

Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies



“Initial Evidence”

Volume 1, Number 2 (July 1998)

AN EVANGELICAL CRITIQUE OF “INITIAL EVIDENCE” DOCTRINE

David S. Lim

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a privilege to be asked to write this article as a representative of the Asian Evangelical theological community. The writer appreciates this openness to honest academic dialogue on one of the key distinctives of Pentecostal theology. It is hoped that this essay will open the way forward for a common understanding and a more biblical theology of those who believe in the doctrine of “initial evidence” and those who do not.

At the outset, may the writer identify himself and his context, for he is a mission theologian who believes that all good theologies are contextual or experiential.¹ In relation to Pentecostalism, he is an “open Evangelical,” that is someone who accepts Pentecostal theology and experience,² whereas a significant number (perhaps as many as half of

¹ Even the best exegetes and theologians come with pre-understanding to the biblical text. Those who do not acknowledge this fact are most prone to the weakness of jumping into dogmatism and/or premature (narrow and sub-biblical) theological conclusions.

² He has many Pentecostal friends and attends a Charismatic church; some (including himself) would consider him a “Charismatic,” as defined in this essay. “Open Evangelicals” believe that tongues and other supernatural gifts are still being endowed by the Holy Spirit, but still find certain Pentecostal doctrines to be problematic; cf. his forthcoming book, *Speaking in Tongues* (Quezon City, Philippines: New Day, 1998); S. Grossmann, *Stewards of God’s Grace* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1981); R. Quebedeaux, *The New Charismatics, II* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983); J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1986); H. Snyder, *The Divided Flame* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986); and T. Campolo, *How to Be Pentecostal without Speaking in Tongues* (Waco, TX: Word, 1991).

Evangelicals) are “closed Evangelicals” who hold to the cessationist,³ anti-Pentecostal view.

Although he came from a closed Evangelical tradition, he became more and more open to Pentecostalism since his college days while serving as a youth leader working for church unity and for campus evangelism.⁴ He is familiar with the theological issues raised from both the Evangelical and Pentecostal camps, and has heard and read of testimonies of Evangelicals who have moved to Pentecostalism,⁵ as well as of Pentecostals who have transferred to Evangelicalism, even of the closed variety. He has made an in-depth academic study of the tongues phenomenon, published a lengthy journal article about it in 1984,⁶ and revised it into a book to be published soon.⁷ In his ministry in Asia, especially in China, he has come across tongue-speaking traditions which do not share the Pentecostal paradigm.⁸

The writer recognizes that the twentieth century has seen at least three major waves of the Holy Spirit which carry Pentecostal theology.⁹ Classical Pentecostalism (simply called “Pentecostalism” in this essay) traces its roots to a Bible school in Topeka, Kansas (January 1, 1901) and the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles (1906-09). The late 1950s brought the second renewal (called “neo-Pentecostalism” here) into many established churches (Protestant, then Roman Catholic and Eastern

³ “Cessationists” believe that, since the completion of the canon, supernatural gifts like tongues have passed away. This viewpoint was popularized by Dispensationism, which based such views on the Dutch Reformed theology of B. B. Warfield. Cf. P. Wiebe, “The Pentecostal Initial Evidence Doctrine,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 27 (1984), pp. 465-72; J. MacArthur, *Charismatic Chaos* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992); and M. Moriarty, *The New Charismatics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992).

⁴ He served as the president of a coalition of church youth fellowships and led the local student leaders council of Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship-Philippines in Bacolod City from 1971-74.

⁵ Most impressive is that of ex-professor of Dallas Theological Seminary, John Deere, *Surprised by the Power of the Spirit* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993).

⁶ “Speaking in Tongues,” *Christian Forum* 7 (1984), pp. 34-73.

⁷ Referred to in n. 2.

⁸ In the Wenzhou area of China, Christian leaders who spoke in tongues started a Charismatic revival in the late 1950s; yet their theological paradigm does not include “initial evidence.” Cf. “Charismatic Churches in Mainland China,” *Chinese Around the World* (February, 1990), pp. 13-14.

⁹ Cf. C. P. Wagner, *The Third Wave of the Holy Spirit* (Ann Arbor: Servant, 1988).

Orthodox). Since the 80s, several independent Charismatic mega-churches and networks (called “Charismatism” here) were formed, often with some unusual teachings. These spiritual “waves of the Spirit” have made tremendous (and perhaps the greatest) impact in the growth of the church worldwide in this century.

2. QUESTIONS

But like almost all others of the Evangelical community, and despite his openness to the Pentecostal doctrines of “baptism of the Holy Spirit” and “initial evidence,” this writer finds problems in fitting them into Evangelical theology: Does the Bible (and Christian experience) really teach: 1) “baptism of the Holy Spirit” as a normative experience?; 2) “evidence” as a necessary element in spiritual experiences?; 3) “initial evidence” as an important element in Christian spirituality?; and 4) “speaking in tongues” as the only “initial evidence”? To each of these four issues, he offers suggestions for a possible way forward towards a common or shared Pentecostal-Evangelical theology.¹⁰

2.1 Spirit-baptism: Normative?

Sharing the Wesleyan-Holiness theological framework for interpreting the work of the Spirit, Pentecostalism clearly teaches that all believers should seek to be “baptized by the Holy Spirit,” which is understood as an experience subsequent to their conversion.¹¹ Among many other listed purposes, the most common reason why this experience is considered normative is that it anoints and empowers the Christian for (more powerful) spiritual service.¹²

¹⁰ This should be a high priority, in light of the observation of Jeremy Rifkin, *The Emerging Order* (New York: Random House, 1979): “If the Charismatic and evangelical streams of the new Christian renewal movement [today] come together and unite a liberating energy with a new covenant vision for society, it is possible that a great religious awakening will take place, one potentially powerful enough to incite a second Protestant reformation” (p. xi).

¹¹ Biblical support for Spirit-baptism is found in the perceived two-fold pattern in the life of Jesus (His miraculous birth through the overshadowing of the Spirit and the Spirit’s anointing at His baptism) and the apostles (born again or reformed in John 20:22 and then Spirit-baptized on the Day of Pentecost).

¹² Cf. G. P. Duffield and N. M. Van Cleave, *Foundations of Pentecostal Theology* (San Dimas, CA: LIFE Bible College, 1983; reprint, Manila: OMF Literature,

Many Evangelicals have found this view to be biblical wanting. It is good that there are Pentecostals who suggest that Spirit-baptism need not be a distinguishable, second event; but rather, may be a “concurrent yet subsequent” experience.¹³ Yet do all Spirit-baptisms have to be an eventful experience? This is not consistently shown in Acts. Barnabas, Timothy, Titus and other close companions of Paul, the twelve apostles, as well as other converts mentioned in the New Testament seem to have had no uniform crisis experiences. The “silence of Scripture” or the scarcity of biblical data leaves this tenet uncertain at best. Insisting on present definitions, Pentecostals are forced to deduce that those who have not been baptized by the Spirit have “imperfect dispositions” or “lack of faith-awareness, faith-expectancy or faith-openness.”¹⁴

So it appears that “Spirit-baptism” as a normative experience has to be redefined: not necessarily as a single event, but as a possible series of crisis experiences one encounters in the normal Christian life. This fosters an ongoing openness and expectancy for “life in the Spirit” which incorporates the full range of Charismatic gifts (including tongues, healing and prophecy) as a present day reality.

Evangelical theology may also be faulty if “conversion” is also perceived as a single event rather than as a process (series of events) that may or may not be highlighted by a memorable crisis experience.¹⁵ This traditional Evangelical and Pentecostal *event-centeredness* should be superseded by the recognition of the clearer biblical teaching of the unlimited creativity of God working *sovereignly* and *differently* in each Christian’s life. Throughout history the Spirit has brought believers *in various ways* into higher levels of awareness of God’s presence, power and glory. This Charismatic dimension of the normative Christian life may include any number of spiritual milestones, breakthrough

1990), pp. 307-13; and G. McGee, ed., *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991).

¹³ Cf. Y. C. Lim, “Acts 10: A Gentile Model for Pentecostal Experience,” *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 1 (1998), pp. 70-71.

¹⁴ P. A. Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985), p. 89.

¹⁵ It seems that most second and subsequent generations of believers, especially those who received good Christian nurture and did not undergo rebellion against their parents’ faith, would testify that such dramatic conversion and other spiritual experiences are rarely distinguishable in their lives.

experiences, and gradual uneventful “Spirit-infillings.”¹⁶ In this way, “Spirit-baptisms” (note plural) can be fully integrated into mainstream Evangelical theology.

2.2 Evidence: Necessary?

Pentecostal theology goes beyond the Wesleyan-Holiness paradigm by connecting “Spirit-baptism” to the concept of “initial evidence,” i.e., the need for a visible sign (in the sense of physical proof)¹⁷ to accompany the experience. This doctrine is supported from the five cases of (recorded and presumed) tongue-speaking in Acts: Pentecost (ch. 2), Samaritans (ch. 8), Paul (ch. 9), Cornelius (ch. 10), and the twelve in Ephesus (ch. 19).¹⁸ Evidence *per se* is considered to be a demonstration of God’s power that His kingdom has broken into this present age; the Spirit witnesses to Christ both inwardly and *outwardly* today.¹⁹

Yet this seems to be opposite to the New Testament or Pauline teaching that Christians are to walk by faith and not by sight (2 Cor 5:7; cf. 2:14-5:10).²⁰ In the synoptic gospels Jesus consistently refused to grant requests for signs (Matt 12:38f.; 16:4; cf. Luke 11:16f.). In John’s Gospel, although John showed that signs (in the sense of supernatural miracles) were useful to lead to faith (2:11, 23; 3:2; 6:2; 7:31; 9:16; 12:18f.; 20:31); nevertheless, Jesus knew that such human expectations are not necessarily linked to true faith (2:18f., 24f.; 4:48; 6:30; 12:10f.; cf. 11:47-53). If indeed there are evidences to be sought, Paul (Acts 14:22; 2 Cor 10-13; Col 1:24; 2 Tim 3:12) and Hebrews 11 emphasize that suffering and pain are the “signs” of true spirituality.

Some Pentecostal theologians have begun to locate this search for proof or evidence in the rise of “the scientific mindset” which has been popularized by Western secularism and empiricism.²¹ Yet this tendency

¹⁶ Cf. H. Lederle, “A Reformed Perspective on Baptism in the Holy Spirit,” *PRRM* *Renewal News* 128 (Fall, 1992), p. 7. May we not include struggles, breakdowns and depressions, too?

¹⁷ On the biblical concept of “proof,” cf. G. T. D. Angel, “*apodeixis*,” *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Exeter: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), III, pp. 570f.

¹⁸ Cf. McGee, ed., *Initial Evidence*.

¹⁹ Cf. Pomerville, pp. 93-95.

²⁰ Cf. D. Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1971), pp. 82, 115.

²¹ R. Spittler, “Suggested Areas for Further Research in Pentecostal Studies,”

seems to be not just a modern Western phenomenon; it seems to be a universal human weakness, dating from Cain (Gen 4:13-15) and manifested in New Testament times (1 Cor 1:18-2:16).²² Thus Asian Pentecostal theologians cannot opt out of this issue by just referring to the need to contextualize in non-Western settings; they need to develop a theology that critiques the general human longing for “visible evidence.”

Is this demand for evidence a sign of spiritual maturity or immaturity? The biblical data seem to point towards the latter.

2.3 Initial Evidence: Important?

Pentecostals emphasize the importance of “*initial* evidence” as a distinctive.²³ It is needed to assure the seeker that he has received the Holy Spirit, as in Acts.²⁴

This seems to detract from the biblical emphasis on the “*ultimate* evidence” or “*primary* evidence” of Spirit-baptism or Spirit-impregnation, which is *love* (Gal 5:6, 22f.; 1 Cor 12-14, esp. 13:1-3).²⁵ There seems to be hardly any emphasis nor any significant reference in the Scriptures to the physical pattern of beginning the believers’ spiritual journey and growth. Spiritual breakthroughs can start from any point, no matter how sinful (like Jacob in the OT and Zaccheus and the Samaritan woman in the NT), for people can come to Jesus as they are, as they are drawn by the Spirit of God (Rom 8).

Just like the Corinthian church, focusing on spiritual gifts (and the experience of initiation behind them) diverts attention from the Giver and His ultimate purpose. Paul had to rebuke the Corinthians for ignoring the fruit of the Spirit which ultimately validates or invalidates the theologies and spiritualities brought by whoever from whatever tradition (1 Cor

Society for Pentecostal Studies (paper presented at its 12th Annual Meeting, 1982), traces it to Darwin’s *Origin of the Species* in 1859 (p. 9).

²² The “demonstration of the Spirit and of power” (2:4) seems to denote non-dramatic conversions that transformed lives, though “signs and wonders” may also be meant.

²³ Cf. McGee, ed., *Initial Evidence*.

²⁴ Duffield & Van Cleave, pp. 320f.

²⁵ Biblical “love” (*agape*) may simply be defined as the sacrificial denial of oneself to serve the good of God’s kingdom and other people, particularly those in need, as modeled by our Lord Jesus himself (Eph 5:2; 1 Cor 13:4-7; 2 Cor 8:9; 1 John 3:16-18).

12:31-14:1; 16:14). The biblical emphasis is on the ethical rather than on the charismatic.²⁶

Thus, to emphasize “initial evidence” is theologically defective for it majors on a biblical minor rather than on a biblical major, that of “ultimate (or primary) evidence.” A couple of Pentecostal theologians have suggested six “permanent evidences,”²⁷ but fail to highlight “love” as the “ultimate evidence.” Can Asian Pentecostals take the lead in working on this corrective?

2.4 Tongues: Sole Initial Evidence?

As seen above, Pentecostals find biblical support for glossolalia as the initial evidence of Spirit-baptism in the five cases of tongue-speaking in Acts (chs. 2, 8, 9, 10 and 19). These biblical references are considered to be model events and hence normative.²⁸ Thus many Pentecostals have considered tongues as the *sine qua non* or the essence of Pentecostalism.²⁹ Some Pentecostals, several neo-Pentecostals and most Charismatics are more flexible in affirming Spirit-baptism as “usually, but not always” accompanied by glossolalia.³⁰

Given the paucity of references to tongues in the Scriptures (mainly in a few portions of Acts and 1 Cor 12-14), it seems improper to insist that God’s manifestation be identified with this specific gift as a “proof,”

²⁶ Quebedeaux, p. 238, who adds Jesus’ words, “By their fruits you shall know them.” See Matt 7:20; cf. 7:15-27; 25:31-46; James 2:14-26; 3:13-18; 2 Pet 1:3-7; 1 John 3:16-18; 4:7-21.

²⁷ Duffield & Van Cleave, p. 323, list: 1) Christ glorified as never before (John 14:21-23); 2) deeper passion for souls (Acts 2:14-41; 4:19f.; 11:22-24, etc.); 3) greater power to witness (Acts 1:8; 2:41; 4:31-33; John 15:26f.; 1 Cor 2:4f); 4) new power in prayer (Acts 3:1; 4:23-31; 6:4; 10:9; Rom 8:21; Jude 20; Eph 6:18; 1 Cor 14:14-22); 5) deeper love for the Bible (John 16:13); and 6) use of spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:4-11).

²⁸ Cf. Y. C. Lim, pp. 71-72. Evangelicals tend to view these cases as “initiatory events” of the universal church, hence non-normative, yet significantly confirming the presence of the Spirit among the early believers.

²⁹ Cf. McGee.

³⁰ W. J. Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), p. xix; cf. Quebedeaux, *New Charismatics*; C. Roxas, *Catholic Life in the Spirit Seminar Speakers Manual* (Quezon City, Philippines: Catholic Christian Community, 1992), pp. 23-24; and others. Duffield & Van Cleave, p. 323, also list other accompanying “signs,” like praise to God (Acts 2:11,47; 10:46), overflowing joy (2:46) and a deep burden and desire to preach Christ (1:8; 2:14-18; 3:31; 19:6).

however valuable the gift might be. At best, Pentecostals can point out that this is the distinctive of Lukan theology in Acts.³¹ But without downplaying its divine origin³² and its spiritual and psychological value (particularly in Spirit-baptism), and in accord with Pauline teaching, tongues need not be exalted above other gifts nor despised nor forbidden, but must be spoken in love and decorum (and preferably with interpretation if used in public) (1 Cor 14:26-33, 39-40).

Moreover, a Gallup poll in 1979 already revealed that only one-sixth of those who claim to be Pentecostals (and neo-Pentecostals and perhaps many more Charismatics) have ever spoken in tongues.³³ How are Pentecostals going to integrate this reality into their theology? An over-emphasis on tongues may be detrimental to the long-term development of Pentecostal theology³⁴ and the growth of Pentecostalism.³⁵ It seems that the less glossolalia is linked to "initial evidence" and "Spirit-baptism," the more universal (and biblical) will Pentecostal theology be. Perhaps the term "common (or usual) evidence" is a step forward?

3. CONCLUSION

Thus, for lack of direct or explicit biblical references (perhaps except for some "clues" in Acts) to glossolalia as the only initial evidence of Spirit-baptism, it may be best for Pentecostal theology to reformulate this doctrine.³⁶ This should be interpreted not as a retreat to tentativeness but

³¹ Cf. Y. C. Lim, pp. 62-72; and Pomerville, pp. 89-92. Yet if tongues were a common experience in "Spirit-baptism" in the early church, why did Luke have to deliberately (did he?) record and teach it in Acts?

³² Yet tongues are also known to occur in non-Christian contexts, even under occult or demonic influence. Besides, some instances may be merely psychological and not necessarily edifying or beneficial to those present.

³³ K. S. Kantzer, "The Charismatics Among Us," *Christianity Today* (February 22, 1980), pp. 13-17.

³⁴ Why insist on a distinctive which is biblically limited (almost exclusively Lukan) rather than on others which are more widely taught alongside other biblical traditions (Pauline, Matthean, Johannine)?

³⁵ Why insist on a doctrine that would alienate potential church members, and may lead to exclude members and disenfranchise ordained ministers who can no longer hold on to such with intellectual and/or moral integrity?

³⁶ One that interests the author is what will happen to the "latter rain" teaching of Pentecostalism, particularly if our Lord Jesus does not return in another 50 years.

an advance to maturation in theological development,³⁷ in at least three directions:

3.1 Redefinition of Initial Evidence

In light of the above discussion, tongues may best be called “a common (or usual) evidence” of Christians who (and not all will) experience Spirit-baptism. The phrase “initial evidence” may mean the “primary (or main) experience.”

Perhaps glossolalia was indeed the initial evidence then, but now it is just one of many, just like Aaron’s rod, the ark of the covenant and the serpent on Moses’ pole; these brought forth a spiritual revival, but were later no longer God’s means. Today Spirit-baptism may be accompanied by “resting (or slain) in the Spirit,” prophetic words, inner healing, holy laughter, or no physical manifestation!³⁸ Thereby the distinctive’s emphasis shifts to the sovereign grace of God,³⁹ who deals with each person in his/her context according to His riches in Christ Jesus. Here is an example of a modified “common evidence” view:

... tongues is not a mark of maturity, because we see unbelievers who come from completely pagan backgrounds who start speaking in tongues right at conversion.... it is not the “initial” experience of having received the infilling with the Holy Spirit, nor does it grow out of a second work of grace because there are many who effectively witness to Jesus Christ, but who do not speak in tongues. It is entirely God’s grace, given not as a reward for holiness or maturity, but as an aid to our Christian development and service.⁴⁰

³⁷ For this writer, the church’s growth into a united and fuller understanding of God and His will take place as each denomination or tradition develops in theological maturity and outgrows its earlier (narrow) “distinctives” and embraces more mature (open) “distinctives” that can be shared by others.

³⁸ The Bible seems to teach that the sovereign Spirit is not only free to grant the known *charismata*, but also *new* (i.e., not mentioned in Scriptures) ones (cf. John 3:8; 2 Cor 3:17; also, none of the Paul’s listings of gifts was meant to be exhaustive). Records of past revivals also include holy rolling, holy dancing, holy barking and (recently) holy laughter!

³⁹ Duffield & Van Cleave, p. 308, characterize “Spirit-baptism” as “a free gift of God’s grace.” Pomerville, p. 92, seems to allow the absence of tongues in Spirit-baptism as “perhaps, a sovereign decision on the part of God, Acts 8.”

⁴⁰ By a Reformed neo-Pentecostal, W. Childs, “The Gift of Tongues Aids Christian Growth,” *PRRMI Renewal News* 128 (Fall, 1992), p. 8.

How big is Pentecostalism's God? May it be the God who deals with His people in creative, multifaceted patterns (with or without tongues) in their respective uniqueness in His unpredictable, sovereign way.

3.2 Reemphasis on Ultimate Evidence

Pentecostalism can then be free to emphasize other possible distinctives. One possibility is to return to one of its greatest contributions to modern Christian theology: that of building bridges across the gap between orthodoxy and orthopraxy.⁴¹

As an alternative to false ecumenism that rejected the importance of orthodoxy, Pentecostalism emphasized that orthodoxy must produce right experience or practice.

As shown above, the regular use of the charismata (right practice) would point less to visible "initial evidence" (tongues), but more to moral "ultimate evidence" (love). Such love will help believers to transcend gender, age and racial barriers (as was manifested in classical Pentecostalism), denominational divisions (neo-Pentecostalism)⁴² as well as social, economic and political gaps (Charismaticism). As "Mr. Pentecost," David DuPlessis said, "The Holy Spirit has never recognized barriers."⁴³ Can Pentecostalism recover such a high level of "evidence" doctrine?

3.3 Revival of Universal Priesthood

Another possible Pentecostal distinctive is the actualization of the "priesthood (or prophethood)"⁴⁴ of all believers." Like most revivals, the Pentecostal movement reintroduced and developed the "universal priesthood" doctrine in a new way, where no earthly distinction hinders

⁴¹ The black American origins of Pentecostalism saw the call for true Christians to give sacrificial response to human suffering by working for the end of racism, prejudice and injustice; cf. Quebedeaux, pp. 210, 238f.

⁴² Pentecostal theologians should continue to take the lead in bridging the gaps between Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy and various Protestant denominations; this sort of bridge-building does not appear to have gone beyond Brighton (1991); cf. M. Harper, *Three Sisters* (Wheaton: Tyndale, 1979); Quebedeaux, pp. 72-85; and Snyder, pp. 45-47, 90, 96f.

⁴³ David Du Plessis, *The Spirit Bade Me Go*, rev. ed. (Plainfield, NJ: Logos, 1970), p. 27.

⁴⁴ Acts 2:17-18 seems to be quite clear on this.

any believer from serving the Lord with his/her particular mix of charismata.⁴⁵ But with the “initial evidence” doctrine, it brought in an inherent “logical contradiction” into this biblical truth: it necessarily leads to a two-tiered system, with a “spiritual elite” (glossolalics) and the rest as “second class citizens” of God’s kingdom. How do Pentecostals define themselves in relation to the rest of the Body of Christ? An important theological issue arises: Are non-glossolalics inferior or equal to glossolalics in spiritual status before God?

In contrast, if Pentecostalism reemphasizes the “universal priesthood” doctrine, its distinctive of orthopraxy will surely keep it on the cutting edge of theological development and global missions. It will call the churches to be constantly renewed by the Spirit (not just by one fixed pattern, but by any pattern which the Spirit sovereignly grants to each) to serve God’s kingdom as fellow priests, prophets and servant-leaders - with or without the initial evidence of tongues.

The failure to develop beyond its “initial evidence” doctrine may just be the reason why Pentecostalism’s three waves seem to have each “run out of steam.”⁴⁶ We await another wave of the Spirit of God - this time more biblical, universal and more truly Pentecostal.

⁴⁵ Hence each Christian (not just the “clergy”) should have a sense of calling or vocation, regardless of race, gender, age, educational attainment or economic status. All believers have equal status before God just by virtue of the fact that they are baptized into the body of Christ by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 12:13, cf. 12:4-30; Rom 12:1-8; Gal 3:28).

⁴⁶ Cf. Quebedeaux, p. 239.