

Regnum Studies In Mission

Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies Series 3

Asian and Pentecostal

The Charismatic Face of Christianity in Asia

edited by

Allan Anderson

and

Edmond Tang

Foreword by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr.

2005



8

CONSTRUCTING INDIAN PENTECOSTALISM: ON ISSUES OF METHODOLOGY AND REPRESENTATION

Michael Bergunder

What is Pentecostalism? The academic study of and the discussion within the Pentecostal movement up to now shows that this is a very complex question. A wide range of answers has been given, reaching from extremely narrow definitions to very broad ones. Certain circles of White Pentecostalism in the United States, for instance, sometimes try to narrow down Pentecostalism to a sub-category of American evangelicalism. In sharp contrast to that stands the approach of David Barrett, who considers a very broad variety of churches, organizations and networks as representative of Pentecostalism. Current Pentecostal and non-Pentecostal academic study tends to use such a broad understanding of Pentecostalism; and when it comes to statistics even Pentecostals (who otherwise count themselves as evangelicals) refer to Barrett's findings that c. 25% of World Christianity is Pentecostal.

Admittedly, a narrow understanding has some real advantages. It would enable a comprehensive definition of Pentecostalism, because a clear-cut dogmatic basis could be formulated (e.g. evangelicalism plus

tongues speaking as initial evidence of Spirit baptism) and an institutional framework assigned (e.g. Pentecostal member-churches of the National Association of Evangelicals). Nevertheless, its heuristic value would be very limited as it is absolutely counterintuitive and arbitrarily separates phenomena that belong together. As the acceptance of Barrett's figures already indicates, even the most evangelical oriented Pentecostals refer in certain contexts to more inclusive identities of Pentecostalism.

From an academic point of view there is no alternative to a broad understanding of Pentecostalism, but so far not much has been done to substantiate this approach in a methodologically satisfying manner. The most serious problem lies in the fact that a broad understanding of Pentecostalism neither refers to a common dogmatic basis nor to a common institutional framework (international umbrella organizations like the Pentecostal World Conference only cover very tiny fragments of the Pentecostal movement). Nevertheless academic research of the last decades has proved the usefulness of a broad understanding of Pentecostalism as a single global phenomenon. But its unity can't be described in the way traditional church history deals with Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Lutheranism and so on. New ways should be found to trace an international discursive network called Pentecostalism.

Looking at the current discussion, three complexes of questions seem to be most hotly debated in the context of constructing Pentecostalism. First: did Pentecostalism originate in the United States and spread out to the rest of the world from there? Second: how is it possible to define Pentecostalism as a global religious movement in a meaningful manner without resorting to specific theological tenets as a basis for definition? Third: how is Pentecostalism to be described within regional contexts (the question of 'indigenous' Pentecostalism)? This article searches for models to answer these three questions more appropriately and it will test their heuristic value on Indian cases. If it proves possible to make some progress in this complexity of problems, a better theoretical understanding of Pentecostalism could be the result.

The first two sections of this article are written from a strictly historical point of view with no immediate theological agenda in mind, though I am fully aware that 'historiographical perspectives are not just history' but that they may 'express and articulate theological visions'.⁹ Therefore I

will explicitly refer to theological implications where I am aware of my own theological concerns. Compared with the other two, the third section is explicitly theological though I am trying to avoid getting too much into normative issues.

Beginnings of Pentecostalism

In the last few decades vigorous historical research into the beginnings of the Pentecostal movement has started. This has been done to a great extent by Pentecostal scholars themselves who tried to overcome an uncritical, more or less hagiographical tradition of telling about the beginnings as was common within their churches. This tradition, often called the 'providential approach', was based on the belief that Pentecostalism was 'a spontaneous, providentially generated, [world wide] end-time religious revival, a movement fundamentally discontinuous with 1,900 years of Christian history'; but such a notion is hardly compatible with academic history. Therefore the "new" Pentecostal historiography' is trying to relate the emergence of Pentecostalism to nineteenth century theological roots and to its contemporary social and cultural context. It was Donald Dayton's *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (1987) that set the standard for that new endeavour.¹⁰ Dayton argued in a richly textured historical analysis that the theological patterns of Pentecostalism could be traced back to nineteenth century Wesleyan, Reformed, and Higher Life holiness circles in the United States. At the turn of the twentieth century, this vast network of holiness institutions and movements constituted 'a sort of pre-Pentecostal tinderbox awaiting the spark that would set it off'.¹¹ Numerous important studies have come out more recently that further prove the continuity between Pentecostalism and nineteenth century popular American evangelicalism, though there are discussions about the details (e.g. Wesleyan versus Reformed roots).¹² Pentecostal and non-Pentecostal historians now consider Topeka and Azusa Street as the outcome of a specific American (and to some extent British) religious history.

As a side effect, this strict historical approach rejects the notion that Pentecostalism was a worldwide revival from its very beginnings. This thesis of multiple, worldwide origins of Pentecostalism was the popular self-understanding of early Pentecostals and became an integral part of the providential historical self-understanding in Pentecostal circles (e.g.

it is part of the famous popular histories of Donald Gee and Stanley H. Frodsham).¹² Nevertheless, from an academic point of view, this kind of Americanization of Pentecostal historiography seemed to be inevitable; as Robeck rightly states: '... without wishing to be triumphalistic, the evidence gathered in all serious quests for origins of the modern Pentecostal movement appears inevitably to point to North America'¹³. However it is not without problems that historiography now runs counter to the early Pentecostal self-understanding as a global movement and that worldwide Pentecostalism becomes necessarily the result of Pentecostal missionary work from North America. Especially among scholars who focus their research on the non-western Pentecostal movement, there is a certain uneasiness with such an American-centred history as this doesn't seem to do justice to the multifaceted and global nature of the Pentecostal phenomenon.

In the following, I would like to offer a way out of the dilemma when I argue that there is an additional historical root of Pentecostalism that has been somewhat neglected as a distinctive category so far: the *missionary movement*. The nineteenth century, up to the beginning of World War I in 1914, was the heyday of colonialism. Under the brutal rule of colonial powers nearly the whole world was brought into the reach of the West. In that situation, parts of western Christianity reacted with missionary initiatives to spread the Christian faith in Africa and Asia and a huge number of missionary societies were founded for that purpose.¹⁴ The specific conditions on the 'mission fields' brought many Protestant missionary societies into close contact with each other and in the course of time a global missionary network beyond denominational boundaries developed. This emerging global network led to the famous World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910 that is arguably the beginning of the ecumenical movement.¹⁵

Religious revivals always played a crucial role in the missionary movement as they influenced many of the missionary recruits. However, in the second half of the nineteenth century a development took place that is of special interest with regard to Pentecostalism. It was during that time that premillennialism permeated evangelical circles in Britain (first in the Brethren movement) and in the United States (in the prophecy conferences, starting in New York 1878). This was accompanied by a new missionary awareness: 'On the great missionary movement hangs

the appointed hour of the millennial dawn, of the marriage of the Lamb, of the glory of the resurrection, of the time of the restitution of all things.'¹⁶ As a result several so-called 'faith missions' were founded.¹⁷ The idea of faith missions (strictly interdenominational, no fixed salary, missionaries are members not employees of the mission, and so on) was first formulated in Hudson Taylor's China Inland Mission (London 1865), but became widely popular through the work of Fanny and Grattan Guinness, who founded the East London Training Institute in 1873. The Guinneses influenced A.B. Simpson and the Christian and Missionary Alliance (1887) and, during a journey through the United States in 1889, Fanny Guinness was instrumental in starting the Boston Missionary Training Institute (A.J. Gordon) and the Chicago Evangelization Society (later Moody Bible Institute). Another very enthusiastic promoter of faith missions was Arthur Tappan Pierson, a Christian journalist, who edited the *Missionary Review of the World* from 1886 (in 1891 joined by A.J. Gordon as co-editor). The Student Volunteer Missionary Union (1886) was also part of this premillennial-oriented evangelical missionary network and was inspired by Dwight L. Moody and led by John R. Mott. The latter chose the motto 'the evangelization of the world in this generation' (originally coined by Pierson) for this organization.¹⁸ Through this vast network, American holiness circles became part of the global missionary movement and this in turn affirmed a strong missionary awareness among them. It was this missionary awareness that became a decisive theological root for Pentecostalism, because it gives some clues why tongues speaking became so important for the movement.¹⁹

Charles Parham created the threefold theological formula that was used at Azusa Street: '1) Tongue speech as the initial evidence of Holy Spirit Baptism, 2) Spirit-filled believers as the "sealed" Bride of Christ, and 3) Xenoglossic tongues as the tool for dramatic endtime revival'²⁰. It is arguable that the idea of xenoglossic tongues ('missionary tongues') was the most important aspect among these three points. In the early days, Pentecostals thought that their glossolalia was actually foreign tongues for missionary purposes. This was hitherto rather overlooked, as the Pentecostal movement quietly gave up the idea of xenoglossia later. Nevertheless a number of sources point to the fact that Parham got his emphasis on tongues speaking from the missionary movement.

William Faupel shows convincingly the deep influence of the

missionary movement on Parham.²¹ The premillennialist missionary strategy was not aiming at converting the whole world to Christianity, but to be a witness to all nations and to give the chance to as many people as possible to accept the Christian message before Christ's Second Coming. Within such a perspective, time was running out and it became an urgent question as to how possible successful missionary work could be with such a limited timeframe. For one thing, the extremely time-consuming learning of foreign languages was felt to be a major obstacle. In this connection, isolated reports about the occurrence of the gift of xenoglossia spread in missionary circles.²² Very prominent was the tale of a young woman called Jennie Glassey who had received African languages through the Holy Spirit in 1895.²³ The Glássey case became known to Charles Parham and impressed him very much, as it seemed to prove that God could enable missionaries by giving them the necessary foreign languages.²⁴ Furthermore, in premillennial circles the idea was widespread that the Second Coming of Christ would be preceded by a worldwide revival that would greatly enlarge missionary work. Through the influence of Frank Sandford, Charles Parham accepted this notion and then brought it all together into the new Pentecostal 'Latter Rain' concept.²⁵

These two points which Parham developed under the influence of the missionary movement (missionary tongues and worldwide revival) became part of the core self-understanding of the Azusa Street Revival in 1906, as can be seen from its periodical *The Apostolic Faith*.²⁶ For the participants of Azusa Street it was very clear that tongues speaking meant missionary tongues for a worldwide end-time revival that now had started in Los Angeles. To prove this claim it was of utmost importance that the revival would develop into a global phenomenon within a very short time. This pressure gave Azusa Street an extremely global outlook from its very start.

As already mentioned, many evangelicals at home and in the 'mission fields' shared the idea of a worldwide end-time revival. Moreover, Azusa Street falls in a time when many thought that such a revival had already started. The revival chronicler Edwin Orr speaks of a global 'Fifth General Awakening' between 1900-1910 (including Keswick, the Torrey and Alexander evangelistic ministry, the Welsh revival, the Khasi Hills revival, the Mukti Mission, and the Korean Revival).²⁷ During that time the global

missionary movement that was connected through a very dense network of extensive correspondence and personal contacts was very much focussed on revival matters: 'What was remarkable was that missionaries and national believers in obscure places in India, the Far East, Africa and Latin America seemed to move at the same time to pray for phenomenal revival in their fields and world wide.'²⁸ Contemporary outsiders, like Frederick Henke, saw Azusa Street simply as small part of this revival: 'This speaking in tongues is but one of a series of such phenomena as "tongues of fire", "rushing of a mighty wind", "interpretation of tongues", jerking, writhing, and falling to the ground, which are occurring in connection with a world-wide religious revival.'²⁹ Moreover, Orr is of the opinion that during this 'Fifth General Awakening' Pentecostalism was not a crucial factor but only an indirect by-product.³⁰

It is important to keep in mind the relatively small impact of the Azusa Street revival at that time, because it contradicts the self-understanding of the Pentecostal movement. Azusa Street claimed to be the definitive formula for and sure beginning of the end-time revival, fulfilling all revival hopes that were transmitted through the missionary movement. So they claimed the whole ongoing revival movement for themselves: 'The present world-wide revival was rocked in the cradle of little Wales. It was 'brought up' in India, following; becoming full grown in Los Angeles later.'³¹ In this situation; it became crucial to get their views accepted within the international evangelical circles. Azusa Street went global from the very start and began to channel their message through the vast international evangelical and missionary network that was receptive to revivals. As the Azusa Street participants were themselves part of this network and as the Pentecostal formula contained mainly elements that were familiar to those circles (fivefold gospel and end-time revival), they found easy access.

It is amazing to see how quickly the Azusa Street revival received positive responses in different parts of the world. However, as Joe Creech has rightly emphasized,³² to join the Azusa Street revival was not necessarily connected with formal changes in institutional structure and ethos or theological traditions; nor did this establish formal institutional ties with Azusa Street. It spread because individuals and organizations generally accepted that a second Pentecost with the experience of tongues speaking and other spiritual gifts like healing and prophecy had

happened and they declared themselves to be part of it. In that way, very different and divergent streams could join the Pentecostal movement, as nearly everybody who desired it could become part of it. Because of that, internal tensions and splits were a fundamental part of the movement right from its beginnings. The spread of the Azusa Street revival was essentially a kind of networking within evangelical and missionary circles. It took place at least in three different ways: correspondence and magazines; evangelistic journeys and other personal contacts; and missionary work. Some examples to emphasize this threefold global outreach might illustrate this."

In September 1906 Azusa Street started its first journal, *The Apostolic Faith*, with 5,000 copies; half a year later it was already printing 40,000. Numerous new Pentecostal periodicals started and existing ones became Pentecostal all over North America and far beyond. It is said that within the first year of the Azusa Street revival vernacular Pentecostal newspapers were printed in Norway, Germany, China, Japan, Palestine, and Brazil." This publication network was accompanied by immense and intensive correspondence. In January 1907, it was reported that up to fifty letters reached Azusa Street alone every day." Nearly all Pentecostal groups in the early years maintained extensive international mail networks. One gets the impression that each corresponded with every one. Through these written channels an imagined global Pentecostal community was created that assured the individual believer of the international success of the revival and made it attractive to join in.

But it was also through personal contacts that the message was spread. Right from the beginning the specific worship practice—heavily shaped by Black spirituality—of Azusa Street was passed on through common worship when people flocked from all over the country and even abroad to Los Angeles to 'get their Pentecost'. Besides, quite a number of Pentecostal leaders undertook global evangelistic tours, so that 'Pentecostals' geographic restlessness seemed so pronounced that the movement eventually became synonymous with itinerancy". For instance Anselm Howard Post was an early member of Azusa Street and in 1907 started his travels abroad that took him as far as South Africa, England, Wales and Ceylon." Thomas Ball Barratt had come from Norway to the USA and became Pentecostal after he had visited Azusa Street in 1906; and in 1908-1909 he travelled through much of Europe and undertook a

journey to India." Daniel Awrey circled the globe in 1909, in 1910-11 he was in India and China and he died in Liberia in 1913." Frank Bartleman, after he had already travelled extensively in the USA, started in 1910 on a round-the-world trip via Europe, Palestine, Egypt, India, Ceylon, China, Japan, and Hawaii." These evangelists and several others travelled along established evangelical networks, and in the 'mission fields' they tried to impress their beliefs on missionaries open to the evangelical revival teachings.

However, the most spectacular global outreach of early Azusa Street were the missionaries who went out being confident that they were equipped with foreign tongues to preach the Pentecostal message in the vernacular. Quite a few former faith missionaries participated in Azusa Street (e.g. Samuel J. Mead and George E. Berg) and even helped to identify specific African or Asian languages allegedly being spoken by some in worship services as is amply reported in *The Apostolic Faith*. Boosted by the impression that he had spoken Bengali at Azusa Street, A.G. Garr and his wife (who supposedly spoke Tibetan and Chinese) started for India where they arrived at the beginning of 1907." S.J. Mead, former missionary with William Taylor in Africa for twenty years, organized a missionary party that allegedly had received African languages to go to Africa and the group embarked in December 1906." In September 1907, M.L. Ryan collected a dozen men and women to go to Japan, clearly confident that they would be equipped with the necessary languages through missionary tongues." When these missionaries arrived at their 'mission fields', they naturally became disillusioned because missionary tongues were not available," but it seems that only a very few abandoned their Pentecostal objectives. Some returned early, some concentrated on revival preaching among western missionaries, like the Garrs, and others stayed and turned to traditional methods;" in that way they played an essential role in establishing an international Pentecostal network.

This threefold global outreach of early Pentecostalism was not without success. Many faith missionaries (especially from the Christian and Missionary Alliance) joined the new Pentecostal network, as did also quite a few indigenous workers of faith missions." At the end of 1908 the Pentecostal movement had taken root in around fifty countries all over the world" and it could be stated that it had virtually 'circled the

globe'.²⁰ So a real worldwide network was established. Only then was it seen that Azusa Street had proved to be the start of a worldwide revival, because without an immediate global establishment the revival would have fallen short of all expectations according to its self-image.

Putting the Pentecostal beginnings into such a global context means that only this worldwide network could be named Pentecostalism in the true sense. Azusa Street was the prelude, but the beginning of Pentecostalism was attained when a global Pentecostal network was established. Neither a creed, an institution nor a place was the beginning of Pentecostalism but a vast and vague international network; and in that specific sense Pentecostalism was a global movement right from its beginnings. India is a good example of this.

Beginnings of Pentecostalism in India

India played an important role in the worldwide revival that took place in the first decade of the twentieth century, especially through the events in the Khasi Hills and at Mukti Mission. At the end of the nineteenth century expectations for a new revival were high in India too.²¹ In 1898, Pandita Ramabai attended the Keswick convention and requested the people there to pray for a missionary awakening among the Indians.²² Ramabai, a Marathi Brahman convert, led a missionary and charity organization called Mukti Mission that was backed by foreign help and many western missionaries took part in its work.²³ In the year 1903, she sent her daughter Manoramabai to Australia along with her very close collaborator, the American Minnie F. Abrams, to monitor the evangelistic efforts of the Torrey and Alexander team.²⁴ Influenced by the revival in Wales 1904-1906, the Welsh Presbyterian mission in northeast India experienced a great awakening in the Khasi Hills which introduced Christianity to the whole region.²⁵ The news of these events soon spread throughout India and abroad and it also caught the keen attention of Ramabai. Under the influence of events in Australia and Wales, she started a special prayer circle in 1905 that led to a great revival at Mukti Mission in Kedgaon.²⁶ In the years 1906-1907, it was accompanied by various manifestations such as speaking in tongues. Different Americans who worked for the mission and had heard from Azusa Street started

similarly speaking in tongues and interpreted the Mukti Mission as proof of the worldwide Pentecostal end-time revival.²⁷ However, as McGee and Blumhofer have emphasized,²⁸ Mukti Mission also shows that even among its very Pentecostal protagonists, the role of tongues speaking as initial evidence and a missionary tool was considered less important in India than at Azusa Street. Moreover Ramabai and the Mukti Mission as an institution later definitely backed out of *the* Pentecostal movement and interpreted the revival there as part of the larger evangelical awakening in the first decade of the twentieth century. This fact is often overlooked in popular Pentecostal hagiographical appropriation of the Mukti Mission.

The Mukti Mission became a vital link for the global Pentecostal network that was to be established and it helped create Pentecostalism; but it was not the Pentecostal beginning in India. Other events were similarly important. Pentecostal revival ideas got an important boost in India when the first active participants from Azusa Street landed there. In the beginning of 1907 the Garr couple arrived and held meetings in English for 'missionaries and Christian workers' in Calcutta and as a result regular Pentecostal gatherings at the Carey Baptist Chapel (Bow Bazaar) are reported.²⁹ Of course they also visited the Mukti Mission. Although their stay was quite controversial among missionaries it certainly further established the Pentecostal network. In 1908, Georg E. Berg, another active participant at Azusa Street, landed in India and settled at Bangalore, a British civil and military centre at that time. He had already been a missionary in India before and he immediately used his contacts in the Brethren mission in Kerala.³⁰ In the same year, T. B. Barratt was invited to India by sympathizing missionaries to tell them more about the Pentecostal experience.³¹ Most of the time Barratt stayed at Coonoor, a so-called hill station, where most of the western missionaries had gathered to take refuge from the hottest months of the year. During his stay some missionaries and Indians received the new baptism of the Spirit, though there were also seemingly outspoken negative reactions. During his stay in India, Barratt also held meetings at Bombay (today officially Mumbai) and Calcutta (Kolkata), and he visited the Mukti Mission.

Within a very short time a widespread and diffuse Pentecostal network was established in India that could be called the beginning of Pentecostalism in India. It was from this Indian network that a Pentecostal

movement was established on the subcontinent through different initiatives. The most far-reaching was the work of George E. Berg, who won quite a few Indian adherents in Kerala through his contacts in the Brethren mission there, including some indigenous leaders mainly from Brethren background but also from Mar Thoma Church and the Anderson Church of God. In the year 1912, Berg returned to the USA for furlough and took part in the 'First World Wide Pentecostal Camp' organized by the Apostolic Faith Mission at Azusa Street. There he met with Robert F. Cook and advised him to follow him as a missionary to India. Cook was to become the key person for the establishment of the first Pentecostal church organizations in Kerala (Indian Pentecostal Church of God, Church of God,⁶⁴ Assemblies of God⁶⁵) that have survived to the present day and were the starting point for many more Pentecostal denominations in South India. However, there are many other connections. One example is the founding of the Madras Pentecostal Assembly that can be attributed to two Swedish missionaries, Karin Andersson and Ida Nilson, who in North India had probably been staying in close contact with Mukti Mission. It is said that, as they waited for their ship in Chennai (formerly Madras) on their way back to their country in 1913, they did evangelistic work in Guindy (part of Chennai today) and as a result a Pentecostal congregation started there led by the Tamil Benjamin Jacob.⁶⁶ The American missionaries Christian Schoonmaker and Herbert Coxe, to give another example, had originally come to India with the Christian and Missionary Alliance and then became Pentecostals under the decisive influence of the Mukti Mission, eventually working for the Assemblies of God in North India.⁶⁷ Moreover, it must also be pointed out that at least two American missionaries who became Pentecostals in India influenced the Pentecostal movement in other parts of the world: Minnie Abrams in Chile, and Alice E. Luce in Mexico and among Hispanic Americans.⁶⁸

Outlining a Definition of Pentecostalism

Pentecostalism could not keep its initial promises. As Faupel has emphasized, by the end of 1908 it had become clear that Pentecostal expectations were not realized.⁶⁹ 'The delay of the parousia and inability to speak in known tongues forced most Pentecostals to reassess their

mission.'⁷⁰ Unlike many others the Pentecostal revival did not vanish after the initial promises had to be revised. The global network that was established within few years marked the beginning of a movement that would vigorously shape world Christianity in years to come. This divergent, multi-voiced and fragmented movement kept the idea of a common Pentecostal identity, but it appears that it is very difficult for scholars to define this phenomenon appropriately. As Everett Wilson has pointed out, there is no institutional setting of Pentecostalism: 'At no time, within the ranks, did adherents make up a discrete, readily identifiable group.'⁷¹ Moreover Wilson also disputes the existence of an essential theological agenda: 'By almost any standard, Pentecostalism presently is not what Charles Fox Parham or any of his successors has pronounced it to be, but rather what contemporary Brazilians, Koreans and Africans demonstrate that it actually is.'⁷² Nevertheless, there are certainly things that form a distinctive Pentecostal identity however vague it might be. One might guess that it has something to do with a certain spiritual praxis (intuitive, experiential Spirit-centred devotion; oral liturgy; firm biblical orientation; narrative theology and testimonies; strong lay participation; healing and so on.), but even then it is rather something that is subject to constant change and dependent on mutual affirmation because 'every generation is the first generation'⁷³ in Pentecostalism. The vigorous debates about Pentecostal identity that are going on within Pentecostal theology will therefore rather help to shape, create and reaffirm this identity than to discover essential categories that could be used as a starting point for a scholarly definition.⁷⁴

If there are no institutional or theological avenues for definition then it might be a good idea to look for a non-essential way of mapping a Pentecostal network as global discursive formation. I would suggest applying two criteria for Pentecostalism: the existence of historical connections and synchronous interrelations. Both these criteria have to be applied within a global context, as Pentecostalism is a global movement right from its very beginning. The first criterion demands that all that we count as Pentecostal must be connected within a vast diachronous network that goes back to the beginning of Pentecostalism. That means that the question of direct historical influences becomes a crucial one and that all parallel phenomena that are without historical connections (e.g. Irvingites, cargo movements) must not be called Pentecostal. In addition to historical connections, the second criterion demands that only

that which is linked up by some sort of synchronous network can be called Pentecostalism. This purely descriptive definition corresponds, as far as I see, to the way most Pentecostal and non-Pentecostal scholars who prefer a broad definition of Pentecostalism are using the term, though they seldom make their use explicit. Moreover, this definitory proposal doesn't seem to be counterintuitive to common Pentecostal self-understanding. Although the definition is very much based on common sense, it has some rather harsh consequences for actual research because without establishing a diachronous and synchronous network one must no longer speak of Pentecostalism.

For the establishment of the diachronous network a critical, strictly historical perspective has to be applied. Tracing historical connections usually means to focus on churches that have split and on pastors who changed their affiliation from one Pentecostal denomination to another, often taking with them whole congregations or even a set-up of churches. It is precisely these frictions that are most important for the historian who tries to sketch a diachronous network. The problem is that this approach is usually not in line with the common stereotyped pattern of testimonies and hagiographies that church leaders like to tell. Especially in many popular accounts of denominational histories, the illusion is fostered that the respective church started under direct godly providence and splits or makes contact with other churches or leaders and so on are not thoroughly analysed. But then such accounts don't contribute much to Pentecostal history because they are not about Pentecostalism as such. If we want to write a history of Pentecostalism we have to trace historical connections and this information is often hard to get. They are usually not found in oral testimonies or written documents and are in danger of getting lost when the respective generation has died. It will never be possible to reconstruct the full diachronous interconnections; but it is necessary to have the gaps carefully in mind because without a diachronous network there is no Pentecostalism. In this context it is of utmost importance that the bias of western archival sources and indigenous hagiographical traditions is not reproduced by the historian but is critically broken up and put under hermeneutical suspicion.

Similarly, establishing a synchronous network is very demanding. The description of a major denomination that calls itself Pentecostal doesn't contribute much to the research of Pentecostalism. Instead it is necessary

to map a communicative network between different churches, organizations, and individuals that share the same diachronous network at the specific time period the research is focussing on. Through this synchronous network, theological styles and oral tradition will be made or kept compatible with each other. Theologoumena can be subjected to comparative control and be mutually assimilated so that some sort of common Pentecostal identity will be created. This synchronous network is very fluid and is in no way a closed structure. It always remains open to discussion because it is subject to rapid historical change and its construction will usually depend on certain biases of the scholar who undertakes it. But that does not mean that the power of representation is equally distributed within the synchronous network. On the contrary, representational power depends very much on the control of material and intellectual resources, so that dominant discourses are shaping the synchronous network and need to be thoroughly analysed.

Moreover within the one ideal global synchronous network there are many partial networks (e.g. regional networks, charismatic movements, White American evangelical Pentecostal churches) and if some church or organization is part of the historical but not of the contemporarily existing synchronous network then this is purely a descriptive statement. It could be the case that it was part of the synchronous network in the past and/or became (again) part of the network afterwards. The synchronous network has always tested boundaries, as the case of the African Instituted Churches shows, which share in many aspects common historical roots with the Pentecostal movement and were at a time, at least to some extent, a loose part of a synchronous network;⁷⁷ there are many signs that some of them will reclaim a Pentecostal identity and re-enter the synchronous network.⁷⁸

To sum up: Pentecostalism is a constructed category that can be meaningfully applied when it refers to both a diachronous and synchronous network of global dimensions.

Writing the History of the South Indian Pentecostal Movement

The case of the South Indian Pentecostal movement can help illustrate

the consequences of these ideas." First of all, as shown above, India was part of the establishment of global Pentecostalism and that means that it is not possible to write its history as the result of a western (or even North American) missionary enterprise because it was already there before western Pentecostal denominations started organized missionary efforts in India. When Pentecostalism became established in India after around 1910, its growth in South India started as a joint enterprise between George E. Berg and a number of Indian co-workers. When Berg visited Kerala in 1911, Robert Cumine, a Tamil-speaking Anglo-Indian from the Kolar Gold Fields near Bangalore who was converted to the Pentecostal faith under his influence, accompanied him. While they were staying in the region of Kottarakara and Adur, Berg approached his Brethren contacts and a small prayer-group under the leadership of Paruttupara Ummachan invited him to their place at Thuyavur (near Adur) and, as a result, they became Pentecostals, being probably the first Pentecostal congregation in South India. During the Kerala tour of 1911, Berg got acquainted with a few young people who followed him to Bangalore where he held Bible studies and instructed them in the Pentecostal faith. Among them were Umman Mammen and Pandalam Mattai who began to work as Pentecostal evangelists after they returned to Kerala. After a serious conflict with Robert F. Cook who had joined him in 1913, Berg left India for good in 1914. During World War I Cook, who wanted to continue the work alone, mainly stayed at the safe garrison of Bangalore, but in winter 1916-17 he undertook, along with Robert Cumine, an evangelistic tour of Kerala with the aim of renewing the contacts made by Berg. During that tour it became manifest that the congregation at Thuyavur had in the meantime developed a lively mission activity under the leadership of Paruttupara Ummachen. Umman Mamman and Pandalam Mattai also had been very active as Pentecostal missionaries in Kerala. In the 1920s more Indian evangelists and leaders, mainly from Brethren or holiness background, joined the Pentecostal faith (e.g. K.E. Abraham and A.J. John in 1923 and K.C. Cherian and P.V. John in 1924). Nevertheless Cook, who permanently moved to Kerala in 1922, exercised quite significant control of the emerging movement as he gave financial support to Indian evangelists and bought church land to build churches (first at Thuyavur in 1919).⁷⁵ In the 1920s funds became more easily available because Cook had joined the Assemblies of God and other missionaries of that organization came as missionaries to Kerala (Mary Chapman in 1921,

John H. Burgess in 1927, and Martha Kucera in 1928). Nevertheless the Indians with their speaker K.E. Abraham were very critical of attempts to combine financial support with organizational control, especially after the regional Council of Assemblies of God for South India and Ceylon was formed in 1929. The late 1920s and early 1930s was a time when Indian Pentecostal leaders got into serious conflict with Robert F. Cook and among themselves about questions of leadership positions, financial matters, affiliation to western missionary societies and so on.⁷⁶ At the end of these quite turbulent conflicts, four larger Pentecostal churches came into being in Kerala in the 1930s, two with direct links to western missions (Assemblies of God, Church of God) and two quite different independent organizations, though not completely without western partners (Ceylon Pentecostal Mission, Indian Pentecostal Church of God). This historical genesis shows that the emerging Pentecostal movement in India could hardly be rendered as the missionary history of western Pentecostal denominations.⁷⁷

Another point concerns the way that a diachronous network is made visible. Diachronous relationships can be described best by biographies which are established through critical reading and thorough investigation. The example of M.O. John, one of the old Pentecostal stalwarts among the Tamils in South India might illustrate that fact. M.O. John (born 1926) came from a Maravar Hindu family in Ammapatti, near Madurai. In 1942 he converted to Christianity and was baptized. He came into contact with Robert F. Cook and his son George who both worked as missionaries of the Church of God at this time. They invited him to Kerala since he faced hostility in his village because of his conversion. He remained an evangelist in the Church of God in Kerala until 1945. Then he went to Madurai where he worked as a casual labourer and there became a member of the Pentecostal congregation led by the Indian M. Benjamin who also belonged to the Church of God at that time. In 1947, M.O. John went back to Kerala and came into contact with the missionary couple Edwards, who worked for the Assemblies of God and sent him to the Bethel Bible School in Kerala. During this period, in 1948, he was married in Punalur and accompanied the Edwards family on a journey to Tamilnadu. After he had finished Bible school, he joined the Edwards in Tamilnadu until 1951. Apparently it was only then that he experienced baptism in the Spirit. Then under the influence of M. Benjamin, who for some time had moved his congregation to the Assemblies of God but

after a deep quarrel with one young American missionary had gone back to the Church of God, M.O. John also left the Assemblies of God and joined the Church of God again. In the second half of the 1950s he left the Church of God and lived for a little while with Victor P.D. Kay, one of the important independent Pentecostal leaders of Tamilnadu in Thanjavur who worked together with P.M. Samuel from the Indian Pentecostal Church of God. Through Victor P.D. Kay, M.O. John also came into contact with P.M. Samuel. P.M. Samuel hailed from Kerala and was the leader of the Indian Pentecostal Church of God in Andhra Pradesh. He also controlled the Indian Pentecostal Church of God in Tamilnadu, mainly through the money that he got from foreign partners. In 1959 M.O. John went to Kalupatti, which was near his birthplace. There with the assistance of P.M. Samuel he founded a congregation in the name of the Indian Pentecostal Church of God. P.M. Samuel enabled him to open an orphanage in Kalupatti with the support of the German-based Christian Mission Service. In 1969, M.O. John had finished a church building; however he did not register it in the name of the Indian Pentecostal Church of God but in his own name. In the sequel he was P.M. Samuel's most important co-worker in Tamilnadu. In 1981, as he was not in agreement with a new leadership in the Indian Pentecostal Church of God in Tamilnadu, he left this denomination and made his congregation independent, which was very easy as the property never belonged to the Indian Pentecostal Church of God. In 1994 he joined the Indian Pentecostal Assemblies, another independent Pentecostal denomination in Tamilnadu. His eldest son Ebenezer (born 1953) studied in 1976-77 at Elim Bible Institute, New York. In 1979 in Tirumangalam near Madurai, he founded his own organization the Elim Church of God, which has an American Neocharismatic church as its main sponsor.

In writing a history of the Indian Pentecostal Movement it is exactly this kind of historical interaction that one has to focus on. Nevertheless in a study on Indian Pentecostalism it is also very important to include all the churches and organizations that show historical connections to Pentecostalism, even if they are currently not within the synchronous network.⁷ Maybe they were part of the synchronous network at one time and maybe they will (re)claim a Pentecostal identity and re-enter the network. But often there are also groups which are in and out at the same time and which show that the borders are absolutely fluid and impossible to draw clearly. A good example is the Ceylon Pentecostal

Mission (since 1984 in India officially under the name The Pentecostal Mission), which currently refuses contact with all other Pentecostal churches and has a whole range of extremely radical and church-dividing exclusive doctrines. Nevertheless numerous Pentecostal pastors were formerly members or even pastors in the Ceylon Pentecostal Mission. Amazingly the very distinctive doctrines of the Ceylon Pentecostal Mission are scarcely a matter of concern, but on the contrary many pastors, evangelists and lay people of the other Pentecostal churches greatly value the teaching of Ceylon Pentecostal Mission. This is connected with the fact that the Ceylon Pentecostal Mission is the only Indian Pentecostal church to have published on all important theological loci in detailed but easily understood publications. Moreover many members of other Pentecostal churches take part in the conventions of the Ceylon Mission and, conversely, their members (and even some of their pastors) attend these churches' conventions. So it is that the Ceylon Pentecostal Mission, in spite of its strong separatism, has not entirely lost its links with the mainstream of the Indian Pentecostal movement and it is very difficult to tell whether it is in or out of the synchronous network.

Furthermore, writing about the South Indian Pentecostal movement means putting the histories of single denominations or churches into the context of a larger framework that brings them together into one network. This is a very difficult task, but the following sketch of the history of the South Indian Pentecostal movement might give some idea of what is meant:

South Indian Pentecostal History

As already mentioned, the clashes in the late 1930s led to the foundation of four Pentecostal churches in Kerala. These churches maintained a leading position in Kerala, but with their increasing establishment they had to contend time and again with internal quarrels and stagnating tendencies. Hence they were not in a position to offer an adequate framework for integrating younger leading personalities with new ideas. That led to the founding of new churches. As a result Sharon Fellowship (P.J. Thomas, 1953) was born as a direct reaction to the quarrels within the Indian Pentecostal Church of God. Also the New

India Church of God (V.A. Thamby, c. 1973) developed itself in the course of its history as a reservoir for many who were dissatisfied with the Pentecostal church to which they once belonged. The leaders of the New India Bible Church (Thomas Philip, Abraham Philip, 1972) did not want their church to be identified outside distinctly as a Pentecostal church and therefore established an independent organization. Gospel for Asia (K.P. Yohannan, 1978) was first founded only as a mission work and began later (1993) to establish its own church structures as a result of its dissatisfaction with the missing missionary dynamic of the existing Pentecostal churches. A common characteristic of all churches mentioned above is that their leadership is in the hands of Syrian Christians.⁷⁷ But since the 1940s, new Pentecostal churches were founded in Kerala which were not led by Syrian Christians but by people groups that were considered much lower on the religio-social ladder: so-called Dalits (and in some cases by Nadars and Ezhavas who normally would not come under the term 'Dalit').⁷⁸ The main reason for this was the inability of the churches led by Syrian Christians to integrate Dalit or Nadar leaders. The foundation of the World Missionary Evangelism in Kerala (C.S. Mathew, 1962) is a good example. An extremely special case of the caste-compartmentalization within the Pentecostal movement in Kerala was the establishment of the 'Kerala Division' of the Church of God (K.J. Chacko, 1972), which demonstrates the exclusion of Dalit participation in a Church of God dominated by Syrian Christians. While the churches dominated by Syrian Christians have fostered comparatively closer contact among themselves, they seldom have a close relationship with churches led by Dalits or Nadars.

The South Indian Pentecostal movement established itself outside Kerala only in the second half of the 1940s. However a few remarkable mission activities had already taken place in the period before (in Tamilnadu: Madras Pentecostal Assembly since 1913, Ceylon Pentecostal Mission since 1930s, British Assemblies of God since 1920s; in Andhra Pradesh: Eastern Full Gospel Mission since 1926, Indian Pentecostal Church of God since 1932). Unfortunately very little is known about this.

Despite an earlier series of missionary activities, the Pentecostal movement was able to put down roots in Tamilnadu only after World War II. Two phases could be seen in that process. First of all in the

1940s until the 1960s, there were increased attempts by foreign missions and at the same time important indigenous ecclesiastical formations. After the end of World War II indigenous Pentecostal churches proliferated in Tamilnadu. The Indian Pentecostal Church of God achieved a few missionary successes coming from their stations in Andhra Pradesh. The Ceylon Pentecostal Mission, which attained new missionary strength under the chief pastor Alwin, also played an important rôle. At the same time, however, several experienced Tamil pastors left the Ceylon Pentecostal Mission and founded their own independent churches (John Rose, Full Gospel Pentecostal Church; S.B. Daniel/S. Ponraj, Pentecostal Church of India; G. Sunderam, Apostolic Christian Assembly). Since most of these pastors had lived together for some time in Malaysia they had close contact with each other and a strong feeling of togetherness, though each of them led independent churches. Several other independent churches began, like in the southernmost part of Tamilnadu where Sadhu Yesudhason became highly respected as the leader of a very influential indigenous church called Kirubasanam.

The second phase began in the 1960s when the foreign mission organizations went over one after the other to indigenous leadership and when it became increasingly possible for the indigenous churches to gain international partners. The result of that convergent development led to the formation of many new indigenous churches, which showed enormous increases since the 1980s and were strongly anchored in the global Pentecostal movement through their foreign partners. Since the 1960s, the Pentecostal movement also began to be deeply rooted in the big cities like Madurai, Coimbatore and Chennai. Chennai in particular experienced big growth and became the most important centre of the movement in southern India. Apart from the especially strong representation of the Assemblies of God, the scene was increasingly marked by many independent regional churches in this city. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the Tamil-speaking south is arguably the most vibrant centre of Indian Pentecostalism.

The Pentecostal movement in Karnataka remained numerically weak right into the second half of the twentieth century. It was limited almost exclusively to migrants from Tamilnadu, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh, and it scarcely touched the native Kannada speaking population. Until the mid 1990s there were no really large centres of the Pentecostal

movement except in Bangalore and in the neighbouring Kolar Gold Fields.

For a long time the Indian Pentecostal Church of God, started mainly by missionaries from Kerala, was the only distinct force of Pentecostalism in Andhra Pradesh. However in the second half of the 1940s, Pentecostalism in Andhra Pradesh entered a new phase. The missionaries from Kerala (who all belonged to the Syrian Christian community) and the new Pentecostal recruits from Andhra Pradesh who were practically all with the Indian Pentecostal Church of God, gave up moving around and became settled. Financial assistance from overseas made it possible for them to build their own churches and to set up local centres which acted very independently (e.g. P.M. Samuel, Vijayawada; P.T. Chacko, Secunderabad; P.L. Paramjothi, Antarvedipalam; K.R. David, Rajamundry; K.S. Joseph, Narasapur). In this way, the Indian Pentecostal Church of God in Andhra Pradesh developed a rather decentralized structure. It proved to be of special significance that the missionaries from Kerala (especially P.M. Samuel and P.T. Chacko) had far more overseas contacts than their colleagues from Andhra Pradesh. So unfair distribution went along with the establishment of local centres and this prepared the ground for recruitment campaigns by the Dallas based World Missionary Evangelism (John E. Douglas Sr.) in the 1960s. This had the result that, with the exception of P.L. Paramjothi, almost all the important Telugu leaders in the Indian Pentecostal Church of God went over to World Missionary Evangelism, which suddenly became the biggest Pentecostal church in Andhra Pradesh. Through World Missionary Evangelism the Indian Pentecostal Church of God suffered a severe setback, but it consolidated its position relatively soon and remained one of the bigger Pentecostal churches in Andhra Pradesh. In the following period it emerged from further secessions comparatively unharmed. Quite different was the situation of World Missionary Evangelism, which was shaken by repeated internal crises and never came to a settled condition. By the end of the 1960s, many more Pentecostal churches were established in Andhra Pradesh. Among these new churches there were significant differences. The missionary success of the classical Pentecostal churches proved to be comparatively modest. In contrast to the rest of South India the Assemblies of God, while successful elsewhere, had scarcely gained a footing in Andhra Pradesh. Indians who had stayed a long time in the USA were returning to Andhra Pradesh to begin their own missions with the backing of foreign sponsors

they had found while staying overseas (e.g. Ernest Komanapalli, Manna/Rock Church; P.J. Titus, New Testament Church). The fact that they were well acquainted with the Indian as well as the American scene was quite an advantage for numerical success. In addition to that churches in the big cities with a regional emphasis proved their potential for growth and developed their own style. In Vizag, for instance, there were two big churches, independent of one another, whose leaders had never belonged to a Pentecostal congregation and each went his own way in shaping their pastoral work (Krupa Rao's Jesus Christ Prayer and Evangelistic Ministries; and M.A. Paul's Christ's Church). Other independent churches were the result of splitting, where financial help from overseas played a part (e.g. Y.S. John Babu's Sion Fellowship).

'Indigenous' Pentecostalism?

Pentecostalism has been a global endeavour right from its beginning. No country or place can claim the origin of Pentecostalism. Nevertheless many Pentecostal and Charismatic churches in Africa, Asia and Latin America (and also in Europe!) display quite a strong White North American evangelical flavour that has its source in the huge missionary activities undertaken by Pentecostals from the United States. Theological statements of faith are copied from American Pentecostal originals, vernacular theological literature is translated from American sources and in many cases, even worship service and style are shaped by American cultural patterns. This easily gives the impression that being Pentecostal—wherever it might be—means practising an American Pentecostal way of spiritual life; this opinion would even be backed up by the popular self-understanding in quite a lot of Pentecostal circles all over the globe. It is this observation that called to the scene many critics who designated Pentecostalism as an American religion that was exported from the United States to the Third World as a means of ideological control.⁴⁷

It was Walter Hollenweger who first forcefully disputed this one-sided-point of view and showed that there are many other variants of Pentecostalism with theological teachings not directly dependent on American models that can claim the same representational right to be Pentecostal.⁴⁸ Hollenweger's insights have shaped a whole generation

of new and critical Pentecostal theologians who are now in the lead of Pentecostal scholarship;⁵³ among them it goes without saying that Pentecostalism must not be defined by North American evangelical standards only.

Next came the anthropologists and sociologists who became interested in non-western Pentecostal communities and started to do field work among them. Especially in the last two decades, a vast amount of research has been done that has deepened the academic knowledge of the Pentecostal movement tremendously.⁵⁴ As the most amazing finding, anthropological research showed the Pentecostal movement as a very contextual phenomenon and hardly as something destructive to existing society. Interestingly, this factual contextualization was found in both independent churches and churches with established organizational links to North American denominations. However what anthropologists observed was not the result of a conscious contextual Pentecostal theological agenda which was, as a rule, absent or even categorically rejected by the respective leaders and theological-spokespersons.

Slowly, Pentecostal theologians are starting to cope with that situation and—coming from the Hollenwegerian approach but also influenced by a recent study of Harvey Cox⁵⁵—they are trying to make theological sense out of the anthropological data. At present, Pentecostal theologians based in North America and Europe are in the forefront of this discussion⁵⁶ and, as a result, the White North American evangelical type is regarded as just one variety of the Pentecostal movement, as can best be seen from the fact that there are now several acknowledged Pentecostal perspectives in the West, like Hispanic-American and African American ('Black') Pentecostalism.⁵⁷ Gradually Pentecostal theologians from Asia, Africa and Latin America are joining in this venture⁵⁸ and certainly it is vital that they should take the lead in future.

The theological challenge which contemporary Pentecostal theology faces is curiously very similar to that in the mainline churches, where over the last decades concepts of inculturation and contextualization have been hotly discussed.⁵⁹ So it is not surprising that Pentecostal theologians sometimes use words like 'contextualization' or 'inculturation' when they go into the issue, but they rarely deal with the philosophical and theological concepts behind it.⁶⁰ At present one can observe some

uncertainty among Pentecostals as to how to deal hermeneutically with the question of contextualization. That has certainly something to do with widespread reservations against ecumenical theology in general but probably more with the intrinsic difficulties: how to relate contextualization to a meaningful Pentecostal theology of mission (which is also still missing); or how to relate actual contextual performance to often explicit anti-contextual attitudes among the persons involved and so on. However, Pentecostal theology can't avoid these fundamental questions, but if it does tackle these issues it will probably become a heated debate. Moreover as the so-called ecumenical theology is still struggling for meaningful concepts of inculturation and contextualization a distinctive Pentecostal voice would be more than welcome to global academic theology in general.

Nevertheless there is some tendency to avoid this delicate debate by using a much older concept that still has some credit within evangelical circles: indigenization.⁶¹ The concept of indigenization stems from Rufus Anderson and Henry Venn in the nineteenth century who propagated as the aim of mission the 'three self's': self-government, self-support, and self-propagation.⁶² This concept avoids a clear attitude towards inculturation or contextualization. It only emphasizes organizational independence from 'western' Pentecostalism but implies that this would also mean independence from western dominance. Nevertheless one should be careful not to fall prey to a wrong postcolonial reading of 'indigenous' as free from western domination. The ongoing academic discussion on postcolonial theory has shown that the simple binary code western/indigenous does not help to decipher dominant colonial and postcolonial discourses because the colonial encounter was quite complex and produced diverse, hybrid and fluid configurations.⁶³

It is too simple to suggest that western denominations like the Assemblies of God try to dominate their non-western sister churches whereas Pentecostal churches in Africa, Asia and Latin America that are without established institutional ties to any western organisation or church would be more free, even if both have indigenous leadership. Oppression must not be narrowed down to the western/non-western antithesis. This would be misleading and would underestimate the effect of dominant discursive practices that work beyond established institutional links. Many independent Pentecostal churches get quite a

lot of money from western partners; their leaders have studied at western Bible schools and they regularly entertain westerners as guests or missionaries at Gospel campaigns, and so on.

Moreover beliefs and rituals in indigenous churches are not necessarily more contextualized than in the churches that have official ties to western denominations. Even if one would add a fourth, 'theological' dimension to the above-mentioned three aspects of indigenization one would not get satisfactory results, because according to this logic churches would be most indigenized when they hold the most non-western set of doctrines and practices. But without discussing criteria for relating that to the universal claim of the Christian message and for determining an authentic Christian witness, this theological dimension remains meaningless.

Furthermore the growth rate of independent churches is not inevitably better than that of western denominations. In many regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the Assemblies of God are the fastest growing Pentecostal church. Indigenous churches are also not a benefit in themselves because independence does not necessarily mean good governance. If one analyses leadership, corruption, nepotism and similar phenomena, then the line is not at all between western and 'indigenous' Pentecostalism, but in between.

So for the hermeneutical task that lies ahead of Pentecostal theology the concept of indigenization would not be suitable because it falls short of expectations.

Indian Pentecostalism as 'Indigenous' Christianity

At present there is no such thing as contextual theology within Indian Pentecostalism, though there have been some rare examples that somewhat headed in that direction, but rather motivated by the search for immediately effective missionary tools than by the search for new ways of theologizing.⁹⁸ Nevertheless things are changing fast and there are quite a few young Pentecostal Indian scholars who seem to be taking up the challenge.⁹⁹

However there is also a tendency to look at Indian Pentecostalism

within the straightforward antithesis of 'indigenous' versus 'western', which causes the above-mentioned problems. Roger Hedlund initiated a project on Indian 'Churches of Indigenous Origin', identifying independent Pentecostal churches as the most important representatives.¹⁰⁰ Hedlund, a long-time missionary to India who has a decidedly American evangelical background, shows a genuine openness and appreciation for the disparate Indian church landscape. His intentions are certainly laudable, especially in the context of rising Hindu nationalism that despises Islam and Christianity as foreign western, non-indigenous religions. Nevertheless, if 'indigenous' only means 'under the control of Indians, guided by Indian leaders'¹⁰¹ then it is not clear why mainline denominations like the Church of South India and the Church of North India are not covered by that term. Accordingly, the assignments of the respective churches remain vague and inconsistent¹⁰² and 'indigenous' remains nothing else but a synonym for 'non-western' or 'native'. A similar example is Indian Pentecostal theologian Paulson Pulikottil who refers to the independent Indian Pentecostal Church of God as an example of 'indigenous Pentecostalism' as against what he calls 'western Pentecostalism'.¹⁰³ He is certainly right when he claims an emancipatory, anti-colonial stance among the leaders of the Indian Pentecostal Church of God who successfully resisted any domination by western Pentecostal missionaries. Nevertheless, the postcolonial debate, which Pulikottil is explicitly referring to, goes much further. The subaltern studies project has shown that the anti-colonial national movement was mainly in the interest of the largely Hindu high-caste elites whereas the subalterns (untouchables, tribals, and so on.) did not benefit to the same extent.¹⁰⁰

In the same way, as the leadership of the Indian Pentecostal Church of God was dominated by Syrian Christians—who, as already mentioned, consider themselves as an ethnically defined caste group of very high social status comparable to Brahmans—the perpetuation of an oppressive structure by the exclusion of subaltern groups from leadership positions took place despite indigenous leadership. And it was not only the Indian Pentecostal Church of God at fault. All major Pentecostal (and most of the mainline) denominations in Kerala have Syrian leadership. This Syrian domination goes back quite early. At the beginning of the 1920s the majority of Pentecostals in Kerala were rather from 'low caste' or 'untouchable' background, people who would call themselves Dalits today. Robert F. Cook, the leading western Pentecostal missionary in

that area, received positive reactions from different independent Dalit-groups and their leaders at that time. For instance Poykayil Yohannan invited him to a central convention of his church in 1923 in which more than a thousand people gathered.¹⁰¹ Cook found keen listeners and as a result further invitations followed. In spite of this those intensive contacts did not bring about the entry of Dalit leaders into the Pentecostal movement, whereas at the same time the Syrian Christians established themselves as bearers of the first line of leadership in the Pentecostal churches in Kerala. About the middle of the 1920s many Syrian Christians who had worked as congregational leaders with the Brethren, went over to the Pentecostal movement taking with them their congregations and thus became automatically the leading Pentecostal figures. It seems that the Syrian Christians particularly utilized a two-year absence of Cook (who had gone on furlough to the United States during 1924-26), to establish themselves in the leading church positions. It was arguably the dominance of Syrian Christians that prevented Dalit leaders such as Poykayil Yohannan from joining the Pentecostal movement. In any case, at that time it would have been hardly possible for Pentecostal Dalit pastors to rise up to leadership positions in a major Pentecostal denomination within the Kerala region, although there are remarkable exceptions like P.D. Johnson, who was for ten years (1980-90) District Superintendent of the Assemblies of God in Kerala. As a reaction to that situation Pentecostal churches arose that are based on homogeneous Dalit congregations with Dalit leadership (e.g. World Missionary Evangelism, Kerala Division of the Church of God) but still they are all at a disadvantage against the other Syrian dominated denominations (whether financially, or regarding foreign contacts and so on). These internal oppressive structures of Indian Pentecostalism cannot be named within a hermeneutical framework that is limited to the antithesis of 'indigenous' versus 'western', but one important context for contextual Pentecostal theology lies just here.

Conclusion

In conclusion one could say that constructing Indian Pentecostalism is a very difficult task that encounters quite a few methodological problems. On the one hand there is a historical problem that must be

radically freed from theological premises. Moreover Indian Pentecostal historiography has to make sure that it really traces a diachronous and synchronous network of a Pentecostal movement. Otherwise it becomes doubtful whether it makes sense to apply the term Pentecostal at all. On the other hand it is very difficult to make theological sense of the peculiarities of Pentecostalism within an Indian context. Anthropologists' observation of factual contextualization could be taken as the starting point of reflective concepts of contextual Pentecostal theology. Constructing Indian Pentecostalism is a task that refers to the very fundamental issues of the academic study of Pentecostalism. So the arguments presented in this paper will hopefully be helpful in the ongoing discussion of how Pentecostalism in general can best be studied.

NOTES

¹ Here, Pentecostalism is understood as a very general term that includes Charismatics, Neo-Pentecostals, Faith movement, and so on.

² cf. e.g. C. M. Robeck, 'Art. National Association of Evangelicals', S. M. Burgess et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 4th ed. 1990), pp. 634-636. It is noteworthy that also in recent sociological literature Pentecostals will often be lumped together with evangelicals, cf. e.g. P. Freston, *Evangelicals and Politics in Asia, Africa and Latin America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

³ cf. D. B. Barrett, *Art. Statistics, Global*, in S. M. Burgess et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 4th ed. 1990), pp. 810-830.

⁴ The recent statistics are found in D. Barrett et al. (eds.), *World Christian Encyclopedia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 4 (table 1-1). For a broad understanding of Pentecostalism in modern Pentecostal scholarship cf. e.g. W. J. Hollenweger, *Charismatisch-pfingstliches Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997 [engl. as *Pentecostalism*, 1998]); A. H. Anderson & W. J. Hollenweger (eds.), *Pentecostals after a Century* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); A. H. Anderson, 'Stretching the Definitions?', *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10.1 (2001), pp. 98-119, but cf. also the critique of G. B. McGee, 'Pentecostal Missiology', *Pneuma* 16 (1994), pp. 275-281 (277).

⁵ D. W. Dayton, 'Yet Another Layer of the Onion', *The Ecumenical Review* 40 (1988), pp. 87-110 (102). Cf. also Robeck who says: 'Whoever determines the identity for the Pentecostal movement is placed in a unique and privileged role. In this definitional act, there is power.' (C. M. Robeck, 'Pentecostal Origins from a Global Perspective', in H. D. Hunter & P. D. Hocken, *All Together in One Place* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993], pp. 166-180. [169]).

⁶ A. Cerillo, 'Interpretative Approaches to the History of American Pentecostal Origins', *Pneuma* 19 (1997), pp. 29-52 (31-36); Grant Wacker, 'Art. Bibliography and Historiography of Pentecostalism (US)', in S. M. Burgess et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 4th ed. 1990), pp. 65-76 (69-76)

⁷ Cerillo, 'Interpretative Approaches to the History of American Pentecostal Origins', p. 32.

⁸ A. Cerillo, 'The Beginnings of American Pentecostalism', in: E. L. Blumhofer et al. (eds.), *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), pp. 229-259 (229).

⁹ Cf. D. W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Metuchen: Scarecrow, 1987).

¹⁰ Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, p. 174.

¹¹ Cf. e.g. I. MacRobert, *The Black Roots and White Racism of early Pentecostalism in the USA* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988); D. W. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); G. Wacker, *Heaven Below* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

¹² 'One remarkable feature of the Latter-Rain outpouring in the early days was the way the Spirit of God fell upon one and another in different parts of the world who had never come in contact with anyone who had received the Pentecostal experience.' (S. H. Frodsham, *With Signs Following* [Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1946], p. 53). '... yet there was also occurring a truly spontaneous and simultaneous Revival on Pentecostal lines in widely separated places. The only agency was a deep hunger for such a Revival produced in the hearts of Christians by the Holy Spirit Himself.' (D. Gee, *Wind and Flame* [Croyden: Assemblies of God Publishing House, 1967], pp. 29-30).

¹³ Robeck, 'Pentecostal Origins from a Global Perspective', p. 170. Cf. already Nichol who called the United States the 'Birthplace of Twentieth-Century Pentecostalism' (J. T. Nichol, *Pentecostalism* [New York: Harper and Row, 1966], p. 25.)

¹⁴ Cf. S. Neill, *A History of Christian Missions* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964); W. R. Hutchison, *Errand to the world* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1987). For the connection between western missionary activities and colonialism cf. H. Gründer, *Welteroberung und Christentum* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verl.-Haus Mohn, 1992).

¹⁵ Cf. R. Rouse & S. Neill, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1968* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1994).

¹⁶ Annual Report of the International Missionary Alliance 1892, p. 62, quoted in K.

Fiedler, *Ganz auf Vertrauen* (Giessen, Basel: Brunnen, 1992 [engl. transl. Oxford: Regnum Books 1994]), p. 364 n. 77.

¹⁷ Cf. Fiedler, *Ganz auf Vertrauen*, pp. 65-102; 359-370.

¹⁸ Cf. G. Rosenkranz, *Die christliche Mission* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1977), pp. 218-219.

¹⁹ Dayton did not identify a theological root for tongues speaking: 'Nearly every wing of late nineteenth-century revivalism was teaching in one form or another all the basic themes of Pentecostalism except for the experience of glossolalia, or speaking in tongues' (Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, p. 167). The following reflections are mainly based on the findings of J. R. Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest* (Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1988); Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, and G. B. McGee, 'Shortcut to Language Preparations?', *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 25 (2001), pp. 118-123.

²⁰ Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest*, p. 173.

²¹ Cf. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, pp. 115-186.

²² Cf. McGee, 'Shortcut to Language Preparations?'.

²³ Cf. Goff, *Fields White Unto Harvest*, p. 72-73; H. D. Hunter, *Beniah at the Apostolic Crossroads*, *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 1 (1997); McGee, 'Shortcut to Language Preparations?'.

²⁴ Cf. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 174.

²⁵ Cf. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 167.

²⁶ 'This is a world-wide revival, the last Pentecostal revival to bring our Jesus.' (*Apostolic Faith*, Vol. 1., No. 1, Sept. 1906, p. 4.). 'God is solving the missionary problem, sending out new-tongued missionaries on the apostolic faith line, without purse or scrip, and the Lord is going before them preparing the way.' (*Apostolic Faith*, Vol. 1., No. 3, Nov. 1906, p. 2.)

²⁷ 'It was the most extensive Evangelical Awakening of all time, reviving Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Disciples, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian and Reformed churches and other evangelical bodies throughout Europe and North America, Australasia and South Africa, and their daughter churches and missionary causes throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America, winning more than five million folk to an evangelical faith in the two years of greatest impact in each country.' (J. E. Orr, *Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia* [Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 2nd ed. 1976], p. 99). Cf. also J. E. Orr, *The Flaming Tongue* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1973); Orr, *Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia*, pp. 99-106.

²⁸ Orr, *Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia*, p. 100.

²⁹ F. G. Henke, 'The Gift of Tongues and Related Phenomena at the Present Day', *American Journal of Theology* 13 (1909), pp. 193-206 (193).

³⁰ 'Indirectly it [the Fifth General Awakening] produced Pentecostalism.' (Orr, *Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia*, p. 99). Cf. also Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 190.

³¹ F. Bartleman, *Azusa Street*, (S. Plainfield: Bridge Publishing, 1980 [first published 1925]), p. 19.

³² Cf. J. Creech, 'Visions of Glory', *Church History* 65 (1996), pp. 405-424.

³³ For a good concise overview cf. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, pp. 212-227.

³⁴ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, p. 263.

³⁵ Cf. *Apostolic Faith*, Vol. 1, No. 5, Jan. 1907, p. 4.

³⁶ On the question of Black spirituality at Azusa Street and its difference from Parham's teachings, cf. MacRobert, *The Black Roots*; Hollenweger, *Charismatisch-pfingstliches Christentum*, pp. 31-56; D. D. Daniels, 'Everybody Bids You Welcome', in M. W. Dempster et al. (eds.), *The Globalization of Pentecostalism* (Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1999), pp. 222-252. But cf. also A. Taves (*Fits, Trances, and Visions* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999], pp. 328-337) who opens up new perspectives to explain the different spiritualities between Parham and Azusa Street.)

³⁷ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, p. 215.

³⁸ Cf. G. B. McGee, 'Art. Post, Anselm Howard', in S. M. Burgess et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 4th ed. 1990), p. 720.

³⁹ T. B. Barratt, *When the Fire Fell and an Outline of My Life* (Oslo, 1927); N. Bloch-Hoell, *The Pentecostal Movement* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964), p. 68.

⁴⁰ *Apostolic Faith*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Oct. 1906, p. 4; H. D. Hunter, *International Pentecostal Holiness Church* (<http://www.pctii.org/arc/iphc.html>, 13.03.2002); Bartleman, *Azusa Street*, p. 83.

⁴¹ Bartleman, *Azusa Street*, p. 146.

⁴² *Apostolic Faith*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Sept. 1906, p. 4; *Apostolic Faith*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Oct. 1906, p. 2.

⁴³ Cf. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, pp. 220-221.

⁴⁴ Cf. Wacker, *Heaven Below*, p. 86.

⁴⁵ As Pentecostal theologian Gary McGee clearly stated: 'Evidence of any early Pentecostal missionary ever receiving a new language in this manner does not exist.' (G. B. McGee, *This Gospel... Shall Be Preached*, [Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1986], p. 45). Cf. also Henke, 'The Gift of Tongues and Related Phenomena at the Present Day', pp. 205-206. A theological reflection on the failing of missionary tongues is now going on within Pentecostal theology, cf. J. E. Powers, *Missionary Tongues?*, *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 17 (2000), p. 39-55.

⁴⁶ It seems to be not entirely clear whether all early Pentecostal missionaries initially believed they were equipped with missionary tongues. Further research should bring clarification, because already at Azusa Street we find the clear notion that tongues were not necessarily for use in a foreign field 'but as a sign to you of Pentecost' as G. A. Cook wrote to T. B. Barratt in October 1906 (D. Bundy, 'Spiritual Advice to a Seeker', *Pneuma* 14 [1992], pp. 159-170 [164]). Robeck gives further examples from the early times where speaking in tongues was not connected to foreign languages (W. F. Carother, Nov. 1906; Report of Chicago Revival, summer 1907; C. H. Mason, Feb./March 1907), cf. C. M. Robeck, *Making Sense of Pentecostalism in a Global Context* (Papers from the 28th Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies, Springfield, 1999), p. 8.

⁴⁷ From China we know that in addition to that indigenous workers from established missions joined the Pentecostal fold, cf. D. Bays, *The Protestant Missionary Establishment and the Pentecostal Movement*, in E. L. Blumhofer et al. (eds.), *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), pp. 50-67 [61]; for India cf. below.

⁴⁸ Cf. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 15 n. 6.

⁴⁹ *Apostolic Faith* (Ore.), July-August 1908, p. 1; *Latter Rain Evangel*, March 1909, p. 5; quoted in Wacker, *Heaven Below*, p. 263.

⁵⁰ Cf. Orr, *Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia*, pp. 107-111; G. B. McGee, "'Latter Rain' Falling in the East", *Church History* 68 (1999), pp. 648-665 (651-653).

⁵¹ Cf. Orr, *Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia*, pp. 144; McGee, "'Latter Rain' Falling in the East", p. 651.

⁵² For Pandita Ramabai and Mukti mission cf. N. Macnicol, *Pandita Ramabai* (Calcutta: Association Press; 1926); R. K. Dongre & J. F. Patterson, *Pandita Ramabai* (Madras: Christian Literature Society, 2nd ed. 1969); M. Kosambi (ed.), *Pandita Ramabai Through Her Own Words* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000); E. L. Blumhofer, *Consuming Fire* (unpublished manuscript, 2001).

⁵³ Cf. Orr, *Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia*, p. 144.

⁵⁴ Cf. F. S. Downs, *North East India in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Bangalore: The Church History Association, 1992), pp. 95-96.

⁵⁵ Cf. N. MacNicol, *Pandita Ramabai* <dt.> (Stuttgart: Evang. Missionsverlag, 1930), pp. 161-162; Orr, *Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia*, pp. 143-148.

⁵⁶ Cf. McGee, "'Latter Rain' Falling in the East".

⁵⁷ Cf. McGee, "'Latter Rain' Falling in the East"; Blumhofer, *Consuming Fire*.

⁵⁸ M. W. Moorhead, 'The Latter Rain in Calcutta, India', *The Pentecostal Evangel* 17th April (1920).

⁵⁹ To avoid unnecessary confusion for those who are not experts on India geographical names are generally given according to their modern usage accepting some grave anachro-

nisms (e.g. Kerala, Tamilnadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh).

⁶⁰ Barratt, *When the Fire Fell*, pp. 157-167. T. B. Barratt stayed in India from 3 April till the August 1908. The invitation came from A. N. Groves, together with Maud Orlebar and Max Wood Moorhead.

⁶¹ In this article 'Church of God' refers to churches and missionary organizations that are affiliated to Church of God (Cleveland, TN).

⁶² In this article 'Assemblies of God' refers to churches and missionary organizations that are affiliated to Assemblies of God (Springfield, MI).

⁶³ They are quite conflicting reports about the details. Cf. *Balm of Gilead*, Vol. 50, No. 9, Dec. 1988, p. 5; N. G. J. Vasu, *My Mites to my Master* (Madras: Madras Pentecostal Assembly, c. 1950), p. 15; B. Andreasson & E. Andreasson, *Pingst i Indien* (Stockholm: Missionsinstitutet-PMU, 1989), p. 33. Cf. also M. Bergunder, *Die südindische Pfingstbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1999), pp. 13, 27.

⁶⁴ Cf. M. L. Ketcham, *History of Pentecost* (unpublished manuscript, 1973); C. H. Schoonmaker, 'My Baptism in the Holy Spirit', in *Cloud of Witnesses To Pentecost in India* (Bombay, Pamphlet Number Six, November 1908); Frodsham, *With Signs Following*, pp. 111-113; E. B. Robinson, 'Art. Schoonmaker, Christian H.', in S. M. Burgess et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 4th ed. 1990), pp. 770-771; E. A. Wilson, 'Art. Norton, Albert', in S. M. Burgess et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 4th ed. 1990), p. 641.

⁶⁵ Cf. Gee, *Wind and Flame*, p. 57; W. J. Hollenweger, *Handbuch der Pfingstbewegung*, 10 vols. (Genf, 1965/67), 03.07.013, p. 1136; McGee, "'Latter Rain' Falling in the East", p. 664-665.

⁶⁶ Cf. Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 228.

⁶⁷ Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 308.

⁶⁸ E. A. Wilson, 'They Crossed the Red Sea, Didn't They?', in M. W. Dempster et al. (eds.), *The Globalization of Pentecostalism* (Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1999), pp. 85-115 (108).

⁶⁹ Wilson, 'They Crossed the Red Sea, Didn't They?', p. 109.

⁷⁰ Wilson, 'They Crossed the Red Sea, Didn't They?', p. 106.

⁷¹ For that debate cf. e.g. C. B. Johns, 'The Adolescence of Pentecostalism', *Pneuma* 17 (1995), pp. 3-17; J. K. A. Smith, 'The Closing of the Book', *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11 (1997), pp. 49-71; S. Chan, *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); A. Yong, *Discerning the Spirit(s)* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); D. M. Coulter, 'What Meaneth This?', *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10.1 (2001), pp. 38-64.; V.-M. Kärkkäinen, 'Toward a Pneumatological Theology of Religions', *International Review of Mission* 91 (2002), pp. 187-198.

⁷² Cf. D. Maxwell, 'Historicizing Christian Independency', *Journal of African History* 40 (1999), pp. 243-264.

⁷³ Cf. A. H. Anderson, *African Reformation* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 2001).

⁷⁴ The following data of the South Indian Pentecostal movement are based on the material collected in M. Bergunder, *Die südindische Pfingstbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1999 [engl. translation in preparation]).

⁷⁵ Saju, *Kerala Pentekosthu Charithram <malay.>* (Kottayam, Kerala: Good News Publication, 1994), p. 42.

⁷⁶ The details of this remarkable and complex conflict which cannot be given here, but cf. Bergunder, *Die südindische Pfingstbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert*, pp. 14-26.

⁷⁷ Histories that focus on the work of western Pentecostal missionaries are still in vogue (cf. e.g. S. M. Burgess, 'Pentecostalism in India', *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 4 [2001], pp. 85-98.), but, when the Indians themselves write about their history, the picture changes completely (cf. Saju, *Kerala Pentekosthu Charithram*; A. C. George, 'Pentecostal Beginnings in Travancore, South India', *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 4 [2001], pp. 215-237).

⁷⁸ E.g. in South India the Bible Mission, Beginning Pentecostal Truth Church, Manujothi Ashram, Yesunamam Churches (cf. Bergunder, *Die südindische Pfingstbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert*, pp. 143-158). Even more important would be the Catholic Charismatic movement which is of considerable strength in South India but has currently no or minimal relationship to the Indian Pentecostal movement. Since the sensational conversion of one of the leaders of the Tamil Catholic charismatics, S. J. Berchmans, to the Pentecostal movement in 1991, the situation has even become worse.

⁷⁹ For the problem of Syrian Christian domination within South Indian Pentecostalism see below. Syrian Christians claim to come originally from Hindu Brahman families that were converted by the apostle Thomas. All Syrian Christians were originally members of the Syrian Orthodox Church. Now, many of them are also Catholics or Protestants. A speciality of the Syrian Christian community is that, in spite of their confessional divisions, they maintain a common identity, analogous to the Hindu system. They practise an extraordinarily consistent endogamy and they keep very much to themselves in churches dominated by them. Regarding the Syrian Christian identity cf. e.g. G. Menachery (ed.), *The St. Thomas Christian Encyclopedia of India* (Trichur, 1973); S. Visvanathan, *The Christians of Kerala* (Madras: Oxford University Press, 1993); A. Kariyil, *Church and Society in Kerala* (New Delhi: Intercultural Publications, 1995).

⁸⁰ Dalit is a modern term that designates people who are considered untouchable in Brahmanical Hinduism, but discrimination didn't end after conversion to Christianity. Cf. e.g. J. C. B. Webster, *The Dalit Christians* (Delhi: I. S. P. C. K., 1992); S. Clarke, *Dalits and Christianity* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998).

⁸¹ Cf. S. Brouwer et al., *Exporting the American Gospel* (London: Routledge, 1996).

⁸² Cf. W. J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (London: SCM Press, 1972).

⁸³ Cf. J. A. B. Jongeneel (ed.), *Pentecost, Mission and Ecumenism* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992).

⁸⁴ For an overview on anthropological literature on Latin America cf. M. Bergunder, 'The Pentecostal Movement and Basic Ecclesial Communities in Latin America', *International Review of Mission* 91 (2002), pp. 163-186; for Africa cf. A. H. Anderson, *Zion and Pentecost* (Pretoria: University of South Africa Press, 2000); for India M. Bergunder, 'Miracle Healing and Exorcism', *International Review of Mission* 90 (2001), pp. 103-112.

⁸⁵ Cf. H. Cox, *Fire From Heaven* (London: Cassell, 1996).

⁸⁶ Cf. e.g. D. Petersen, *Not By Might Nor By Power* (Oxford: Regnum Books International, 1996); Yong, *Discerning the Spirit(s)*; Anderson, *Zion and Pentecost*.

⁸⁷ Cf. e.g. R. I. Gerloff, *A Plea for British Black Theologies* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992); S. Solivan, *The Spirit, Pathos and Liberation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Daniels, 'Everybody Bids You Welcome'.

⁸⁸ But cf. D. Kim, 'The Healing of Han in Korean Pentecostalism', *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 15 (1999), pp. 123-139.; J. Sepúlveda, 'Indigenous Pentecostalism and the Chilean Experience', in: A. H. Anderson & W. J. Hollenweger (ed.), *Pentecostals after a Century* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 111-134.

⁸⁹ Cf. e.g. G. Collet (ed.), *Theologien der Dritten Welt* (Immensee, 1990); D. J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1991), pp. 420-457; S. B. Bevans, *Models of Contextual Theology* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1992).

⁹⁰ But cf. Yong, *Discerning the Spirit(s)*, p. 206-219.

⁹¹ For a critique cf. Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, pp. 448-450.

⁹² Through Melvin Hodges (*The Indigenous Church* [Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1953]) this concept became quite well known in Pentecostal circles too.

⁹³ Cf. e.g. B. J. Moore-Gilbert, *Postcolonial theory* (London: Verso, 1997); R. J. C. Young, *Postcolonialism* (London: Blackwell, 2001).

⁹⁴ Already in 1975, John Thannickal wrote a dissertation in which he researched Hindu and Christian ashrams to find some stimulation for a contextual proclamation of the Christian message, cf. J. Thannickal, *Ashram — A Communicating Community* (D. Miss. Thesis, School of World Mission, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, 1975); for information on John Thannickal cf. Bergunder, *Die südindische Pfingstbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert*, pp. 103-104. In the 1980s Sadhu Chellappa started to go to the Hindu scriptures to prove Christ (cf. Bergunder, *Die südindische Pfingstbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert*, pp. 138-139). Moses Choudhary - strongly influenced by Donald McGavran's church growth movement - promotes an accommodation strategy for Christian mission among high caste Hindus so that they can stay with their own people even after going over to Christianity, cf. G. Moses (Gullapalli Vinayak) Choudary, *Reaching and Discipling Caste Hindus in Andhra Pradesh, India* (A Class Term Paper, Church of God School of Theology, Cleveland, 1980), and Bergunder, *Die südindische*

Pfingstbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert, pp. 131-133).

⁹⁵ For instance, V. V. Thomas (United Biblical Seminary, Poona) works on a PhD theses on 'Pentecostalism among Dalits in Kerala', and he explicitly relates this research to the concept of 'Dalit theology' which is the Indian variant of liberation theology. Others, like M. Stephen (Faith Theological Seminary, Manakala) or Isaac V. Mathew (Bethel Bible College, Punalur) are trying to make theological sense out of the encounter between Indian Pentecostalism and popular Hindu religiosity.

⁹⁶ Cf. R. E. Hedlund, 'Indian Instituted Churches', *Mission Studies* 16.1 (1999), pp. 26-42; R. E. Hedlund (ed.), *Christianity is Indian* (New Delhi: ISPCK, 2000); R. E. Hedlund, *Quest for Identity* (Delhi: ISPCK, 2000).

⁹⁷ Hedlund, *Quest for Identity*, pp. 81-82.

⁹⁸ The Syrian Orthodox church though it uses a 'foreign' (Syrian) liturgy can at the same time serve as the 'Original Indigenous Paradigm' (Hedlund, *Quest for Identity*, p. 23). Likewise, for instance, it is not clear why Pentecostal churches like the Tamil branch of the Church of God (Cleveland) or World Missionary Evangelism (Dallas, Texas) should be good examples for indigenous Pentecostalism (cf. Hedlund, *Quest for Identity*, pp. 82, 198). Similarly, Stanley Burgess knows of 'Indian Neocharismatics' which he explicitly considers as part of Hedlund's indigenous Christian movements, but as the most important example, he refers to the New Apostolic Church which is actually a Swiss-based centrally organized church of German-speaking origin with no Pentecostal ties so far (cf. Burgess, 'Pentecostalism in India', pp. 95-96).

⁹⁹ Cf. P. Pulikottil, 'As East and West Met in God's Own Country', *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research* 10 (2001).

¹⁰⁰ Cf. V. Chaturvedi (ed.), *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial* (London: Verso, 2000).

¹⁰¹ After his membership in the Church Missionary Society, in the Mar-Thoma Church and lastly with the Brethren, Poykayil Yohannan (who belonged to the Pulaiya community which is considered untouchable by caste Hindus) had founded his own independent church in 1907 (cf. W. S. Hunt, *The Anglican Church in Travancore and Cochin 1816-1916*, (Kottayam: Church Missionary Society Press, 1920/1933), vol. II, p. 235; S. Fuchs, *Godmen on the Warpath* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1992), pp. 236-238; Saju, *Kerala Pentekosthu Charithram*, p. 51).