JOHANNINE ROOT OF PENTECOSTALISM:
JOHANNINE SELF-UNDERSTANDING AS AN ARCHETYPE OF
PENTECOSTAL SELF-UNDERSTANDING

Dongsoo Kim

1.   Introduction

What is the essence of Pentecostalism? In what respect does Pentecostalism radically differ from evangelicalism and fundamentalism? What are the historical or biblical roots of Pentecostalism? Historical theologian Donald Dayton suggests that the historical roots of Pentecostalism can be traced in Wesleyanism and American revival movements in the nineteenth century.[1] An evangelical theologian Alister McGrath holds that Pentecostalism is not so much different from evangelicalism except for the doctrine of the Spirit-baptism.[2] A biblical scholar Roger Stronstad argues that Lukan theology of Spirit-baptism, which is believed to be the cardinal doctrine of Pentecostalism, is the biblical basis of Pentecostal theology.[3]

This study concerns the biblical (and New Testament in particular) roots of Pentecostalism. Roger Stronstad was a pioneer in this area when he published *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* in 1984. Following in his steps, Gordon D. Fee, Robert P. Menzies and many other scholars have endeavored to find New Testament foundations of Pentecostalism.[4]

---

[1] Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987).

[2] Alister McGrath, *Evangelicalism and the Future of Christianity* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1995).

[3] Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984).

[4] Cf. Craig S. Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997); Blaine Charette, *Restoring Presence: The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Paul Elbert,

Whereas scholars may suggest new ideas and concepts regarding the subject, they have been one in believing that biblical foundation of Pentecostal theology is to be primarily found either in the Lukan two volume writings[5] or in Pauline epistles.[6] There have been a few who have tried to find Pentecostal theology in the Synoptic Gospels;[7] there have been few scholars who have tried to find Pentecostal roots in the Johannine writings.[8]

"Spirit, Scripture and Theology through a Lukan Lens: A Review Article," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13 (1998), pp. 55-75; Archie W. D. Hui, "Spirit-Fullness in Luke-Acts: Technical and Prophetic?," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 17 (2000), pp. 24-38; Gregory J. Leeper, "The Nature of the Pentecostal Gift with Special Reference to Numbers 11 and Acts 2," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 6 (2003), pp. 23-38; Youngmo Cho, "Spirit and Kingdom in Luke-Acts: Proclamation as the Primary Role of the Spirit in Relation to the Kingdom of God in Luke-Acts," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 6 (2003), pp. 173-97.

[5] Cf. Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); William W. Menzies and Robert P. Menzies, *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000); Roger Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Characteristic Theology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Paul Elbert, "Pentecostal/Charismatic Themes in Luke-Acts at the Evangelical Theological Society: The Battle of Interpretive Method," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 12 (2004), pp. 181-215.

[6] Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994); idem, *Paul, the Spirit, and the People of God* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996); Steve Summers, "'Out of Mind for God': A Social-Scientific Approach to Pauline Pneumatology," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13 (1988), pp. 77-106.

[7] Cf. John Christopher Thomas and Kimberly Ervin Alexander, "'And the Signs Are Following': Mark 16.9-20—A Journey into Pentecostal Hermeneutics," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11 (2003), pp. 147-70; Emerson B. Powery, "The Spirit, the Scripture(s), and the Gospel of Mark: Pneumatology and Hermeneutics in Narrative Perspective," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11 (2003), pp. 184-98; Robert W. Wall, "A Response to Thomas/Alexander, 'And the Signs Are Following' (Mark 16.9-20)," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11:2 (2003), pp. 171-83.

[8] There are some exceptions. Cf. Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987); Robert P. Menzies, "John's Place in the Development of Early Christian Pneumatology," in *The Spirit and Spirituality: Essays in Honour of Russell P.*

In this scholarly atmosphere, am I too bold to suggest that biblical roots of Pentecostalism can be traced in Johannine theology? At first sight this appears to be fruitless as one cannot find any Pentecostal distinctive practices in the Johannine writings such as exorcism, tongue-speaking, or the spiritual gifts. Yet if one seeks to find the essence of Pentecostalism not in those practices, but in the self-identity of Pentecostal community, I suggest one can find an archetype of Pentecostal self-identity in the Johannine writings.

It is my thesis of this study that a Pentecostal type of self-identity can be primarily found in that of Johannine community among the diverse Christian communities in the first-century. First, this study will argue that the essence of Pentecostalism is to be sought in the self-identity of Pentecostal churches.[9] Further, I will show that both Johannine community and Pentecostal community have similar self-identity as correctives to the established churches. Pentecostal churches are critical to the mainline churches regarding the right relationship with God. Pentecostals pursue right relationship with God through the experience of the Holy Spirit.[10] I will show that this type of community can be traced in Johannine community in the New Testament times.

2.   Pentecostal Self-Understanding as a Corrective

2.1 The Essence of Pentecostalism

What is the essence of Pentecostalism? Is Pentecostalism different from the other Christian denominations in its understanding of the Spirit-baptism? Is its emphasis on the experience of the supernatural through the Holy Spirit a trait of Pentecostalism?[11] Is the emphasis on the eager

Spittler, eds. Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies (London: T & T Clark, 2004), pp. 41-52.

[9] Cf. Amos Yong, "The Marks of the Church: A Pentecostal Re-Reading," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 26 (2002), pp. 45-67.

[10] Pentecostals find their self-identity in their interest in the right and personal relationship, whereas the Roman Catholics concern right structure of the church and the Reformed churches the right doctrine. Cf. Steven J. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), pp. 41-42.

[11] Kenneth J. Archer, "Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 8 (1996), pp. 63-81 (64): "The essence of

prayer essential characteristic of Pentecostalism?[12] Does the tongue-speaking as an initial evidence for the Spirit-baptism mark Pentecostalism? Or is "the passion for the kingdom" the core of Pentecostalism?[13]

True, the above traits are the characteristics of Pentecostal theology. Any single element among the characteristics, however, does not constitute the essence of Pentecostalism. As Pentecostalism is so diverse these days, it cannot be categorized into a single trait.[14] It will be more fruitful to find Pentecostal distinctive in the self-identity of Pentecostal community rather than in its doctrines. Cheryl Bridges Johns has already suggested that essence of Pentecostalism can be primarily found in its self-identity and self-definition.[15]

2.2 Pentecostal Self-Understanding as a Corrective

How can we describe the self-identity of the Pentecostal community? To begin with, in the sense that Pentecostal community seeks the full gospel, latter rain, apostolic faith, Pentecostal spirituality, it started as a revival or a renewal movement.[16] In the sense that it seeks to reform established Christianity, it is a refreshing corrective. D. William Faupel defines Pentecostal movement "as a critique directed at an emerging fundamentalism which was attached itself to the Old Princeton

---

Pentecostalism is its persistent emphasis upon the supernatural within the community."

[12] Cf. Dongsoo Kim, "Lukan Pentecostal Theology of Prayer: Is Persistent Prayer Not Biblical," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 7 (2004), pp. 205-17.

[13] Steven J. Land (*Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*) believes that eschatology is the core of Pentecostalism for the first ten years of the movement.

[14] Cf. W. Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997).

[15] Cf. Cheryl Bridges Johns, "The Adolescence of Pentecostalism: In Search of a Legitimate Sectarian Identity," *Pneuma* 17 (1995), pp. 3-17.

[16] Cf. Mark W. G. Stibbe, "The Theology of Renewal and the Renewal of Theology," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993), pp. 71-90; Peter D. Hocken, "A Charismatic View on the Distinctiveness of Pentecostalism," in *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*, eds. Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 96-106 (102).

Theology."[17] According to Michael Harper, it "was in part a reactionary movement" against sacramentalism of the Catholic churches and against the enslaving of the Spirit to the doctrines of the Protestant Reformation.[18] In other words, one of the *raisons d'etre* of the Pentecostal movement has been a revitalization of established, mainline Christianity. The restoration and revitalization of spiritual power of the apostolic predecessors is claimed to be crucial to revitalize Christianity.

In a sociological term Pentecostal movement can be described as a sectarian movement, not in the sense that it is heretic but in the sense that it is critical against the "orthodoxism" of the established churches.[19] As a sectarian movement Pentecostal community was at odds with the established churches.[20] Importantly, however, it did not go so far as to quit having further fellowship with the other forms of Christianity. At the present time after its centennial celebration, Pentecostalism goes beyond its adolescence into adulthood.[21] It began absorbing in one of the mainline churches. For instance, Pentecostal community as one of the responsible members participated in the ecumenical dialogue with the Catholics, as well as with other Protestant churches. Further, Pentecostal community has an active role to play in the theological scholarship.

3. Johannine Community as a Corrective

My concern in this study is whether or not Pentecostal self-identity as a corrective can be justified theologically. If we can justify Pentecostal

---

[17] D. William Faupel, "Whither Pentecostalism?," *Pneuma* 15 (1993), pp. 9-27 (21).

[18] Michael Harper, "The Holy Spirit Acts in the Church, Its Structures, Its Sacramentality, Its Worship and Sacraments," *One in Christ* 12 (1976), pp. 319-28 (320); cf. Veli-Matti Karkkainen, "Church as Charismatic Fellowship: Ecclesiological Reflections from the Pentecostal-Roman Catholic Dialogue," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 18 (2001), pp. 100-21 (106).

[19] I borrowed the term from Charles Augustus Briggs, *Whither? A Theological Question for the Times* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1889). He uses "orthodox" in a positive sense and "orthodoxism" in a negative sense.

[20] For sectarian identity of Pentecostalism, see Cheryl Bridges Johns, "The Adolescence of Pentecostalism: In Search of a Legitimate Sectarian Identity," *Pneuma* 17 (1995), pp. 3-17.

[21] Cf. John Christopher Thomas, "Pentecostal Theology in the Twenty-First Century," *Pneuma* 20 (1998), pp. 3-19.

self-identity, in what sense can we do that? Is it possible for us to trace a precedent in the scripture? In this study I suggest that the self-identity of the Johannine community can be a biblical precedent for that of Pentecostal community.

How can we define the self-identity of Johannine community? There are several ways to do it. I attempt to show that Johannine Christianity was a corrective within early Christianity. It was a refreshing corrective and challenge to mainline Christianity in the first century.

3.1 Johannine Self-Identity

In what respects can one find the self-identity of Johannine community? One can find it through Johannine attitude towards the other forms of Christianity in the first century. What appears to be an initial difficulty here is the fact that the Gospel of John does not include any direct confrontational or critical claims against contemporary Christianity. There are, however, some undercurrent implications of the Johannine attitudes against the mainline churches.

Especially, the sophisticated relationship between Peter and the Beloved Disciple (BD hereafter) implies the Johannine stance *vis-à-vis* apostolic Christianity.[22] Further, if scholars reach a general consensus that Peter and the BD are symbolic (or representational) figures for respective communities in John, the pictures of Peter and the BD and the relationship of the two disciples depicted in the Gospel of John will suggest the nature of the relationship between Johannine community and the apostolic. If Peter represents the mainline (or apostolic) church and the BD stands for the Johannine community, the nature of the relationship of the two disciples refers to the attitude of the Johannine community towards the apostolic church.

---

[22] There have been divergent suggestions regarding the symbolism of Peter and the BD. For R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), the BD is the representative of the Gentile Christianity, whereas Peter is representative for Jewish Christianity. For David J. Hawkin, "The Function of the Beloved Disciple Motif in the Johannine Tradition," *Lavel theologique et philosophique* 33 (1977), pp. 130-50 (146), Peter represents for the *Gesamtkirche* (the whole church) and the BD the Johannine *Einzelkirche* (a local church). For Alv Kragerud, *Der Lieblingsjunger im Johannesevangelium: Ein Exegetischer Versuch* (Hamburg: Grosshaus Wegner, 1959), pp. 65-67, the BD represents for a pneumatic circle (*Geist*), and Peter is symbolized as ecclesiastical office (*Amt*). For further discussions, see K. Quast, *Peter and the Beloved Disciple: Figures for a Community in Crisis* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), pp. 9-10.

There are two basic and conflicting views currently held with regard to the relationship between Peter and the BD. For some, it can be described as "rivalry, or hostility,"[23] for others, it is "friendship or trust."[24] The real picture of Johannine understanding of the relationship seems to be in between. Or, it is depicted to be deliberately ambivalent? The Johannine community, whose community was identified by the BD, contained elitism over against the mainline church, which was represented by Peter. Yet the Johannine community did not break off communion with the apostolic community. In the words of O. Cullmann, "On the one hand it deliberately maintains its own independence, but on the other it is convinced of the need for mutual supplementation in the common interest."[25]

The story of "visiting the empty tomb" (John 20:1-10) shows it explicitly. There is competition between Peter and the BD to reach the empty tomb first. "The two men running together, but the disciple [BD] outran Peter and reached the tomb first" (v. 4). One can perceive that the Fourth Evangelist gives superiority to the BD. This is confirmed in the following verse where the BD is introduced as "the other disciple who reached the tomb first" (v. 8). Peter had the special position in early Christianity; the BD had the leadership of the Johannine community. This implies that the Evangelist intends to claim the priority of his community *vis-à-vis* the mainline Christianity. Importantly, however, the Evangelist does not intend to detract from Peter. Peter is highly regarded throughout the story. The BD yields to Peter in entering the tomb.

3.2 Johannine Community as a Corrective

3.2.1 Johannine images of the church

We can find the nature of the Johannine community through the images of the community in the Gospel of John insofar as they are reflections of the self-identity of the Johannine community.

---

[23] Among others, see E. L. Titus, *The Message of the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Abingdon, 1957), p. 220; Graydon F. Snyder, "John 13:16 and Anti-Petrinism of the Johannine Tradition," *Biblical Research* 16 (1971), pp. 5-15; A. H. Maynard, "The Role of Peter in the Fourth Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984), pp. 531-48.

[24] Among others, see O. Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr* (London: SCM, 1953); Quast, *Peter and the Beloved Disciple*, pp. 9-10.

[25] O. Cullmann, *The Johannine Circle* (London: SCM, 1976), p. 55.

The shepherd discourse (John 10:1-18) and the vine discourse (John 15:1-17) are two main texts for Johannine images of the church. The most salient common characteristic of the images is its exclusively Christological orientation. The centrality of Jesus is unmistakable in the images. In both, with the solemn phrase ἐγώ εἰμι, Jesus proclaims that he is the shepherd and the vine. In order to have eternal life and have it abundantly (10:10), the sheep are bound to the shepherd. In order to keep alive, the branches must remain in the vine. The disciples can do virtually nothing without having an organic relationship with Jesus (15:5).

The Christocentric images of the church are not peculiar to John in the New Testament. It is also typically seen in the Pauline images of the church such as the "body of Christ." However, the degree of Johannine Christocentricity cannot be comparable with that in the other New Testament writings. In the Johannine images Jesus himself is the new Israel. Therefore, in John it is only through having intimate union with Jesus that the disciples can be a part of the Church. In Paul, by contrast, Jesus as the head of the body, together with the disciples as the members of the body, represent the church.

Another common characteristic of the images is that the Christocentricity is indivisibly woven into the union between Jesus and each believer. Both images insist similarly "upon the importance of an intimate personal relationship with Jesus."[26] The union is based on reciprocal knowledge and reciprocal immanence, which is to be recognized by love for one another in the community. This reciprocal knowledge is not superficial; it is even patterned to the Father-Son relationship: "just as (καθὼς) Father knows me and I know the Father" (10:15). The Greek word γινώσκω, especially in John, denotes not an intellectual knowledge but a living personal bond between personalities.

The emphasis on the union of each believer with Jesus is shown even more clearly in the vine discourse (John 15:1-17). As no branch can exist without being in living contact with the vine, the necessity of dwelling (or remaining) in Jesus is continuously mentioned (ten times in vv. 4-10). The Johannine phrase μένω ἐν (vv. 4-6) is used to express the close relationship between Jesus and each believer. Here the "dwelling in" is also reciprocal as "knowing" is in the shepherd discourse.

In short, the distinctive character of the Johannine images of the church can be found in their Christological orientation expressed by the

---

[26] John Ashton, *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 131.

centrality of Jesus and by the emphasis on the personal union of each believer with the head of the church.

How can we interpret this distinctive Johannine expression with regard to the images of the church? Some scholars tried to find such distinctiveness in the concepts of the other religions. This endeavor was proven to be fruitless. Others claimed that such distinctiveness became to be made while Johannine community was fighting against the Jewish authorities. This theory appears attracting in that it explains the Christocentric orientation of the shepherd discourse. However, it does not explain why the theme of individual union of the sheep is woven with the shepherd.

I suggest that we may read from it a corrective voice *vis-à-vis* mainline Christianity in the late first century, the time when the Gospel of John was written. At that time, primitive church was becoming institutionalized; especially the Pastorals evince a development towards the "Great Church." Johannine shepherd discourse could be read against this background. For John the core element of the church was none other than Jesus himself. On the part of the church members, the close individual union of each member with Christ was indeed the *sine qua non* of church life. For John, the vertical relationship must be the basis for the horizontal relationship in the church. Accordingly, this voice was critical to the tendency of the contemporary mainline church, whose direction was headed unfortunately towards institutionalization.

This voice, however, was not so expressively critical as to detract from the mainline church, as is implied where Peter and the BD appear together. It was similar to the voice of the prophets in the Old Testament who had served as corrective to the contemporary Jewish religious tendencies. The fact that the Johannine voice was prophetic can be an explanation why Johannine Christianity was easily incorporated into the Great Church in the second century. Prophets tended to disappear after their missions were completed. I believe that Johannine Christianity was exactly such a case.

3.2.2 Johannine church order

Johannine church order confirms that Johannine ecclesiology can be read as a corrective against the institutional tendency of Christianity in the late first century. As is well recognized, at that time the Pastorals evince the development towards the institutionalization of the church.

The Gospel of John, according to James D. G. Dunn, is the clearest witness to this resistance to institutionalization.[27]

There is no direct reference to church officials in John except for chapter 21, which is considered as a later addition. The term "apostle," obviously an essential office for church order in the New Testament writings, is completely absent in John. The "twelve" (disciples) are mentioned (6:67, 70, 71; 20:24), but they are not depicted as privileged. Although John does not lose the aspect that Peter is the representative of the twelve, he does not give Peter such a prominent position among the twelve, as do the Synoptic Evangelists (cf. Matt 16:16; 17:24; 18:21). Rather the BD makes an appearance as the disciple *par excellence*.

These facts led some scholars to hold that in John there is no concept of any ministry or any office. For example, E. Schweizer claims that John "has no priests or officials. There is no longer even any diversity of spiritual gifts.… There is no church order at all."[28] Admittedly, in John there is no direct reference to church officials. This, however, does not mean that the ministerial idea is completely absent. There are several passages in which a leadership position for mission is implied (4:35-38; 13:20; 21:15-17).

In order to answer the question as to whether there exists church order in John, the qualification of the phrase "church order" is required. If we attempt to find church order similar to that in the Pastorals or in Ignatius of Antioch, we cannot find such kinds of church order in John. But if we recognize that John depicts church order with his own way and expression, we can find it in John.

The most striking characteristic of Johannine church order is that all believers are equally described as disciples; both men and women are equally classified. The "twelve (disciples)" are distinguished from "many disciples," but they are preferably called "disciples." In the words of R. E. Brown, in John, "there are no second-class Christians in terms of status." They are called "brothers" (20:17) or "friends" (15:13-15), the titles which imply democratization of the leadership in the church. What is of crucial importance is not apostleship or church office, but discipleship, "a status that all Christians enjoy."[29]

---

[27] James D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 1990), p. 118.

[28] E. Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1961), p. 127.

[29] R. E. Brown, *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (New York: Paulist, 1979), p. 91.

This Johannine egalitarianism stands in sharp contrast to the tendencies in late first-century Christianity. At that time church had a tendency to become institutionalized; church order became rigid rather than flexible. Women, in particular, did not have any leading role to play in the church (cf. 2 Tim 3:1-9). In contrast, in John men and women are equally described as the disciples. In John greatness is determined by a loving relationship to Jesus, not by function, office, or even gender.

3.3 Johannine Community and the Mainline Church

Johannine community was a refreshing corrective to the mainline churches in the late first century. It fulfilled its task as a refreshing corrective. Then we cannot trace the history of Johannine community from mid-second century. What happened? It probably became absorbed into the mainline churches after it fulfilled its task.

In a sense, the Johannine voice was a challenge to the mainline Christianity. John was critical against the other Christian groups in terms of its ecclesiology. Importantly, however, John's challenge did not detract from them. John's role was similar to that of the prophets in Israel whose main role was to challenge the contemporary mainline religious tendencies against God and awakened the complacent mass from their slowly fossilizing religiosity. What John had done was to challenge the church to place the living union with Jesus, not only above the fellowship among Christians, but also above church organization. Thus, John's challenging voice, as those of the prophets were, was "from within the heart of the Christian Church."[30]

4. Conclusion

This study is concerned with a biblical root of Pentecostalism. I have shown that Pentecostal self-identity has a precedent in the self-identity of Johannine community. There is another area which is not dealt with in this study, but which can further support my thesis. Johannine and Pentecostal community have in common that both seek their self-identity through the Spirit.[31] In the Gospel of John there is no Christian

---

[30] Thomas L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 150.

[31] Cf. D. Moody Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 79.

community without the Spirit; needless to say, it is likewise in the Pentecostal community.

The New Testament does not provide us with the single model of Christianity. Rather, it reveals to us several different types or ideals of communities, which were formed in different environments where communities were situated. James D. G. Dunn detects several models of the New Testament communities: charismatic (as in Paul's genuine letters), early Catholic (as in Pastorals) and Piestic (as in Johannine Gospel and letters).[32] He suggests that the closest parallel of Johannine Christianity in Christian history was the American Holiness movement in the nineteenth century in that it was characterized by "emphasis on the spiritual experience of the individual, and perfectionist in tendency."[33]

Based on the above observation, am I suggesting beyond credulity to hold that Pentecostal movement had a similar stance to Johannine community with regard to its stance against mainline Christianity and that a biblical root of Pentecostal self-identity can be found in the self-identity of the Johannine community?

---

[32] James D. G. Dunn, "Models of Christian Community in the New Testament," in *Strange Gifts?: A Guide to Charismatic Renewal*, eds. David and Peter Mullen (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984), pp. 1-18.

[33] Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*, p. 199.