots of scripture to prove rational points being made (MacArthur and Faculty 2005). Such sermons dealt with matters ranging from depression to standing up against immorality in society to developing spiritual leadership skills within a church setting. The

last type of sermon was rational and oratorical. It was often persuasive with many logical “proofs” drawn from the Bible and intended to persuade the congregation of a particular way of living (Chapell 2005).

Pastors used a wide variety of methods to achieve relevance for the worshippers within the sermon. Most every sermon was preached from notes rather than a manuscript, giving it the feel of spontaneity. In several cases the notes appear to be extensive while in other cases the sermon appeared to spontaneously combust from inner fuel from a reservoir deep within the pastor. One pastor used methods more like a variety show, including preaching on roller skates. From a different perspective, another pastor said that the Bible was always relevant. When asked specifically about ministry relevance, most pastors said that the term “relevance” was now overused and indicated they thought it had lost meaning. They preferred to talk about being simultaneously biblical and effective within the surrounding milieu.

The second research question asked: How does the message reframing for cultural adaptation impact rituals and speech codes, faith, and practice? When the message was reframed for adaptation to surrounding milieu, accessibility was the main focus. Through the reframing process of the message, worship practices (rituals) changed very little except in the reported frequency of charismatic gifts. The narrative remained the same and spontaneity was preserved. Through spontaneity, authenticity of worship expression was preserved within the speech community.

Summary

The results delineated in this chapter allow me to heed Philipsen’s advice about culture given in an insightful lecture to the National Communication Association

(Philipsen 2008). Philipsen summarized his model for coming to terms with cultures through seven words that specified four modes of action. The four modes were a “means that one might consider ... when trying to encompass a situation in which one seeks to contend with the cultures of one’s life world” (Philipsen 2008, 4). Through the interview and observation process I was able to *listen*, *scour the text* (search thoroughly the speech community’s conversation), *embrace nuance* in the complexities of communal life, and *talk* as in the give and take of interaction (emphasis added, Philipsen 2008, 4). Embracing the nuance led me to spontaneity, its many forms within the speech community, and the inferences of its attendant practices.

The spontaneity of the worship experience flowed from four commitments of the speech community. Authentic worship flowed from personal expression revealing the authenticity of worship. Second, spontaneity revealed the affections because it was heartfelt worship. Third, spontaneity envisions freedom from various spiritual fetters, a freedom the speech community finds in the experiential presence of God. Fourth, spontaneity was valued because it allowed individuals to renew their social relationship with God through giving worship spontaneously during the free-flow of music. Based on those commitments the speech community protected spontaneity through a progression moving from unpredictability to planned and structured worship. I will now turn to the first of those commitments, “expressing” worship, employing principles from SCT for analysis.

CHAPTER 7. “EXPRESSING” VITALITY FROM WITHIN

When God used Moses to lead the nation of Israel out of Egypt (Exod. 1-12), the miraculous deliverance reverberated throughout the region. Immediately after God parted the Red Sea, always taken by most Pentecostals as an actual miracle of incredible proportion, Moses led the people in singing a song to celebrate the deliverance. Then Moses’ sister Miriam took a tambourine and began to dance and sing of deliverance. All the women grabbed tambourines joining in the celebration. At one of the most crucial moments in the Old Testament narrative, God’s people rejoiced and celebrated with expressive worship.

Moses’ celebration would not be the last time such a spectacle was recorded. In 2 Samuel 6 a narrative unfolded with similar themes. The small box known as the Ark of the Covenant had previously been captured and King David determined to bring it back to Jerusalem. After many struggles, the King led the procession that included priests, military men, and many common people filled with jubilant celebration. The king danced as he led the procession, dancing “with all his might” as all his subjects watched, following his lead. There were horns blowing and a lot of shouting like at a modern sporting event. Pentecostals typically admonish people with the next portion of the story, warning against anyone who casts doubt on expressive worship. One of the king’s wives saw what he was doing and met him that evening to complain that he looked undignified. King David assured her that he did not care if he looked dignified because he was dancing before God. From that day on, his wife was cursed and had no more children.

Expressions

“If you are new here this morning, we want you to feel at home and know that you can express your worship at your own comfort level. Church, the Bible tells us to worship God with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength. I believe the Lord would say to us this morning that if we will freely express our love for Him, His presence will be here among us to set you free and transform your life.” These hypothetical four sentences might be uttered at nearly any Pentecostal church on a given Sunday because each sentence symbolically represents an aspect of communicative behavior within the speech community. “Express your love to the Lord this morning.” That one phrase described the communication pattern of worship in U.S American Pentecostal churches.

“Expressing” is a way of talking. When people wish to describe their opinion, they often say they would like to express their thoughts. While thoughts on a particular subject could be stated and would imply a recitation of factual information, expressing thoughts on a subject implies that there might be passion or dismay, or some other affective attitude included in the response. Yet “expression” could also imply simply a figure of speech as in, “a home spun expression.” People express their wishes, not their stock portfolio. “Expressing” would certainly not be the correct frame for a scientific gathering according to Bassett’s speech code assessment because it would include too much opinion and not enough “fact” (Bassett 2009).

In Carbaugh’s terms for talk paradigm (Carbaugh 1989), the researcher examines various terms used for talking and then explores the meaning of those terms within the speech community. He found four levels of verbal performance: the level of act, the level of event, the level of style, the level of functional shaping of speech (98-103). The act

level points to individual acts of communication; the event level is for two or more people and features coenactments of communication; the style level refers to speech where one enactment is selected over other possible choices; and the functional level accomplishes sociocultural ends, indirectly or reflexively. These four levels produce messages about communication, society, and personhood (Carbaugh 1989).

“Expression” as a term for worship would be positioned at the level of style because it is a choice among other potential worship choices. As I will show, the Pentecostal speech community positions their expressiveness in worship as a preferred style over other worship styles for reasons deeply seated within the community’s identity. “Expression” as a term for talk produces messages about communication, particularly “the tone, the emotional pitch, feeling” one brings to the worship moment (Carbaugh 1989, 106). I will show how the messages about the communicative enactment of worship dialectically interact with the identity so that it furthers the identity and the identity perpetuates the form of worship.

I knew Pentecostal worship could be expressive because I had been part of the speech community all my life. However, I was surprised by how often people used the word “express” or “expression” to talk about various aspects of worship and the Christian life. In fact it is so thoroughly interwoven into the fabric of the Pentecostal culture (Philipsen 1997) that I was unaware of it until the analysis phase of research. Several interview questions used the word “express.” For example, question twenty-one asked congregation members: “Pentecostal worship is expressed through a variety of physical activity, like clapping. What physical activity do you use in worship?” (see Appendix B) A companion question asked pastors something similar. The interview transcripts reflect

that unplanned probe questions used the word “expression” also. Were the interviewees just responding to my use of the question? The question bank does not use the word “express” until question twenty-one and many congregation members used the word before that point. Sometimes the word was used in direct response to a question but often pastors used it when discussing kinesthetic activity. The term “expression” was used in a variety of ways, sometimes well before I used the term in the interview.

The data showed the true *flexibility* of the term because it did not seem to matter what people were asked, they could use “expression” as a term for communication and various practices. The concept appeared regardless of the diversity of interviewees. There was no difference between male or female usage. Racial differences made no difference either. People from all four denominations used the word. Pastors and congregation members both used the word. Pastors from both coasts as well as the heartland used the word. Pastors from rural communities used the concept of “expressing worship” with equal weight, as did pastors in suburban or urban settings. Neither the age of the pastor or the seminary training of the pastor (some were not seminary trained) nor the position held (associate or senior pastors) made a difference. The only difference noticed was based on age but even that difference comes with mixed results. Neither the word “express” nor its attendant varieties were used by people from the church in an Arizona retirement community; however, a pastor from New England who said he was close to retirement age used the word. The interviewees from the retirement church were no less likely to describe worship in terms of it being affective, personal, or flexible. They discussed the kinesthetic nature of worship in terms of it being demonstrative.

Expressing Worship: From Their Own Words

It did not seem to matter what a Pentecostal was asked about worship, “expressing worship” was always an appropriate answer. The data demonstrate that an interviewee did not need the word to be in the question in order to use it in the answer. The transcript information also demonstrated that while some situations were more prone to be described as expressions, the term was quite inclusive.

A manager with a major bank’s national mortgage department told me she was in her fifties. Debra (Interview, 8/1/2011) talked openly about a wide variety of worship practices as “expressing worship.”

DHT: ... because whatever you’re doing, you’re doing it to the honor and glory of God. So if it’s raising your hands outspread, if it’s, if it’s dancin’ in the Spirit, whatever it is that you express what you feel, I believe that it gives you a closer connection with God. I don’t know if I said this but I would say worship is a communication with God. It’s a way for you to communicate with God. It’s for Him to see you express how you feel.

Expressing a Definition of Worship

Pastors were asked what they teach and preach about worship in order to gain insight into their collective definition of worship. They often used the word “express” in their answer. They said things like worship is an “expression of showing an individual how much they are worth, how much you honor them and how much you ... appreciate what they have done for you” (Greg D., Interview, 8/1/2011). With a more personal touch, worship was seen as a time to “express my love and adoration and my thankfulness.” In a demonstration that “expression” is flexible, one pastor said, “Different people express their worship in different ways” and not everyone “conforms to this

certain type of expression” (Larry, Interview, 9/25/2011). Therefore, for these pastors expression was *personal* and *flexible*.

In a sign that expressive worship was tied to the orthopathy (right affections) of Pentecostalism, one anonymous pastor (8/5/2011) said that worship “is the very essence and expression of our heart to God. And it isn’t exclusive to singing. It’s your life lived out, the things that you do, the words of your mouth, the meditation of your heart, are expressions of worship. Ah, you know, what you focus on is really where your mind is, where your action are going to be ... led to.” For this pastor, expressive worship included orthopathy, orthopraxis, and orthodoxy, the whole of Pentecostal spirituality. That was shown by his concluding statement. “Worship is an expression, on so many levels, unto God.”

The pastors also saw expression as a term for the physical activities described in the previous chapter, demonstrating what happens in the individual’s spirit. Expression came from the inside to the outside according to that pastor. Another pastor talked about “inexpressible joy” in one’s heart “from being changed by the power of Jesus” (Josh, Interview, 8/3/2011). Presumably, the ineffable could be expressed through either kinesthetic or other symbolic means since the same pastor often talked about both.

Congregation members were asked a question with similar motivation, an attempt to know their overall approach to worship. It was framed as a hypothetical situation. “If someone asked you why they should actively participate in worship, what would you tell them?” The responses varied from specific responses to a general definition of worship. One young father who played on a church worship team said worship was his “way of communicating with God.” It is “expressing your love to someone and that would be to

God” (Miguel, Interview, 8/3/2011). A pastor from the South talked about his goals for the Sunday morning service. He said his congregation was less willing to “express” themselves when many outsiders were present. A pastor of a church that met in a strip mall in the Southwest included the concept of expressing worship several times saying things like, “It is a time to express our devotion and our love toward our God,” and the worship service is a time to “come and express our worship and praise to God” (Greg D., Interview, 8/1/2011). Therefore, expressing was seen as *affective* as well as *flexible* and *personal*.

Expressing Activity in Worship

As noted, when I first wrote the list of questions, I used the phrase “worship is expressed through a variety of physical activities” without foresight that it was a term deeply seated within the speech community. Also, as noted, before that question arose in the interview, many referred to physical activity as expressions of worship. Varieties of answers were given to show the breadth of responses. An older pastor from New England with a young congregation commented that the people of New England do not tend to be very expressive; however, in his church they engaged in some physical activities that he described as expressions of worship.

All of the activities described in the previous chapter were also described as “expressions” in interviews especially raising hands, dancing, and singing. While the physical activity was seen as an “expression” (and therefore *flexible*, *personal*, and *affective*), it was also seen as connecting the body to the inward parts of an individual. As well as connecting the inward parts to the physical, physical expression also connected the individual to God. Another worshipper named Thomas (Interview, 10/10/2011) said:

I would say that ... our expression of worship is really just an outward expression of what's going on inside of us. My own personal life I would say, I am led to lift my hands because I just can't contain myself. It's like I want, I want to reach God and touch God so much that the outward expression I have is just lifting my hands in surrender to Him.

For that worshipper, expression was something very deep, touching every aspect of spirituality. While he narrated it differently than the pastors, he tied expression to all of spirituality. Spiritual desire also takes place inside worshippers. One pastor twice repeated "expression" as a "reflection" of worshippers' desire for God. He noted that desire does not always connect to the way one lives everyday life, but expression does connect to desire, an important first-step in Pentecostal worship, as I will show in the next chapter.

Another worshipper tied expression to celebration likening it to the reaction of people who win the lottery or a sweepstakes on national television. He talked about celebrating as a high school football player, even demonstrating it a little bit in the interview before comparing expressive worship to similar celebratory activity. He inferred that if he were willing to celebrate after a touchdown, he should be willing to celebrate the things God had done in his life. Continuing the sports analogy, a pastor from a rural Midwestern area talked about raising one's hands as analogous to what happens when a football team scores. Then he added "It's an expression of um, of overcoming, of victory, surrender."

One of the associate pastors in a larger urban church also talked about raising her hands in worship as expression. The church is a leader within its denomination, in its community, and nationally. She has been in the church since the beginning and is the pastor's sister.

B: When people raise their hands in worship, what do you think that means?

H: I think when people, ah, raise their hands, I think number one it's a, um, a demonstration of, to the Lord that I surrender, ah, all to you. I want you to know that you know, my hands are lifted. Ah it's a, it's an expression of praise. It's an expression of reverence for you. Um, and it's, it's an expression of obedience.

B: What do you think are the factors that influence how much physical activity there will be in a service?

H: I think it's all under the auspices of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit. Ah, um, I can say for myself, I um, you know, when I feel ... one of the things the beauty of the holiness for me, is when I do feel the Spirit of the Lord, um, ah, come upon me, I'm able to express myself, I'm able to cry. I'm able to lift my hands up. I'm able to stand. You know, I'm able, you know, to, to express in some kind of way, um, the awesomeness of, of feeling the presence of the Lord in that particular kind of way. (Hattie, Interview, 7/21/2011)

The most common time to use the term was in response to dancing or some "less active" form like swaying. A salesman from a heavy equipment manufacturing firm talked about why people would dance in worship saying "there's just this joy flowing." He added, "God's joy is flowing into that person and out of them in the form of dance" (Jeffrey, Interview, 8/7/2011) A young lady who attended the same church said that she would put music on in her bedroom and start dancing so when people come into church it would be natural to dance, especially if they were "so filled up that they just, you know, that's their expression to it" (Kathleen, Interview, 8/7/2011). Quite a few more interviewees talked about dance as an "expression" of celebration in worship using phrases like "expressing their excitement" and "express their love for God" in connection with dancing.

In one Charismatic church, people did not tend to dance according to the pastor. However, they did move in some ways as individuals felt compelled to express their worship. The pastor explained, "I always think it's just a good physical response. It's a way of kind of enjoying the presence of God. Um, a way of expressing worship, expressing joy" (Pat, Interview, 7/12/2011). In this case it was tied to "enjoying the

presence of God.” Expression was more than celebration or just an overflow of an affective display; it was talked about as something more spiritual, the enjoyment of God joining the speech community in an experiential way.

A younger single woman raised as a Roman Catholic started attending a Pentecostal church within two years prior to the interview. She became very active in the church but enjoyed friendship with people of diverse religious backgrounds. In the interview, she talked about the vast differences between her Roman Catholic upbringing and her current Pentecostal church. I asked her if she brought a friend and they saw someone dancing “and then they asked why someone would do that, what would you tell them?” Her confident answer showed the conversation probably had taken place once or twice with friends. “I would explain to them that it’s definitely different from what we grew up with but that here we learn about having a relationship with God. And um, the release and abandonment and just turning your life over to him and that’s a way of expressing that” (Kristie, Interview, 7/27/2011). For her, expression was a sign of spiritual vitality and flowed from the quality of her relationship with God.

Expressing Other Forms of Worship

There were other forms of expressing worship. Music was an expression of worship in Pentecostal churches. In fact, it is difficult to imagine one of their worship services without music. Therefore, the choice of music can be pivotal in the group’s expression of worship. A pastor (Ricky, Interview, 8/5/2011) from a college town in Louisiana talked about music choices in his traditional Pentecostal church.

R: Um, I think it reflects, probably thirty percent of our congregation. And the other seventy percent, ah, I’m workin’ on leadin’ them to a whole new expression.

The same pastor was raised attending a Pentecostal church in the South. He and I first met as fellow undergraduate students. We spent six months together as ministry interns in the New York City area but we had not spoken in twenty years when I saw him at a national conference. While we shared common ministry training when we were twenty years old, more than twenty years had passed since that training when I formally interviewed him. He used the term “expressing” to describe an approach to preaching saying that sometimes he had “a passionate expression” in a sermon to demonstrate an idea.

Congregation members were asked if they enjoyed creativity in worship. The question elicited a wide variety of responses. Several interviewees connected creativity with expression. The personal aspect of expression connected with creativity. “I appreciate creativity and, and people expressing themselves, you know. In a way that they, they feel is who they are.” The same worshipper went on to say creativity in worship showed that it was “coming from within” and it was “me expressing myself to God” (Kristiana, Interview, 10/10/2011). For her and several other worshippers, creativity was about individual spontaneity in worship.

I interviewed a doctoral student from the University of Iowa while I was in Iowa City. He was studying mathematical theory. After the interview he said he had been to a workshop on worship and found it very useful so he read a book written by the seminar speaker, James K. A. Smith’s *Desiring the Kingdom* (2009) and found it very insightful. He talked about the connection between physical expression and interior values, using Smith’s terminology of embodiment. The subject of dancing in church came into the conversation. The brief exchange demonstrated how a mathematician talked about it,

someone who admitted he was not a very emotional person and not prone to emotional displays.

LIA: I think if they were really moved or really touched by the Holy Spirit and just became emotional. Dance is a way that some people um, not myself, but some people express their emotions. So ... or you know, ah, and as far as the Holy Spirit thing goes, you know. (Luke, Interview, 10/2/2011)

The pastor of that church was writing her dissertation at a major Evangelical seminary to conclude a Doctor of Ministry degree. She was very much aware of the demographics of the congregation and molded many responses in the interview around the fact that the church had many people attend who knew nothing about church previously. She said that they often attracted people from the world's religions and other people who had very little religious background. I modified questions to gain further insight about how that particular church shaped the narrative in response to such a dynamic situation.

B: So when one of those unchurched people comes to you and says, "That's kind of different. I saw people raising their hands. Why did they do that?" What do you tell 'em?

A: I say, "Did you ever have those moments where you love something or someone so much and you don't know how to express it? And you're at a loss. And you think to yourself, 'My words can't do it. Nothing that I can say is gonna capture how much I love you, how grateful I am. I can't, can't do this with words alone?'" I just say, "That's people who have tasted the goodness of Jesus um, and they don't know any other way to do it. It's like I have to, everything has to cry out to you from my whole being not my mind, just not my spirit, not just my words. It's like, all of me." (Adey, Interview, 10/2/2011)

I interviewed an African American male who attended a predominantly Caucasian church. He worked as a supervisor in the parole office for the state. He was asked about how he would introduce the idea of a Pentecostal worship service to someone who had never attended a similar style service and his answer demonstrated that the question was anything but hypothetical for him. He said that he explained it could be both

unpredictable and expressive. The services I attended at his church were quite predictable but his explanation clearly indicated that unpredictability meant individual expression. In other words, the person standing next to a worshipper might stand quietly or might sway to the beat of the music while waving their hands in expression.

One associate pastor was in charge of communication design and involved in the church's music. He had been in ministry in Minnesota before joining the staff of a church in Arizona. He said that leadership in the church had done a good job of balancing encouragement for worshippers to be expressive and yet respectful of people around them. As with spontaneity, expression had social rules within the speech community. Other pastors mentioned things like asking particularly expressive worshippers to sit in the back so they did not distract other worshippers. Expression points to values within the speech community but not the highest value. Expressive worship is a means of worship, a style according to Carbaugh's delineation. As a style it is one choice among many. If a worshipper chose too much expression, rules about orderliness came into play. It also demonstrates that "expression" comes in degrees. Rather than being right and wrong, it is less demonstrative or more, more authentic or less authentic. It was flexible not only as a referential term but also as a qualitative term.

Expressing as Cultural Interaction

Several questions inquired about the differences between churches. Some people compared various churches in their own community. Others compared churches they had attended which was particularly useful for people who had attended more traditional churches as a child before starting to attend a Pentecostal church. In discussing those differences, a leader within a local church talked about the variety of expression even

within the church he attended, saying he enjoyed “the different expressions of worship” and listed flags, raising hands, and dancing.

Pastors were asked to assess whether or not their church’s ministry was culturally specific for their own “slice of society” or if the things in which the church engaged could be done anywhere. A pastor of an urban church with people from diverse ethnic backgrounds talked about cultural differences as it pertained to worship, saying he believed his church could be dropped into other locations and their ministry would still be effective. His answers in content, style, and form consistently reflected the fact that he was a part-time pastor and part-time attorney.

PDY: Um, (pause) It just goes with my particular philosophy which is um, I just, I typically, and I may be wrong and it may be why I pastor a small church. I just typically believe that people are more alike than they are different. That if they can be taught um, what’s most important they can overlook some of the cultural differences. So I think it’s more about the expression of love, the leadership of the pastor and the people. I think you could take um, the core values that we embrace and you know, even how that’s fleshed out. And I think it’s because we just minister in a small church setting to a number of cultures. I think it would resonate with a number of communities because it is diverse and it is multicultural. And in what we try to do, we try to hit a number of cultures, a number of people groups. (David, Interview, 8/5/2011)

Expression as Liturgical Activity

Often the word “express” was used for liturgical activity. One pastor (Aaron, Interview, 7/18/2011) used the word several times about water baptism, demonstrating the flexibility of “expressing worship.” His response to baptism was instructive for its referential of the symbolic activity. “My personal concern was, is that I think ah, I don’t think baptism, water baptism saves anyone but it’s an outward expression of an inward action.” Thomas (Interview, 10/29/2011) said, “A third expression is we’ll have people

serve each other communion.” He went on to describe communion as expression saying, “I believe that their love and worship become ... interchangeable points of expression.”

Expressing as a Form of Spirituality

Many pastors described worship as an experience in the presence of God. One pastor connected that experience to an expectation of worship transforming the everyday life.

PGL: Well one of our, our core values is the, is the dynamic life-style of worship. Because we talk about, we express our core values in terms of Live the Dream. And it's just an acronym. It's not a, Live the Dream is not a get rich, it's not a prosperity thing. When we think Live the Dream, instantly we think of a mansion and a yacht, you know, kind of thing. But what we're talking about is, is, is tools to live a balanced Christian life. That is really what our core um, objective is, is to help individuals live a balanced Christian life. And um, um the D of Dream is dynamic life-style of worship. It's Relationships devoted to unity, Empower through Biblical training, Active ministry involvement, and Mission to reach our world for Christ. And that D, again, much like our morning worship experiences, that dynamic life-style worship, actually do use a three-spoked bike wheel in the um, analogy of this when I explain it in membership class. The D is the center. And the D really is your relationship with the Lord. A life-style of worship, he created people to worship him. (Greg L., Interview, 9/23/2011)

Worshippers were asked a similar question. They were asked if attending church impacted the way they communicated in everyday life. After affirming that it did, a young mother named Kimberlee (Interview, 8/3/2011) expanded her answer.

KRM: I think the fact that I'm constantly growing and learning about Jesus and what he's done for us. I'm able to use that information by just sharing God in many different ways. And my actions that I do express the things that I do during the week. Just because of what I have learned in church and in the Bible studies that I've done.

In response to a question about being different from the “world,” a pastor from a church in a rural area of the Midwest talked about the differences expected in a believer's life. In this case, expressions were a way of revealing God's character in the character of the believer saying, “There's so many different expressions to deal with that subject.” By

such things as showing love, obeying God's commands, and proclaiming God to others, "We make an expression of God's character in our community."

In an extended exchange about how one pastor (Thomas, Interview, 10/29/2011) arrived at his current church, he used the term "express" to refer to all of the life of faith. He had been at the church I visited for eight years. He used the word in a wide variety of ways, including the following snippet from his answer about the initial interview with the church's leadership group. The second abbreviated quote comes from a lengthy answer about music in worship.

PTS: And having never been through it. And ah, they spent two and half hours asking me primarily church questions. You know, regarding ah, critical aspects of faith and expression. But I take that back. It wasn't critical aspects of faith and expression. It was church stuff, ah largely. Ah sort of um, ecclesiastical functionality aspects of within the domain of a Pentecostal emphasis.

PTS: I struggle with that ... How do I nurture this whole "God's here, God's here today subjectively manifest in a moment of worship in the song?" In songs there's certainly the, if you will, the macrocosmic representation, in He, in ah Romans 12, one and two. So there is the microcosmic representation, a single song with one person sitting in a room saying, "Jesus loves me." That same God, that same *expression* of shaped worth and, and interaction with eternity can happen right there. You know, big picture, little picture. So how do you nurture all that? Um, that can experience God but danger, danger Oral Robertson, that doesn't make you the center of the universe or that it stops with you.

When it comes to music and worship, he commented on *the song*, with emphasis.

I have included a lengthy portion of his interview answer to maintain the context:

PTS: Well, I think music as a component of worship, I believe *the song* in scripture is big deal. I'm working on a book entitled *The Dance Between Two Worlds*. And, and ah, the thesis of that actually starts in 1 Kings 18, um, the term that Elijah uses. When he says, "How long will you halt between two opinions?" And it was a catalytic worship moment when he met the Baal, the prophets of Baal, you know. ... And so he says, "how long will you halt between two opinions?" It's my belief that there's three things and you get your typical preacher mnemonic. We have um, humanized God. Um, we have mechanized worship expressions. And we've marginalized ah, human spirituality as a result. In our response to worship ... so ... Um, *the song* as an expression goes back to my snow globe thing. Because I believe *the song* is a unique expression ah. I

don't believe there's any more concentrated ah, model of concentrated worship than *the song* in scripture, in my opinion. I believe the fact that *the new song* um, happens in, in Revelation 5 verse 9 is indicative of this sort of, redemptive consummation of the lamb entering the heavenlies and again if you want to believe that is yet to come at the end of the age or this is some model of what's already transpired, and then will have a very much a parallel expression of that later, whatever it may be.⁶

He (Thomas, Interview, 10/29/2011) used the word with such variety that it is worth an extended look. He used it as a substitution for the life of faith a believer would live every day. He used it in reference to a youth camp for performing arts that his church hosted, talking about "contributions to the Kingdom" as "other expressions in areas of worship in arts." There were varieties of "expressions of benevolence" as well as "practical expressions of ministry." He talked about the church's "liturgical expression." In discussing issues which were specifically Pentecostal he talked about "a practical and active expression of the model from 1 Corinthians 14" to refer to the charismatic gifts in operation in public worship. In reaction to some Pentecostals who felt their expression of faith to be superior, he said, "What's amazing is that Pentecost was, was God's expression of inclusion." He saw worship as "intentionally subjective and individualistic spiritual expression." He was concerned about the authenticity of worship as a human practice and making sure that the worshippers' focus remained on the differential between God and humans. "We have um, humanized God. We have mechanized worship expressions." He described the connection between character and worship saying, "the

⁶ There are several theories on interpreting the last book of the Bible. One theory traditionally held by Pentecostals holds that the book is a timeline of future events. For more information, see Walvoord (1971). Another theory of interpretation understands the book of Revelation as a series of symbols that describe the same events that are already underway on earth in the cosmic struggle between God and Satan. For an example, see Morris (2009). In either interpretative scheme, the lamb that enters heaven (Rev 5:9) is considered to be Jesus who died, resurrected, and ascended into heaven.

simplest expression of mercy and grace that, you know, that begets redemption and makes people's world a bigger place." He emphasized that worship was not "some sort of debt repayment in our expression of worship." Finally, he saw the Lord's Supper as part of a "pointed expression" that engages "physical expressions of our body" (Thomas, Interview, 10/29/2011).

Expressing Relationship or Ritualizing Religion

Expressiveness works in the speech community to present authenticity because if a person expresses something from deep within the self it is thought to be more authentic than if an action were forced. Building on that expressive tendency, Pentecostals often eschew ritual and claim they are not ritualistic according to Albrecht (1999, 2004) and many of the writers in *Practicing the Faith* (2011). For members of the speech community ritual was seen as part of other speech communities that thrive on "religion" but they constitute their group identity on having a relationship with God. Religion was seen as lifeless and "dead" while a relationship was vital and thriving. Within the speech community, expression was an important differentiator from other faith-based speech communities and worked to guarantee a personalized, authentic practice of one's faith. "Expressing worship" with its attendant spontaneity, flexibility, and personalization works to make sure that the community maintains an authentic and affective worship realized through relational metaphors rather than the formality associated with ritualistic metaphors.

The contrast between religion and relationship was visible in both participant observation as well as interview conversations. It was slightly more prevalent among pastors but certainly not exclusive to pastors. The contrast tended to cluster in particular

churches but it was not confined to any particular style of church or level of expressiveness; additionally it would not have been out of place in any church I visited. It was slightly more prevalent in smaller towns where church attendance still pervaded the milieu but it was not limited to those settings. The contrast between religion and relationship was not limited to any particular question; in fact, it does not seem to matter what you ask Pentecostals, they were able to answer almost any question with the contrast of religion and relationship.

Most congregation members were not told that I was an “insider” of the speech community until after the interview conversations but were told that I was studying “religious communication” at a major research university sometimes not identifying the university and sometimes using the name. I used language in the questions that was conducive to formal understandings of religion, including using the word “religion.” None of that seemed to matter to the interviewees. I asked an eighteen-year-old female student and pastor’s daughter about conversations she might have with people in classes at the local university. She said she hoped there would be a difference between her lifestyle and their lifestyle so I asked her how she would explain the difference to them if they asked. She knew I was also a pastor’s kid and a Pentecostal pastor before the interview.

KNM: Um, That would be really cool if someone asked me that. But um ... I think I would explain (pause) How, how it’s not just religion or anything. It’s really just Christ’s love on you and everything. And you know, how it’s, it’s not like, you’re not made to do it. You know God wants a relationship. You know, it’s not like someone is, you know, sitting there and he’s king and his lowly servants and everything. It’s like, you know God really wants a relationship with you. And I would tell them, you know, how Christ even died for them and everything. (Kathleen, Interview, 8/7/2011)

The attack on “religion” did not escape even the speech community’s own traditional expression. The practice of laying hands on someone when praying for them has characterized Pentecostal practices since the beginning; however, several interviewees said they only would lay their hands on someone if they believed they were led by God to do so. In other words, any ritual even one special to the speech community, was dependant on relational factors. Expression without the relationship would be classified as “ritual” or “religion.”

I asked the pastors about the main task of the church. One replied with a relational answer. The main task was “to not only promote the gospel of Jesus Christ but also to, as far as in word, but as far as also in deed and the lifestyle that we live because it is a relationship that we have. And it’s not a religion” (Greg D., Interview, 8/1/2011). Without living by patterns of “Godly principles,” one was merely living in religion. In terms of narration, the only stories acceptable for members of the speech community to choose were those that pointed to spiritual vitality and authenticity. Other stories were mere “religion” and not about relationship.

A corresponding theme was “being led by the Spirit.” One rural pastor said, “You know, if you need prayer for something specific that we can, we do altar calls for salvation, to prayer with people for healing. Ah it’s, it’s, well there again, I don’t, I don’t like to get real traditional or real, or religious with it. We try to be led by the Spirit” (Doug, Interview, 8/1/2011).

The range of questions for pastors covered a great deal of material (see Appendix A). It did not matter what the pastors were asked, the response could include the contrast between a relational paradigm and one they called “religious.”

B: Pentecostals have long talked about the world and being in, being different from the world usually. How do you talk to people in your church about that subject?

PTT: Um, I try to always bring it back to relationship. Always trying to bring it back to relationship. Uh, you know, on the sign right out there I have right now, “Who is Jesus to you?” Because people’s idea of Jesus is different. And to me it’s all about relationship. And try, like I told you all these people that think they’re Christians in our community. You ask ‘em, “Yeah I go to church.”

“Are you Christian?”

“Yeah, I’m a Christian.”

“You goin’ to heaven?”

“Yes, I’m going to heaven.”

They can’t really tell you why. They can’t really tell you anything else. There’s no relationship there. It’s all religion. Very religious area. Um, false religion, to me. Wrong. So tryin’ to teach the people it is all about religion – sorry, it is all about relationship. Um, it has nothing to do with religion. And so tryin’ to just get them to be the light by your relationship that you have with Jesus. Not because you come to [church name redacted]. Not because of anything else. But you have an impact in your community because of relationship. And it starts with you and Jesus. Then it goes to what relationship you have with the people, um, around you. (Todd, Interview, 9/29/2011)

I asked a young associate pastor (Josh, Interview, 8/3/2011) about how their church interacted with the surrounding culture. He gave a comprehensive answer that included a significant amount of material about communication. He used the term “religion” in both a generic and pejorative sense. In general religion was seen as being part of culture and referenced all groups; however, he added that there were “some aspects of religion” that were good. By inference, there would be some aspects of religion that were not good. One aspect mentioned was the attitude and motivation of the “heart,” making sure one did not live with a “religious attitude” which meant “making sure everything looked right” on the outside but not having things right in the affections.

Pastors were asked about their style of preaching and whether or not their preaching reflected the milieu in which they ministered. For the most part, pastors replied

that their preaching grew out of their own personality, strengths, and abilities rather than in response to the congregation or surrounding milieu.

B: How do you think your preaching – I mean you’ve been here doing it for twenty-one years now in the same community and seem to really enjoy that – how do you think you’re preaching reflects the community or do you think it does?

PLP: In some ways it does. And in some ways it doesn’t. Um (pause) maybe this will, maybe this will bring back to the previous question as well is I feel like that there’s a very, there’s a very religious spirit in this community. Um, I think that ah, people are open to religion but they’re not necessarily open to, to, to a deep relationship. And ah, not every ... and I mean ... and I realize I’m making a judgment. That’s just my observation and my opinion, for what it’s worth but um ... so ah, for me, you know, our emphasis is, is really on that, on that relationship because ah, I want people to get past just the religious exercise. (Larry, Interview, 9/25/2011)

In a general question about serving the Lord’s Supper, one of the few typical Christian rituals in the Pentecostal speech community, one pastor took the opportunity to talk about symbolic expressions and the need to keep those formalized symbolic expressions genuine and authentic.

PTS: The same thing with water baptism. We treat that as symbolic. And I believe that there is intangible spiritual component taking place as we baptize people in water. I think there’s four passages in the New Testament that use (Greek word) baptism in a poetic fashion. And what it does, to sever the past you know, and resurrect us in Christ. Circumcision’s another one, mark us as God’s covenant people. I think we’ve, we’ve, we’ve closed the door on those being spiritual appropriations and we’ve reduced them to simply religious symbologic gestures [sic]. (Thomas, Interview, 10/29/2011)

In a question about creativity, which followed questions about music choice, an associate pastor in charge of music (and much more) talked about creativity as an antidote to religious tendencies, whether those were “Pentecostal” or “liturgical.”

PGL: ... I wrote a Easter musical for this last year that was really the intention of it was to shake the snow globe of people who have really settled into their religious life at all levels. Whether they Pentecostal religious or, or liturgical religious or whatever. But it’s just to shake the snow globe. And Jesus did that. He says, you know, um, I mean, and when He would tell His parables. It was just

from the opposite direction of what they were knowing. And, and it was the point, it was shaking the snow globe. It was using His creativity to help them, to help them to look at something differently. (Greg L., Interview, 9/23/2011)

For a question about living in the tension of being genuine while living in a nonchristian atmosphere at work, a pastor said:

PPM: They need to be connected in the church because they need to have a support community of people that they have real relationships with, where they can be honest about where they're at, and that they can be honest about where they're at. They don't have to be religious. They can just be real with each other. Um, and they can go and do the same thing out in the community. (Patrick, Interview, 7/12/2011)

The distinction between religion and relationship can be included at any point in a service also. In a sermon about the condition of a person's heart, the third main idea out of five points was to be aware of the "danger of a religious spirit" (Field notes). The preacher contrasted religion and a relationship saying that the greatest "revival we need now is a revival of the changed heart" (Field notes). He then contrasted religion and giving in an "hour of need" offering proof that it was the churches of U.S America that helped immediately after the hurricane Katrina disaster while the government was "trying to get their act together." In the same service they said that they had "not come to go through the form or motion." The theme can show up in prayer. I also heard it during the singing portion of worship.

Congregation members were asked about the impact church attendance had on their everyday lives, with a follow up question about communication. Two women from different churches and with a great age difference replied that church attendance did not make a difference but it was the regularity of a relationship. The young woman said, "I don't know if it's because I attend church so much, I mean it's more like my relationship with Christ" (Kathleen, Interview, 8/7/2011). The great-grandmother said in a matter-of-

fact tone, “I don’t think its attending church that does that” (Carol, Interview, 8/4/2011). She added that attending church kept her focused but said, “No, I don’t think attending church affects it. Um, I think being a Christian, being a, a full time Christian effects my relationships much more deeply than attending church.” As though there was nothing else to add, her voice drifted off and she paused.

Ordering Embodied Spirituality

In the previous chapter, I have shown how the range of meaning for kinesthetic activity typically includes relational proclivities. In this chapter, I have shown how those kinesthetic activities are forms of personal expression, especially dance and raising hands in worship. “Expressing worship” is flexible allowing for a great deal of range. A person may well feel like he/she is expressing their authentic “heart” by standing perfectly still while another individual may run up and down the aisles of their church and still another may sway back and forth without moving her/his feet. The word “expression” uniquely fits the form of spontaneity because the word infers human emotion and affect. Some interviewees pointed out in free response questions that emotions are shifting and should be disciplined in worship. This leads to the conclusion that expression may reflect emotional conditions but is not limited to an emotional response. One pastor went so far as to deride any other Pentecostals who used fast songs as “frenetic and induced super-conscious exchange of the spirit” (Thomas, Interview, 10/29/2011). Another pastor pointed out that restrictions on expression of charismatic gifts in public worship found in the Biblical passage of 1 Corinthians 14 was a reaction to “this excess of emotionalism” (Aaron, Interview, 7/18,2011). While some of the pastors clearly wanted to guard against emotional responses, the same pastors wanted worship to touch the emotions. They

wanted to move beyond only manipulating an emotional response through various choices available with “expressing worship.”

As the language of Pentecostal worship “expressing” relies on the characteristic of the term. Simultaneously, the process is highly *personal*, *affective*, and *flexible*. An expression can be almost anything that comes directly from the affections (from the heart). Therefore, expressing something is more than just stating a cognitive fact but extends to the emotion and affect behind the attending cognitive processes. Because expressing appears most frequently in reference to kinesthetic practices, it includes the embodiment of Pentecostal worship that also implies that participants intend to communicate the truest of their affections to God when they engage in the activity. As I have shown, many expand the term to include not only the affections but also the entirety of spirituality including cognitive processes with praxis implications.

The emotional potential of “expressing worship” points to an embodied communication. Not only does the body express worship, but it connects the “heart” with the actions which also touches the spiritual dimension of a human. As previously cited, many authors now point to the embodied nature of Pentecostal worship. The embodiment of worship includes the reality that every aspect of a worshipper is expected to be touched by worship with many pastors listing various aspects of an individual in lists that were not meant to be definitive but inclusive with words like physically, spiritually, emotionally, and relationally.

The degrees of the word are in terms of comfort. That is to say, expressing worship is not a dichotomous concept with degrees of being right or wrong. Expressing worship thrives in degrees of comfort based either on personal comfort with expression

or cultural acceptability. Some interviewees who said they were uncomfortable being expressive themselves recognized that other people had a far greater level of comfort for expression in worship. For those who were less comfortable being expressive, they often relied on personal desires for not being expressive or their perception of cultural norms of expression for reasons why they were less expressive in worship. Those interviewees who said they were more expressive often described their physical practices in terms of obedience to the Bible, though this observation did not apply in every case. One interviewee included a well-articulated phenomenological explanation quoted in Chapter 6. She said that people in some Christian traditions do not express their worship while others do and it was based on comfort both internally and socially with people around them. “It’s just, I think it really is defined by the people who attend and, and what everybody is comfortable with everybody else doing” (Kristiana, Interview, 10/8/2011). She said that people choose a church based on their comfort with what takes place, part of which is the level of expression.

The inspiration for expression was clearly a social process as well as a personal process. In one incident during the singing portion of the service, as the congregation was standing a lady left her spot and discreetly walked across to the other side of the room and talked to another lady. The two of them subsequently went to the front and knelt to pray together. A younger lady also went forward (the pastor subsequently confirmed her to be the daughter of the second lady). Several additional ladies joined them to pray together. The inspiration for the entire drama was a social event. When asked about the event, the pastor said that the initiator was particularly “open.” Since he did not elaborate, I assumed he thought I knew what he meant. My reflexive response as a Pentecostal

insider is that she was open to hearing the voice of the Holy Spirit and responding in obedience to what she believed was intended for the moment. Such an expression is still a social process if God were included as part of those who are present (Keane 1997) and capable of interacting socially (Grenz 2001) as a member of the speech community. Albrecht noted the social nature of the Pentecostal worship by saying that “Pentecostals influence each other’s forms of worship, gestures, and behavior” (Albrecht 1999, 147). Therefore, Pentecostal expression is inspired by social processes including the process of receiving divine instruction through the Bible and the continuing internal voice of the Holy Spirit.

“Expressing worship” may be flexible, affective, and personal but it is not a free-for-all. The expressions of worship are expected to be done in orderly fashion, as the pastors repeated over and over again. They were willing to allow people to express the worship as long as it met a Biblical expectation. Put differently, as long as the particular expression was found in the Bible, they would allow it, including banner and flag waving.⁷ In one church the pastor and interviewees mentioned that someone attended their church that waved a flag during singing but the pastor asked them to sit in the back when they did that so they did not distract other worshippers. The term “decency and in order” comes from 1 Corinthians 14 and was a major concern for many of the pastors. It was defined largely through a social process of not distracting other worshippers and not

⁷ I join many Pentecostals in interpreting the Biblical references to flags and banners as metaphorical and therefore not constitutive of a command to be obeyed. It would have been out of place in most of the churches for someone to wave a flag or banner during the worship service. It would have been acceptable in some of the churches for individuals to wave something smaller like a decorative scarf or handkerchief but even that would have been rare, if not out of order, in five out of the six Assemblies of God churches and one from the Vineyard.

drawing attention to one's self. Several pastors indicated that they were quite willing to address issues of order through private conversation when they saw something they felt violated the orderly manner of worship. An additional definition of "orderly" combines the expression of worship and the witnessing to outsiders. This definition extends the social process of orderliness to people who do not understand many Pentecostal expressions with a desire to make worship accessible to those people. As I have shown, Pentecostal churches are often quite concerned with developing an atmosphere and attitude that welcomes outsiders and makes worship accessible to them through the décor of the building (lighting and special effects).

Pastors and worshippers alike reported a desire to eliminate distractions during worship to enhance the focus necessary for the Pentecostal worshipper. Interviewees repeatedly said that technology could be a distraction when it does not function properly. Others talked about dancing in relationship to a distraction, one man joked that if he danced it would be a distraction. A lady talked about her church upbringing where dancing and any movement were out of order because it was a distraction. Another man mentioned attending churches where out-of-control kids were very distracting. The pastors were also concerned about distractions. One pastor mentioned distractions as it relates to charismatic gifts saying he wanted to make sure that all worshippers were not distracted so their church explained what happened. Other pastors talked about the "distractions of life" that people brought in to worship and the need to help people set those things aside to focus on worshipping God. One pastor who was very mindful of distractions said they wanted to "clear the sidewalk ... to clear the path for people to connect with God, remove obstacles" (Greg L., Interview, 9/23/2011). The goal of

removing distractions according to that pastor was to help people connect with God, which was the same goal repeatedly referenced by the pastors.

I started research with five interrelated research questions one of which can be answered through the data of this chapter. *How do diverse approaches to surrounding cultural milieu (local and regional influences) impact speech codes in Pentecostal faith communities and in turn faith and practice of congregants?* The surrounding milieu in which the church worships impacts its code of expression in terms of more or less expression. Put differently, the flexibility of expression allows for more expression in some circumstances and less expression in other locales. Therefore, the level of expression is determined by the milieu that influences the people to the extent that worshippers are influenced by their heritage, family, emotional constitution, background events, and expressive proclivities. A retired capital fundraiser was asked about levels of physical activity. He was raised in a conservative, Lutheran church with little expressiveness in worship and has visited all sorts of churches through the years. He unequivocally said that the level of physical expression in worship is directly attributed to the people within the church and what they find acceptable. Other people mentioned the leadership of the church. Therefore, it can be stated that the level of expressiveness in worship in Pentecostal churches is influenced partially by surrounding cultural milieu, partially by the direction of the leadership of the church, and partially by the dominant desires of the people within the church.

Expression as Psychology of the Speech Community

As mentioned, several researchers like Steven (2002), Wright (2003), and Lindhardt (2012) pointed to the theory of optimal experience nicknamed “flow”

(Csikszentmihalyi 1990) for explaining the phenomena of Pentecostal worship.

Csikszentmihalyi found that people reached a point of consciousness when everything else was shut out and there was complete focus on the task at hand that led to reaching a high level of achievement. Neitz and Spickard (1990) elaborated on the flow theory to develop a sociological theory of religious experience by including Shutz's theory of a "mutual tuning-in relationship." Shutz first related mutual tuning-in relationships to musical performance where a performer tunes-in to the composer and to the audience, simultaneously allowing the audience the experience of tuning-in through a social connection. The feeling of "we-ness," as Neitz and Spickard term it, allows for a collective consciousness.

The process described in the combined theories explains what happens through Pentecostal expressive worship. The experiential nature allows for tuning-in as the embodied narrative gathers the whole person into the flow. The worshipper often feels like no one else is there but simultaneously gathers strength from the social setting and the communal support of the gathered worshippers. As previously noted, Pentecostals claim that God's presence inhabits their praise; therefore, one may tune-in to God and to the other in a social relationship. Since God is seen as part of the speech community, one tunes into God and to the various aspects of the sermon. The resultant meaning may be accessed after the fact, as interviewees sometimes said. They reflected on an event and said they did not entirely understand until afterward.

In order to tune in and enjoy an optimum experience, focus becomes an essential aspect of worship to remove distractions. One may not tune-in to what God wants to do or to the presence of God through the flow process if one is distracted. As already noted,

excessive expressions were sometimes seen as distracting other worshippers. Further, technology was seen as a double-edged sword of enhancing worship but also distracting worshippers when it malfunctioned. One pastor talked about distractions and said that an essential task of the worship planners was to “clear the sidewalk” of potential distractions. The theme of limiting distractions pervaded the interviews. It was often tied to terms like “focus.” Some worshippers described their experience by saying that “nothing else mattered” or “no one else mattered.” One person said it was like no one else was there other than God.

The experience of expressive worship allows for individuals to flow from moment to moment, even to get caught up in the process, through a social relationship with the humanly other and God. While the most intense experiences elicited the strongest descriptions of a tuning-in relationship with flow events, certainly there were other descriptions of less intense experiences that might occur in any Pentecostal church regularly that also described it as a “just-me-and-God-experience.” The same worshippers described worship as an inherently social process where the presence of the other helped in the meaning making of the event.

Theory Development

The results of this chapter demonstrate the possibility of adding insight to SCT. Not only may a speech community have multiple speech codes (Philipsen, Coutu and Covarru 2005) but an individual may participate in multiple speech communities using multiple codes. Dual citizenship in religious speech communities and other speech communities points to the participation in multiple codes and the negotiation of identity in a way that preserves those codes. The heavy equipment salesperson quoted earlier in

the chapter was asked how attending church impacted the way he communicated with people throughout the week. He replied (Jeffrey, Interview, 8/7/2011):

I'd say more like I just want to make sure that people really understand what I'm trying to tell them, even if it's something technical about a piece of equipment or whatever. And that I'm a lot more sensitive to people's hurts and um, I'm probably less of a joker than I used to be because I realize that a lot of stuff I might joke around about they might have hurt, you know. Um, I don't, you know maybe that makes me more sensitive to people and um, in their hurts. I think I see people as people more now than I did, do as customers. And they're just people I want to help out and usually it's in the context of getting them the right equipment. But I've got, I just talk to um, one of my contractors and his wife has me pray for her husband. You know, I mean we're – she's, I just, I don't know. It just seems like I always just start talking to people and pretty soon we're talking about God and then that ... and they know Him, great! And then it's like, cool! You know it's like, "Oh man." You're in the club. And if they're not, that makes it seem like, "That sounds kind of interesting. Ah. I never heard that."

At minimum, it could be said that his participation in the Pentecostal speech community caused him to renegotiate his communicative behavior at work and in other areas of life.

A business consultant was asked the same question and he said that his experiences at church have made him more likely to talk to people about spirituality in a way that might lead to conversion (see Chapter 10). A theoretical mathematics PhD student was asked about his communicative behavior outside of church also. I asked, "Have you found there to be a conflict studying advanced math and being a Christian?" Luke's (Interview, 10/2/2011) reply was quick and to the point. "Nope! Not really." When asked about worship, he referred to embodiment and other technical ideas borrowed from Smith's work on worship (Smith 2009). In other words, he negotiated his studies in a way that did not cause a conflict and used his academic proclivities to understand worship, using academic material that no one else in the study referenced (pastor or congregant). When people find that their identity is constituted in such a way that they are part of two speech communities, either competing or complementary, they negotiate the various aspects of

those identities in a way that satisfies an internal need for consistency, often with a dual citizenship approach as previously noted from Ahern (1999).

Summary

Expressing worship leads to several important summary points. The expression of worship pervades the Pentecostal speech community as a preferred way of worship juxtaposed against formal ritual and liturgy so that the focus may be shifted from the individual's affections laden with the cares of everyday life to focusing on God. The flow experience brings about the shift as one gets lost in flowing from moment to moment until eventual "triumph" or "deliverance" bring about the desired outcome. The process is anything but individualistic from their perspective but arises in an interiority fashion when God takes up residence in the interior. It is an entirely spiritual process to the Pentecostal speech community and, therefore, it is not my intent to explain it without recognizing the divine role. However, SCT proposes that members of a speech community manipulate the code to navigate social situations (Carbaugh 1989). The concept of manipulation was not meant in a pejorative sense, though manipulation infers poisoned potential. Within the Pentecostal collective consciousness, an underpinning attitude suggests a deep-seated reaction against manipulating expressive worship for anything other than the purest motivation. One interviewee said, "I don't want to do anything that's gonna be fake or seem um, like I'm just trying to, you know show everyone, 'Okay! Look! I'm here, you know. Ah I'm, I'm legit.' Or anything like that" (Chad, Interview, 10/29/2011). As a member of the community, I recognize the apprehension so aptly stated by the young man as a fear that fake expression would be used either by the worshipper or by an observer to suggest something other than the

genuine. The notion of something fake was guarded against both to express the authenticity of one's heart and to guard against critics who historically claimed that everything done in Pentecostal worship was an emotional response and not a genuine interaction with God.

The third research question was: *How do the variety of speech codes from congregation to congregation within the Pentecostal speech community with a variety of expressions, impact socialization within each congregation?* Through expressive worship, people are socialized within the speech community through many facets of spirituality. Since "expression" opens the door to nearly every aspect of Pentecostal spirituality, including sometimes symbolizing the entire Christian life, expressive worship socializes people into the spirituality of the speech community. The essence of Pentecostal Christianity is spirituality; therefore, expressiveness in worship allows access to the speech community for participative worshippers.

The narration of worship builds on both the spontaneity and expressive proclivities. In the next chapter, I show how the seeds planted in expressive worship form a narration of worship to guide everyday living for people in the speech community.

CHAPTER 8. WORSHIP AS NARRATION

The “expression” of worship narrates the lives of Pentecostal worshippers. While other Christians may also engage in expressive worship practices, for Pentecostals expression vitally defines their spiritual identity as explicated in the Chapter 7. If Pentecostal worship is a combination of embodiment and narration then the kinesthetic activity explicated in Chapter 6 will assist people in narrating their lives and the question of “how existential encounters with the divine presence define the daily narratives” might be answered. If the narrative produced through embodied activity provides people with the raw material to develop their everyday lives as Smith suggested (2009, 2010), then “expressing worship” and the narrative would be closely linked together. Further, that narrative would provide the raw material used to develop a worldview that narrates worshippers’ everyday lives. Every Pentecostal worship service I attended gave prominent place to reading, proclaiming, and obeying the Bible. The combination of expressing worship and Bible obeying participate in the narration of worshippers’ lives, not separately or independently but both work together to align the affections, cognitive processes, and everyday activity for participative worshippers. Albrecht showed how the rituals of Pentecostal worship produced liminality, *communitas*, reflexivity, and transformation (1999, 209) demonstrating the sensibilities produced through totemizing rituals. I am proposing that those are developed through an embodied narration structured around seven elements.

I will provide an overview of the narrative elements observed in worship, provide evidence for each element, and describe how those elements cohesively develop the plot that inextricably weaves through embodied practices. I will then situate those elements

within other narrative plots previously reported in academic literature, harmoniously combining the observation of others with my own participant observation data. Those elements extend into the way worshippers live their everyday lives so I will provide evidence of that process. I will also show how the narrative elements imply unique roles for agents and how that impacts the research of Pentecostal worship, communication, ritual, and other phenomena. Along the journey in this chapter, I will make use of Fisher's narration paradigm approach to explain observed phenomena and interview data.

Christian worship in all settings presents itself as narration (Chauvet 1995; Webber 1999, 2008). Fisher defines narrative in his paradigmatic approach as "symbolic actions – words and/or deeds – that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them" (Fisher 1987). Fisher's narrative paradigm said that human beings are essentially story telling beings who base the logic of those stories in their decision making process through evaluating "good reasons" for action based on narration. Producing those good reasons is based on the human capacity to engage story-generating situations. Through the engagement, humans use the rationality of narrative for decision-making, a rationality governed by *narrative probability* and *narrative fidelity* where a reason is a good reason if it rings true with the listener. A narrative decision making process allows humans to inhabit a world that demands a set of stories accepted as true to guide the choices made every day. Therefore, the creation, re-creation, affirmation, and acceptance of a community's stories create cultural myths that define it as a speech community through the development of internal values. Human beings are as much "valuing as reasoning," Fisher said.

Narrative Melody Line

Since “expressing worship” dominates worship communication in the Pentecostal speech community, the beginning of the narrative starts with inferences flowing from the expressions described in Chapter 6 and the SCT analysis of “expressing” in Chapter 7. The narrative behind the expressions begins with desire because desire initiates expression. While Pentecostal worship services had a beginning, middle, and ending, the narrative elements were juggled in any way necessary for a particular service, with flexibility rather than fixity. However, the narrative typically began with spiritual desire as a presupposition of worship and embodied celebration followed desire. The mystical, existential encounter of the Divine presence produced intimacy. Worshippers were nurtured through the worship process, with interviewees often suggesting a cause/effect relationship between the communal encouragement and nurture. The teaching/preaching moment intended to provide direction, though direction certainly happened with other communicative activity such as charismatic gifts. Interviewees often commented on receiving personal transformation during worship. These narrative elements comprise the entire narrative and pragmatically produced reliance on God for everyday situations as well as desperate crises that require a miracle.

Spiritual Desire

Some of the narrative elements are seen in cause/effect relationships; however, it is better to envision the elements as a paradigm with internal coherence. For example, the decision to rely on God may come from good reasons found in the narrative probability or narrative fidelity found in direction, personal transformation of yourself or others, or

nurture, celebration, communal encouragement, or intimacy with God. In the same way the fidelity of the worship narrative and its probability, increases or decreases each element of the narrative in a cohesive manner so that the depletion of one impacts all elements.

Spiritual desire was often described through metaphors like “hunger,” “thirst,” “going after God,” “seek God,” or just “seeking” in a general way, “feeling,” One pastor (Todd, Interview, 9/29/2011) typifies the response of others:

PTT: Overall? I think it’s affected it in the opposite way that I thought it would. I thought it would hinder it. But what you got is a larger group of people that recognize they need God and without God they’d be lost. Dead! And um, so it makes people more hungry for God. Now you, I’ve got two single ladies right now that are new to the church and are hookin up with different guys that are new to the church that are also messed up. So they’re so immature, so twisted in their beliefs and stuff, so ... It’s tryin’ to guide them through that without chasin’ them away. Tryin’ to teach them right from wrong. Helpin’ them to find God without being legalistic. Waitin’ for God to do the change in their life.

Carol (Interview, 8/4/2011) A worshipper connected desire to the kinesthetic practice of raising one’s hands in worship.

B: What does it mean to raise your hands in worship?

FCG: (almost crying) I’m here. I’m here. I’m praising you. My hands are open to you. Fill them up with whatever you’ve got for me. And help me to apply it to my life. Um, I think probably it’s a hold-over from ... remember when Jesus entered Jerusalem on that ah ... no you don’t remember. You weren’t there. (Laughter) You’ve read about it though.

B: I’ve read about it.

FCG: Um, they were waving palm branches, you know. And I think that’s our way of waving a palm branch, you know. Ah ... (Pause) ... (Singing) With our hands lifted high. ... And the Psalms also tell us to lift your hands in worship.

As she so plainly articulated, the kinesthetic worship expresses a heart of desire, longing to be spiritually filled. Based on the responses of these two, desire operates both as a presupposition and as an active part of the narrative in the worship service. A third

function of desire was articulated by several pastors in a more general way. The entire worship service functioned to produce desire in people who may come into the service without it, in which case the narrative experienced by that person may end at desire for that service. As Fisher theorized, narrative provides flexibility and requires negotiation for all involved in the process. When applied to worship, an individual may negotiate all other aspects of the narrative to privilege just one narrative element for a service.

As Chapter 6 described, much of the kinesthetic movement operated dialectally with celebration. Some interviewees even used the term celebration interchangeably with worship. Celebration marked all Pentecostal worship historically (Land 2010). If their worship is known for anything, it is associated with enthusiastic singing, accompanied by hand clapping and other celebratory kinesthetic expressions, all of which simultaneously express the heart of spiritual desire, give worship, and build spiritual desire.

Expressed Celebration

The data pointed strongly to an attitude of celebration in worship (see Chapter 6). Celebration typically marked the singing portion of the service but was not limited to that portion. It was acceptable at any point in worship to celebrate as long as it corresponded with the current content theme such as a statement about conversion-salvation. The atmosphere of celebration in a service pointed worshippers to extend that attitude to everyday life so that even through difficult situations a believer will look to God as a source of joy and goodness.

Expression uniquely enables the speech community to engage in celebration because of the flexible and affective nature of “expression” as a term for talk. Celebration cannot be planned or structured, at least within the Pentecostal speech community.

Through embodied spontaneity, celebration comes alive and permeates the whole person. In the worship of some Christian traditions, celebration is not combined with the flexible, personal, and affective nature of expression. In those instances celebration seems to mean something completely different (Chauvet 1995); however, the drama of celebration within the Pentecostal tradition thrives on connecting the whole person. The celebration is based on the Five-fold Gospel; therefore, the embodiment reinforces the belief structure.

Intimate Presence

As with the concept of celebration, the concept of God's presence infers different concepts within the Christian tradition. For Pentecostals and Charismatics it is a mystical, existential encounter of the Divine presence experienced in an unmediated way that produces manifestations and spiritual intimacy. In the context of the worship service, God's presence may be experienced at any time; however, it is most likely to occur after singing several songs according to interviewees or in a time of prayer. Particularly interviewees talked about the intimate presence of God through the altar prayer time.

Carol had lots of experience in Pentecostal churches and commented on altar prayer:

CGC: I know it sounds kind of silly but I feel like I'm closer to God. I mean I know the Holy Spirit is present throughout the building. He's right here with us right now. But, I don't know. It's designated as this is the sanctuary. I mean this is the platform. This is the altar. And I want to get as close to the altar as I can get. And I know in my head that I'm not any closer to God at the altar than I am sitting in the pew. But there's just something about being up there that, that makes me feel like I'm closer to God. I know that's silly. But you know, that's me. (Carol, Interview, 8/4/2011)

Quite a few interviewees talked about times when it seemed that it was just them and God in a service and the size of the crowd did not matter.

There was an expectation that the presence of God would change people. A pastor commented, “And then, you know, God can do more in ten seconds or thirty seconds of silence then I can do in a lifetime of talking to somebody” (Jon, Interview, 8/4/2011). Such sentiments pervaded interviews. They were not devaluing communication as much as privileging the experienced presence of God. Communication and the presence of God were tied together in many stories of tongues-speech, as was the case in the following description of an initial experience of Spirit baptism and tongues-speech given by Kristiana (Interview, 10/8/2011):

KOC: So I just, I was reading and I like, I was just – revelation. I was like, okay. So if this, then this and then ... I had a friend in, in college that was, you know, I guess kind of like a mentor. And so I would go to her with really tough questions and we’d, sometimes we’d argue and then I’d leave frustrated and, um, but then I’d go back to the Word and I’d say, “Well God says this about the Holy Spirit.” And, the Bible was true and God wouldn’t lie. And so maybe there is more than just ... I grew up in a church that didn’t even talk about the Holy Spirit at all. Like, I mean other than He’s a part of the trinity. So um, I remember, I started going to prayer groups with her and still not feeling completely comfortable with the whole like, Spirit-filled experience but I remember one night, just, just, quietly, it wasn’t even like I was in front of a big church or during an altar call or anything. I was just praying like, “Okay God,” you know. “I just want you to open my eyes to this. It’s, you know, open my eyes to this. And if this is something that is real, you know.” And so I was just praying and then, I just felt like, just, just this strength and this power and, and um, prayed in tongues. And I just felt like this is just so, I just felt peace about it. You know? It wasn’t, I always thought it was this crazy thing that had to happen. And it was, like shaking and falling and the floor. It was just very, I felt like, you know, if I, I feel like God would have told me that, or I would have felt like this isn’t right if it wasn’t, if it wasn’t God, if it wasn’t the Holy Spirit. And so I remember, since then, praying and praying, you know. Like praying and just spending a lot of time in the Word and just learning everything I could, going to different places, going to different churches and talking to people. And, I’m a very much like an information gatherer. I need to be, I’m not just like, okay. Like this is what it is? You know! I like to go and, and, and read it for myself and know it for myself. And I think that that was just the point in my life where it was like, “Okay. Like, this is it. And this isn’t, you know, just something that people are saying. And it’s real and, and it’s kind of ...” I had to get to that point on my own. I couldn’t have somebody else say, “Well this, this is why the Holy Spirit is important in your life and this is

what He can do.” I had to like kind of going to go through a rough time and experience that on my own through like reading the Bible and prayer.

In the Pentecostal speech community desire propels a person to a new experience in God’s presence that produces relational intimacy between the individual and God. As I have shown such experiences form the essence of their worship and spirituality but such experiences should lead one to intimacy with God. Many interviewees described it with terms like “seeking” or “seeking God” or modified it further to say “seeking God’s face.”

Life Transformation

As mentioned earlier in Chapter 6, spontaneity was tied to freedom. The free flowing nature of bodily expression in worship reminded worshippers of the freedom they described as coming from God releasing them from sin and internal residue left from difficult life situations. Again, every aspect of the worship service participated in life transformation, though the sermon most commonly enacted transformation. For worshippers, it was often a cognitive process especially for those with experience in the process. Interviewees described their initial days after conversion-salvation as times when miraculous freedom came during times of prayer, singing, or other affective activity. After people spent several years in the speech community, they tended to describe transformation and personal freedom as a response to cognitive activity such as a sermon or Bible study. The concept of transformation was more readily accessible from interviewees that received conversion-salvation as an adult. Those who grew up in a Pentecostal church with their parents taking them to church talked less about their own transformation than other themes.

Transformation was a unique response to the differences expected between believers and other people. When asked about living differently than other people, people

talked about transformation using words like “Christ-like” and “love” and “Christ follower” and “living for God.” While not all members of the speech community said something similar to the following statement, it is likely that none would disagree because it describes so many important themes:

KRM: Well, the world is a sinful place and it’s our job to strive to live for God and not for the world. And that overall is basically being different, not living for the world or at, with the world but for God. (Kimberlee, Interview, 8/3/2011)

Nurture

Worshippers were nurtured through the worship process, with interviewees pointing to a cause/effect relationship between communal activity, encouragement, and nurture. In a fast-paced interaction, a former Roman Catholic (Kristie, Interview, 7/27/2011) described the new experience of people laying their hands on her while praying for her.

B: [Has] anyone laid their hands on you and prayed before?

KLC: Yes. Not before I started attending here, though.

B: What did you think the first time that happened?

KLC: I was at a Bible study that was through, um, a small group through Life Church. And um, it, it really had a big impact on me. I got very emotional that someone was caring that much to lay hands on me and to pray with me in agreement. And I could feel, um, I could feel God’s presence as we prayed.

B: Are you saying that you found it very supportive?

KLC: Yes.

B: From other people ...

KLC: Yes!

B: ...laying their hands on you?

KLC: Yes!

While other activity often received more attention, the nurturing communal activity was a deep current rushing through many of the interviews. Particularly interviewees pointed to the practice of laying hands on someone in prayer as a nurturing and encouraging activity. Again the embodied activity connected with the spiritual process to narrate people's everyday lives as evidenced by the rest of the young lady's interview where she talked about spiritual nurture as a new experience and pervading other areas of her life.

Direction

Perhaps more than any of the other worship narration elements, receiving direction tended to be more isolated within the teaching/preaching moment; however, the prompting of God for a particular task or decision may come at any time during the worship service because it was believed to be the result of God's presence activated within the believer. Direction may also come from God speaking directly to an individual, which was also reported by Luhrmann (2007, 2012). While direction implies that, someone will follow the given direction, interviewees emphasized obedience with greater frequency than direction. Obedience was the result of spiritual direction from scripture, a sermon, or God speaking directly to an individual. Spiritual direction was expected as a regular aspect of worship as evidenced by the words of the pastors at the end of some services. One pastor told people who had not yet received conversion-salvation that they knew God was speaking to them. In a similar context, another pastor said that people should respond for conversion-salvation if they knew that God was prompting them.

The altar prayer time embodied the commitment to a new direction. One of the churches tried to be as little like a Pentecostal church as possible in terms of ritual and verbal charismatic gifts but still gave an opportunity at the end of the service for people to respond to the sermon about marriage. Kimberlee was a single mom from a different church. She said (Interview, 8/3/2011), “For me it’s being called to the altar and obeying. And um, and just by being called and obeying God, the presence is just so much more. I think it’s more of just obeying and listening to what God’s called me to do and to physically, if I go that far it’s because I’ve been told to do that.”

Reliance

The entire narrative produced reliance on God for both everyday situations as well as desperate crises that require a miracle, making reliance a result of the narration. Reliance typically would be described as “faith” within the Pentecostal speech community but because other speech communities use the term for other activities, “reliance” better suits the meaning. It describes the expected attitude of long standing believers who should rely on God for everything from miraculous intervention to the air they breathe every day. Reliance was reinforced in worship services by regular prayer for healing of the sick and prayer for other personal situations. Reliance was also reinforced through the expectation that God could perform a miracle at any time. It was seen as part of the narration that was open to anyone willing to participate in what was perceived to be God’s agenda. An eighteen year old young woman described being part of a situation where she believed God intervened after she relied on God.

KNM: Well there is once like I was praying and I read, I read something and it was really cool to me. It was about David and how he trusted in God and everything. And then that – um, it was on a Sunday morning – and then later a

lady came to church and her purse got stolen and everything. And I just, I really felt like God just put an impression that – and I told her this too – that like, you know we all have, you know, kind of like a wall around us. And like with her purse being stolen, her ID was, her social security, her cell phone. I mean everything was in there. You know, I felt like um – and she felt like this too – she earned it and she said like part of the wall had been torn down, and everything. And she said that you know, all this fear was on her. And I gave her a Psalm. I forget what Psalms it was. And that seemed to really encourage her. It was like God wanted me to share, you know, specifically what I felt was going on and, you know, she affirmed it. And she said that verse, she really hung on to that verse after I talked to her, like a week later. (Kathleen, Interview, 8/7/2011)

Through the narration of reliance, Fisher's theory of narrative logic comes into full view. The constant telling and retelling of stories of God's miraculous intervention adds to the probability of the miraculous and builds a greater sense of reliance. To reinforce the probability, stories were often told with an element of surprise. God was believed to be speaking because it was something that would not happen otherwise in the mind of the narrator. Through such stories the probability structure was created, re-created, and affirmed and the belief structure was reinforced as the foundation for that probability structure.

Luhrmann described how people come to believe that God is speaking to them (Luhrmann 2007). One must develop the reliance through various potential processes in knowing that it is God speaking and one must then rely on God's speaking for direction. While reliance initially presents itself as pointing to the psychology of the speech community, it more appropriately points to the hegemony of their sociology because anyone can rely on God to see miraculous intervention. Through the reliance narrative element, the speech community democratizes itself. More often than not, when I saw someone praying for a worshipper it was not the professional clergy but members of the congregation. I asked one pastor about that and he said that he keeps a watchful eye especially when it happens spontaneously but not for hegemonic reasons. He watched to

make sure it was done in order and seemed to be God's desire at the time. The process of relying on God's voice for direction, then, can call all members of the congregation into a unified direction for a particular moment as each relies on God's prompting.

Harmonious Combination

The seven narrative elements I just described work harmoniously with the Five-fold Gospel narrative. As previously noted, theologians conjectured that the full narrative of Pentecostal worship encompasses the Five-fold Gospel (Macchia 2006; Karkkainen 2007; Archer 2010). The Five-fold Gospel centers on Jesus as one who enters into the speech community as the agent of spiritual change through conversion-salvation, healing, Spirit baptism, spiritual formation including sanctification, and initiating eternal hope of Jesus as the coming king. The many aspects of expressive worship, spontaneous worship, and giving worship, however, are not readily included within that narrative. For example, worship as celebration connects in an ancillary way to the Five-fold Gospel as an expected response. Worship as the culmination of spiritual desire connects in a similar fashion as a necessary background motivation. Since important worship practices are not central to the Five-fold Gospel, the narrative rises from other places and responds to the gospel narrative but produces various responses within worshippers that phenomenologically encapsulate a different meaning. The worship narration responds to the activity of the Five-fold Gospel. Celebration typically stems from remembrance of Jesus' activity. Transformation follows the path marked by the Five-fold Gospel.

Social researchers have situated Pentecostal worship as an adventurous journey (Percy 2011). Luhrmann (2004) emphasized romantic elements of worship, particularly as it related to Vineyard churches. Steven (2009) followed a five step progression of call-

to-worship, engagement, exaltation, adoration, and intimacy but noted other possible narratives such as traveling through the Old Testament temple through the various temple courtyards into the Holy of Holies culminating in an encounter with the glory of God (Steven 2009, citing Stibbe). Cartledge (2006) followed a narrative of encounter progressing through a three-step progression of search, encounter, and transformation (Cartledge 2006).

The seven narrative aspects I have proposed (spiritual desire, expressed celebration, intimate presence, life transformation, nurture, direction, and reliance) work harmoniously with the proposal of others who primarily propose a progression that typically functions with a resolution to narrative tension. Resolving the narrative tension in worship requires background from interviewees on the nature of that tension. They often spoke of releasing the concerns of everyday life, of either a deep-seated nature or a lesser intensity. Typically, they talked about deep-seated release with terms like “deliverance” and lesser intense issues with words like “focus.” The deliverance-refocus paradigm operated within the tension to either release or reconfigure the narration of everyday life where some tensions achieve permanent release already and other aspects receive continual refocusing of the affections because full release of such things has not yet arrived, to appropriate the already/not yet language of theologian Fee (1994). Therefore, in the narrative melody line of spiritual desire, expressed celebration, intimate presence, life transformation, nurture, direction, and reliance, the tension reflects the already/not yet reality prevalent in Pentecostal theology while also addressing the widely expressed practices of worship. It further advances the triadic emphasis of Land (2010) bringing worship into orthodoxy (direction), orthopraxy (transformation and reliance) and

orthopathy (nurture, expressed celebration, and spiritual desire) as well as including a more all-encompassing experience of intimacy within God's presence.

The seven elements expand the burdens where other motifs fall short. While the language still includes romantic tones, the limitations of that motif squeeze out life transformation, stripping away substantive vitality. The adventure or journey metaphors require an eternal perspective that believers only pass through this life but cannot fully explain the worship practices associated with celebration. Narrative plots that include a journey into God's presence imply that every worshipper realizes the full experience of God's presence in every service rather than acknowledging that some people never move past spiritual desire because of the current constitution of their spirituality. Therefore, it becomes an ideal type, an all-or-nothing narrative where either a person enters the narrative or it has no use for them. In my observations and interviews, a worshipper may not fully enter into the presence of God on a particular Sunday but may still receive something out of the service. Cartledge's three-step progression closely corresponds with the narrative I propose because he includes transformation. I add several features to Cartledge's configuration, particularly direction and celebration while separating transformation from reliance because it more closely reflects praying for the sick and expectation of miraculous intervention.

Structuring Everyday Life

Having explored the narrative development of worship, I will now move to answering one of the original questions. *How do existential encounters with the divine presence define the daily narratives outside worship services for Pentecostals? How is this evident through speech codes?* Speech codes may be accessed through the rituals,

cultural myths, and social dramas of a speech community according to Philipsen (1997). Within the worship narrative, the speech codes combine to point beyond the worship moment toward everyday life that reflects the attitudes developed within the social drama of worship. The narrative points to the deliverance-refocus paradigm that extends into everyday life as worship services to refocus one from the stress of every day concerns. Worshippers did not seek escape from problems, readily acknowledging things like home foreclosures, drug addiction, sexual promiscuity, unemployment, and other issues of everyday life; however, they also pointed to feeling “like ten tons of weight had been taken off” them (Charles, 8/2/2011). Through deliverance, some obstacles are removed from the believer. The process of refocus moves through various narrative elements such as celebration or direction so that everyday life takes on new meaning. Since a worshipper cannot orally respond when presented with a moral violation (the social drama process) the worshipper chooses from other options. The ideal-type is to surrender to God’s ways and repent of one’s own wayward path. The worshipper may also reject the presentation of a moral violation as though there were no violation, thus rejecting the messenger’s interpretation. The worshipper may also reject the message, which would be seen in the speech community as rejecting God as the message’s author. Further, interviewees consistently talked about their spirituality as a relationship that they juxtaposed with religion in a configuration that differentiates the vitality they experience through expressive worship. The vitality extends to everyday life through the ethic of giving as means of accomplishing loving God and loving the other (see Chapter 9).

Bible-Readers and Spirit-Listeners Living the Narrative

The worship narration produces efficacious results for Pentecostal Christians within the worship environment and extending into everyday life through usage of the Bible, producing the narrative fidelity Fisher described (Fisher 1987). Their interpretation of everyday life reflects their interpretation of scripture. I will leave it to others to analyze theologically how closely the worship narrative mirrors scripture; however, the salient fact now is that Pentecostals want to examine their worship through biblically based theological reflection. In fact, biblical reflection relevantly applies to any aspect of what one interviewee termed “life and Godliness.” Reliance on the Bible for reflection extends the worship narrative into everyday life as pastors instruct worshippers to read the Bible on their own. One pastor in a sermon insisted that their church was going to stop projecting scripture onto their giant screens so that people would be forced to use their own Bible. “You will not have that [projected scripture] tomorrow morning but you will have your Bible,” he said (Field notes). Interviewees talked casually about reading their Bible as though it were an expected practice outside of worship. Through the extension of Bible reading and obeying, the worship narration produces efficacious results for worshippers in everyday life.

Worshippers used the Bible in different ways depending on the need in their life as if it presented a set of stories by which to pattern their own direction. They told stories assuming that the Bible was an important part of decision-making and that every Christian should read the Bible. Some interviewees distinguished between their use of scripture as a Lutheran or Roman Catholic, juxtaposing it against the reality that as a Pentecostal they read the Bible “every day.” They relied on the Bible for spiritual

sustenance and spiritual substance. They relied on scripture to settle disputes and resolve interpersonal tension especially within the church context. Because of the theological belief that God revealed the Bible, they elevated the Bible as God's voice to all people in all ages, thereby elevating the Bible as a final arbiter of disputes. They acknowledged disagreements on interpretation but once they arrived at an interpretation of the Bible the matter would be settled.

If the Bible settles matters because it is the voice of God, then an inner voice of God would also settle matters (T. M. Luhrmann 2007, 2012). Pastors repeatedly talked about arriving at their current ministry location through the direction of God often combining an interpretation of unique circumstances and inner guidance as evidence of God's direction. For them, knowing that God directed them provided security and direction in the decision making process. Congregation members talked about divine direction for everything from everyday conversations to job changes. The twin factors of the inner voice of God and the external voice of God through scripture extends worship from the weekly moment into everyday spirituality by providing narratives from which to choose as a pattern for life.

Authority in Social Drama

An engaging young woman sat across the classroom table from me in a church on a Saturday for an interview. As the questions started, she quickly displayed a defensive tone, the only one of fifty interviewees to use that tone. Six months earlier, she had graduated from a Pentecostal university, a fact that probably influenced the interaction. She knew nothing of my background and clearly ascribed to me the role of an antagonist, though my questions were all neutral. She tried her best to present her Pentecostal church

as a normal, biblical church. I asked her, “If you met someone someplace, in a store or someplace else and ended up talking about religion, and they had never heard of a Pentecostal church and wanted to know what to expect from a service, what would you tell them?” Her response revealed not only her tone, but also the way she believed a dispute should be settled. She assumed there were issues that might be disputed so she appealed to the Bible for a resolution of that dispute.

1 F: I would say that (pause) I feel like our church is just like, well we’re any, we’re
 2 just like, we just believe in the Bible, you know. If you find it in the Bible, that’s
 3 what we believe in. We’re a typical Christian church. And most Sundays I think
 4 we are, I don’t, because I always went to Pentecostal church I always see people
 5 you know, like raising their hands in worship and maybe that’s different in other
 6 churches. So to me that doesn’t faze me at all. Like I don’t think that’s weird. Um,
 7 so I don’t think I would tell anyone about like, “Oh we, you know, we sing a lot
 8 of songs. Some people like to like, raise their hands or speak in tongues.”
 9 Because, but so I don’t think that’s weird. I know like there’s sometimes like at
 10 the end of the service where someone will like bust out in tongues really loudly
 11 and they’ll like stop the music. I think when that happens, there was one time my
 12 Grandma, she came to our church, when someone did that, I’m always afraid that
 13 they’re going to be like, “Woah. What kind of church is this? Like what do you
 14 believe in? Like what is this?” But then I explain to them, um, it’s like, 1
 15 Corinthians chapter twelve where they explain like the gifts of the Spirit and how
 16 like, no this really is, it’s not just back in Biblical times that people were um,
 17 gifted with tongues. That it can happen now. And so I think that when they can
 18 see it in the Bible then it’s like, “Okay, this isn’t some crazy whacked out church.
 19 It’s ...” you know, it’s still Biblical. So I think if I were to meet a stranger like in
 20 the mall and just be, like, oh it’s a normal Christian church. We believe in
 21 anything in the Bible. But if they were to come with me to a service and maybe if
 22 that happened where someone busted out in tongues, and then someone else in
 23 interpreted it, I would explain like, “Oh those are gifts of the Spirit. You can find
 24 them in, in the New Testament. They’re listed there.” (Mary, Interview,
 25 10/8/2011)

The paradigm Philipsen (1997) described for a social drama was played out in her explanation in what seemed to be a mixture of hypothetical explanation and real situation recollection. She was asked a question that she interpreted as a likely point of confrontation based on her use of the word “weird” in line nine. Therefore, she answered as though she were confronted with a moral dilemma, someone who might find the

service weird. According to the social drama paradigm, when confronted with a charge of moral rupture there will be a response followed by either acceptance of the response or a counter-response. The interviewee responded to the potential moral charge of weirdness in worship by relying on the Bible in lines 2, 14-18, 20-21, and 22-25. She framed the answer as a biblical response and a biblical challenge with references to the Bible at the beginning, middle, and end. In a basic sense, her conversational outline followed an approach of:

A	(Bible)
B	(hypothetical)
A'	(Bible)
B'	(hypothetical)
A''	(Bible)

For her, the references to the Bible were intended to end the conversation. Every appeal after the moral charge was to be based on interpreting scripture or the potential of rejecting scripture as an acceptable text by which to resolve the socially dramatic tension.

Settling Social Drama

As the interview episode shows, when something was biblically based it becomes a mandate and the matter was settled. The community relies on the twin function of “spirit and truth” for the resolution of socially dramatic tension. Over and over again in interviews, people referenced a scripture verse often to truncate their line of thought. Particularly people referenced a biblical phrase to describe how Christians should relate to the world around them. I asked congregation members, “What do you think it means when the Bible says Christians should be different than the world?” Brad replied (Interview, 7/29/2011), “I think we need to be ah, we need to live in the world but not be of the world.” The statement combines pieces of John 17 for a popular phrase used in

some form by eight interviewees. Since none of those eight appealed to any other source for their description, they expected that it settled the matter. Combined with the earlier story it points to a method for resolving social drama. However, further evidence will firmly establish the role of arriving at the truth as a means for settling matters.

One associate pastor described the way their church talked with people about being different from the world.

HDR: Well, we, we talk to people based on the way the Word, that ah, we're in the world and we live in the world. Ah, you know that's nothing different. But, as we also have a Father lives with, a Father that lives, Jesus Christ that lives within us so we don't take on worldly habits or um, (pause) the sinful nature of the world. Ah because he helps us to stay focused, to ah stay spiritual. But we live in the world. Ah, so that's a reality. You know, but we're not of the world. (Hattie, Interview, 7/21/2011)

Additionally one pastor was not comfortable with my description of his position as “nuanced.” After answering three more questions, he went back and said that he thought his answer was biblical and not nuanced. He then said he would challenge anyone to defend biblically a different position. Again, finding the truth from the Bible settled the matter for him. Interviewees described reading the Bible on a daily basis for the purpose of allowing it to be a stabilizing force. They appealed to biblical narratives as examples. They found patterns for living in the Bible. The Bible served as strength for difficult times in their minds. One pastor gave lengthy and detailed answers based on scripture, quickly jumping from scripture to scripture, from Greek word to Greek word. For Pentecostals biblical study and interpretation involves “an act of willful obedient response to the Scripture’s meaning” (Archer 2004, 99).

Within the Pentecostal speech community, agents rely on the Bible because their plausibility structure, relevance structure, and belief structure combine to cast the Bible as the words of God. Therefore, in times of tension, either socially or within the interior

of the self, the tension is resolved by the direction of the Bible before other sources are considered. Narrative agents seeking to bring peace to a situation rely on the Bible as God's revealed truth to direct acting in a particular situation. While the action may change situation to situation, reliance on the Bible remains the constant for agents.

As previously mentioned, Berger and Luckmann (1967) developed their theory of the social construction of reality to include a plausibility structure that Berger (1969) expanded into the sociology of religion. The plausibility structure constitutes what a community believes possible. The plausibility structure constitutes part of the "rules" Philipsen (1997) saw as interwoven within a speech community's speech determining the intelligibility of cultural myths, the rules for settling social drama, and the constitution of totemizing rituals, what makes a ritual sacred. The plausibility structure also determines the boundaries for what will be accepted as potentially transpiring within reality based on the supernatural and the miraculous. Since Pentecostals have a generous plausibility structure allowing for the miraculous interruption of everyday life by God, they also have the same sense about communication. Therefore, the narrative element of direction includes direction from God through the Bible and through an inner guidance with God speaking to them directly.

Since God is seen as part of the speech community, agents rely on God as one who coauthors the direction of their story and resolves the tension of social drama. While other Christian traditions also hold that God's presence enters their speech community and coauthors speech, for Pentecostals those realities unquestionably define the essence of their identity. Talking about encountering God's presence elicits a hearty, positive response. In interdisciplinary terms, God through the Holy Spirit enters the speech

community by His very presence to create and perpetuate the community as communicative agents who follow the Spirit's direction developed in totemizing rituals, embedded through cultural myths, so that Bible-readers and Spirit-listeners might resolve social drama within the community and expand the community through conversion-salvation speech. The only way to describe adequately the evidence was to build it upon this crucial Pentecostal belief, lending cultural communication evidence to the ecclesiology of Volf (1998) and Macchia (2006) who both build their ecclesiology on God's presence entering into the gathering of Christian believers. The idea of being a Spirit-listener and Bible-reader finds a voice in a Bible story in which Jesus encountered social drama with a woman of a different ethnic group and he told her that people should worship in spirit and truth.

Dramatic Worship That Resolves Social Drama

One day Jesus left the northern part of Judea to travel to the southern part that was divided by the ancient region known as Samaria. The Jews and Samaritans experienced racial tension so typically a Jew (like Jesus) would cross over the eastern side of the Jordan River to avoid traveling through Samaria. According to the Biblical narrative (John 4) Jesus had to go through Samaria, which is typically explained as a revelation of the Holy Spirit of the forthcoming interaction. As he traveled with a group of followers, Jesus sat next to a well and sent the rest of his traveling partners into town to buy food. A woman came out to the well and Jesus asked her for water. Based on her response, she clearly believed a social drama interaction ensued. She challenged the moral structure of the simple request by asking, "How is it that you, a Jew, ask for a drink from me, a woman of Samaria?" (John 4:9) The Biblical writer adds the parenthetical statement: (For

Jews have no dealings with Samaritans.) The ethnic tension informed her question and the charge that a moral breach occurred. Jesus replied to the charge with a metaphor often referenced by Pentecostals, drinking from the well of eternal life.

Jesus answered her, "If you knew the gift of God, and who it is that is saying to you, 'Give me a drink,' you would have asked him, and he would have given you living water." The woman said to him, "Sir, you have nothing to draw water with, and the well is deep. Where do you get that living water? Are you greater than our father Jacob? He gave us the well and drank from it himself, as did his sons and his livestock." Jesus said to her, "Everyone who drinks of this water will be thirsty again, but whoever drinks of the water that I will give him will never be thirsty again. The water that I will give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life." The woman said to him, "Sir, give me this water, so that I will not be thirsty or have to come here to draw water." (John 4:10-15)

Jesus established the spiritual nature of the social drama, transforming the conversation from one marked by ethnic tension to a spiritual conversation. Immediately the woman admitted a deep desire and need for something more in her life. Jesus offered her eternal life as resolution to the inner tension.

After establishing the spiritual nature of the drama, the interchange continued with what Pentecostals often point out was a charismatic gift. Jesus told her to call her husband so that they might all three engage in a conversation. The woman said that she did not have a husband and Jesus replied that he knew that she had been married five times and was living with an additional man to whom she was not married. The woman then said, "Sir, I perceive that you are a prophet. Our fathers worshipped on this mountain, but you say that in Jerusalem is the place where people ought to worship" (John 4:19-20). As the social drama transpired, she continued with moral questions and Jesus continued with answers. At some point in time the woman went from presenting Jesus with a moral complication to presenting him with spiritual seeking. The next part of the exchange revealed the resolution of tension with the socially dramatic situation.

Jesus said to her, “Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father. You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews. But the hour is coming, and is now here, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for the Father is seeking such people to worship him. God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth.” The woman said to him, “I know that Messiah is coming (he who is called Christ). When he comes, he will tell us all things.” Jesus said to her, “I who speak to you am he.” (John 4:21-26)

After telling her just one fact about herself, the woman ran into the town and told everyone, “Come, see a man who told me all that I ever did. Can this be the Christ?”

The interaction parallels many of the Pentecostal “symbols, meanings, premises, and rules about communication” (Philipsen, Coutu and Covarru 2005). A thread of each of the seven narrative elements previously explicated is found in the story including spiritual desire, celebration, intimate presence, transformation, nurture, direction, and reliance. The attitude of Jesus in the story reflected love, kindness, and gentleness. The metaphor of drinking at the well continues as a favorite metaphor for Spirit baptism within Pentecostal circles with the attendant metaphor of “thirst” describing spiritual desire. Preachers would also be likely to point out that the tension was resolved when the woman received a revelation of the true nature of Jesus as the personification of truth.

The importance of worshipping in spirit and truth can be seen throughout the Pentecostal worship events. While there was no universal theological agreement on the exact nature of the two components, there seemed to be agreement that it references two essential components of worship. Most would agree that worshipping in truth involves use of the Bible. Worship in spirit probably references the human spirit being touch by the Holy Spirit. The disagreements over the word “spirit” here are theological not ethnographic. The immediate ethnographic concern originates with the phrase “spirit and

truth” and how it is understood as a pattern for worship and what that means for the rhetoric of the speech community.

By situating worship as an act of becoming a Bible-reader living out the narrative and a Spirit-listener relying on God’s direction, God becomes situated as the ultimate co-author of the worshipper’s life-story. While some may want to say that God is the author and not co-author, it is more correct from a cultural communication perspective to see it the other way around. In the spirituality of the worshippers as well, they talked about “yielding” or “surrendering” to God, which means that they were in control but wanted God to become the Ultimate co-author. Since such references were often used by individuals with many years of living as Bible-readers and Spirit-listeners, it is reasonable to conclude that the process is ongoing so that one is always aware that God needs to be given place as a co-author.

Co-Authorship is Everything

In the Pentecostal speech community, co-authorship is more important than any other communicative activity because of the reliance on the Bible as God’s words, the words of the Holy Spirit spoken to the interiority, as well as verbal charismatic gifts. No matter what technical language or analytical school of thought one uses, eventually communication within this speech community must consider the role of the Holy Spirit in communication as giving impressions that are subsequently put into words, providing the divine energy so speech efficaciously influences the other, and allowing the other to receive what the Holy Spirit would communicate. Co-authorship (as Fisher called it) often supersedes any other consideration.

Co-Authored Worship

When God was seen as the co-author of life and worship through the phrase worshipping in spirit and truth, the ramifications echoed in surround-sound. The content of worship took second place to allowing God to author the worship. One pastor talked about the preeminence of being a Spirit-listener as superior to planned liturgy.

PLP: There's a still, there's a still small voice that still works. And ah, um, there are times when um, I'm seeking direction from the Holy Spirit as to, should we, should we go on with the order of service? Is there another direction, you know, ah, Lord that you want to go? If there is, please let me know. And um, you know, um, let me be sensitive to respond to what you want, want me to respond.

... I'm more concerned about um, about people responding to God than I am about ... form or the order of service as such. We have an order, a structure that we follow, a liturgy if, if you will. Ah, every church does. But yet um, there are times when, for whatever reason, ah, people ah, they feel a need to pray. And ah, some of it's probably my raising as well. Um, I grew up in a church where my pastor ah, ah, he was very encouraging of people responding. And if you need to pray come pray. And so ah, and that's something that ... we haven't always been what we are today because of it's something that we've fostered over a process of time that ah, you know, if you need to pray, come pray. There are times that we'll hold the service and pray with people as a congregation. There are other times when we will encourage them to continue to pray and we'll progress on. (Larry, Interview, 9/25/2011)

When the pastor was seen as a Spirit-listener, the entire notion of worship was impacted. Through observation, it was obvious in worship services that the content could run from the deepest theological points to other sacred content to sexuality to stories about completely mundane (profane) things because the contrast of Pentecostalism is not between sacred and profane but between the co-authorship of the Spirit and all other authors. The agency of the Spirit as one who seeks to dwell inside a worshipper defines their communication repeatedly. As I previously demonstrated, congregants believed that God spoke to them through the sermon but were often unwilling to say that the sermon was directly authored by God. They believed that God directed the preacher in

preparation and in speaking but also knew that sometimes speech went in other directions. They expected that through the worship service, God would speak to them. When asked what a worshipper wanted out of a service, they often responded that they wanted to “hear from God” or “receive from God.” Within the context of worship, giving preeminence to the Holy Spirit as a co-author is almost always a factor, with a belief that everything can be used by God to create an atmosphere in which to facilitate that goal.

I observed several aspects of worship that did not fit that paradigm, however. One church extensively used videos for announcements and testimonies of either individuals or the result of group projects based a belief that using video in worship appealed to the younger audience they sought. Those videos often used humor, especially for announcements. Other churches used videos for their announcements as well often with the production of excellent videos as the first goal. In one church, the pastor engaged in playful banter about his life for a few minutes. In these situations, the worshipper distinguishes between God as co-author and human authorship and ascribes differentiation according to one’s own discernment. A worshipper may well find that during humorous announcements they believe that the Holy Spirit speaks to them about getting involved. In humorous stories, they may find a profound truth. The listeners negotiate the mix between the Holy Spirit as co-author and human authorship according to their own level of discernment as a Spirit-listener.

The negotiation typically happens more during the preaching/teaching moment than other places in the service. The preacher is expected to be a Spirit-listener during preparation and speak for God during the sermon as a prophet in the sense meant by Stronstad (speaking for God) and Schultze (enacting change). The congregation listens in

discernment as the Holy Spirit clarifies the message to each individual. Since both the audience and the preacher listen to the same Holy Spirit, the objections of intentionality of the speaker are overcome. Through the one Ultimate co-author, the Holy Spirit, both the speaker and the congregation function under the co-authorship of the Spirit who narrates the worshipper's life. The question of whether the speaker intends the same thing as the audience hears becomes neutralized because both understand that the Holy Spirit is at work. If just the speaker were a Spirit-listener the congregation would fall under the critique of intentionality as referenced in the literature (Du Bois 1992; Keanne 1997; Shoaps 2002; West and Turner 2010).

Co-Authored Sermons

Three pastors demonstrated different techniques of preaching as a prophetic task. By prophetic preaching I mean speaking on behalf of God with technique that challenges beliefs about the appropriate narratives by which to live. An African American pastor used a technique typical within African American spirituality, using the biblical text to take the worshippers on a journey to God's presence through the sermon. He began by emphasizing and explaining the sermon title, "Sometimes I Just Feel Like Holding On," emphasizing the word "sometimes" (Field notes). As his intensity gradually increased, the celebration of the congregation increased until the sermon was interrupted by a large number of people dancing in celebration of God's ability to work within a deliverance-refocus paradigm, helping the worshipper live as Bible-readers in the everyday world. People ran up and down the aisles. One young man left the platform to dance in front of the pulpit in the center aisle. People around me stood and cheered. People from the other side of the large worship room shouted in celebration. My few descriptive words do not

begin to capture the enthusiasm of the congregation or resultant energy of the moment. People expressed worship with all forms of embodiment as the prophetic journey took the worshippers into an experience of God's presence.

Another pastor used the prophetic technique of a teacher but provided information for the congregation to live differently, information that challenged the narratives by which people live their lives (Field notes). The pastor told his congregation that he wanted to preach about "Perilous Times" which was in preparation for the next week's sermon entitled "Standing Fast." He provided information from scripture based on 2 Timothy 3 about perilous times in the last days.¹ He travelled a well-marked homiletical journey of presenting the scripture, introducing it with illustrative stories that demonstrate the main idea, several salient points that reinforce the main idea, and a conclusion that calls people to prayerful action. The form was not what made it prophetic, but rather the content. He said things like, "Today there is every kind of doctrine you can imagine." He went on to say that if one does like Jesus and the rules he established, one can pick between other choices. "They may be good to live by but they won't be good to die by," he said. At another point he said, "We don't make the rules, we just live by them" (Transcription, 7/31/2011). The prophetic teacher provides information based on being a Bible-reader and shows how one should choose stories presented in the Bible for patterns

¹ "But understand this, that in the last days there will come times of difficulty. For people will be lovers of self, lovers of money, proud, arrogant, abusive, disobedient to their parents, ungrateful, unholy, heartless, unappeasable, slanderous, without self-control, brutal, not loving good, treacherous, reckless, swollen with conceit, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having the appearance of godliness, but denying its power. Avoid such people. For among them are those who creep into households and capture weak women, burdened with sins and led astray by various passions, always learning and never able to arrive at a knowledge of the truth." (2 Timothy 3:1-7)

rather than stories offered by surrounding milieu. The prophetic teacher operates as a Spirit-listener to know both what areas to challenge and when. Most sermons I heard used the prophetic teacher mode.

A third form of prophetic preaching used displacement of narratives within a narrative style message. That pastor started with a series of stories, many humorous, some received as an email forward and others collected from various sources (Field notes). He spoke casually while sitting down, telling the congregation that they were going to talk about “Things Christians Say.” He joked about Christians as well as other people who say “crazy things.” He used a lot of humor to keep the narrative moving and keep people engaged. While drawing people in using the narrative, he switched to asking people what they said about Jesus. He used the choices presented by C. S. Lewis (1952) that Jesus is either a liar because he claimed to be God, a lunatic because only a crazy person would claim to be God if he were not, or Lord just as Jesus claimed to be. He ended his prophetic narrative by saying that people had to choose one of those three choices and gave them an opportunity to make that choice. The prophetic displacement style narrates a series of anecdotes that seeks to show people where they currently live, how that choice may not be sufficient, and how a different set of stories provide better solutions for those willing to become a Bible-reader (and follower). The goal is that one of the stories allows the listener to become a Spirit-listener, seeing their own situation in a different light.

In the prophetic performative model, the preacher seeks to accomplish things by the very act of saying those things. While I did not hear such a sermon, it was represented in the literature in Gifford’s (2011) chapter in *Practicing the Faith*. In the prophetic

performative paradigm, the preacher's words perform things in the lives of the audience. In a very real sense it is believed that when the preacher says, "You are living a victorious life" that something is performed spiritually by saying it and the spoken words will come true. The model is presented here because it is common among Charismatics in U.S America who follow the Word of Faith tradition represented by the late Kenneth Hagin and Kenneth Copeland.

Co-authored sermons advance the speech community's understanding of itself by reminding the community of the preeminence of God in all things. The communication from God is used to settle disputes, resolve the tension of social drama, advance the melody line of the worship narrative, and structure everyday life. The co-authorship of worship is so important that it excludes other liturgical formulae. The phenomena that led other authors to call Pentecostal liturgy "oral," I would term spontaneous, expressive, and co-authored by God, who enters the speech community to direct the worship and communicate in spirit and truth.

Summary

Through narration analysis, I have shown how seven discrete, overlapping elements extend from worship to everyday life. The structure of everyday life is also developed by the extension of ritual, cultural myths, and the resolution of social drama through being a Bible-reader and Spirit-listener. It corresponds to the loose structure of worshipping in spirit and truth.

Toward the development of methods for speech codes analysis, I have shown how the addition of one other method impacts the analysis of cultural myths. While SCT intends to grasp the rules and values created, re-created, affirmed, and accepted through

cultural myths, it sometimes requires additional analysis based on the construct of a given speech community. As a meta-theory of communication, SCT provides the tools and structure to develop communication theories for discrete communities. In this case, the community thrives on narrative as noted by their theologians (see Chapter 5); therefore, additional assistance from a narrative theory clears a wider path for development of their communication.

Up to this point, I have been building to an additional speech codes analysis of the atmosphere and attitude of “giving” that pervaded worship services. The narration analysis points the way because it is only through the atmosphere of giving that the narrative elements meaningfully interact. Spiritual desire anticipates giving worship to God while reliance finds expression through giving charismatic gifts. Life transformation begins with giving one’s life to Jesus in conversion-salvation and proceeds through living a lifestyle of giving in everyday situations. As I show in the next chapter, the atmosphere of giving in the worship service provides embodied narration for the everyday ethic of giving to the other.

CHAPTER 9. CAN WE GET A SANDWICH FOR YOU? :
GENEROUS LIVING (CULTURE), HOSPITALITY (CHURCH), AND
COMMUNICATIVE GIVING (GOSPEL)

On my first weekend of observation, I went to a suburban church on Saturday night and a late service at an urban church on Sunday morning, both significantly sized churches. Immediately I was struck by several similar themes at both churches though they were different denominationally and demographically. Both churches emphasized their involvement in the community with the suburban church showing a video of over one hundred fifty church volunteers hosting their community's July 4 parade and the urban church hosting the Negro League Baseball Players Induction of honorees with introduction of players during the service and a ceremony that followed in the adjacent conference center. The suburban church hired an ice cream truck to pull up after the Saturday service and offered free (unlimited) ice cream to anyone present. The urban church emphasized that their upcoming picnic would be free and everyone was welcome with generous portions (unlimited) available. The suburban church pastor said that they were having ice cream for no reason whatsoever, saying that sometimes things should be done just because they are fun and church should be fun. The urban church pastor spent several minutes during the announcements joking around. Both churches knew how to create an atmosphere based on joyful, generous hospitality.

Biblical Giving

In a story only understood within the context of the ancient world, Abraham was told by God to sacrifice his son Isaac whom God had promised to give him. Isaac was

born when Abraham was very old and symbolically represented all of God's great promises to Abraham about having many descendants and receiving much land. Out of love and obedience to God, Abraham set out on a journey with everything needed for a sacrifice, everything but a lamb (Genesis 22). When they arrived at the right location, Abraham told the servant accompanying them to stay at the bottom of the hill while he and his son "went to worship." It has always been a peculiar thing for a man to say while walking up a hill expecting to sacrifice his son, the son of God's promise. When they got to the top of the mountain and prepared to sacrifice, suddenly God provided an animal caught in a bush nearby and they sacrificed the animal instead of Isaac.

Many years later Jesus went up a similar mountain (or the same one perhaps) where he would be nailed to a cross. As previously noted (Chapter 5) Pentecostal Christians believe that conversion-salvation comes through forgiveness that was given by the sacrificial actions of Jesus on that cross. Forgiveness is seen as the greatest gift ever given and it came from the gift of Jesus giving up his own life. For those who have received such a great gift of forgiveness it is important to give forgiveness according to Pentecostal theologian Volf (2005) because it follows what he called the "so that" principle by which he meant that believers have received "so that" they might give to others. Everything a believer receives from God was given "so that" it might be passed on to bless other people. The greatest gift of forgiveness was given so that believers might become forgiving and giving to people because of Jesus' sacrifice on the cross. It cannot be repaid by giving to God, Volf says, so it must be repaid by giving to other people (2005).

With that view of giving, I will show how the Pentecostal speech community follows that pattern of giving in attitude and atmosphere, as well as through using “giving” as a term for talk. In this way, giving becomes part of a speech code in the community.

Giving as Habitus

Toward the end of my field research, I traveled to Tennessee to visit a church. Because of the travel distance, interviews were scheduled on Saturday. As the day progressed, young women working hard to prepare for the Sunday service recognized that I had been at the church for a long time and not taken a lunch break. They were part of the church’s leadership training program, a two-year program where people with ministry aspirations participate in ministry in the church, receive mentoring, and engage in distance education from a Pentecostal university. Several times they offered to leave the building and bring back a sandwich for me. Their generous offer was greatly appreciated beyond a normal generous gesture because I had once been in ministry training and recognized that I had no spare money available to buy a sandwich even for myself. While I rejected their offer because of previous plans made with friends, their generous hospitality signaled systemic hospitality. The display of generosity demonstrated the hospitable attitude and atmosphere of the church developed through systematic and conscientious emphasis on giving.

The following morning, I made my way to the church, winding up the hillside driveway to the parking lot. Men directed traffic at every major spot in the driveway and parking lot. Others were assigned to stand on the sidewalk and welcome guests. There

were people holding every door open greeting people. Because it was Friend Day,² there was a table in the lobby for people to write their name on a nametag and affix it to their shirt. At the same church, generosity was institutionalized through community involvement with food distribution, a thrift store, a home for children in crisis, and sponsorship of a Christian addiction center. The pastor told me he encouraged the church people to keep a bag of nonperishable groceries in their trunk so that when they met someone in need they could help the needy.

On another Sunday, I walked no more than ten feet inside of a new church building when I was greeted by a polite young woman. It was not unusual to be greeted by someone; indeed, it happened at every church I visited either in the parking lot or in the church entry. Greeters are an institutionalized form of hospitality and, based on interview data, are often jobs given to people who are just beginning to volunteer in the church. I walked a few more feet and another person greeted me. The entry way opened up into a larger, all purpose room in which there was a window with people serving coffee and bagels. Two-thirds of the churches I visited served beverages and food before the worship service and most of the interviewed pastors said they had something similar. There was something different about this particular church from any other church I attended, however. Nearly everyone I saw greeted me. Nearly every person went to get coffee or tea. They either arrived early or stayed late to spend time with friends. Both of the people I interviewed at that church said that what their church did best was build quality relationships. Both also connected the quality relationships with their enjoyment

² Friend Day has been a fixture in churches for over two decades. Generally, it is a special day where people invite friends who have wanted to try out the church. The sermon is often prepared with guests in mind.

of the pre-service coffee session. There is often a time in a Pentecostal worship service to greet the people sitting around you, a form of liturgical hospitality that may last a minute or two but might also extend longer. At this particular church, the pastor said that they seldom had such a time during the service because their people felt it was forced and trite, “cheezy” was the word the pastor used. Instead of a liturgical form of hospitality, they worked really hard at building authentic relationships with other people.

Their relationship building was not an accident. The pastor and her husband started the church ten years earlier with the intention of establishing a place where strong relationships would be built. They had been inviting people they knew to attend the church they were attending but those people were unable to process the overtly Charismatic expressions. They started their own church to meet the needs of people with little previous church background. Within ten years, many people started attending who did not share their religious background, partially attributed to the hospitality and relationships built, according to the pastor. The church developed relationships with the Muslim community, nearly every community service non-profit agency, and a host of other groups. Several times they painted the offices of nonprofit agencies for free. The pastor said (Adey, Interview, 10/2/2011): “[We] created this strategic program that we call Hands-On Faith. So we um, right now are getting ready to redo the domestic violence shelter for them. We’re gonna paint it. We’re gonna reorganize it. We’re doing a million things. We have people on almost every board in this city.” As a church, they systematically tried to build a relevance structure and taken-for-granted world constituted by generous living where hospitality moved beyond a buzz-word and into the status of

the assumed world. They successfully extended their hospitality into the surrounding milieu.

If it were only the actions of one church, there would be nothing to report; however, every church I attended practiced habits of generous living and hospitality and the congregation members reflected the attitude. The people of a rural church in Indiana were very interested in developing an attitude of friendliness. When asked in interviews what the image of the church was in the community, both interviewees and the pastor immediately said they hoped they were known as a friendly church. They were also very proud of their clothing distribution program and the various things they did to assist the people who lived in their area.

Red Mountain Christian Center, the church described at the beginning of the introduction, allowed me the space to get used to the church without a lot of friendly interaction. However, there was a significantly sized café in one of the buildings at Red Mountain with a sign advertising that they served food before every service. People were welcome to bring drinks into the sanctuary, their attempt at building a habitus of relaxed hospitality. The pastor I interviewed at Red Mountain was excited about their cooperation with a local school for a backpack give-away at the beginning of a school year. The people interviewed volunteered that they had close relationships with people in the church through the small groups within the church.

As I walked through the front doors of another church, the greeter handed me a bulletin and said, “Welcome to Holy Redeemer where your life will never be the same” (Field notes). There was a very friendly parking lot attendant and greeters outside the church who had already made me feel welcome. At the end of the service, I went to the

front to try to meet the pastor and secure permission to study the church. Because of the previously mentioned induction for baseball players, several assistants were trying to screen out people trying to get to the pastor. He quickly silenced the assistants and smiled at me, motioning for me to come up the stairs to talk to him. Clearly, the attitude of generous living flowed from the pastor. His attitude and vision prompted the structure of the church. On their campus, they have three schools either sponsored by the church or in cooperation with the church. They have a day care, a Boys and Girls Club, an orphanage, a dormitory for young people who need a different environment, a credit union, and a host of other community-oriented ministries. Their vision for transformation in a poor neighborhood has prompted them to respond with great compassion. It is not my intention to develop fully a description of their nationally known community involvement but rather to use that involvement as evidence pointing toward their attitude and atmosphere of generous living, joy, hospitality, and giving. The fun and jokes in the service from the pastor seemed part of a plan to make church a place that was fun, but also warm and inviting for people who do not have a lot of warmth throughout their week. The pastor was joking about preaching in a different church where there was a meal planned after the service and the people were told that they were limited to “one chicken bone, or one hot dog.” He then moved to an announcement of their church picnic which would be free and open to anyone who wanted to attend and no one would be limited to just one of anything!

I went to Believer’s Tabernacle in Kansas because they had a program to help the poor in their city with a variety of means of assistance, something I thought was uncommon for Pentecostals but clearly was far more prevalent than expected! I had

previously visited the church two times as a worshipper with my daughter and the people had been very friendly, offering to give my daughter a ride to church whenever needed because she was a college student far away from home. In addition, I went because I knew the church was more racially and economically diverse than most churches I had seen in my life. I asked the pastor how they got started helping the poor. He talked about the church he attended as a boy and how his dad would drive a bus to a neighboring town in rural Kansas to pick up kids. One late night there was a phone call from one of the families who rode the bus to church. They had a domestic situation and they did not know whom else to call. He recalled how his dad and their pastor helped the family. The situation clearly shaped and formed his desire to offer hospitality and generosity to people. As the pastor continued with his church's involvement with the poor he said that the church started helping people shortly after he arrived while the church was still small. The story interestingly points to both the attitude of giving as well as the faith of a Pentecostal church that was willing to give, even while they were still in need, believing that God would provide for the church's needs. Pastor Marty said (Interview, 10/10/2011):

Oh we started the Dream Center, I started September. The next April of, of '02 we started. We started the Dream Center in concept. Um, you know, we, we had, I had a youth group of six here, you know (Chuckles), six kids. And I, you know, of course you know I didn't know the kids real well. My kids were very little. And so they were in the, in the children's ministry of ten. You know. (Chuckles) And two of 'em were my kids and three of 'em were my brother's kids. (Chuckles) You know so we were half of the children's ministry. But the youth, we had a couple of kids that were coming from ah, ah, part of town down here called South City. And South City is a, um, you know, it's a lower income area. It's probably, it's not the, I'm gonna say it's not the worst in Wichita but it's a lower impoverished area, a lot of minority um, a lot of single moms raisin' babies, a lot of grandmas raisin' grandbabies. You know. And parents are gone. Daddy's in jail. Mom's, mom's in jail or mom's got, you know, just all of those stories. And we started um, just once a month ah, you know loadin' up a, on Friday I

would encourage the people to, we'd, we'd, we'd bring groceries. Bring as much groceries as you can, you know, we'd try to get food. And then we would literally, Friday night sack up a bunch of groceries and we'd stick em in a flatbed in a pick-up. And ah, and we would just go knock on doors and "Hey we've got groceries here for ya." And at the end of the month, um, a lot of time when vision cards, you know, welfare was wearing out, you know, and run out, boy I, I, I honestly do not remember one door ever being closed in our face. I mean food, I'm just a big believer in, if you feed them they will come. You know. (Chuckles) Food opens up a door. . . . I just want to, I'm gonna try to meet a physical need so that maybe that wall will come down and we can meet a spiritual need and meet a need of the heart. And so that's what happened. We had a little flier about the church, and about you know the children's ministries and different things, especially if they had kids in the sacks. And then we would just ask them, you know, it wasn't any gimmicks, it's like no strings attached. And then, God bless you. If there's anything that we can pray with you about, you know, and boy probably half the people would stop and say, "Well you know now that you're here," you know, "I'm lookin' for a job," or you know, "My son's in jail," or you know. And it was just so cool to be able to pray for a lot of those people.

Twice I went to a Sunday evening service at a church within thirty minutes driving of my house. The pastor had been at the church for over twenty-five years and it experienced tremendous growth under his leadership, from a small group of forty people to two thousand five hundred worshippers on a Sunday morning. In those years, the church went through five major building additions. The most recent addition added a food court and mezzanine area impressive in size and scope even if it were a shopping mall. After the worship service, many people went down to the food court to buy coffee or food and spent time talking. When I left the building one night, I saw the senior pastor sitting at a table with an ordinary looking senior citizen talking freely. I recognized many of the associate pastors sitting in the food court also. Again, there was a clear attempt to build an atmosphere and attitude of hospitality.

The pastor of the church in a retirement community talked about the people of the church being involved all throughout the local community. Pastor Ben (Interview, 8/6/2011) talked about a teddy bear ministry where women in the church made teddy

bears and then took them to hospice facilities. He said, “To me I, I look and say, it’s kind of ridiculous. But it’s not ridiculous to people who are hurting.” They were asked to supply bears regularly and it became something for which the church was known. The pastor said, “We just try to find a need. And if there’s a need somewhere, we try to fill it if we can.”

Every church I attended contributed something to the mosaic of generous living and hospitality. A small church, just one year old, meeting in the pastor’s basement had decided to stop spending money on advertisement and put the same money into distribution of food to people in their area. The pastor of a storefront church in an urban area talked about their church’s involvement in the community, proudly discussing their clothing and food distribution as well as many other areas of involvement in the local government. The interviewees from a suburban church said their church was known for their involvement in the community. In a very real way the attitude and atmosphere of each church was remarkable. It immediately grabbed my attention during field research. Even though I was the ultimate insider who grew up attending a Pentecostal church, led Pentecostal churches, and was an associate pastor at one, I had seldom experienced the atmosphere from the perspective of a worshipper. It was so noticeable it was hard to escape the reality that institutions and individuals tried hard to create an atmosphere of hospitality and practice an attitude of generous living.

Thirteen pastors were interviewed without me attending their churches with each of those pastors describing similar things. One pastor talked about taking over the movies-in-the-park for the community because of administration and financial issues. That church also did a regular meal for people in need as well as a plethora of other

“compassion based” ministries. Another church in a community of less than 6,000 people talked about a monthly food distribution program through a national organization that would send a semi load of food. Still another pastor talked about being completely integrated into the local community in a small town by allowing the kids to walk across the street from the high school to use the church’s phone after sports practices. Another pastor talked about being involved in a countywide program through a social service agency for distressed families and marriages. Two pastors in separate areas were involved as chaplains for their county sheriff’s departments. One pastor talked about having a gathering time after service with coffee, juice, and food for people to linger and get acquainted.

I started research with the question: How do diverse approaches to surrounding cultural milieu (local and regional influences) impact speech codes in Pentecostal faith communities and in turn faith and practice of congregants? My hypothesis was that surrounding cultural milieu greatly impacted the speech codes. However, I found that each church displayed a proclivity toward hospitality and generous living. In each of the participant observation experiences it was obvious that hospitality was defined by the immediate milieu in which the church worships. Put differently, churches in the Southwest offer hospitality as defined by the Southwest; churches in the Midwest offer hospitality in ways fitting with their surrounding milieu. In urban areas where anonymity is valued churches offer hospitality as an option. In rural areas where the interviewees reported, “everybody knows everybody,” the church worked hard to reflect the same friendliness. The pastors were quite attentive to this reality often commenting that they did not minister in an area that needed a soup kitchen so they met the needs present.

Some were very much aware that their church was developed as a unique response to local situations. Others, in a matter of fact tone said they believed their church could thrive if it were transplanted in another community because they would “be adapting to make sure we’re connecting with the individuals around us,” as one pastor said (Greg L., Interview, 9/23/2011). They met the needs of people and people everywhere have needs.

Giving as Communication

All of the events of generous living point to a code within the Speech Community. Hospitality, generosity, and compassion ministries are all forms of giving. At the same time, the Pentecostal speech community uses the word “give” as a form of communication, a term for talking. Pastors talked about giving a teaching or giving a talk. In the same way, over and over again interviewees talked about giving a word of knowledge, one of the charismatic gifts. One Vineyard pastor (Pat, Interview, 7/21/2011) described the ending of their service. “Um, the end of the service, um, it hasn’t been an altar call in the sense that we don’t give out the words and say, ‘Okay everybody come on up as the Words are given.’ We just, we, we’ll give out the Words and we’ll say, ‘Hey once we dismiss, anybody who wants prayer come up and get it.’” In his short answer, both prayer and charismatic words of knowledge were gifts to be given and received. “Giving” was a term used for talk. In the Pentecostal speech community, it was usually combined with another term.

As a term for talking, “giving” was not only concerned with the gift given, the communicative act, but also with the world-in-front-of-the-gift as well as the world-

behind-the-gift, to appropriate Vanhoozer's language (1998, 108).³ The world-behind-the-gift would be the intention of the giver and while we may not have total access to intentionality (Du Bois 1992), for the gift giver the intention matters a great deal, especially in a Pentecostal framework. For the one who gives communication, their intention of the communicative act as a gift matters a great deal. The symbolic intentions behind the text should not be lost on the activity of giving communication. For the giver it is entirely possible that the world-behind-the-gift is more important than the gift itself. The world-in-front-of-the-gift is a pragmatic concern of what the gift does for the one who receives it. Giving as communication is primarily a pragmatic issue because the focus is on the one receiving the gift and what they receive with special attention paid to what happens when the gift is given even more than the gift itself. Since the concern in "giving" is primarily pragmatic, it would fall under the fourth level described by Carbaugh (1989). The four levels of cultural communication are act, event, style, and function, with the last being a pragmatic level. As such, it answers the question, "What are the culturally identified actions doing?" (Carbaugh 1989, 102)

Examples abound within the speech community of using the word "give" as a term for talk. Pastor Adey (Interview, 10/2/2011) said, "I gave a teaching." Of the many possible terms, the choice of "gave a teaching" is significant because it implies that the teaching was a gift to the audience. A common usage of "give" as a term for talk was connected to the term "testimony." Personal testimonies are well known examples of communication within some Christian traditions, especially in Pentecostal services

³ Vanhoozer leans heavily on the many writings of Ricoeur for the idea of what constitutes a text and a world.

(Martin 1990; Schultze 1994; Austin-Broos 1997; Csordas 1997; Stringer 1999; Sharp 2004; Lindhardt 2009; Cartledge 2010; Smith 2010). Those I interviewed talked about “giving” testimonies. Sometimes the pastors talked about giving people an opportunity to share, speak, testify or engage in other communicative activity. In “giving an opportunity” the giving is indirect since the person giving (the pastor) does not do the communicating. Both pastors and congregants use the term “give” for the altar call at the end of a service. The altar call is often a vital aspect of Pentecostal church services (Tomberlin 2006; Cartledge 2010). For the people I interviewed the altar call was an intimate time of great importance (see Chapter 6).

“Give” is also the most common term used for the charismatic gifts. According to interview data, a person “gives a message in tongues” when they speak out in tongues-speech during a worship service as one of the charismatic gifts. For all of the verbal charismatic gifts, the term “give” would usually be attached, like give a prophetic word or give a prophecy, give a word of knowledge, give a messages in tongues-speech, give an interpretation, or give a word of wisdom. The story of one Vineyard pastor (Adey, Interview, 10/2/2011) who downplays tongues-speech will suffice for an example.

PAV: Um, in terms of people praying in tongues, doubtful that many are on a Sunday morning. Now I don’t know that because I’ve never asked. But it’s certainly not something that’s going to happen out loud three times and a interpretation. Although one of my, um, women’s retreats, some person new to our church um who really liked tongues, um out loud, prayed in tongues. “Oh I have a tongue.” (Whispers) And I’m like, “Oh my God!” (Normal volume) And not because I don’t like it. I was like, all of these unchurched people, like I have a tongue ... what are they thinking? So, do I!

And ah, so this person gives her tongue and I’m thinking, “Okay, let’s move on, let’s move on, let’s move on. I don’t have the faith. I don’t ever know if there’s a real God. I just gotta get out of here.” Someone else says, “I have an interpretation.” “Oh my gosh. We have an interpretation. We are really charismatic at this moment.” And ah, which all believe in. Like if I’m in a prayer time with someone, that’s happening all the time. I’m just not used to it in this

bigger ... So the person gives an interpretation. And I'm freaking out even more. And the interpretation was like some like really emotional like, ohhhhh! "Um I have this picture of Romeo and he's shouting up to Juliet." And I'm like, "Oh God! My anti-cheese congregation or women's meeting!" The next thing I know there's a woman sobbing. Her kid has muscular dystrophy and, and she's saying, (pause) "I don't know how to respond. Just yesterday I was saying, 'God you're so far from me. I feel like Juliet and I'm waiting for my Romeo. Can you come?'"

The plain language of Pentecostal theologians Menzies and Menzies will advance the discussion, which I offer as data and not theology. "Paul quickly shifts from this Corinthian language to the term of his preference, *charismata* ('gifts,' 12:4). This word builds on *charis*, the Greek word for 'grace.' With this shift in vocabulary, Paul skillfully emphasizes that spiritual gifts are, above all, gifts of grace" (Menzies and Menzies 2000, ch. 13). In worship, Pentecostals emphasize giving through the charismatic gifts in a way that builds the atmosphere and attitude, as each person understands "giving" of the gift to the congregation. As grace, it comes directly from God as an undeserved gift to help the congregation flower and flourish into all that God intended it to become.

Is there really a connection between giving a message in tongues-speech and giving ice cream sandwiches at the end of a service? Is there a connection between the gift of hospitality and communication as a gift? The ideas connect quite indirectly through one more aspect of giving as communication, giving worship.

Giving Worship

During an interview with a great-grandma who was very active in her church I inquired, "If someone asked you why they should participate in worship, what would you tell them?" Her reply insightfully shows a pervasive attitude about worship. "The Word says to worship. We are to give glory to God. God's Word says so. That's in obedience to him and to His Word. To be submissive and obedient to the Lord" (Carol, Interview,

8/4/2011). The giving of worship and giving of glory to God through worship are aspects of giving. Interviewees like Debra (Interview, 8/1/2011) said, “Worship is time to give honor, glory and praise.” Earl (Interview, 8/1/2011) commented on setting an example and said, “Give God the glory.” Charles (Interview, 8/3/2011) said, “Raising hands to me, means like giving God honor and glory and putting Him in His rightful spot because I’m the worshipper and, and He deserves all my praise.” Jeff (Interview, 9/25/2011) said, “You know, he wants us to give him worship and he wants us to give praise, you know. He desires that from us.”

Worship is an act of giving of oneself to God (Webber 1994; Chauvet 1995). At the level of worship the giving of hospitality and giving speech come together since both are worship and both involve giving of something from within. The three aspects of giving, in worship, in hospitality, in speech, all require something coming from within as a gift to someone else. In the case of charismatic gifts, the speech community believes that those are given to the gathered worshippers by God as a co-author. Rather than coming from within the communicant, the belief is that the person becomes a mouthpiece for God’s words. The message moves from God to the “heart” of the communicant who then “gives” that message to the church. Ronald said:

RIN: Well, (pause) sometimes, I want to say it can be scary because you, you don’t want to ah, say anything, you know, that’s just you sayin’ it. Because you know I mean, especially if you know the person so you know the situation. You don’t want to say, “Well I know this that’s going on so I’m going to inject this, my own personal thing in this.” No. That part is kind of scary. Because I want to make sure I’m saying what the Lord has put on my heart and not what I think should happen in this situation or what I think, you know ... Because I’m wrong a lot. (Ronald, Interview, 9/25/2011)

From the interview data, it can be clearly stated that charismatic gifts are “given” to the church. It may also be clearly stated that both worship and giving are a lifestyle.

When asked about worship, many of the pastors wanted clarification on what was meant by the word worship. I assured them that I was interested in their perspective by asking them what *they* meant by worship. The word “worship” in Pentecostal churches often means singing and most of the pastors wanted to make sure that their perspective was understood: worship was more than singing. Pastor Marty (Interview, 10/10/2011) said, “Everything a Christian does is an act of worship.”

Two people used the word “vessel” to describe the giving relationship. One attached that word to giving prophecy or other charismatic gifts. The entire exchange provides the necessary context.

B: Have you ever been used in the gifts in the Spirit that are listed in 1 Corinthians 12: prophecy, message in tongues, word of wisdom, word of knowledge?

T: Mmhmm.

B: What was that like?

T: Different. (chuckles) It's not a like a day-to-day, you know, it's not like a day-to-day thing. It's definitely the Holy Spirit taking over. And ah, and using you. It's just, you're just a vessel for Him to work through. So it's ... there's really no words to describe it.

B: You say the Holy Spirit taking over ... did ... was it something that was uncontrollable, do you feel?

T: Not necess ... well, not necessarily uncontrol – like the gift of prophecy, that's somethin' that you can't really control. If the Lord's tellin' you something and you know you're prophesying over somebody then, um, I mean there's things that you can choose if you're going to say or not but if the Holy Spirit tells you to go and say something to somebody and it's a word of, of the prophetic ... that he's given you, then you can't control that I don't think. Unless you just don't listen to Him and don't walk in obedience. That's different. (Tjede, Interview, 10/29/2011)

The believer becomes a vessel, a willing vessel, rather than an inanimate tool unable to consent. The act of giving prophecy or another charismatic gift implies that the person is not the originator of the information. Pentecostals believe that God is the

originator of such things so when they “give a message” they are only passing it along from the divine author to the rest of the assembled worshippers.

Giving interfacing with culture

In Chapters 6 and 7 I observed that some churches consider the worship environment, its atmosphere, and the attendant attitude of the people. They strategically plan to make worship accessible to people with no previous experience in the Pentecostal tradition. At the beginning of research, one of my hypotheses was that churches seeking to interact with the surrounding milieu would frame their message and shape their worship in a way to accommodate outsiders. The evidence is very mixed on that hypothesis. A Vineyard pastor started the church she pastors ten years earlier in response to people who did not understand the worship of the church she and her husband attended. Their worship service was clearly structured in a way that considered people new to the tradition, including their limitation of charismatic gifts; however, Pastor Adey (Interview, 10/2/2011) said that she was unwilling to change her worship for new people.

PAV: That’s one place that I won’t be sensitive to new people unless I bring my Jewish relatives then I’m sensitive. But I’m not willing, I want people to see me worshipping like David. So it’s the one place that I’m not asking, “Who’s looking? And what are they thinking? And how uncomfortable are they that that crazy woman in the second row is going crazy and dancing and weeping?” I don’t care if they see me weeping every week. Um, I, so that’s sort of my no-compromise-place. Um, so you’ll see I think the same as most Charismatic churches, maybe less on a Sunday morning than some.

However, just minutes earlier in the interview she talked about adjusting songs and being sensitive about lyrics. She talked about arranging the worship space to accommodate people who may not understand a more traditional setting.

The most socially progressive Pentecostal church I visited was Holy Redeemer Church of God in the Christ. The pastor I interviewed said that they were known

throughout the nation for their involvement and transformation of the surrounding neighborhoods with people traveling from all over the country to see what they were doing. Yet their worship was truly expressive and unhindered in any way, the most expressive I observed. Through interview data, it was determined that they did not see a connection between the style of their worship and their involvement in transforming the neighborhood. Additionally, Believer's Tabernacle had significant involvement in their neighborhood yet their worship did not reflect any adaptation. They also were more expressive than most other churches.

Other churches clearly considered the effect their worship atmosphere and attitude would have on outsiders. Some were unwilling to limit expression but mentioned they do a lot more explaining of things that take place. Others were more restrictive of expression so that every worshipper could access what was happening. One Assembly of God church was not nearly as expressive as other churches I attended but they were more expressive than other churches many of their worshippers previously attended according to the Associate Pastor, and confirmed through interview data.

The principle arising from the evidence is that a local Pentecostal church's approach to surrounding culture does not influence their expressiveness unless the church conscientiously plans the worship atmosphere and attitude to interact with the surrounding milieu. Churches are likely to adapt the atmosphere and attitude in their worship only when it is felt necessary to make the worship accessible to those people. The level of adaptation will be negotiated within the leadership of the local church to protect aspects of the identity believed to be vital within that local church while still

making other aspects of the worship accessible to all people present, including newcomers.

The primary way that Pentecostals interface with the surrounding milieu is by giving the gospel message of conversion-salvation to them. Interview responses demonstrated that churches were likely to include the gospel either explicitly or implicitly. Many of the pastors said that the greatest need in their community was for people to receive the gospel of conversion-salvation. When pastors were asked how they saw the relationship between the church and surrounding community either through engagement, transformation, counter-culture, or something else no matter which option they chose, only one pastor did not imply the task was “witness” first.

When asked, every pastor saw the task of the church as engagement with the surrounding milieu. Many added transformation and some added “counter-culture,” with some explicitly rejecting the option of a counter-culture because of the implication that Christians would turn inward and shut out other people. Since the terms were not defined for the pastors, I will use their words to help explain what they meant.

PWM: I think it’s a combination. Um, transformation happens one life at a time. (William, Interview 8/7/2011)

PBL: Yeah. Engagement. We certainly are involved in that. And, and I, I look at that of that in the sense of engagement as far as engaging them, confronting them with the gospel. Um, transformational, transforming people and so forth, but also in um, in, in, in, um, not just the spiritual aspect of it, but also in the, in the physical sense in which we will seek to touch lives through what we do in outreach ministries. (Ben, Interview, 2011)

PMF: That’s a good, yeah. You know, um, (pause) It, it probably, what you’re sayin’ a combination of that. I, I’ve always kind of shied away from the idea of, of ah ... I guess, well let’s put it this way. Again, because I was raised very traditional Pentecostal which is not very mainstream anymore, if it ever was. But, but you know, um, if we’re not careful I, I heard a, I don’t know if you know who [name redacted] is in South Africa. Heard him preach at Barnett’s pastor’s school one time. And he talked about big church like twenty thousand or something. But

he just said, he said this. He said, “If you’re closed tomorrow, would anybody in your community know? Or would they care?” You know, and that’s a riveting question to me. You know, would anybody in Wichita know or would they give a rip if, if, so what! You know, you didn’t leave any, you didn’t leave a hole. You know. So I believe we’re supposed to go out and make that difference in the you know. But, but I’ve always been careful that we not become a sub-culture. (Marty, Interview, 10/10/2011)

PAV: Yeah. I would just say yes to all of those, to all of them. I don’t ever remember ‘em now that you’ve said it. But we are engaging, certainly! In the culture all the time. That’s what we exist for. We exist for the culture. We exist to bring Jesus to the world around us. Um, if there’s not transformation, I would say we’re just not doing a very good job. Um, that doesn’t mean every single person. Like our folks will say, “So if we go to Hope Lodge do we pray for every cancer victim we talk to?” No! But if there’s an opening, whether they know Jesus or not, and a natural conversation, maybe you’ve prayed and God’s given you a divine moment there, of course you do. ... There’s engagement. We hope there’s transformation. There certainly is not transformation every time that we’re aware of, except I think for us. We would say, if there were never moments where you were proclaiming Jesus overtly with your mouth, we have failed. That really is a goal. It’s one of our goals, proclaiming Jesus. If you’re only proclaiming Jesus and you’re not demonstrably loving your homeless brothers and sisters or your ill brothers and sisters or your Muslim brothers and sisters or your gay brothers and sisters or whatever it is you’re engaging in, if you’re not looking for ways to love then you’ve missed it. (Adey, Interview, 10/2/2011)

Engagement meant building relationships and finding ways to meet people’s needs within the milieu. Transformation flowed as an expected (though not guaranteed) result of engagement and it took place one life at a time through spiritual transformation of conversion-salvation.

Many churches I visited engaged in individual development, i.e. they empowered individuals for change. One or two churches made use of methods more common in mainline denominations such as adult education classes, particularly English as a second language classes. One church partnered with existing agencies who work more on the structural level and provided volunteers and other needed help (like painting offices) for those agencies. However, most of the churches engaged in groups and classes with more overt spiritual connections like groups for addictive behaviors, groups for people recently

divorced, and groups meeting similar needs. At least two of the churches offered social ministry through affinity groups such as health and wellness classes, aerobics classes, scrap booking groups, or outdoor hobby groups. Many of the churches partnered with other Christian organizations engaged in community transformation of some type, particularly through drug and alcohol addiction centers from a Christian perspective.

Holiness as Relational Giving

A new development in the Pentecostal speech community is the tendency to define holiness in a different paradigm than previous generations (Dayton 1987; Synan 1997; Cox 2001; Wacker 2001). In the traditional view, Christians should strive to live differently than the world in practices such as drinking alcohol, wardrobe selection, entertainment venues, and a host of other categories in which holy living occurred. Mostly the preaching centered on avoiding even the appearance of participating in things that might lead to evil so Pentecostals were taught to abstain from alcohol, attending dances, and movie attendance as examples. The pastors interviewed were all familiar with those “holiness standards,” to use a term from the speech community and some pastors knew other Pentecostal pastors who actively taught some of those standards. When pastors were asked how they talked to their people about being different from the world, answers fell along two lines. There was a group of pastors (not the largest group but significant) who answered with an updated version typically addressing modest dress, though the definition of modesty has changed from past generations. Some congregation members mentioned that their life style differentiates them from other people. One young lady who got engaged the day before the interview freely brought up her decision to abstain from sexual activity until she got married and that she refrained from “partying.”

She was not alone in bringing up such things without prompting. One female interviewee who recently came into a Pentecostal church after being raised as a Roman Catholic mentioned a change in habits.

KLK: (chuckle) My life has done a complete one-eighty since I started attending Life Church. I learned so much more about the Bible and um how our actions affect others. And so I've really changed my life a lot. I've changed a lot of my habits. Um, a lot of my dating style. I now practice abstinence. It's definitely change a lot just from what I've learned here. (Kristie, Interview, 7/27/2011)

The second way that pastors addressed the issue seemed like a new definition entering the Pentecostal speech community. The pastors talked about being separate from the world in attitude, particularly in interpersonal relationships. They emphasized the need to love neighbors and enemies and living in social relationships in a different way. An older pastor was raised in a rural community in a Pentecostal home and received ministry training at a conservative Pentecostal college easily shifted his answer from one paradigm to the other:

PBL: I really don't have to talk to them much about it. They already know that. And they're in, they're engaged. You know you talk about being engaging in the community, they're engaged in where they live. Um, several of our ministries have to do with family and community areas. For instance, ah, this year we haven't done it but, ah, our Koinania, we have fellow, we have home fellowship groups and they're encouraged to invite then. But we had Koinania fellowship, we will probably start it again – I don't know if it would be this fall or the spring – but Koinania fellowship was where we just had the areas – group people of their areas that they would have get together and have a afternoon, evening, morning, whenever. Ah tea, coffee, cookies, fellowship-type thing, just for fellowship and would invite the community, invite their families, invite people next door. A lot get involved like that. So that's part of it. (Ben, Interview, 8/6/2011)

I interviewed another pastor in a hotel lobby at a national conference. We had only talked on the phone and he said that I would recognize him because he looked different than everyone else with a pink/peach shirt and a long, braided pony tail. He was raised in the Spanish speaking Assemblies of God in a traditional era and made it clear he

has not completely abandoned some of those ideas, only modified them and added a new emphasis. He knew my background so in his answer several of the times when he says “you know” it was more than typical filler-words but a direct address to me, associating his experience with my own.

PJL: Well you know, in my particular history was like that. I mean we, my goodness! You know we, you know. I could give you a list a mile long of the things we couldn't do. The problem was, is that I couldn't really give you a list of the things that we could. And, um, I think it's a primary difference today. Is that we are, we, we're trying to remain, you know, be in the world but not of the world. So there isn't a completely, complete detachment when you're in something. You know. And yet that's what we strived to do when I was growing up. Um, you know they, they, they quote Psalm 1:1 that you know, if you go to your particular place, you, you were, by virtue of that being seated in the seat of the scornful. You know. Well, what we found is that um, man it's all about attitude. And when the Bible says you need to work out your salvation with fear and trembling, um, you know saying that, just because you attend church every week makes you an unbelievably great Christian was like saying because you live in a garage, you're a car. You know. I mean there has to, there has to be ... so, so what we're finding is that, is we're basing a lot more of our particular self-assessments um, not on a litany of do's and don'ts but on love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control, on the fruits of the Spirit. You can tell me you're an apple tree all day long. But if it's evident to me that oranges are hanging from your branches, then we've got a disconnect. So for me, more than ah, maybe shouldn't go there, you shouldn't talk to so-and-so, you shouldn't do whatever, it's more like, wait a minute. Are the fruits of the Spirit evident in my life? Am I doing what the Bible calls me to do? Am I being, am I really working out my salvation in fear and trembling? Or am I working it out on the basis of what's comfortable for me or what I'm used to. So it's easy to say. But there's still a challenge, you know, for us. And so, um, we are by, in a lot of ways pretty conservative as a church, especially in California, Bay area church. We're pretty conservative. Um, and how that would be, how that would evidence in a way that maybe that you, you, you totally get it is that if we use a film clip, we never use an R-rate film clip. It's just, you know. Ah, and people will say, “Well man but it's perfect.” Yeah but there's gotta be something else because there's too much loaded for bear. If we're havin' a blended experience then we've got fifteen or sixteen year olds um, you know. We are by virtue of showing that, we're kind of saying it's okay. But it's not necessarily okay. So we take real pains to, to be again a safe environment so when we do something, it cuts the widest possible sloth for effectiveness. And there's gonna be people always, you know, who think it's too much and not enough. That's okay. But um, as leaders we put our focus on what to do and if we do our best doing it. (Jon, Interview, 8/4/2011)

An older pastor from New England (Gary, Interview, 8/1/2011) bluntly stated that he seldom talked about the “don’ts” but often talked about the things people should do, defining it relationally with God and with other people.

PGP: Ah, you know, I don’t talk to them so much about the, the, the, the do’s the don’ts, what you wear, what you don’t wear, or that sort of thing. I mean you have limitations of course. But I just talk about a relationship with the Lord and reaching out to the lost and touching people’s lives and, you know, interfacing with them. Um, we also have a pretty good reputation for being a missions church. We do a lot in our community and in our area as well as overseas. So people are aware of that. And that’s how I talk to people about how we relate to the world. We care about the world.

Theologically, the shift has moved the emphasis from 2 Corinthians 6:14-18 to Matthew 22:34-40. In 2 Corinthians 6 the emphasis was on being separate. It asks, “What fellowship can light have with darkness?” The Pentecostal speech community historically saw the emphasis in that passage leading to avoiding things that might influence the believer’s position as part of the Kingdom of light. Since the discussion is included here only to make a point of the shift, I will not fully describe the passage or attempt to plumb its depths. It is worth noting, however, that the first part of the passage refers to being the temple of the Holy Spirit; therefore, it was of particular importance to early Pentecostals that they live in a way that reflected their bodies being the temple of the Holy Spirit, including how those bodies looked and what vices ensnared them. As the pastors pointed out in the quotes given above, the shift moves toward the quality of interpersonal relationships as well as engaging people in a way that shows the love of Jesus. In Matthew 22:34-40 Jesus answers the question asked by a religious leader, “What is the greatest commandment in the law?” Jesus quickly and definitively tells them that the greatest commandment is to love God with their entire being, a fact reflected by one of the pastors quoted above. The relationship with God defines the difference between a

believer and other people. Jesus proceeds to tell the religious leaders that the second greatest commandment is that people should love their neighbor as they love themselves.

The responses to this question show that “giving” is now a major definition of being different from other people. The emphasis is on receiving love and forgiveness through a personal relationship with God as well as giving love and forgiveness to other people. Through “the love and the compassion for the world,” as one pastor said (Interview, 8/5/2011), Pentecostals find their distinctive from the surrounding milieu. No pastor made the statement as an exclusionary statement about love, as though they were the only people in the milieu capable of loving but they said they wanted to teach their people to live in a way that reflected the compassion and love of Jesus. The words of one more pastor will demonstrate the emphasis:

PGD: Being different. Um, part of that I talked about every Sunday. Ah as far as how the world even view success. Um, viewing success as having material things. Ah which I’m not against having material things. We have to live in this world .We have to function. We still have to buy groceries, pay bills just like everybody else. And I teach our congregation that. But the difference between um, someone that does not have a relationship with God and someone that does have a relationship with God is their way of life. Ah their lifestyle. There are certain things that because of scripture, ah, tells us certain things of doing certain things or not doing certain things. Then our life should line up with that. And so that um, that may, that really makes a difference in our life. Our, our attitude um, how we react, our response, ah how we treat people, ah showing love. It’s not a love that as long you’re on my good side I love you and when you’re on my bad side, I don’t want to have anything to do with you because our Bible tells us even when we know we have an enemy, that the Bible tells us we are to love our enemy. And that’s something that, you know, someone that does not have a relationship, I think that would be really hard to ... it’s really hard to do sometimes when you have a relationship but it’s something that you are, ah, cognizant of, that, and you’re aware of it that regardless of I know this may be here but I’m striving to get to this point where I should be in order to show the world that there is a difference between havin’ a relationship with Christ and not having a relationship. (Greg D., Interview, 8/1/2011)

As Compassion

The love and compassion emphasized in the previous section as part of the self-differentiating activity of people within the speech community takes structural and institutionalized form. After coming back from a national meeting, one of the pastors told me that he was impressed that the denomination with which he was affiliated was “into everything.” By that he meant that there was a diverse approach that included many institutional responses to needs through compassion ministries. The term “compassion ministry” means any kind of response to a social need, usually involving money.

As previously noted, every church I attended and every pastor I interviewed talked about the compassion ministry of their church. Some churches had recently stopped many of their efforts because of financial limitations after the U.S American economic crisis in 2008-2009. Some of the churches lost significant money from member contributions when members lost their jobs or when businesses suffered greatly. The pain was obvious in the pastors’ voices when they talked about the impact of the economic crisis on their ability to minister to such needs.

The ministries were as diverse as the milieu in which the churches worshipped. The pastors were very much aware that their responses to such needs were based on the specific needs within the community with several pastors who ministered in smaller towns mentioning that they did not have needs for homeless shelters so they met the needs of their community. Suburban churches were likely to meet needs appropriate to the community as well as attempting to collaborate with needs in more impoverished neighborhoods. Because the trend is relatively new, the impact to the speech community is not fully known. Further study ought to be done with a longitudinal approach to

ascertain the impact on the speech communities terms for talk and the ways such involvement impacts the speech community.

Giving as a distinctive is not exclusive to Pentecostals but extends to most of Christianity (Sider 2002). The inclusive nature of giving should not preclude analyzing the Pentecostal use of it, but should be seen as situating the Pentecostal speech community within the broader Christian tradition. The distinctive aspect is giving communicative acts like words of knowledge, messages in tongues and giving teachings. In the case of Pentecostals, giving was also tied to a way of living and perpetuated through using it as a term for talk vital to the distinction of the speech community, as well as through the attitude and atmosphere created in the gathered worshipping community.

Crisis of Generosity

When Philipsen wrote about speaking in Teamsterville (Philipsen 1975), he pointed to a crisis event as further evidence of the speech code he explicated because the violation of a speech community's code often creates a crisis. One of the pastors⁴ told me a delicate story about a serious crisis surrounding the church he pastored related to generosity and giving.

B: Would you be willing to share what that, the nature of that conflict and what it was about?

P: Sure. ... The problem with, ah, the church and the school system, ah is that, um, our church was instrumental in bringing some ah, faith based programs to the school on, ah for convocations and then evening rallies. And um, the administrator at that time um, felt like that he was ah, deceived as to the, the true content and intent of the program. In which case he ah, he, he, he said he was going to cancel the event. Um, obviously people had already paid money and,

⁴ Name and identity markers withheld because of the delicate nature of the situation. Interview took place in August, 2011.

and, and made arrangements. And ah, so he canceled the event based on the fact that there might be ah, a call to life change or an altar call in the evening in which case our people or our church um, got upset, contacted the national organization that brought in legal counsel for the next board meeting. And ah, because of the past situation between our church and other churches, board members being involved in other churches, there was a real um, ah spirit of, of confrontation at that meeting and almost a ridicule by some of those board members. And after a period of time, ah, the legal counsel and the people from our church realized that they weren't going to get anywhere. And so the, the legal counsel, the lawyer, a very sharp person, ah pretty much ah, um, led 'em in a come-to-Jesus-meeting. He said, "This is how it is. And ah, you can either capitulate and follow the letter of the law or we'll back in here, bring suit and we'll have your jobs, we'll have your assets and you'll do it the way the law says." Ah all of them things were correct. Ah, but it left an attitude of confrontation between the church and the school system to the point where now the school system really ah, is trying to distance themselves from our church or anybody to do with our church, ah, which is unfortunate because our front doors face each other across the same street. Um, so one of our issues right now is , is trying to erase some of the effects of that, ah of the encounter and um, and it's as much in our congregation as it is in the community.

When the church entered conflict with the surrounding milieu, it was a rupture within the way of life of a rural community where the rules of neighborliness dictated that everyone knew everyone else and treated each other with civility and kindness, according to the interview. It was also seen as a rupture within the identity desired for the church by the pastor. The pastor I interviewed was not there when the incident happened, but subsequently desired to restore the identity internally and the reputation of the church within the surrounding milieu.

Crisis of Generosity and Expression

An interesting event occurred during one of the services I visited. A man was invited to the front to sing a special song. While Albrecht (1999) chronicled special music as a more regular occurrence, the practice has almost completely disappeared from churches that I attended. However, in one church it was still a regular aspect of the Sunday worship service. The man took the microphone and gave a very passionate

testimony. He said, “The song was not written by me -- it just came out,” which in context meant that he did write the song but he was giving credit to God. During his terse and harsh testimony he said, “This world is a sin-ridden world and we have to live with it.” After a few minutes of intensity he said, “Sorry I'm shouting but we have to understand this.” He said that Christians needed to “stand up in a place that does not accept them” (Field notes, Transcription).

With very little notice, he started singing the song. The song that followed was rock-country, with more rock than country. It was loud and hard to understand the lyrics. During the song, several men who were sitting in the back stood up with a concerned look and talked to the man in the sound booth after which the soundman made some adjustments and the volume went down a little bit. When the song was over, the pastor stood up and was clearly unsure of how the song would be received. He said, “I don't think the Lord is concerned about style. He's concerned about our praise” (Transcription). In other words, the pastor clearly recognized a possible crisis for some people and drew upon the raw material of available attitudes working within the church. With the terminology of speech codes, the pastor was helping the people negotiate any potential conflict of values. He wanted to situate the song within the domain of expression and show that it was in order, even though it might not have been seen as a proper gift by some members of the community.

I interviewed the pastor and two other men from the congregation that afternoon and all three mentioned the situation without me bringing it up. The pastor talked about it with me as a colleague, mentioning technical issues about the drums and the sound system. He talked about it with a “pastor's heart” mentioning that it was a learning

opportunity for the drummer and the singer and indicated that he was in ongoing conversations with them to turn their expression into a gift the entire worshipping community might enjoy. The other two men said that the song was “not their thing” but they were willing to tolerate it because they knew the man. They were willing to understand the song as a gift only because they knew him and “his heart.” They only wanted to be able to hear the words. For both of the men as well as the pastor, their focus was on the song. My focus would have been on the hard hitting and passionate words spoken before the song. When “everybody knows everybody,” as they said was the case, they were more willing to allow expression because of their generosity and accept the heart of the person. For a church in a rural community, they negotiated two aspects of the group identity in such a way as to take into account their proclivities emanating from the local milieu as well as the speech codes within the church. Therefore, as I have previously noted, the speech codes of a Pentecostal church reflect the speech community of the worshipping tradition but are often defined within the local milieu. Further, speech codes are negotiated to maintain the most salient aspects of the core identity as determined by the individual, a determination that receives feedback from the rest of the speech community as manifested through the local church in this case.

By adopting the definitions from local milieu for hospitality and generous living, Pentecostals situate themselves in any culture relatively seamlessly. The logic of gift giving guides the pathway to make sure that practices related to generous living are received as such by the surrounding milieu. Therefore, they do not seek to redefine the hospitality of new members as such but rather they attempt to magnify and “perfect” the practices already within the playing field. For example, the church in the South with

parking lot greeters took southern hospitality to a new level, trying to do their best within the accepted practices of hospitality to present the ideal type. The church in the Midwest with authentic relationships but no greeting time in the worship service did their best to magnify the ideal of what-you-see-is-what-you-get. In rural settings with the rule “everybody knows everybody,” the churches tried to emulate that value through being as friendly as possible. When it failed, a rupture threatened the fabric of the speech community.

The values of giving, hospitality, and generous living with attendant practices, unite the Pentecostal speech community situating it within the larger Christian faith and the world’s religions. It unites the community by providing cohesion from church to church. Even though the worship services were often quite different with different levels of expressiveness and different narratives emphasized, hospitality became a constant upon which I could depend. Pentecostals were enthusiastic in practicing their faith, warmly open to outsiders joining them.

Summary

Speech Code Theory as articulated by Philipsen, Coutu, and Covarru (2005) pointed to a unique sociology for any speech community. The speech code of generous living implicates social relationships both within the speech community and with those outside the speech community. I have shown how the sociology of the group emphasized giving through an attitude and atmosphere of hospitality in a worship service. The code of generous living inferred that much communication within a worship service was a gift. It is understood to be a gift from God given through a person rather than a gift given by

another person. Giving defined the relationship with those outside the community, never as an ideal type, but recognized as being a struggle.

Within each local church, hospitality was defined in relation to the surrounding milieu. No specific actions were required but since the attitude and atmosphere were part of every church, it may be concluded that it would be expected in every Pentecostal church with varying degrees of effectiveness. Within each local church, the giving of compassion ministry to those in need was first interpreted through the lens of conversion-salvation but was not limited to spiritual solutions to issues. It extended to diverse aspects of practical solutions to needs within the surrounding milieu. One can see how compassion ministries were developed as responses to needs and therefore are localized acts of compassion.

Giving of communication was seen as originating from God, passing through the one giving the communication, and being received by the worshipping community. As a gift, many churches try to make it understandable to all worshippers with the goal of accessibility clearly in view.

Through giving communication and hospitality, Pentecostals build an attitude and atmosphere in worship that socializes worshippers into generous living potentially transforming all aspects of their life. That helps answer the fifth research question: *How do the many speech codes within each particular Pentecostal congregation comprise the speech codes of U.S American Pentecostalism?* Speech codes did not present congregation to congregation but the national code was defined within each congregation. Said differently, each congregation took the Pentecostal speech community codes and

adapted those to their local situation with local definition from within the congregation and from the surrounding milieu.

The three components of church, culture, and gospel interact through the code of giving, defining the attitude and atmosphere of the church as hospitality to make members of the surrounding milieu welcome when they visit the church. Through every day generous living individuals and institutions from the speech community interact with the surrounding milieu. Both of those components are defined locally with generous living adapting to local needs and hospitality reflecting attempts to perfect the local definition. Communicative giving allows the speech community to maintain its identity by focusing on God as the co-author. By focusing on “giving” as the unifying concept for all three components, the speech community tries to maintain a balance so that none of the three dominates.

Theological Excursus on Tongues-Speech

Tongues-speech has been included in the previous chapters, first as an expression in worship and then as giving to others in worship. The fabric of the speech community includes both strands. The differentiation based on these two codes may help explain tongues-speech for some people. Pentecostals have always defined tongues-speech through a pragmatic dichotomy founded in utilitarian issues. Said differently, there is one usage of tongues-speech for public address in a worship service or prayer gatherings where a believer gives a message in tongues-speech. There is another usage that is found either in private expression to God or private prayer. Tongues-speech in private prayer may be either in public settings where a person enjoys personal edification by speaking to God in tongues-speech or in an individual prayer time where tongues-speech may often take the form of “sighs too deep for words” (Macchia 1992, 1998b). Both usages were based on scripture because 1 Corinthians 14 says that if no one is present to interpret tongues-speech the believer should “speak to himself and to God” (1 Cor. 14:28). In other words, there is a prayer in tongues-speech that is just between the individual interlocutor and God as well as speaking out in public worship for everyone to receive.

The separation often causes theological confusion particularly when the two are treated in identical ways by those trying to ascertain the correct usage of tongues-speech. Public worship is the subject addressed in the bulk of 1 Corinthians 14; private prayer was addressed only in three verses. Since the Apostle Paul was addressing public worship, Menzies and Menzies (2000) as well as Fee (1996) have shown that the Apostle Paul was not squelching tongues-speech entirely but only bringing order to public worship. Through the further differentiation of gift giving and expression it can be seen

that tongues-speech as expression was never censured on any grounds or in any circumstances. Giving tongues-speech to the entire assembly was brought into order, though not completely repressed. Therefore, through a move to separate linguistically the two usages into expression and giving, both operations of tongues-speech find a rightful place within the worshipping community.

With the linguistic differentiation, the charismatic gifts find a context where order is not only desirous but necessary. By focusing on the charismatic gifts as gifts that are given to the worshipping community, the only proper way for any gift to function is through a pragmatic concern. What does the gift do for the community? In a classic work on the philosophy of “gifts,” Mauss has shown how honor is an important part of the giving process (Mauss 1954). In charismatic gifts, the intention of the giver (the person speaking as one passing on the gift from God) only comes into play with an honorable intent. As long as the giver of a gift has honorable intentions, other intentions are not as important, because the focus shifts to the gift itself and what it will accomplish within the receiver(s) of the gift. Paul’s concern has often been quoted that outsiders will not understand and will think a worshipping community filled with unbalanced and unstable people if they witnessed tongues-speech in public worship, especially if that tongues-speech were not orderly. Such a concern was pragmatic and therefore a proper concern within the properties of gift giving. If the gift was given honorably yet caused the receiver to believe the giver was not honorable, a true gift was not really given. For a true gift to be given, symbolically it must reflect the noble intent. Therefore, those churches attempting to bring order to giving tongues-speech messages by asking that interlocutors first speak to the pastor before giving the message are not squelching or quenching the

Holy Spirit necessarily. While it does limit spontaneity, it balances other aspects of group identity. They are only providing a social process to discern the best way to give honorable gifts to the worshipping community, gifts that may be understood and received on the same symbolic level as intended. (While there are other ways to engage social order, the one I most commonly encountered was the submission of communication gifts to the pastor before submitting them to the church.)

When it has been determined that a charismatic gift should not be given within the worshipping community, tongues-speech becomes an individual expression and can be seen as expressive speech with the same limitations and rules as any other expression. A believer should not see that expression was stifled when gifts were not allowed because the two usages follow separate rules. In this way, the speech community may “artfully use” the speech codes to their own advantage, to follow Philipsen’s terminology that those who know speech codes may shape communicative action (Philipsen 1997). The speech community may encourage believers that one function builds the speech community while the other aligns the heart of the believer with God’s heart through purifying the affections.

CHAPTER 10. TIGHTLY WOVEN FABRIC

Many writers have sought explanations for Pentecostals' cultural versatility and ability to adapt seemingly to any culture, pointing to the incredible numerical growth globally. Many have tried to explain the growth of the movement including an analysis of the portability of Pentecostal ritual with the ability to extend ritual into everyday life (Robbins 2011). While those explanations offer useful insight, the top-to-bottom commitment to conversion-salvation fervor also provides part of the explanation. Members of the speech community point to the many biblical passages instructing people to witness to others about the power and efficacy of conversion-salvation (Carpenter 1989; Dempster, Klaus and Petersen 1991). While there are many acceptable synonyms for the same process that I will explicate, I will follow Carbaugh's method and primarily use the term "witness" or "witnessing" because it is a term for talk in the speech community (Carbaugh 1989).

While most Pentecostal preachers would not use the Old Testament scriptures to teach about witnessing, Pentecostal missiologist Carpenter (1989) included many scriptures, especially from the Psalms and the prophets, demonstrating that Israel was supposed to teach "the nations" about the greatness of their God. The classical Pentecostal wing of the speech community has long pointed out that the empowerment of Spirit baptism is an empowerment for witness (Menzies and Menzies 2000). While Spirit Baptism may be more, even much more in Pentecostal theology as Macchia uses the metaphor for the entirety of the Christian life (Macchia 2006), it is never less. Theologian Stronstad (1999) uses the witnessing of the early Christians as evidence for the prophethood of the believer.

The word “witness” can certainly mean a wide variety of things even in the Pentecostal speech community. It was not uncommon to have people talk about witnessing an event or witnessing a miracle, which would be a common usage. However, it was also not uncommon to hear people use it as a technical term for talk, in which it meant telling someone else about conversion-salvation. The technical term is special to Pentecostals because it comes right from the Bible in Acts 1:8. As I have shown, anything that comes directly from the Bible will receive preferred treatment. Further, in that Bible verse it is attached to the experience of Spirit baptism so it again receives preferred treatment by the Pentecostal speech community.

While “witness” even in that sense infers that the person doing the witnessing has seen or experienced something of value and they are going to tell someone else, that is too neat and tidy of an explanation for the reality I saw and heard. Moments where other opportunities were given to receive conversion-salvation in worship services were not built on such a pure form of witness. Only one pastor emphasized that witnessing means passing along information about an experience that one “witnessed,” as in a court of law.

In interview conversations, people used all sorts of words and phrases for the idea behind “witness.” Some used the term “evangelism” others talked about “sharing their faith.” Some talked about “missions” or being “on mission with God.” Some used classical terms to describe what happened in a worship service calling it an “an altar call.” The pastor of one church emphasized the word “witness” in the interview and the people from that church I interviewed used the term “witness” far more than other people. Because there are many synonyms in interview data for the same practice, I will

use the term witness whenever possible for consistency to mean the act of sharing one's faith in such a way that the other has an opportunity to accept conversion-salvation.

Deeply Woven

Proposition five in SCT states, "The terms, rules, and premises of a speech code are inextricably woven into the fabric of speaking itself" (Philipsen, Coutu and Covarru 2005). Through analysis, I looked for words repeated, with the attendant standard of finding foundational ideas without which the speech community could not be understood. Of equal importance were concepts included in response to diverse questions so that it was more than just a content answer but the framing context of the taken-for-granted-world. The act of witnessing fits all of those criteria and much more. In spite of not asking congregation members specific questions about witnessing, the conversation always managed to get to the topic. In fact, it did not seem to matter if interviewees were young or old, if they had been in a Pentecostal church all their life or only a year, if they were a minority or Caucasian, male or female, pastor or congregation member, in ministry training or a housewife well past retirement age. Whatever I asked it was possible to answer the question with the idea of being a witness. I asked about the main task of the church and everyone included the idea. I asked about the difference in the interviewees' everyday life from going to church and several people answered that they were able to witness better. It was included in response to several questions about preaching, response about music selection, responses about helping the community, responses about what to expect in a church service, even responses to questions about specific practices in worship. I asked worshippers, "Have you always lived in this area?" Several people included their own conversion-salvation narrative in the response and two

people included stories about sharing their faith. When worshippers were asked what role the Sunday worship played in their church, several people responded that their services were useful to spread the gospel so that people could receive conversion-salvation. It was woven into nearly every possible concept discussed.

I interviewed twenty-four pastors and heard were twenty-four different stories showing how churches wanted to be a faithful witness in their community. Every story was different and unique, yet the commonality linked them all together. I asked one of the pastors I met at a national convention to tell me about the place where he was a pastor and he replied:

PRN: Very rural. A town of one hundred ninety-one people. Four hundred people in the county. Seventy miles from nothin'. Very remote. Um, at a cross roads of two major highways. Um, ranching ah, agriculture is the industry. Everybody there either participates in ranching something or ranching. (Ronald, Interview, 8/3/2011)

When the interview formally ended, we talked for another forty-five minutes. During that time, he told me that one of the previous pastors left the church because he had witnessed to everyone in the county multiple times and if they were going to respond positively, they would have already done so; therefore, it must be time for a different voice.

I asked every interviewee, worshippers and pastors, about the main job or task of the church and every person included “witnessing” in the answer. The answers often included multiple facets and often were in the form of the vision statement for the church the person attended. Two memorable vision statements will demonstrate the simultaneous unity and diversity. One church saw the task of the church as “bringing the world around you to life.” It was flexible enough to allow for many avenues of fulfillment while still including conversion-salvation as the heart of the statement, at least the way each member of that church interpreted it. In another church, each person interviewed gave me

the same five word answer as the task of the church, and seemed shocked that I needed to ask the question. For them the church was to “win souls and make disciples” (Larry, Jeff, Ronald, Interviews, 9/25/2011). Through the course of research, people would often ask me about the nature of my research. One person casually told me that no Pentecostal would say that they are not in favor of witnessing and that every Pentecostal would say that the main task of the church was to win the lost. While my sample was neither random nor representative according to research standards, it certainly means something that all fifty interviewees included “witnessing” in their answer about the main task of the church.

At one growing church, an associate pastor told me that they included conversion-salvation as part of everything they did. I asked if there were any settings in which it would be inappropriate, such as funerals. He earnestly responded that funerals were the perfect place to talk about eternal things because people tend to think about eternity during such moments. While it might not be the best place for a “forward moving altar call,” he said it was still one of the best places to talk about it. They have multiple major events annually for the community and each event includes the conversion-salvation message. It was so deeply woven into the fabric of the church that they decorated their new mezzanine with flags representing every country where they supported a foreign missionary.

My claim is not about the prevalence of the practice of witnessing, but only about the acceptance of the practice and its place within the speech community. It is part of the identity of Pentecostal Christians to expect moments in worship services when there will be an opportunity for people to receive conversion-salvation. Every person, pastor and

congregation member, readily made it part of their answers, even if they simultaneously struggle with the practice. Without a doubt, there will be those voices from the speech community that will object to the presentation of witnessing as part of the fundamental core of speech codes within the Pentecostal speech community. My role here is not to settle that debate within the speech community, only to diagnose the depth to which witnessing is a core of the speech community's collective identity.

It would be an understatement to say that some of the churches I visited were obsessed with finding new methods of witnessing. One of the pastors called his church "missional." I asked him to help me understand what he meant by that term and he replied:

PAC: For me missional is, ah, is, much how, for an Americanized concept or construct would be more of how we would view someone going to a foreign field. And ah, ah, going to say, say India. Instead of trying to get people ah in that context to get onto my American Westernized mindset, to understand first and foremost, to understand before I seek to be understood, to use a Covey term. AH, to um, to understand who and what they are, what they value, what's going on, and then based on what I, what God has put in my heart to do, ah and for, for the Kingdom and for the work that he wants to build, how to make that connection. So, because for the church, for, for, for years in America we have said, "Hey if you ah, if you ah, believe what we believe then you behave, then you can belong." And missional says you belong. You're a child, you're a child of God. That God loves you now. You've got a decision whether you're gonna accept or reject that and eternity hangs in the balance. We're not rock-em, sock-em robots, especially from an Armenian view. We believe, you know that we have free moral choice. But that God still loves you. That God still has a plan for your life, that God still, you are created in His image and in His likeness and you're a child of, of God. The question is whether you're gonna accept the love of the father, you're gonna accept the plan that God has for you, and you're gonna walk that out. And so, ah, so with that being said, you, you belong. And then, then in belonging to God, you're going to begin to, you may behave before you ever completely believe. And it's kind of what I call on Sundays, when I'm preaching, it's called kicking tires on faith. That people are, um, the mindset is is look, we're, we're here to serve, we're, we're not here to be served. We're, we're here to give, we're not here to receive as a church. We're, we're here to serve humanity. And so whatever that means, how they serve on noncontroversial projects that could be some humanitarian effort, that could be some physical need in the community.

That could be before it ever opens the door for spiritual conversation. And so whole it's the whole principle of bar-b-queing first. I'm going to get to know you relationally. I'm just going to invest in you relationally. Whether you ever accept the, the faith that I believe, whether you ever accept Jesus Christ, my job is to, is to seek and save. My job is to love. My job is to go. My job is to serve. So that's a missional mindset. . . . I'm not talking about watering down the gospel or pulling back or redrawing the lines on sin or softening anything, but, it's hard to hear that Jesus loves you and has a plan for your life when you have an empty stomach. It's hard to, to, to accept the truths of God when everything in your world is falling apart. So sometimes that means meeting the needs of humanity ah before they ever receive our message. Many times that means in, in Americanized concept ah that we're relationally connected to those people and that they, you know, ah, they may not care how much you know until they know how much you care, kind of a deal there. I gotta trust your heart before I can trust your hand. And so again, all these little, you know, things. But missional to me means getting on, finding out what the page is, getting on that page, and then translating this unchanging truth into an ever changing world that Jesus loves you and has a plan for your life. And that you don't have to live this way here and now. And honestly that, that, that there's a heaven to gain and hell to shun and I think there's a balance to do both of those things. And so that's what missional means to me. (Interview, Aaron, 7/18/2011)

Nearly everything that took place at that church revolved around witnessing. I formally interviewed four people from that church and informally interviewed three more. I talked to people who had been in the Pentecostal speech community for thirty-five years as well as people who started attending only within the previous year. Everyone talked about how they witnessed to people around them, how much of their life now revolved around going on compassion ministry foreign trips to provide shoes to people in third-world countries, how much they looked for opportunities at work or with friends to witness.

As previously mentioned in Chapter 9 on generous living, the Pentecostal speech community understands transformation in spiritual terms before transforming neighborhoods in other ways. They lead with the idea of witnessing and include other things even though the actual order of events may be reversed. One pastor said that some compassion ministry was almost like a bribe to get people to listen to the conversion-salvation message. While other pastors interviewed would probably not want to share that

sentiment, they would understand that the end goal for the things they did was to witness to as many people as possible.

The congregation interviewees talked about such things as preaching in prisons and preaching on the streets to the homeless. The pastors talked about personally witnessing to people in their surrounding milieu on street corners, health clubs, restaurants, or other places. They talked about success in terms of people receiving conversion-salvation. The pastors would talk about a particular methodology or stylistic choice and establish a rationale by saying things like “it works” or “it is working” by which they contextually meant that people responded for conversion-salvation.

Driven by a desire to witness in a way that leads people to conversion-salvation the speech community typically sees communication as a tool to use for that goal. Repeatedly pastors would say that the message does not change but the method does. One pastor who described his church as very traditional and the setting as very rural said, “The message doesn’t change but the delivery does” (Ronald, Interview, 8/3/2011). For Pentecostal pastors I interviewed, there was no sense that the medium changed the message. They were content to employ whatever medium was available and whatever genre was necessary to present the message of conversion-salvation. One pastor talked about intentionally exploding objects in a sermon (with the help of an expert) to present the message of a conversion-salvation better. There seemed to be no limits on how far that pastor would go to present the message. The same drive creates the atmosphere of worship services that makes use of contemporary technology as well as simulating concert venues.

At the beginning of the Introduction I started by describing my experience at Red Mountain Christian Center. The sermon was best described as an “apologetic sermon” (Loscalzo 2000) because it walked the congregation through stories and illustrations intending to prove a point about conversion-salvation, as well as providing long-term believers with guidance for their lives. At the end of the sermon, the pastor took about sixty seconds to give people the opportunity to respond for conversion-salvation. When I attended New Hope Church, the service had a special emphasis on bringing friends and the sermon described conversion-salvation for guests who may not be familiar with the idea or who wanted to make a conversion-salvation decision. Both services I attended at Life Church ended with opportunities for people to receive and each time several people raised their hands to respond. During one of the services at Believer’s Tabernacle, the pastor gave such an opportunity between songs in the song portion of the service. While such opportunities usually come at the end of a sermon, the Believer’s Tabernacle experience was not the only time it happened at a different time. At least half of the services included an opportunity for people to respond to the conversion-salvation message. The only rule seemed to be that it was acceptable at any point in time to explain the concept and give people a chance to respond. “Rules about communicative conduct are woven into the communicative conduct” (Philipsen, Coutu and Covarru 2005).

Processes of Witness Worship

Because of the deep-seated nature of the communicative act of witnessing, the processes should be accessible through ethnographic methods but there were at least six discreet practices to begin the process. First, some talked about using compassion ministries to “open the door.” Second, others talked about interpersonal relationships as a

starting point. Third, some mentioned that worship services led the way. Fourth, two pastors talked about the presence of God experienced in worship attracting people to return to the church and subsequently receive conversion-salvation. Fifth, other pastors talked about using big events as an initiator for the process. Sixth, one or two talked about signs, wonders, and miracles getting the attention of people. These six should not be taken as a definitive and exhaustive list. The diversity of the list implies that there were more initial event options that might be uncovered through more detailed research focusing specifically on the process. *The commonality amongst the practices suggests that the first stage was to appear within the view of an individual in a way that would cause the person to focus his/her attention.*

After appearing in an individual's life picture, *the second stage was to focus the individual's attention, to sharpen her/his focus*, again through a variety of practices. For example, by focusing their attention I mean that once an individual was the recipient of compassion ministry, it was necessary for the church to find ways to connect that event to spiritual practices like church attendance. Some interviewees mentioned using an encounter with the presence of God to focus the individual's attention. In actuality they often used some sort of event as the first stage and then trusted that an experience in God's presence through worship would sharpen the individual's focus on God.

In the third stage, the task was to build a bridge to the person's understanding. Varieties of techniques were described in the natural course of interview conversations. Again, I did not ask planned, specific questions about the process but particularly pastors freely volunteered information about their practices of witnessing. The bridge to a person's understanding almost always involved communicative interaction either in a

group or one-on-one. Those who relied heavily on interpersonal relationships for the first stage almost always relied on interpersonal relationships for the second and third stage also, though the fluidity of the situation dictates that nothing was prescribed as the set practice. After appearing in the individual's picture, sharpening his/her focus, and building a bridge to her/his understanding, the individual might allow the process to move to the fourth stage, the most critical stage.

The fourth stage depends on communicative activity because it is where the conversion-salvation process is explained to the individual. Churches that depended on church services in the first stage may well depend on church services for every stage. While it was true that the fourth stage could happen anywhere and through any believer as the communicative agent, it was also a reality that the most likely scenario was that a believer would "invest" in a friend or relative to allow the first three stages to occur. Then they would "invite" the person to a service where the witness would be given. The dual process of "invest and invite" was used by several interviewees from the same church and simply describes the process in a memorable, mnemonic fashion.

The next stage, the fifth and final stage, only happens if the individual has moved through each stage without hesitation. According to most Pentecostal theologies, at any stage an individual could choose not to respond to the attempts made by a well-meaning and well-trained individual. *However, if the individual chooses to respond in each stage, the final stage is where the conversion-salvation would occur, typically by praying a prayer.* The explicit statements of Pastor Adey (Interview, 10/2/2011) speaks for the inferences of many. "So I don't really care if you have said the prayer or if you've baked the cookies or if you've played the game of sorry. Or if you've painted or if you've been

the one to say, ‘Would you like to meet my God?’” Casting it in terms of a relationship was a common way to talk about conversion-salvation. I used that metaphor in crafting questions and everyone immediately understood what I meant. Several pastors talked about “coming into a relationship with God” during their witness moments at the end of their sermons.

Pentecostal Christians emphasized, “It’s all God.” They contextually meant that moving from stage to stage was believed to be a response to the action of the Holy Spirit within the individual. It should also be noted that an individual may move through each stage quickly or may take years in one stage. Interview data suggested that sometimes it was seemingly instantaneous that a person went through all five stages and other interviewees described a lengthy process.

Conflicts of Witness and other Communicative Activity

Because the most generous action of a Pentecostal is usually to witness, conflict inevitably surrounds the activity within the priorities of the speech community. The most hospitable action many Pentecostals could imagine was to make sure the other was prepared spiritually for eternity. If seen as a gift of hospitality, however, witnessing must be recognized as an action of hospitality, operating as a gift with pragmatic concerns the primary focus. The noble intentions that are necessary for gift giving are often present in the witnessing act; however, the pragmatic concerns of gift giving would require that the recipient be able to receive the act as a gift. If the recipient cannot receive the witness as a gift, then the nature of giving has been violated.

Perhaps the greatest contemporary conflict arises not between giving and witnessing but between expressing and witnessing. From the tone of the interviews, it

was clear that the subject requires continuous negotiation by a pastor. When asked, the pastors did not seem shocked by the question and typically had ready answers. An obvious tone of concern pervaded answers about the expression of tongues-speech, the use of charismatic gifts, and physical manifestations as pastors traversed the worship landscape attempting to make worship accessible to everyone present. The conflict typically takes the form of negotiating tongues-speech, how much will take place, when it will take place, and its visibility. The negotiation of various commitments within a speech community required that members of the community maintain the most central elements of the values of generous living, expression, Spirit-listener, Bible reader, and witness.

Summary

Based on the immediately preceding discussion, several observations arise. When more than one aspect of a speech code exists in a speech community, any conflict will be negotiated to preserve each code. The self-reflection of the speech community will ultimately determine what aspects may be compromised and what aspects must be preserved. Conflict arises within the speech community when too much compromise chews up the raw material of one aspect. Further, speech communities typically have built-in mechanisms to reinforce their communicative practices so that rules of speaking are reinforced. For example, the observed continuous challenge with the Pentecostal community as to how much witnessing takes place acts as a reinforcement mechanism continuously challenging the community to maintain the attendant practices of the code.

There are several principles related to SCT and the act of being a witness, principles that inform the theory and the speech community's self-identified task. First,

when a Pentecostal Christian engages in witnessing to the other, he/she may seek to use the raw material from other speech codes interwoven in the other's life. Success and failure may depend on using such raw material, the symbols, rules, meanings, and premises of the other. Many have called it speaking the language of the other. Second, stripping the Pentecostal language of its traditional terms and heritage for the purpose of granting access to those outside the speech community risks the very identity to which the community seeks to convert the other. Developing new metaphors requires great attention to the historical values of the speech community.

CHAPTER 11. REFLECTIONS

The Pentecostal voices are the voices of neighbors, anyone's neighbors. They have responsible jobs that require intellectual firepower in the banking industry, as a university fundraiser, as a PhD student in mathematical theory, a construction worker, a human resources consultant, an actuary science student honing those skills through an internship with a Fortune 500 company, a welder, a real estate developer, or any other job. Their pastors ranged from having earned doctorates to never having formal ministry training. Some of their pastors were eager to help with a research project and others took quite a bit of coaxing. Some of their pastors work secular employment but most are employed full time by the church.

In my observation their worship was not the wild ecstatic version described in historical literature but orderly and structured, spontaneous, free flowing, giving worship in spirit and truth. Communication in that worship told a story of desire and direction, intimacy with God and life transformation. Their practices develop an embodied narration that focuses their affections for everyday living and provide information for better life choices. Their attitude and atmosphere invites outsiders to come and stay. The attitude and atmosphere of giving might be the greatest asset but also their most risky adventure as they mold and shape practices to make their experiences more accessible to the outsider.

Research Questions Revisited

The study was designed to answer a series of questions. The first question and the one from which the other four flow, started with speech codes. *How do diverse*

approaches to surrounding cultural milieu (local and regional influences) impact speech codes in Pentecostal faith communities and in turn faith and practice of congregants? In giving, expression, the worship narration, and spontaneity local congregations protect authenticity of worship while still providing unique emphasis and definition for each local setting. Each church followed the same speech codes but with local influences shaping those codes. There was little regional influence, though in giving hospitality, there were some signs of a regional influence. Put differently, churches in the Southwest offer hospitality as defined by the Southwest; churches in the Midwest offer hospitality in ways fitting with their surrounding milieu. In urban areas where anonymity is valued churches offer hospitality as an option. In rural areas where the interviewees reported that “everybody knows everybody” the church works hard to reflect the same friendliness.

The second research question asked: *How does the message reframing for cultural adaptation impact rituals and speech codes, faith, and practice?* Through message reframing worship was made accessible to outsiders. Worship practices (rituals) changed very little through reframing except in the reported frequency of charismatic gifts. The narrative remained the same and spontaneity was preserved through a variety of spontaneity-paradigms for the preservation of authentic worship expression.

The third research question was answered through expressive worship. *How do the variety of speech codes from congregation to congregation within the Pentecostal speech community with a variety of expressions, impact socialization within each congregation?* People are socialized within the speech community through many facets of spirituality since “expressive worship” opens the door to Pentecostal spirituality. The

essence of Pentecostal Christianity is spirituality; therefore, expressiveness in worship allows access to the speech community for participative worshippers.

The narrative development of worship answered the fourth question. *How do existential encounters with the divine presence define the daily narratives outside worship services for Pentecostals? How is this evident through speech codes?* Philipsen said that speech codes may be accessed through the rituals, cultural myths, and social dramas of a speech community (Philipsen 1997). The worship narrative acts as a cultural myth, pointing beyond the worship moment toward everyday life. The narrative points to the deliverance-refocus paradigm that extends into everyday life to refocus one from the stress of every day concerns and deliver from obstacles. The process of deliverance-refocus gives life new meaning through such narrative elements as celebration or transformation. Spirituality is accessed through a relationship juxtaposed with religion to differentiate spiritual vitality. The vitality extends to everyday life through the ethic of giving love to God and love to the other.

The fifth research question was answered through generous living. *How do the many speech codes within each particular Pentecostal congregation comprise the speech codes of U.S American Pentecostalism?* Common speech codes existed throughout the Pentecostal speech community, but were defined locally by each congregation. Each congregation takes the Pentecostal speech community codes and adapts those to their local situation with local definition from within the congregation. The surrounding milieu helps define giving hospitality and generous living. Giving communication and hospitality builds an attitude and atmosphere in worship that socializes worshippers into generous living for everyday life.

Pentecostal Communication Reflections

Speech Codes Theory is a meta-communication theory that allows the generation of specific communication theories for specific speech communities. An introductory set of guidelines emerge through this study to guide future research of Pentecostal communication and worship. There are rules followed for communication in the speech community, rules followed in worship, and suggestions for the refinement of SCT.

Reflections on Premises in Pentecostal Worship

At least eleven premises for worship are seen through the study. The premises developed in ethnographic research await theological development and evaluation.

1. Worship is about experiencing intimacy in the unmediated presence of God.
2. Worship in truth affirms the speech community's validity because it validates their unique experiences.
3. Spiritual freedom is reinforced by the free flow of expressive worship.
4. Expressive worship reinforces vitality of a relationship rather than lifeless religion.
5. Spontaneity of a worshipper is interwoven with the fabric of worship to produce authenticity.
6. Each individual worshipper experiences the Pentecostal worship narrative. It is believed that different emphases in the narrative correspond with spiritual development.
7. Embodied practices reinforce the speech community's values.
8. Pastors are expected to rely on God as the Ultimate co-author of worship.

9. Worshippers should extend the co-authorship of God in worship to everyday life narratives.
10. Discernment takes place when both the interlocutor and audience rely on God as the co-author of the communicative process.
11. The attitude and atmosphere of giving hospitality are essential elements of healthy Pentecostal worship services.

Rules for Communication

While my primary task was to describe worship as a communication process, I believe the data provides access to communication in the speech community in a more general way because Pentecostals emphasize worship practices throughout everyday life. Therefore, communication practices observed in worship were also described by interviewees as influencing everyday life. Eight rules emerge for communication as an ideal type with variations expected.

1. Expressive communication intends to show the true nature of affections.
2. Removing expression threatens the speech community's identity by undermining an emphasis on being filled with the presence of the Holy Spirit.
3. Spontaneous communication throughout worship demonstrates the community's commitment to authenticity.
4. Hospitality and giving both balance church, communicative content, and the surrounding milieu. Without hospitality and giving, the speech community becomes a self-indulgent community, obsessed with the next wave of spiritual blessing through an ever increasing need for greater expression and manifestations of the Spirit.

5. Believers strive to settle morally tense situations through Bible-reading.
6. Believers rely on Spirit-listening to direct everyday decision making.
7. God-as-co-author defines most of Pentecostal communication.
8. Communication media act as tools for the presentation of the message and are subject to change with the mantra “the methods change but the message does not.”

Rules for the Relationship of Church, Message, and Surrounding Milieu

An underlying presupposition of the interview questions came from the Driscoll triad theory. The combination of surrounding milieu, communication, and the local church interact for a delicate balance to define what happens in a worship service. Eight values for the relationship developed in the Pentecostal speech community are presented in no particular order.

1. Spontaneity of worship follows locally constructed rules of order.
2. Hospitality is defined by the milieu outside the church that surrounds the worshipping community.
3. When the background of people with an individual church supports expressive behavior, the church is likely to be expressive and claim that their expression is in obedience to God. When the background of people in the church is less expressive, the church is likely to reflect a less expressive experience and acknowledge the influence of the background.
4. Pentecostals use speech codes from their citizenship in multiple speech communities dialectically informing their participation within the multiple communities. The modification of each speech code will follow a pathway that

respects the essence and core of the code while negotiating elements not seen as crucial to identity.

5. Changing the Pentecostal speech community to better facilitate the conversion of other people will not be accomplished without a tacit change in the belief structure at minimum with the maximum ascending all the way to a radical overhaul of the belief structure. In short, changing culture without changing beliefs cannot happen; changing culture requires a change in beliefs.
6. When a person enters the Pentecostal speech community, they must learn the belief, practices, and communication. Once they are socialized to the beliefs, practices, and speech codes, they are likely to stay in the speech community.
7. The principle arising from the evidence is that a local Pentecostal church's approach to surrounding culture does not influence its expressiveness unless the church conscientiously plans the worship atmosphere and attitude to interact with the surrounding milieu. Churches are likely to adapt the atmosphere and attitude in their worship only when it is felt necessary to make the worship accessible to those people. The level of adaptation will be negotiated within the leadership of the local church to protect aspects of the identity believed to be vital within that local church while still making other aspects of the worship accessible to all people present.
8. The speech community makes worship accessible to outsiders as an act of witness.

Speech Codes Theory Reflections

Through the current research project, I suggest the expansion of Speech Codes Theory, not through the propositions necessarily but a contribution nonetheless.

1. Not only may a speech community have multiple speech codes, but an individual may participate in multiple speech communities using multiple codes. Dual citizenship in religious speech communities and other speech communities points to the participation in multiple codes and the negotiation of identity in a way that preserves those codes.
2. In a religious speech community, the doctrinal belief structure implicates the speech community's speech code(s).
3. To change the beliefs of a speech community, one must change the symbols, meanings, premises, and rules of that community. However, changing the symbols, meanings, premises or rules will change the community in a way that corresponds to the depth of those changes.

Call for Further Study

Several areas of further study are recommended as a result of this study. With the accommodation for supernatural ruptures of people's lives and the expectation of supernatural interventions comes a triumphalism that may cause a personal crisis when the miracle that has been the subject of prayer does not take place. The reactions of people that have not been healed or not received an expected miracle would make for fertile content for a communication study and would make for a particularly insightful interdisciplinary study. A theological explication of what it means for Pentecostals to

experience God awaits consensus within the Pentecostal theological community. The dichotomy of religion and relationship noted within Pentecostalism may represent a broader trend within American spirituality. Comparative studies across many worshipping traditions should be done.

Since tongues-speech was not a centerpiece of this study, a further study would allow it to be resituated in light of the data produced within this study. By design tongues-speech did not dominate the study; however, with other communication trends and speech codes not explicated, tongues-speech may now be situated among the other communicative practices. However, tongues-speech as a gift was not observed in the services I attended. The trend deserves greater study from a communication perspective. While the interview questions did specifically address the “meaning” of tongues-speech the subject rarely came up in the answers to other questions. Other factors were more dominant and readily pervaded answers to diverse questions.

Since tongues-speech is still a central distinguishing characteristic of Pentecostals, the systematic exclusion of it from some worship services suggests a hegemonic control by pastors that is out of step with the prophethood of believers. The contradiction surfaces quickly in analyzing both the communication theology and practices of the speech community. Leaders should carefully consider the implications of practices of order. Pastors should reexamine their hegemony on the practice. Theologians should continue to emphasize the theology behind the democratization of the movement. Researchers should fully consider the influences generate by the contradiction. Worshipers should gently nudge the situation to claim their position as a Spirit empowered communicator.

The combination of giving and witness still resonates as a new practice. Witness still seems to require some form of communication while giving now acts as a common springboard for witnessing. Further research should consider the relationship between witnessing and giving in the surrounding milieu.

Theological Reflections

A theological undercurrent runs throughout my presentation of the findings and analysis. I made every attempt to report the findings as the other rather than an insider of the Pentecostal speech community even though I readily admit the challenges involved with that task. However, several theological reflections deserve mention and flow from my role as an insider. For parsimony, I will limit my reflection to five salient points.

First, while worship was seen by theologians as a central act of Pentecostal theology and spirituality, much of worship theology remains underdeveloped especially at the local church level. When worship is an experience of God's presence or even an intimate encounter with God it misses the Pentecostal point. Since Macchia taught us that Spirit baptism was a central motif for the Christian life (Macchia 2006), the logical extension influences worship theology. A mere experience in God's presence or intimate encounter is not enough. The goal of the worship experience must be an infilling of the believer by the Spirit's presence. While an infilling may be presupposed in experience or encounter, in actuality it infers that a believer goes to worship and leaves after a great moment. Rather, the believer should go to worship with the anticipation of leaving filled with the Holy Spirit, the only adequate mechanism for sustained life transformation. Further, the seven elements of the worship narration I developed, along with the worship

narration of several others, depend on the infilling of the Holy Spirit. The infilling brings the vitality of the resurrection into the believer's everyday life.

The second theological reflection concerns the form of contemporary worship. I have no theological objection to free-flowing worship and personally enjoy it. In the same way, worship as lights, cameras, and smoke machines serves a purpose and does not present a theological objection any more than worshipping in a stained-glass building or a giant tent. While free-flowing worship may remind believers of spiritual deliverance and freedom, it is a poor substitute for actual spiritual freedom. The deliverance-refocus paradigm depends on an authentic work of the Holy Spirit. At this juncture, SCT theory helpfully informs theology because SCT infers that knowledge of the speech code allows one to manipulate those codes to successfully maneuver in the community. One can simulate the deliverance-refocus paradigm through secular means of expressive worship with intense music, lights, and special effects but it will always be a discordant theme without genuine spiritual deliverance. Worship as lights, camera, and smoke machines would be great if it actually reminded people of heaven; instead, I argue it reminds people of a rock concert (which I have shown is part of the strategy) and those two are not exactly the same thing! Genuine deliverance flows from an actual infilling of the Spirit. The ideal type of Pentecostal spirituality depends on an infilling. The worship narration advances only with an infilling of the Holy Spirit. Without an infilling, Pentecostal worship potentially becomes a cheap trick of emotionalism. Whether or not the worship environment includes special effects does not necessarily influence an infilling of the Spirit but leaders must account for the effects incurred by changing the environment.

Third, as I have shown, changing the Pentecostal culture cannot be done without changing the belief structure, even though some would like to try. Having people bring their verbal charismatic gift before leadership for examination shifts the belief structure, but only slightly. While it adds a hegemonic layer, the inter-subjectivity allows for a healthy process of discernment before presentation. In the contemporary worship moment where presentation is important to provide greater accessibility for outsiders, it adds a better communicative presentation than the historic alternative of waiting until a person gives a charismatic gift and discerning if it was from God. The symbolism of addressing an errant prophecy will likely add further confusion for someone new to the speech community. However, shutting out charismatic gifts from public worship all together changes the belief structure. It moves it from a belief that every person can hear from God to a belief that God only speaks to the magisterium.

One of our contributions to the broader theological discourse should come from our great distinctive, communication. I have shown how Pentecostal communication is broader and significantly more complex than only tongues-speech. However, tongues-speech as a symbol provides a useful guideline for all of Christian theology. Religious communication may follow the logic of the incarnation as some have observed (Kraft 1991; Smith 2002) but a narrative theology approach recognizes that the incarnation is not the climax of the Jesus narrative. The climax of the Jesus narrative is the three day drama of the crucifixion and resurrection. The drama of the cross (and resurrection) form the logic of the New Testament; therefore, New Testament worship must follow the logic contained in that drama. The dramatic tension of the crucifixion narrative was not fully resolved at the resurrection as Thomas demonstrated. Rather the narrative tension only

begins to find resolution through the faith of Jesus' followers. Faith in the resurrection drama anticipates the Pentecost event because Jesus himself anticipated Pentecost as a result of the resurrection. While the narrative climax of the Jesus event and the entirety of the biblical narrative is the resurrection of Jesus, the narrative tension was sustained through efforts to bring the followers in line with the mission of Jesus, an effort that culminated at the Pentecost event. Jesus himself anticipated the Pentecost event when he said he had to leave his disciples or else they would not receive the promised Holy Spirit. Therefore, the brief sketch of the Jesus narrative demonstrates that communication must not be limited to an Incarnational view but must follow the narrative logic of the New Testament through crucifixion suffering, resurrection vitality, and an enriched understanding of Pentecostal empowerment. The speech community makes one of its greatest theological contributions through the distinctive of communication.

The social science explication through SCT demonstrates the theological potential anticipated by theologians such as Doran (2005) that social research would inform a theological agenda. By using SCT for the development of communication, the emphasis moves to the church as a speech community. The Pentecostal belief in God's presence entering the worship moment comes to the forefront as more than a nice benefit of worship but *the essential* belief of both worship and ecclesiology. Without the presence of God in the speech community, the co-authorship of God lacks relevance. However, the speech community depends on the co-authorship of God. When God enters the speech community, the community must account for His co-authorship abilities and desires. There are voluminous implications from the dual facts of God entering the speech community and God co-authoring the lives of worshippers. The most important

implication is that God co-authors the lives of Pentecostal believers, sometimes in ways that are not understood by those who interface with them day to day. Ideally believers find their narrative in worship where the presence of God enters and begins to co-author life's script. When the Presence of God fills the interior of a worshipper, that person leaves the worship service with their co-author resident inside and they are equipped to take on the challenges of everyday life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND WORKS CITED

- Ahern, Annette Jean. *Berger's Dual-Citizenship Approach to Religion*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1999.
- Akkoor, Chitra Venkatesh. *Ways of Speaking in the Disapora: Afghan Hindus in Germany*. Dissertation, Communication Studies, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa, 2011.
- Albrecht, Daniel E. "An Anatomy of Worship : a Pentecostal analysis." In *The Spirit and Spirituality : essays in honour of Russell P. Spittler*, edited by Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies, 70-82. New York: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- . *Rites in the spirit : a Ritual Approach to Pentecostal/Charismatic Spirituality*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Albrecht, Daniel E. "Worshiping and the Spirit: Transmuting Liturgy Pentecostally." Chap. 11 in *The Spirit in Worship, Worship in the Spirit*, edited by Teresa Berger and Bryan D. Spinks. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009.
- Alexander, Estrela Y. *Black Fire: One Hundred Years of African American Pentecostalism*. Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011.
- Anderson, Allan. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism :Global Charismatic Christianity*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Anderson, Allan. "Introduction." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Michael Bergunder, Andre F. Droogers, Cornelis van der Laan Allan Anderson, 1-12. Berkeley. CA: University of California Press, 2010a.
- Anderson, Allan. "Varieties, Taxonomies, and Definitions." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder, Andre Droogers and Cornelis van der Laan, 13-29. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010b.
- Anderson, Allan, Michael Bergunder, and Andre F. Droogers. *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Anderson, E. N. "How Much Can we Privilege "Native" Accounts." *American Anthropologist* 95, no. 3 (September 1993): 706-707.

- Anderson, Gordon. "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Part II." *Paraclete* 28, no. 2 (Spring 1994): 13-22.
- Anderson, Kenton. *Choosing to Preach*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006.
- Anderson, Robert Mapes. *Vision of the Disinherited: the Making of American Pentecostalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Aoki, Eric. "Mexican American Ethnicity in Biola, CA: An Ethnographic Account of Hard Work, Family, and Communication." *Howard Journal of Communications* 11, no. 3 (Jul-Sept 2000): 207-227.
- Archer, Kenneth J. *A Pentecostal Hermeneutic for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: T& T Clark, 2004.
- Archer, Kenneth J. "A Pentecostal Way of Doing Theology: Method and Manner." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 9, no. 3 (July 2007): 310-314.
- . *The Gospel Revisited*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2010.
- Assemblies of God Official Web Site*. April 08, 2003.
http://www.ag.org/top/News/index_articledetail.cfm?Process=DisplayArticle&targetBay=ea7fb5b4-34e2-4cd7-99a1-b7ce6556476b&ModID=2&RSS_RSSContentID=2856&RSS_OriginatingChannelID=1184&RSS_OriginatingRSSFeedID=3359&RSS_Source=search (accessed May 1, 2010).
- Austin, J. L. *How to do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Austin-Broos, Diane J. *Jamaica Genesis: Religion and the Politics of Moral Orders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Bangeni, Bongi, and Rochelle Kapp. "Shifting Language Attitudes in a Linguistically Diverse Learning Environment in South Africa." *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development* 24, no. 4 (2007): 253-269.
- Bassett, Deborah R. *"Talk About Nano": Ways of Speaking about Science, Society, and Ethics Among Scientists and Engineers*. Dissertation, Communication, University of Washington, University of Washington, 2009.

- Baxter, Leslie A. "'Talking Things Through' and 'Putting it in Writing': Two Codes of Communication in an Academic Institution." *Journal of Applied Communication* 21, no. 4 (November 1993): 313-326.
- Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Kindle. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- . *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*. Kindle Ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Berger, Peter L. *A Rumor of Angels*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1969.
- . *The Sacred Canopy*. New York: Anchor Books, 1969.
- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1967.
- Berger, Peter, and Anton Zijderveld. *In Praise of Doubt: How to Have Convictions Without Becoming a Fanatic*. New York: Harper One, 2009.
- Bergunder, Michael. "The Cultural Turn." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder and Andre F. Droogers, 51-73. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Berry, Michael, Donal Carbaugh, and Marjatta Nurmikari-Berry. "Communicating Finnish Quietude: A Pedagogical Process for Discovering Implicit Cultural Meanings in Languages." *Language & Intercultural Communication*, November 2004: 261-280.
- Blumhofer, Edith Waldvogel. *Restoring the Faith :The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Bright, John. *The Kingdom of God*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1980.
- Brodwin, Paul. "Pentecostalism in translation: Religion and the production of community in the Haitian diaspora." *American Ethnologist* 30, no. 1 (February 2003): 85-101.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Cadences of Home*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "Rescripting for a Fresh Performance Midst a Failed Script." *Reformed Review* 55, no. 1 (2001a): 5-17.

- . *Texts Under Negotiation: The Bible and Postmodern Imagination*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press Books, 1993.
- . *The Creative Word*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- . *The Prophetic Imagination*. 2nd. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "The Social Nature of the Biblical Text for Preaching." In *Preaching as a Social Act: Theology and Practice*, by Arthur Van Seters, 127-166. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1988.
- . *The Word Militant: Preaching a Decentering Word*. Minneapolis: Fortress Books, 2010.
- . *The Word that Redescribes the World*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 2006.
- Brumback, Carl. *Suddenly ... From Heaven*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1961.
- Brusco, Elizabeth E. *The Reformation of Machismo: Evangelical Conversion and Gender in Colombia*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1995.
- Burgess, Robert G. *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. Boston: George Allen & Unwin, 1984.
- Capenter, Harold R. *Mandate and Mission*. Springfield, MO: Central Bible College Press, n.d.
- Carbaugh, Donal. "Fifty Terms for Talk: A Cross-Cultural Study." *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* 13 (1989): 93-120.
- . *Talking American: Cultural Discourses on DONAHUE*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1988.
- Carey, James W. *Communication as Culture, Revised Edition: Essays on Media and Society*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Carpenter, Harold R. *Mandate and Mission*. Springfield, MO: Central Bible College Press, 1989.
- Carson, D. A. *Christ and Culture Revisited*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

- Carter, Craig. *Rethinking Christ and Culture: A Post-Christendom Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2006.
- Cartledge, Mark J. *Encountering the Spirit: The Charismatic Tradition*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2006.
- . *Testimony in the Spirit: Explorations in Practical, Pastoral and Empirical Theology*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2010.
- Ceja-Zamarripa, Tanya L. "Casting Out Demons: The Native Anthropologist and Healing in the Homeland." *North American Dialogue* 10, no. 1 (April 2007): 11-14.
- Cerroni-Long, E. L. "Introduction: Insider or Native Anthropology?" *Annals of Anthropological Practice* 16, no. 1 (1995): 1-16.
- Chan, Simon. *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Chapell, Bryan. *Christ-Centered Preaching: Redeeming the Expository Sermon*. 2nd. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Chauvet, Marie-Louis. *Symbol and Sacrament*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Coleman, Simon. "Voices: Presence and Prophecy in Charismatic Ritual." Chap. 7 in *Practicing the Faith: The Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin Lindhardt, 198-219. New York: Berghahn, 2011.
- Coleman, Simon. "Words as Things: Language, Aesthetics and the Objectification of Protestant Evangelicalism." *Journal of Material Culture* 1, no. 1 (1996): 107-128.
- Coleman, Simon, and Peter Collins. "The 'Plain' and the 'Positive': Ritual, Experience and Aesthetics in Quakerism and Charismatic Christianity." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 15, no. 3 (2000): 317-329.
- Conn, Charles W. *Like a Mighty Army: A History of the Church of God, 1886-1995*. Definitive. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press, 1994.
- Coutu, Lisa Marie. *Worshipping issues of "debate" and debating issues of "theology": Communication codes in the discourse of and about Robert S. McNamara's "In Retrospect"*. Dissertation, Communication, University of Washington, University of Washington, 1996.

- Cox, Harvey. *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: De Capo Press, 2001.
- Craddock, Fred B. *Overhearing the Gospel*. 2nd. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2002.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. *Flow :The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. Kindle. New York: Harper & Row, 1990.
- Csordas, Thomas J. *Language, Charisma, and Creativity: The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1997.
- Csordas, Thomas J. "Prophecy and the Performance of Metaphor." *American Anthropologist* 99, no. 4 (June 1997): 321-332.
- Csordas, Thomas J. "Ritualization of Life." In *Practicing the Faith: The Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin Lindhardt, 129-151. New York: Berdahn, 2011.
- . *The Sacred Self: A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1994.
- Cucchiari, Salvatore. "Between Shame and Sanctification: Patriarchy and its Transformation in Sicilian Pentecostalism." *American Ethnologist* 17, no. 4 (1990): 687-707 .
- Dayton, Donald W. *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1987.
- Dharmalingam, A., and S. Philip Morgan. "Pervasive Muslim-Hindu Fertility Differences in India." *Demography* 41, no. 3 (Aug 2004): 529-545.
- Dillon, Shaye. *Glossolalia: an Ethnographic Study of the Rhetorical Role of Speaking in Tongues in the Creation of the Pentecostal Religious Culture*. Dissertation, Communication, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI: Wayne State University, 1998.
- Doran, Robert M. *What is Systematic Theology?* Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Driscoll, Mark. *The Radical Reformation: Reaching Out Without Selling Out*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004.

- Droogers, Andre. "Essentialist and Normative Approaches." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder and Andre F. Droogers, 30-50. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Du Bois, John W. "Meaning Without Intention: Lessons from Divination." Chap. 2 in *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*, edited by Jane H. Hill and Judith T. Irvine, 48-71. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Duffield, Guy P., and N. M. Van Cleave. *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology*. Los Angeles, CA: International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, Foursquare Media, 1983.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. New York: Free Press, 1915.
- Epstein, Daniel Mark. *Sister Aimee: The Life of Aimee Semple McPherson*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1993.
- Faupel, D. William. *The Everlasting Gospel: The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*. Sheffield, EN: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Fee, Gordon. *God's Empowering Presence*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- . *Gospel and Spirit: issues in New Testament hermeneutics*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.
- . *Paul, the Spirit, and the People of God*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Fee, Gordon, and Douglas Stuart. *How to Read the Bible For All Its Worth*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981.
- Fenn, Richard K. "Editorial Commentary: Religion and the Secular; the Sacred and the Profane: the Scope of the Argument." In *The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Richard K. Fenn, 3-22. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003.
- Fisher, Walter R. *Human Communication as Narration : Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value, and Action*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1987.
- Gause, R. Hollis. *Living in the Spirit: The way of Salvation*. Revised and Expanded. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2009.

- Gifford, Paul. "The Ritual Use of the Bible in African Pentecostalism." In *Practicing the Faith: the Ritual Life of Pentecostal-charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin Lindhardt, 179-197. New York: Berghahn, 2011.
- Gilbert, Ronald. *From Icons to iPods: Visual Electronic Media Use and Worship Satisfaction*. Dissertation, Communication, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University, 2009.
- Gill, Lesley. "'like a veil to cover them': women and the Pentecostal movement in La Paz." *American Ethnologist* 17, no. 4 (1990): 708-721.
- Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory; Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1967.
- Goffman, Erving. *Interaction Ritual*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.
- Goodman, Felicitas D. *Speaking in Tongues: A Cross-Cultural Study of Glossolalia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Gooren, Henri. "Conversion Narratives." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder and Andre F. Droogers, 93-112. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Green, Nile. "Oral Competition Narratives of Muslim and Hindu Saints in the Deccan." *Asian Folklore Studies* 63, no. 2 (2004): 221-242 .
- Grenz, Stanley J. *The Social God and the Relational Self :A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei. Matrix of Christian Theology. Vol. 1*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Grenz, Stanley J., and John R. Franke. *Beyond Foundationalism*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Grudem, Wayne A. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. 3rd. London, EN: Routledge, 2007.
- Hastings, Sally O. "Asian Indian 'Self-Suppression' and Self-Disclosure: Enactment and Adaptation of Cultural Identity." *Journal Of Language And Social Psychology*, 2000: 85-109.

- Hauerwas, Stanley. "A Story-Formed Community: Reflections on Watership Down." Chap. 9 in *The Hauerwas Reader*, edited by John Berkman and Michael Cartwright, 171-199. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Hayano, David M. "Auto-Ethnography: Paradigms, Problems. and Prospects." *Human Organization* 38, no. 1 (1970): 99-104.
- Hayford, Jack W. *The Beauty of Spiritual Language*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1996.
- . *Worship His Majesty*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Henderson, David W. *Culture Shift: Communicating God's Truth to Our Changing World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998.
- Higgins, John R., Michael L. Dusing, and Rank D. Tallman. *An Introduction to Theology: A Classical Pentecostal Perspective*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1994.
- Holdcroft, L. Thomas. *The Holy Spirit: A Pentecostal Interpretation*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1979.
- Hollenweger, Walter J. "An Introduction to Pentecostalsms." *Journal of Beliefs and Values* 25, no. 2 (August 2004): 125-137.
- . *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- Horton, Stanley M. *Systematic Theology*. WORDSearch ebook. Edited by Stanley M. Horton. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2007.
- Horton, Stanley M. "The Last Things." In *Systematic Theology*, edited by Stanley M. Horton, 597-637. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2007.
- . *What the Bible Says about the Holy Spirit*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1976.
- Huber, Stefan, and Odilo W. Huber. "Psychology of Religion." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder and Andre F. Droogers, 133-155. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Hudson, R. A. "Speech Communities." In *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal Communication: Essential Readings*, edited by Leila Monaghan and Jane E. Goodman, 212-218. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.

- Hunter, George G. *How to Reach Secular People*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1992.
- . "Learn Why." Unpublished Paper, September 4, 2006.
- Hyatt, Eddie L. *2000 Years of Charismatic Christianity*. Dallas, TX: Hyatt International Ministries, Inc, 1996.
- Hymes, Dell. *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality*. Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2004.
- . *Foundations in Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1974.
- Hymes, Dell. "The Ethnography of Speaking." In *Anthropology and Human Behavior*, edited by Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant, 13-53. Washington D. C.: Anthropological Society of Washington, 1962.
- Jacobsen, Douglas. "Introduction: The History and Significance of Early Pentecostal Theology." In *A Reader in Pentecostal Theology: voices from the first generation*, edited by Douglas Jacobsen, 1-17. Bloomington, IN; Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- Jacobs-Huey, Lanita. "The Natives Are Gazing and Talking Back: Reviewing the Problematics of Positionality, Voice, and Accountability among 'Native' Anthropologists." *American Anthropologist* 104, no. 3 (2002): 791-804.
- Jenkins, Philip. *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Jenney, Timothy P. "The Holy Spirit And Sanctification." Chap. 12 in *Systematic Theology*, edited by Stanley M. Horton, 397-421. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2007.
- Johannesen, Stanley. "Third-Generation Pentecostal Language: Continuity and Change in Collective Perceptions." In *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture*, edited by Karla Poewe, 174-199. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.
- Jones, Jimmy Wayne Jr. *Modern American Pentecostalism: the Significance of Race, Class, and Culture in Charismatic Growth. 1900-2000*. Dissertation, University of Arkansas, University of Arkansas, 2002.

- Karkkainen, Veli-Matti. "'Encountering Christ in the Full Gospel Way': An Incarnational Pentecostal Spirituality." *The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 27, no. 1 (2007): 9-23.
- Karkkainen, Veli-Matti. "Pneumatologies in Systematic Theology." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder and Andre F. Droogers, 223-245. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Katriel, Tamar. *Towards a Conceptualization of Ways of Speaking: The Case of Israeli 'Dugri' Speech*. Dissertation, Communication, University of Washington, University of Washington, 1983.
- Keane, Webb. "From Fetishism to Sincerity: On Agency, the Speaking Subject, and their Historicity in the Context of Religious Conversion." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 39, no. 4 (Oct. 1997): 674-693.
- Keanne, Webb. "Religious Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26 (1997): 47-41.
- Keats, Daphne M. *Interviewing: a Practical Guide for Students and Professionals*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2000.
- Kildahl, John P. *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.
- Klaus, Byron D. "Session 5." *Communicating the Gospel to Post-Christian America*. Washington D.C.: Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, July 2003.
- Kraft, Charles H. "Allegiance, Truth and Power Encounters in Christian." In *Pentecost, Mission and Ecumenism Essays on Intercultural Theology*, edited by Jan A. B. Jongeneel, 215-230. New York: Peter Lang, 1992.
- . *Communication Theory for Christian Witness*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991.
- Kraft, Charles H. "Dynamic Equivalence Churches." *Missiology* 1, no. 1 (1973): 39-57.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B Eedrmans, 1974.
- Ladd, George Eldon. "The Gospel of the Kingdom." In *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement*, edited by Ralph D. Winter and Steven C. Hawthorne, 64-72. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1999.

Ladriere, Jean. "The Performativity of Liturgical Language." *Concilium* 82 (1973): 40-62.

Land, Steven Jack. *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*. Kindle. CPT Press: Cleveland, TN, 2010.

Lardner, Gerald V. "Liturgy as Communication: A Pragmatics Perspective." Dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, 1979.

Laurance, John D. "Catherine Bell and Liturgical Theology." *Antiphon* 4, no. 2 (1999): 14-18.

Lawless, Elaine J. *Handmaidens of the Lord: Pentecostal Women Preachers and Traditional Religion*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.

Lewis, C. S. *Mere Christianity*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1952.

Lindhardt, Martin. "Introduction." In *Practicing the Faith*, by Martin Lindhardt, edited by Martin Lindhardt, 1-48. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011a.

Lindhardt, Martin. "Narrating Religious Realities: Conversion and Testimonies in Chilean Pentecostalism." *Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 34, no. 3 (2009): 25-43.

—. *Power in powerlessness : a study of Pentecostal life worlds in urban Chile*. Boston: Brill, 2012.

Lindhardt, Martin. "When God Interferes: Ritual, Empowerment, and Divine Presence in Chilean Pentecostalism." In *Practicing the Faith: the Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin Lindhardt, 220-248. New York: Berghahn, 2011b.

Lofstedt, Torsten. "From Sect to Denomination: The Russian Church of Evangelical Christians." In *Global Pentecostalism*, by David Westerlund, 157-178. London, EN: I.B. Tauris, 2009.

Lonergan, Bernard J. F. *Method in Theology*. Minneapolis: Seabury Press, 1979.

Loscalzo, Craig A. *Apologetic Preaching: Proclaiming Christ to a Postmodern World*. Downer's Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2000.

Lowry, Eugene L. *The Homiletical Plot: The Sermon as Narrative Art Form*. Revised. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

- Luhrmann, T. M. "How Do You Learn to Know That it is God Who Speaks?" In *Learning Religion : Anthropological Approaches*, edited by David Berliner and Ramon Sarró, 83-102. New York: Berhahn, 2007.
- . *When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.
- Luhrmann, Tanya M. "Metakinesis: How God Becomes Intimate in Contemporary U.S. Christianity." *American Anthropologist* 106, no. 3 (2004): 518-528.
- Ma, Wonsuck. "Pentecostal Worship in Asia: Its Theological Implications and Contributions." *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 10, no. 1 (2007): 136-152.
- MacArthur, John, and Master's Seminary Faculty. *Preaching: How to Preach Biblically*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005.
- Macchia, Frank D. *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.
- Macchia, Frank D. "Discerning the Truth of Tongues Speech: A Response to Amos Yong." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 12 (1998b): 67-81.
- Macchia, Frank D. "Groans Too Deep for Words: Towards a Theology of Tongues as Initial Evidence." *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 1, no. 2 (July 1998b): 149-173.
- Macchia, Frank D. "Jesus is Victor: The Eschatology of the Blumhardts with Implications for Pentecostal Eschatologies." In *Perspectives in Pentecostal Eschatologies: World Without End*, edited by Peter Althouse and Robby Waddell, 375-400. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.
- Macchia, Frank D. "Pentecostal and Charismatic Theology." In *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*, edited by Jerry L. Walls, 280-294. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Macchia, Frank D. "Sighs Too Deep for Words: Toward a Theology of Glossolalia." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1 (1992): 47-73.
- Martin, Bernice. "The Pentecostal Gender Paradox: A Cautionary Tale for the Sociology of Religion." Chap. 3 in *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology of Religion*, edited by Richard K. Fenn, 52-66. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2003.

- Martin, David. *Tongues of Fire: The Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America*. Oxford, EN; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1990.
- Martinson, Jay R. *Wesleyan Ways of Speaking: Transforming Experience Through Sunday School Talk*. Dissertation, Speech Communication, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 1994.
- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by Ian Cunnison. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1954.
- McLoughlin, William. *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979.
- McLuhan, Marshall. *The Medium and the Light: Reflections on Religion*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010.
- Menzies, William W. *Anointed to Serve: the Story of the Assemblies of God*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1971.
- Menzies, William W., and Robert P. Menzies. *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Menzies, William W., and Stanley M. Horton. *Bible Doctrines: A Pentecostal Perspective*. WORDsearch CROSS e-book. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2004.
- Meyer, Birgit. "Pentecostalism and Globalization." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theory and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder and Andre F. Droogers, 113-130. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Mittelstadt, Martin William. *Reading Luke-Acts in the Pentecostal Tradition*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010.
- Molina-Markam, Elizabeth. *Listening Faithfully with Friends: An Ethnography of Quaker Communication Practices*. Dissertation, Communication, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 2011.
- Morris, Leon L. *Revelation: Tyndale New Testament Commentaries*. Downer's Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009.
- Mouw, Richard J. *He Shines in All That's Fair: Culture and Common Grace*. Grand Rapids: William. B. Eerdmans, 2002.

Nanez, Rick M. *Full Gospel, Fractured Minds?: A Call to Use God's Gift of the Intellect*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Narayan, Kirin. "How Native is a "Native" Anthropologist?" *American Anthropologist* 95, no. 3 (Sep 1993): 671-686.

Neitz, Mary Jo, and James V. Spickard. "Steps Toward a Sociology of Religious Experience: The Theories of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi and Alfred Schutz." *Sociological Analysis* 51, no. 1 (1990): 15-33.

"Gwendolyn Etter-Lewis and Michèle Foster." In *Hands in the Chit'lins: Notes on Native Anthropological Research among African American Women*, by Linda Williamson Nelson, edited by Gwendolyn Etter-Lewis and Michèle Foster, 183-200. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Nelson, P. C. *Bible Doctrines*. Waxahachie, TX: Southwestern Press, 1934.

Neville, Robert Cummings. *The Truth of Broken Symbols*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. *Christ and Culture*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1956.

Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. "'Native'"Anthropologists." *American Ethnologist* 11, no. 3 (1984): 584-586.

Oliverio, Louis William. *Theological Hermeneutics in the Classical Pentecostal Tradition : a typological account*. Diss. Milwaukee: Marquette University, 2009.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: the Technologizing of the Word*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Our Purpose -- The Foursquare Church. June 6, 2012.
http://www.foursquare.org/about/our_purpose.

Parham, Charles F, and Sarah E. Parham. *Selected Sermons of the late Charles F. Parham and Sarah E. Parham*. Edited by Robert L Parham. Baxter Springs, KS: Apostolic Faith Bible College, 1941.

Parker, Stephen E. *Led by the Spirit : toward a practical theology of Pentecostal discernment and decision making*. Sheffield, EN: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

- Pearlman, Myer. *Knowing the Doctrines of the Bible*. 4th. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1943.
- Percy, Martyn. "Adventure and Atrophy in a Charismatic Movement: Returning to the 'Toronto Blessing'." Chap. 5 in *Practicing the Faith: the Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin Lindhardt, 152-178. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011.
- Philipsen, Gerry. "A Theory of Speech Codes." In *Developing Communication Theories*, edited by Gerry Philipsen and Terrance L. Albrecht, 119-156. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- . "Coming to Terms with Culture." *The Carroll C. Arnold Distinguished Lecture at the National Communication Association*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2008. 1-19.
- Philipsen, Gerry. "Permission to Speak the Discourse of Difference: A Case Study." *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 2000: 213-234.
- . *Speaking Culturally*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Philipsen, Gerry. "Speaking 'Like a Man' in Teamsterville: Culture Patterns of Role Enactment in an Urban Neighborhood." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 1 (1975): 13-22.
- . *The Ethnography of Speaking at the UW*. 2009.
http://gerryphilipsen.com/?page_id=18 (accessed November 23, 2009).
- Philipsen, Gerry, and Donal Carbaugh. "A Bibliography of Fieldwork in the Ethnography of Communication." *Language in Society* 15 (1986): 387-98.
- Philipsen, Gerry, Lisa M. Coutu, and Patricia Covarru. "Speech Codes theory: Restatement, Revisions, and Response to Criticisms." In *Theorizing About Intercultural Communication*, by William B. Gudykunst, 55-68. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2005.
- Plantinga, Cornelius. *Engaging God's World: A Primer for Students*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2002.
- Pollock, John Charles. *George Whitefield and the Great Awakening*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1972.

- Poloma, Margaret M., and John Clifford Green. *The Assemblies of God: Godly Love and the Revitalization of American Pentecostalism*. New York: New York University Press, 2010.
- Poloma, Margaret M., and Ralph W. Hood. *Blood and Fire: Godly Love in a Pentecostal Emerging Church*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Price, Charles. *The Real Faith*. Wichita, KS: EM Publications, 2008.
- Purdy, Vernon L. "Divine Healing." In *Systematic Theology*, edited by Stanley M. Horton, 490-525. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2007.
- Reddin, Opal L. *Power Encounter A Pentecostal Perspective*. Springfield, MO: Central Bible College Press, 1989.
- Riggs, Ralph. *The Spirit Himself*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1949.
- Robbins, Joel. "Anthropology of Religion." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder and Andre F. Droogers, 156-178. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Robbins, Joel. "The Obvious Aspects of Pentecostalism: Ritual and Pentecostal Globalization." In *Practicing the Faith: The Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin Lindhardt, 49-67. New York: Berghahn, 2011.
- Rodgers, John Bryden. *Liturgy and Communication*. Slough, EN: St. Paul Publications, 1975.
- Romaine, Suzanne. *Language in Society*. 2nd. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Ryang, Sonia. "Native Anthropology and Other Problems." *Dialectical Anthropology* 22, no. 1 (1997): 23-49.
- Ryle, Jacqueline. "Laying our Sins and Sorrows on the Altar: Ritualizing Catholic Charismatic Reconciliation and Healing in Fiji." Chap. 2 in *Practicing the Faith: the Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin Lindhardt, 68-97. New York: Berghahn, 2011.
- Samarin, William J. *Tongues of Men and Angels: The Religious Language of Pentecostalism*. New York, NY: MacMillan Company, 1972.

- Scharen, Christian, and Aana Marie Vigen. *Ethnography as Christian Theology and Ethics*. London ; New York: Continuum, 2011.
- Schultze, Quentin J. *Communicating for Life*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- . *High-tech Worship? : Using Presentational Technologies Wisely*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2004.
- Schultze, Quentin J. "Orality and Power in Latin America Pentecostalism." Chap. 3 in *Coming of age: Protestantism in contemporary Latin America*, edited by Daniel R. Miller, 65-88. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.
- Searle, John R. *Intentionality: An Essay in the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge, EN: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, EN: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Sequeira, Debra-L. "Gifts of Tongues and Healing: the Performance of Charismatic Renewal." *Text and Performance Quarterly* 14 (1994): 126-143.
- Sharp, Ethan Philip. *Sharing Testimonios: Narrative Practices, Christian Faiths, and the Formation of Transnational Mexican Communities*. Dissertation, Department of Folklore and Ethnomusicology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2004.
- Shaw, R. Daniel, Charles E. Van Engen, and Lamin Sanneh. *Communicating God's Word in a Complex World*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003.
- Sherrill, John L. *They Speak With Other Tongues*. 40th anniversary. Grand Rapids, MI: Chosen Books, 2004.
- Shoaps, Robin A. "'Pray Earnestly': The Textual Construction of Personal Involvement in Pentecostal Prayer and Song." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12, no. 1 (2002): 34-71.
- Sider, Ronald J. *Churches That Make a Difference: Reaching Your Community with Good News and Good Works*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2002.
- Smart, Ninian. *The World's Religions*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

- Smith, James K. A. *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009.
- Smith, James K. A. "Is There Room for Surprise in the Natural Order? Naturalism, the Supernatural, and Pentecostal Spirituality." In *Science and the Spirit: A Pentecostal Engagement with the Sciences*, edited by James K A Smith and Amos Yong, 34-49. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2010.
- . *Speech and Theology: Language and the Logic of Incarnation*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- . *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy (Pentecostal Manifestos)*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010.
- Spickard, Paul R., and Kevin M. Cragg. *A Global History of Christians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994.
- Stark, Rodney, and Charles Y. Glock. *American Piety*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.
- Steven, James H. S. *Worship in the Spirit: Charismatic Worship in the Church of England*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2002.
- Steven, James. "The Spirit in Contemporary Charismatic Worship." Chap. 13 in *The Spirit in Worship, Worship in the Spirit*, edited by Teresa Berger and Bryan D. Spinks. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009.
- Stewart, Tony K. "In Search of Equivalence: Conceiving Muslim-Hindu Encounter through Translation Theory." *History of Religions* 40, no. 3 (Feb 2001): 260-287.
- Stone, Barton Warren. *The Biography of Barton Warren Stone*. Cincinnati: American Christian Publication Society, 1853.
- Stringer, Martin D. *On the Perception of Worship*. Birmingham: EN: University of Birmingham Press, 1999.
- Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1984.
- . *The Prophethood of All Believers*. Sheffield, EN: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Suurmond, Jean-Jacques. *Word and Spirit at Play: Towards a Charismatic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1995.

- Sweeney, Douglas A. *The American Evangelical Story: A History of the Movement*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Sweet, Len. *The Gospel According to Starbucks: Living with a Grande Passion*. New York: WaterBrook Press, 2007.
- Synan, Vinson. *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century*. 2nd. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997.
- Thomas, Frank A., and Henry M. Mitchell. *They Like to Never Quit Praisin' God: The Role of Celebration in Preaching*. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1997.
- Thompson Klein, Julie. *Crossing Boundaries: Knowledge, Disciplinarity, and Interdisciplinarity*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996.
- . *Interdisciplinarity: History, Theory, and Practice*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1990.
- Tomberlin, Daniel. *Encountering God at the Altar: The Sacraments in Pentecostal Worship*. Cleveland, TN: Center for Pentecostal Leadership and Care, 2006.
- Toulis, Nicole Rodriguez. *Believing Identity : Pentecostalism and the Mediation of Jamaican Ethnicity and Gender in England*. Oxford, NY: Berg, 1997.
- Tozer, A. W. *Wingspread: A. B. Simpson: A Study in Spiritual Altitude*. WORDSearch ebook. Camp Hill, PA: Zur Ltd., 1943.
- Turner, Victor W. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- Tuttle, James E. "The Communicative Impact of Focused Worship." D. Min. Dissertation, Drew University, Madison, NJ, 1982.
- van der Laan, Cornelis. "Historical Approaches." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder and Andre F. Droogers, 202-220. Berkeley: University of California, 2010.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is There a Meaning in that Text?* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin, Charles Anderson, and Michael Sleasman. *Everyday Theology: How to Read Cultural Texts and Interpret Trends*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

- Volf, Miroslav. *After Our Likeness*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *Allah: A Christian Response*. New York: Harper Collins, 2011.
- . *Captive to the Word of God: Engaging the Scriptures for Contemporary Theological Reflection*. Grand Rapids: William B Eerdmans Publishing, 2010.
- Volf, Miroslav. "Forward." In *Unconditional?: The Call of Jesus to Radical Forgiveness*, by Brian Zhand. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2010.
- . *Free of Charge: Giving and Forgiving in a Culture Stripped of Grace*. Kindle. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Volf, Miroslav. "Soft Difference : Theological Reflections on the Relation Between Church and Culture in 1 Peter." *Ex auditu*, 1994: 15-30.
- Vondey, Wolfgang. *Beyond Pentecostalism: The Crisis of Global Christianity and the Renewal of the Theological Agenda*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2010.
- Wacker, Grant. *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Wagner, C. Peter. *Spiritual Power and Church Growth*. Altamonte Springs, FA: Creation House, 1986.
- Walvoord, John F. F. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1971.
- Ward, Mark. "'I Was Saved at an Early Age': An Ethnography of Fundamentalist Speech and Cultural Performance." *Journal of Communication & Religion* 33, no. 1 (2010): 108-144.
- . "Pastor, Preacher, Brother, Ladies: Rhetoric as a Generative Source of Cultural Alienation in American Protestant Fundamentalism." *Conference Papers -- National Communication Association 1*. 2008.
- Warren, Rick. *Purpose Driven Church*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Webber, Robert E. *Ancient Future Worship*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2008.
- . *Worship Old and New*. Revised. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

—. *Worship: Journey into His Presence*. Mansfield, PA: Kingdom Publishing, 1999.

Weber, Max. "The Sociology of Religion." 1915.

West, Richard, and Lynn H. Turner. *Introducing Communication and Theory: Analysis and Application*. 4th. Boston: McGraw Hill, 2010.

Wigglesworth, Smith. *The Teachings Of Smith Wigglesworth: Ever Increasing Faith and Faith that Prevails*. Kindle. Radford, VA: Wilder Publication, 2007.

Wilson, H. S. "Mission and Cultures: Some Paradigms of Encounter." *Asia Journal of Theology* 18, no. 1 (April 2004): 14-32.

Wimber, John, and Kevin Springer. *Power Evangelism*. New York: HarperOne, 1991.

Woods, Robert H., and Paul D. Patton. *Prophetically Incorrect: A Christian Introduction to Media Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2010.

Wright, Bonnie. *Experiencing God : An Ethnography of Pentecostal Worship, Race, and Place*. Dissertation, Detroit, MI: Wayne State University, 2003.

Wyckoff, John W. "The Baptism in the Holy Spirit." In *Systemmatic Theology*, 423-455. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2007.

Yong, Amos. *Spirit-Word-Community : Theological Hermeneutics in Trinitarian Perspective*. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002.

—. *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Yong, Amos. "'Tongues of Fire' in the Pentecostal Imagination: The Truth of Glossolalia in Light of R.C. Neville's Theory of Religious Symbolism." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 12 (1998): 39-65.

Youngblood, John D., and J. Emmett Winn. "Shout Glory: Competing Communication Codes Experienced by the Members of the African American Pentecostal Genuine Deliverance Holiness Church." *Journal of Communication*, 2004: 355-370.

Zahnd, Brian. *Unconditional?: The Call of Jesus to Radical Forgiveness*. Kindle. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 2011.

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PASTORS

1. Tell me a little about yourself.
Do you have Family?
2. How did you get to this church? Tell me the story.
How is this church different from your preceding church?
How is this church different from your home church?
3. What strengths did the church have when you came?
What opportunities were here?
What has happened since you became pastor here?
4. How do your personal strengths fit this church and community?
What factors from your personal history shape your ministry in this location?
5. What does the congregation do best?
6. What are the special needs of the slice of society that effects the ministry of this church?
7. Please describe the slice of society in which your church ministers.
8. What is the church's main business as you see it?
9. How do you articulate the gospel message in this area?
10. What role does Sunday worship play in your church?
11. What is your goal for a church service?
What's most important for a Sunday service?
How do you want the Sunday service to translate into action throughout the week for people in your audience?
12. Who makes up your audience? Tell me about the people here.
What are their needs?
13. What do you preach/teach about worship? Why should people worship?

14. I'd like to ask you some questions about creativity and innovation. Do you strive for creativity in worship?

Do you strive for Innovation in worship?

What is your goal with creativity?

15. How do you serve communion?

How often do you have communion?

16. When do you baptize people in water?

Where?

17. Do you have a time of fellowship before, during, and/or after the service?

The next set of questions will have to do with preaching.

18. Do you emphasize themes and issues in this church which might not be relevant in other locations?

19. How does your slice of society influence your sermons?

20. What sorts of things are relevant for people's lives in this location?

21. How would you describe your style of preaching?

When you get feedback, what does the congregation say about your preaching style?

22. Do you think that there should be contextualization of the message for your location?

In what ways do you articulate the gospel message to connect with the lives of your audience?

23. When you listen to other preachers, do you enjoy personal stories?

24. How do you make use of personal stories in your preaching?

25. How do you make decisions about how much of your personal struggles you will share in a church service?

26. Let's talk about music choice for a little bit. How does the music choice reflect your audience?

Do people ever express a desire for the church to use a different style of music?

How is that handled?

27. How does this church use technology to enhance worship?

How was the decision made to use technology in those specific ways?

Are there draw backs for using technology in worship?

28. Just a few more questions about your services. Now a little bit about prayer. How is prayer used in your services?

Who prays? How Often? How long? In what manner?

Prayer in tongues?

29. When do you lay hands on people for prayer?

30. Do you make use of altar calls?

31. Pentecostal worship is expressed through a variety of physical activity, like clapping. What physical activity is used in your church?

What factors influence how demonstrative your church is in worship?

What does it mean to raise your hands in worship?

Why would people dance in worship?

What other sort of things do people do spontaneously?

32. Sometimes in a worship service there is silence beyond a lapse between speakers. What do you call that silence?

What are the goals of that quiet time?

Is there music playing in the background?

33. How are the gifts of the Spirit expressed in your service?

How do you accommodate outsider's lack of knowledge when the gifts of the Spirit are expressed?

34. Do you make use of some form of personal testimonies in Sunday services?

Are those always done the same way? (For example, video, live, interview, etc)

The next set of questions covers the relationship between the church and your slice of society.

35. Do you feel that you could drop this church into any community and have the things you do resonate with that community?
36. Churches always have things for which they are known. What is your church's image in the community?

If you don't know, what do you hope it will be?
37. Pentecostals have long talked about "the world." How do you talk with the people of your church about the subject?
38. The term "culturally relevant" is currently popular. How does that term apply, or not apply to the ministry of your church?

Do you plan Sunday services to be culturally relevant?
39. How does your local community impact the way people in your church practice their faith?
40. What are your thoughts about the relationship between the church and the surrounding community? Do you see the task as engagement, transformation, developing a counter-culture, or a combination?

Can you give me an example of how this has played out?

Do you think this church influences its community?

Does this community influence how you minister?
41. Many of the questions I have asked discover how this church fits into this particular community.

Is there anything about that topic which you would like to add?

Is there anything you think I should have asked about this subject which you like to see me add for the future?

Thank you very much for your time.

APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CONGREGANTS

I have some general questions about your personal background. They are not intended to pry but to gain a personal context for the rest of your answers.

1. Where do you work?
2. Do you have a spouse or children?
3. What was your highest level of education?
4. Have you always lived in this area?

As we shift topics and begin to talk about your spirituality, I would like to begin with general questions about your involvement in church.

5. What was your relationship with church growing up?
6. What events brought you to this church?
7. How did you come to a relationship with Jesus?

The next group of questions and the majority of my questions will be about your response to the main church service of the week.

8. What role does Sunday worship play in your church?
9. How important is a church service in your life?
What do you expect from a church service?
What is most important for a church service?
10. How is your church different from other churches you have attended?
11. If you met someone in a store and ended up talking about religion and they had never heard about Pentecostal churches and wanted to know what to expect from a service, how would you describe a service to them?
12. What are the differences in your day-to-day life caused by attending Church?
How do you put the Sunday service into action throughout the week?

How do you express your spirituality throughout the week?

13. Would you share a story of a situation where something was different in your life because of something that happened at Church?
14. Does attending church impact the way you communicate in your everyday life?
If so, would you please share an example?
15. If someone asked you why they should actively participate in worship, what would you tell them?
16. Do you consider yourself a Spirit-filled believer?

A Pentecostal?

Is being baptized in the Holy Spirit important for you to live in a different way?

17. The music at your church sounds like a concert. The lighting effects, smoke machines, and special effects make it look like a concert. If it looks like the world, sounds like the world, how is it different from the world?
18. What does it mean to you to raise your hands in worship?
19. Sometimes in Pentecostal churches, I see people go forward and pray at the front. Have you ever prayed at the altar?
What is that like?

You are doing great. There are just a few more questions about worship services.

20. Do you enjoy creativity in worship?
How does creativity make worship meaningful for you?
Is it important that worship be meaningful for you?
21. Pentecostal worship is expressed through a variety of physical activity, like clapping. What physical activity do you use in worship?
22. Do you feel technology enhances church services?
Are there draw backs for using technology in worship?
23. Have you ever been used in the gifts of the Spirit?

Could you tell me about it?

24. Have you ever been healed?
25. Have you ever witnessed a miracle?
26. Do you ever put your hands on people when you pray for them?

What is that like?

What do you think that means?

27. What factors influence how demonstrative your church is in worship?
28. If a friend came to church with you and saw people dancing and asked why people dance in worship, what would you tell them?
29. Sometimes in a worship service there is silence beyond a lapse between speakers. What do you call that silence?

What happens during that quiet time?

30. Does your church make use of some form of personal testimonies in Sunday services?

What do you like about that?

Thank you for your help with talking about quite a few specific Pentecostal activities.

Now I have several questions about sermons.

31. Do the sermons in your church emphasize themes and issues which might not be relevant in other locations?

How does your slice of society influence sermons in your church?

32. Do you enjoy personal stories in sermons?

I have several general questions about your church, your involvement in church, and your church's involvement in the community.

33. How are you involved in the ministries of the church?
34. What does your church do best?

What are the special needs of the slice of society that affects the ministry of this church?

35. What is the church's main business as you see it?
36. If you had the chance to share the gospel with your friends, how would you explain it?
37. When you tell people what church you attend, what is their response?
38. What does it mean when the Bible says that Christians should be different than the world?

Many of my questions explored the way you react to various things in a church service.

39. Is there anything you would like to add about that subject?

Is there anything you think I should have asked about this subject which you would like to see me add for the future?

Thank you very much for your time.

APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW CODES

The words in bold operated as both categories and codes, usually in the most general sense of the category word.

Table. Interview Codes.

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
Affective	28
Love for God	13
Reward	4
Desire	22
Energy	7
Excitement	13
Hope	9
Intimacy	38
Joy	12
Love	42
Motivational	3
Passion	8
Perseverance	3
Refreshed	13
Reverence	2
Scary	2
Strengthening	3
Victory	1
Church Atmosphere	120
Church Calendar	2
Demographics	31
Effective	31

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
Excellence	5
Facilities	8
Finances	14
Religiosity	12
Tradition	3
Weird	43
Community of Believers	114
Bigger Than Me	3
Comfort	15
Connection	40
Diversity	18
Encouragement/Edification	26
event	7
Every Man Communication	23
Hospitality	29
Human Association	10
Individualistic	8
leadership	50
Physical Touch	3
Priesthood	4
Relationships	26
Safe	14
Social Forces	5
Team	85
Tradition	92
Unity	13
Variety	7
Vision	18

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
Expressions	30
Orderly	12
Altar	68
Casual	3
Celebration	4
Cheering on God	10
Clapping	30
Communion	22
Crying	12
Dancing	57
Every Day Communication	28
Experience	28
Eyes Closed	2
Falling	9
Flags/Ribbons	2
Foot washing	1
Guarded	35
Hands On	39
Hands UP	72
Humor	6
Jumping	8
Kneel	19
Music	69
Narrative	5
Painting	1
Participation	32
Performance / Show	12
Physical Activity	86

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
Praise	4
Prostrate	3
Reflection	25
Ritualistic	6
Running Aisles	2
Shaking	1
Shouting	7
Silence	34
sing	13
Spontaneity	18
Standing	4
Stomping Feet	1
Testimonies	86
Tongues	24
Transparency/Authenticate	48
Verbal Interjections	2
Water Baptism	23
Holy Spirit	33
Led by the Spirit	31
Experience God	12
Spirit's Power	26
Miracles	36
Anointing	11
Big God/Faith	44
Flow Through	10
Healing	40
HS Gifts	83
Moving of the Spirit	27

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
Presence of God	52
Spirit Baptism/Filled	20
Voice of the Spirit	98
Interview Points	23
Crisis Point	2
Disclosure- interviewer	8
Turning Point	3
Member	26
Associate Pastor	4
Pastor	20
COG	8
Vineyard	7
AG	31
COGIC	4
Male	38
Female	12
Personal	27
Decision Making	51
Area Living	41
Background	63
Church Background	52
(Ch Back) Discard faith	1
(Ch Back) Baptist	3
(Ch Back) Boring	4
(Ch Back) Catholic	19
(Ch Back) CMA	1
(Ch Back) De-Churched	1
(Ch Back) Lutheran	3

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
(Ch Back) Methodist	2
(Ch Back) Nazarene	2
(Ch Back) Pentecostal	76
(Ch Back) Unchurched	23
(Ch Back) Vineyard	14
Education	36
Family	42
Involvement	27
Job	26
Life Need	13
Prayer	90
Fasting	4
Intercession	10
Revival	3
Slice of Society	275
Serve	51
Compassion	56
Accommodation (Anti-Excessive)	4
Battle	2
Comfortable	7
Contextualization	20
Counter-Culture	8
Cultural Uniqueness	2
Engagement	34
Environment	2
Evangelism	109
Generous Living	4
Holistic	3

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
Image of Church	40
Influence	1
Ministers	18
Missional	10
Missions	21
Needs	28
Outreach	32
Relevant	35
Respect	7
Tension	7
Universality	42
World	72
World Religions	16
Surrender	54
Enthroning God	4
Focused	9
Obedience	17
Transformation	95
Addictions	16
Christ-Likeness	19
Discipleship	5
Equipped/Empower	22
Every Day Difference	38
Forgiveness	10
Freedom	39
Grace	7
Growth	10
Holiness	5

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
Humility	5
Hurt & Pain	11
Idols	3
Live for God	6
Peaceful	8
Positive Attitude	10
Practical Action	10
Purpose	14
Redeemed	21
Relationship With God	60
Renewing Mind	3
Salvation	32
Something Different	12
Something More	6
Training	23
Vices	14
Vitality	13
Word Centered	198
Doctrinal Beliefs	4
Gospel	43
Heaven/Hell	4
Intellectual	24
Message (Method)	12
Satan	54
Sermon	139
Universality of Word	8
Worship	148
Church Service	124

Category/Codes	Total Coded Segments
(Ch Ser) Always Attend	2
(Ch Ser) Central event	3
(Ch Ser) Climax of Week	2
(Ch Ser) Heavily Involved	5
(Ch Ser) Priority	5
(Ch Ser) Very Important	21
Created	5
Creativity	57
Define Worship	8
Deserving (God)	8
Distractions	26
Glory to God	24
Technology	71

APPENDIX D. CHURCHES VISITED**Life Church, Germantown WI**

Date Attended:	July 8, 2011; September 10, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	Four
Service Attended:	Saturday Evening
Estimation of Church Size:	1,000 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Suburban
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Upper Middle Class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Mostly Caucasian

Holy Redeemer Church of God in Christ, Milwaukee, WI

Date Attended:	July 10, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	Two
Service Attended:	Second service
Estimation of Church Size:	2,500 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Urban
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Lower class to Middle Class
Congregation Ethnicity:	African American

Oak Creek Assembly of God, Oak Creek, WI

Date Attended:	July 24, 2011; October 23, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	Three
Service Attended:	Sunday evening, both times
Estimation of Church Size:	2,500 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Suburban
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Diverse range from Lower to Upper Class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Very Diverse

Red Mountain Christian Center, Mesa, AZ

Date Attended:	July 20, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	Four, one in Spanish
Service Attended:	Saturday Evening
Estimation of Church Size:	1,000 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Suburban
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Middle class to Upper middle class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Partially Caucasian, partially Hispanic

Holy Trinity Church of God in Christ, Mesa AZ

Date Attended:	July 31, 2011
----------------	---------------

Number of Weekend Services:	One, Sunday morning
Estimation of Church Size:	100 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Urban
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Lower Middle Class
Congregation Ethnicity:	African American

Church on the Green, Sun City West, AZ

Date Attended:	July 31, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	Three
Service Attended:	Sunday evening
Estimation of Church Size:	500-1,000 people (Retirement community)
Type of Neighborhood:	Retirement community
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Middle Class to Upper Class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Caucasian

East Mountain Vineyard, Albuquerque, NM

Date Attended:	August 7, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	One, Sunday morning
Estimation of Church Size:	25 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Suburban
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Upper Middle Class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Caucasian and Hispanic

Believer's Tabernacle, Wichita, KS

Date Attended:	August 13, 2011; August 14, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	Four, one in Spanish
Service Attended:	Saturday evening and First Sunday morning
Estimation of Church Size:	1,000 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Urban
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Lower class to Upper Class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Caucasian, African American, Asian

Rochester Church of God, Rochester, IN

Date Attended:	September 25, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	One, Sunday morning
Estimation of Church Size:	100 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Rural
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Lower Middle class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Caucasian

Vineyard Community Church, Coralville, IA

Date Attended:	October 2, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	Two
Service Attended:	Second service
Estimation of Church Size:	250 people
Type of Neighborhood:	Suburban
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Upper middle class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Caucasian

New Hope Church of God, Sevierville, TN

Date Attended:	October 30, 2011
Number of Weekend Services:	One, Sunday morning
Estimation of Church Size:	500 People
Type of Neighborhood:	Mid-size City
Estimate of Socio-economic status:	Middle Class
Congregation Ethnicity:	Caucasian (mostly), African American