

## Pure Gospel or Full Gospel

Vondey, Wolfgang

DOI:

[10.1111/dial.12278](https://doi.org/10.1111/dial.12278)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Vondey, W 2016, 'Pure Gospel or Full Gospel: On the Principles of Lutheran and Pentecostal Theology', *Dialog: A Journal of Theology*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 324-333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dial.12278>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Vondey, W. (2016), Pure Gospel or Full Gospel: On the Principles of Lutheran and Pentecostal Theology. *Dialog*, 55: 324–333, which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/dial.12278>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

**Pure Gospel or Full Gospel:  
On the Principles of Lutheran and Pentecostal Theology**

By Wolfgang Vondey<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:**

The claim in recent conversations among Lutherans and Pentecostals that the “pure gospel” and “full gospel” paradigms held respectively by each tradition represent contrasting theological principles is examined through a historical and theological study of the notion of “gospel.” The two paradigms, although not mutually exclusive, identify different hermeneutical and doctrinal commitments which suggest that the contrast between the two traditions exists not in the idea of the gospel but in its mode of expression.

**Keywords:**

gospel, Luther, Pentecostalism, justification, law, revelation, scripture, ecumenism

In 2004, Lutheran and Pentecostal representatives entered into exploratory conversations that preceded the approval of official dialogue between the Lutheran World Federation and Pentecostal churches. The central theme for the conversations was the experiential concern, “how do we encounter Christ?” The report of the conversations, published in 2010, appears in a generally hopeful tone but nonetheless ends on a cautious note: Pentecostals wondered if

---

<sup>1</sup> Wolfgang Vondey is Reader in Contemporary Christianity and Pentecostal Studies at the University of Birmingham, UK, and Director of the Centre for Charismatic and Pentecostal Studies. He has published widely on Pentecostalism and ecumenical themes, including recently, *Pentecostalism: A Guide for the Perplexed* (2013), *Beyond Pentecostalism* (2010); and two volumes of *Pentecostalism and Christian Unity* (2013 and 2010). For ten years he was also consultant to the Luther Academy (US) and the *Luther Digest*.

Lutherans believed in something “less than the full gospel,” while Lutherans were concerned if Pentecostals held to “more than the pure gospel.”<sup>1</sup> Despite its explanatory power, the aphoristic juxtaposition of *full gospel* and *pure gospel*, identified as the central tension between Lutherans and Pentecostals, is only marginally explored (and explained) in the document. The conversation focuses only on identifying the respective positions but engages not in a comparative analysis of the two modifiers, “full” and “pure,” or questions if the concept of the “gospel” held by each side indeed allows for such comparison.

Considering the ongoing neglect to study the charismatic renewal among Lutherans and the Lutheran response to Pentecostalism,<sup>2</sup> clarifying the veracity of this central tension might affirm foundational differences between the two groups, provide direction for further (official) investigation, and offer ecumenical opportunities for theological reconciliation. This essay intends to close this gap by offering a theological assessment of the distinction between the so-called pure gospel and full gospel paradigms. The modest goal of this essay is an etymological study of the notion of “gospel” on historical and theological grounds between Lutherans and Pentecostals. The first section identifies the respective understandings of the notion of “gospel” held by Lutherans and Pentecostals and evaluates its comparative usage. The second section traces the development of the notion of “gospel” from the Reformation to the birth of twentieth-century Pentecostalism. The investigation begins with Martin Luther’s theology and traces the development of Lutheran theology and its influence on Protestant and Pentecostal notions of the gospel. The final part contrasts the modifying terms, “pure” and “full,” applied to characterize the theological principles of each perspective and offers an evaluative analysis of both paradigms.

## **Gospel among Lutherans and Pentecostals**

Luther's criticism of the charismatic movement of his days is well known.<sup>3</sup> His understanding of the gospel emphasized faith rather than charisma, albeit not at the cost of rejecting spiritual gifts but with the intention to offer an integrative principle of participating in God's work of salvation.<sup>4</sup> Luther's concern was to protect the gospel against the fanaticism of the enthusiast and a complete subjectivizing of revelation. Lutheran confessional strictures point to the Smalcald Articles, which are typically seen as an unambiguous expression of Luther's denial that these movements were of the Holy Spirit.<sup>5</sup> Contemporary appropriations of Luther's critique, such as the report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod in 1972, have continued to reject Pentecostal and Charismatic movements on the basis of Luther's apparent disavowal of the "claim that God communicates directly with believers through prophecy, visions, tongues, or other means."<sup>6</sup> Whether this is a correct reading of the Smalcald Articles can be debated.<sup>7</sup> Surprisingly, however, Lutheran interpretations have focused more on the pneumatology and psychology of Luther's criticism than on his emphasis on revelation and definition of "gospel."

In turn, Pentecostals have generally looked favorably at Luther, who is seen as a restorer of sound doctrine at the cost of entering into conflict with religious, political, and spiritual powers.<sup>8</sup> When referencing Luther, Pentecostal pioneers frequently highlighted his advocacy for the gospel and embraced Luther's emphasis on the good news in its pure form, even identifying particular biblical texts with Luther's help as "the chief book of the New Testament" and "the purest Gospel."<sup>9</sup> For most Pentecostals, Luther had preached the gospel as "the doctrine of atoning blood to slumbering Europe."<sup>10</sup> Classical Pentecostals widely identified with the

evangelistic and missionary thrust of the Reformation. Contemporary Pentecostals, however, often distinguish between Luther and Lutherans, challenging the tradition's lack of emphasis on charismatic practices yet without questioning what precisely Luther meant by his notion of "gospel."

For both Lutherans and Pentecostals, the Gospels of the New Testament form the heart of the Christian message of salvation offered by God in Jesus Christ. The Gospels form the core narrative of the Christian faith and thus the ground for Christian confession and witness. From the New Testament context, both Lutherans and Pentecostals typically identify the "gospel" as the "good news," a word-for-word translation of the old English, *gōd-spell*, derived from the Greek, *euangélion*, and in the Latin, *evangelium*, rendered in Luther's German as *Evangelium*. Similarly, Pentecostals are not shy to use the term "evangel" in some form for the title of their publications, assemblies, churches, and educational institutions to emphasize the missionary intent and soteriology of the movement.<sup>11</sup> Both traditions therefore use the term "gospel" in the twofold sense of referring to the biblical texts and to the content of these texts, a distinction that deserves more attention in the ecumenical conversation.

### *Luther and Gospel*

In his preface to the New Testament, Luther explains the notion of "gospel" precisely through reference to the biblical proclamation: the gospel is the message of the Gospels. Consequently, "there is only one gospel ... because the gospel ... is ... the proclamation of Christ the son of God and of David, truly God and man."<sup>12</sup>

By his death and resurrection, He has conquered sin, death, and hell for us and all who believe in Him. The gospel may be proclaimed in few words or in many; one writer may describe it briefly and the other at length. If at length, then many of the works and words of Christ will be set down, as in the case of the four evangelists. Those who write it briefly . . . tell succinctly how He conquered sin, death, and hell by His own death and resurrection on behalf of those who believe in Him.<sup>13</sup>

Arguably, Luther's idea of "gospel" is located precisely in his concern for the proper confession of the revelation of Christ.<sup>14</sup> Consequently, thesis 62 of the 95 Thesis describes the gospel not only as "the glory and grace of God" but as "the true treasure of the church."<sup>15</sup> One might argue that, for Luther, revelation and gospel are two interdependent aspects of the responsibility of the church, which is to be upheld in its doctrines. In the Smalcald Articles, Luther consequently orders all Christian teaching around the proclamation of the gospel and exclaims: "The first and chief article is this, that Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, 'was put to death for our trespasses and raised again for our justification' (Rom. 4:25)."<sup>16</sup> At the same time, Luther subsequently identifies the gospel not only as the gift of God but by its "peculiar office"<sup>17</sup> to the world manifested in the ministry of the church. Lutherans have appropriated this task in a twofold sense, denoting with the responsibility to the gospel both the proclamation of God's saving work in Christ and its application to those who believe.<sup>18</sup> The Formula of Concord distinguishes similarly between the gospel in the proper sense, identifying "solely the preaching of God's grace" and the gospel in the general sense, referencing "the entire doctrine of Christ, our Lord, which He proclaimed in His ministry upon earth, and commanded to be proclaimed in the New Testament."<sup>19</sup> It was the affirmation of this dual responsibility as the foundation for protecting the authority of the gospel that was to be restored by the Reformation movement.

## *Pentecostals and Gospel*

Luther's emphasis on the Gospels as the proclamation of Christ is echoed by Pentecostals, however, with a strong emphasis on the historical narratives of the church. Although not exclusively, the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts are widely heralded as the focus of Pentecostal hermeneutics.<sup>20</sup> The Pentecostal emphasis is on the "power of the gospel" (1 Thess. 1:5) contained in the saving work of Christ as made evident in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (see Acts 2). While Luther frequently preached on Pentecost, he held no lectures on the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>21</sup> In contrast, Pentecostals often see Luke-Acts as a single, continuous Gospel narrative in which the good news of Jesus Christ (in Luke) is reinterpreted with the day of Pentecost through the work of the Spirit of Christ (in Acts). Pentecostals consequently agree on the essential core of the gospel, namely that "in Christ God was reconciling the world to Himself" (2 Cor 5:19).<sup>22</sup> At the same time, Pentecostal rhetoric has emerged from various revival movements during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and emphasizes the experience of the gospel rather than its historical or intellectual content. The gospel as the proclamation of Jesus Christ is therefore the proclamation of the experience of Jesus, which advocates a narrative of Jesus' ministry as savior that highlights also the diverse experiences of Jesus as sanctifier, Spirit baptizer, divine healer, and coming king. It was this appropriation of Jesus' ministry as the foundation for the power of the gospel that was to be restored by the Pentecostal movement.

## **Gospel from the Reformation to Pentecostalism**

Luther's quest to protect the authority of the gospel from the revelatory claims of the enthusiasts was a motivating factor in articulating the Protestant principle, *sola Scriptura*.<sup>23</sup> For Luther, Scripture functions as the rule and norm of the gospel because it contains revealed doctrine.<sup>24</sup> In turn, the gospel forms the uncontested internal principle of Scripture in its revelation of Jesus Christ.<sup>25</sup> However, the exact relationship of Scripture to gospel has become subject of debate and among Lutherans exacerbated with the theological distinction between the form and matter of revelation.<sup>26</sup> Put succinctly, *sola scriptura* ("scripture alone") is not identical with *solum evangelium* ("gospel alone")! From the perspective of this distinction, it is not the "content" of revelation, the biblical texts, but their inner "form," where the authority of the gospel is located.<sup>27</sup>

### *The Form and Content of Revelation*

The Formula of Concord is one of the earliest indications of pursuing a twofold theological sense of "gospel." Noteworthy in the theological content of the document is not only the identification of "gospel" in terms of "doctrine," and the latter in terms of its opposition to the law, but the distinction drawn between the nature and content of the gospel itself. Accordingly, the Formula identifies the nature of the "gospel" as "that doctrine (*sic!*) which teaches what a man should believe in order to obtain the forgiveness of sins from God, since man has failed to keep the law of God and has transgressed it, his corrupted nature, thoughts, words, and deeds war against the law, and he is therefore subject to the wrath of God, to death, to temporal miseries, and to the punishment of hell-fire."<sup>28</sup> At the same time, the document highlights that "[t]he content of the Gospel is this, that the Son of God, Christ our Lord, himself assumed and bore the curse of the



law and expiated and paid for all our sins, that through him alone we reenter the good graces of God, obtain forgiveness of sins through faith, are freed from death and all the punishments of sin, and are saved eternally.”<sup>29</sup> The identification of “gospel” in the twofold sense noted above and the further equation of gospel (in this twofold sense) with Christian doctrine have forged a unique theological identity in Lutheran theology.

Among early Lutherans, this distinction between form and content is perpetuated in the influential systematic account of orthodox Lutheran theology by Johann Gerhard,<sup>30</sup> who suggested that one was justified to speak also of a formal and material principle of Christian doctrine.<sup>31</sup> J. W. Baier’s *Compendium of Positive Theology* and Johann Philipp Gabler’s theology were influential in weaving this fundamental distinction into the theological training of generations of Lutheran pastors since the end of the seventeenth century.<sup>32</sup> Gabler argued that the only *material* foundation of the Christian religion could be a *doctrine* that would serve as the source of all other teachings.<sup>33</sup> From a Lutheran perspective, Luther’s doctrine of justification was the clear champion to serve as the highest material principle. However, Gabler questioned whether it was possible to offer a single material principle as the chief teaching of the gospel that could also serve as the supreme principle of Lutheran theology.<sup>34</sup> He insisted that the theological task was guided instead by a *formal* principle, and not by a matter of content.<sup>35</sup> This distinction opened the way for the longstanding historical discussion on the integral principle of Protestant thought.<sup>36</sup> Its most immediate and far-reaching consequence is the (theo)logical separation of Scripture, doctrine, and gospel.

*Scripture, Doctrine, and Gospel*

In contrast to Luther's intentions, *sola Scriptura* came to serve the historical evaluation of the Reformation and the resulting confessions; it delineated a formula for identifying the principle of contemporary Protestantism rather than aiding in protecting the authority of the gospel.<sup>37</sup> In other words, if the gospel serves as the *formal* principle of the Lutheran worldview, it has to be supplemented by a *material* counterpart from within the system of Lutheran doctrines. In this way, the doctrine of justification retained its positions as the material principle of the theological enterprise, which, understood as a compendium of propositional, dogmatic truths, still demands adherence to the authority of Scripture on formal grounds but can find its core identified with a particular doctrine rather than the narrative content of the Gospel.

The problematic nature of these distinctions was formally recognized by a report of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, in 1972.<sup>38</sup> The confusion is evident in the report itself, which initially acknowledges that some “have in effect made the Bible, rather than the Gospel, the heart and center—the ‘material principle’—of their faith”<sup>39</sup> while later explaining in reverse that “today there is a frequent confusion of these principles, with the result that the Gospel, rather than the Bible, is employed as the norm of our theology.”<sup>40</sup> The same report identifies that most Lutherans see the formal principle as *sola Scriptura* and the gospel as the material principle.<sup>41</sup> Yet, at a later point still it is suggested that “the material principle of Lutheran theology is in reality only a synopsis and summary of the Christian truth” and “when Lutheran theologians speak of justification by faith as the material principle of theology, they merely wish to indicate that all theological thinking must begin at this article, center in it, and culminate in it.”<sup>42</sup> Finally, the report suggests that the term “gospel” could be applied in a minimalist sense and not mean to cover all church doctrine and practices. In response, the report recommends that while the gospel is the norm of Scripture, the gospel is not normative for Lutheran theology in the sense of a basic

principle. In turn, Scripture is the norm of the gospel because the latter is derived from the former as the word of God. Formal and material principles are therefore interdependent insofar as “Lutheran Symbols are correct expositions of Scripture, [and] they teach the Gospel purely.”<sup>43</sup>

This confusion is symptomatic not only for Lutherans; we can find a widespread disagreement among evangelical and protestant traditions on the nature of the relationship between Scripture, gospel, and doctrine.<sup>44</sup> Moreover, there exists a fundamental impasse of reconciling a formal with a material principle of theology: either both principles are given equal authority, which would elevate doctrine to the same status as revelation and effectively equate justification with the gospel, or one principle supersedes the other, which would separate gospel and doctrine.<sup>45</sup> The only logical alternative is a separation of the formal element from the material, which in fact separates the doctrine of justification, as the material principle of the gospel, from Scripture as the formal principle of Protestantism.<sup>46</sup> This separation has allowed the doctrine of justification at times to emerge as a synonym for the Lutheran understanding of the gospel. Beyond the Lutheran fellowship, this equation suggest that it is appropriate to make similar distinctions in ecumenical conversations with other traditions: if the gospel is the formal principle of Pentecostalism, then what is the material principle identifying the chief teaching of Pentecostal doctrine?

## **Pure Gospel**

Demands for the purity of the gospel are not unique to Lutherans and can be found among a variety of Christian traditions and thinkers, including Pentecostals.<sup>47</sup> The history of the notion of gospel among Lutherans suggests that the phrase “pure gospel” can refer as a formal principle

both to the purity of the gospel, thus emphasizing the content of Scripture (“Gospel”) and its proclamation of Christ (*solus Christus*), and to the purity of doctrine, thus emphasizing the content of the church’s teaching as “purely gospel” or the “gospel alone.” However, Lutheran theology demands historically that the pure proclamation of the gospel of Christ alone is identified by a further material principle, which qualifies the purity of the church’s teaching. At Luther’s time, the notion of a “pure” gospel carried the substantial undertones of his dissatisfaction with the way the church (Catholics, enthusiasts, and others) proclaimed and protected the good news of Christ. Strictly speaking, Luther was not concerned with the purity of the gospel as such, since it is the word of God, but with the purity of the church’s proclamation. Hence, when Luther warned “that many have the gospel but not the truth of the gospel,”<sup>48</sup> his concern was in fact that the truth of the gospel revealed by Scripture was reflected in the church’s “pure doctrine.”<sup>49</sup> In the same vein, the Augsburg Confession defines the church as “the assembly of all believers among whom the gospel is purely preached and the sacraments administered according to the gospel.”<sup>50</sup> For Luther, and for Lutherans, the purity of the gospel and the demand for the purity of doctrine are at the core identical.<sup>51</sup>

### *Law and Gospel*

Luther’s demand that the church’s doctrine must proclaim the pure gospel is clearly distinguished from Luther’s equally stern rebuke that the proclamation of the gospel must be radically distinguished from the law. The distinction of law and gospel was maintained by the Augsburg Confession and with the Formula of Concord became a general hermeneutical principle.<sup>52</sup> This contrast is significant for understanding the Lutheran demand of a “pure” gospel

insofar as the disabuse of the law (understood as God's absolute demand that cannot be satisfied by humankind) is the presupposition for the authority of the gospel.<sup>53</sup> The "law-gospel" dichotomy represents for many the *de facto* material principle of the Reformation contained within the single term "gospel" and as a hermeneutical principle identical with the heart of the biblical message.<sup>54</sup> The understanding of a "pure" gospel here emerges from the contrast to the law, as is well preserved in C. F. W. Walther's classic treatise, *The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel*, which ends, in the North American context of rising revelatory claims made by various marginal Christian groups, with Walther's admonition that the "pure gospel" is presented correctly as "pure doctrine" only if law and gospel are not confused.<sup>55</sup> Influential contemporary works, including Edmund Schlink's *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*, therefore warn that the church must always bear witness to the gospel and not to herself.<sup>56</sup> Even faith must not be seen as a condition for salvation, and any emphasis on repentance, sanctification, and other works necessary for salvation pollutes the objective nature of justification granted by faith alone. The distinction of law and gospel, for Schlink, is not a matter of logical deduction or formal adherence but "takes place . . . by experience alone," that is, by faith.<sup>57</sup> Contemporary Lutheran concerns maintain that the gospel must be received in the experience of faith apart from the law so that even the authority of dogma is based on the promises of God.<sup>58</sup> Pure gospel is encapsulated by pure doctrine only with the singular emphasis that "faith alone" (*sola fide*), apart from the works of the law, leads to justification. For Lutherans, the singular emphasis on justification therefore preserves the purity of doctrine because it defines the role the Christian and of Christian works for salvation precisely by negating their significance.

## **Full Gospel**

The emphasis on a “full” gospel emerged historically in relative isolation from the Reformation debates and the Lutheran emphasis on justification, law, and gospel. Instead, the idea developed originally from the attempt among Pentecostal pioneers to narrate their experiences with God in their encounter with Christ. The most widely-known framework for narrating the set of Pentecostal experiences emerging on the ground is the so-called four- or five-fold gospel.<sup>59</sup> The pattern has endured the short history of modern-day Pentecostalism as a consistent narrative for articulating the spirituality and theology of the movement.<sup>60</sup> The larger, five-fold pattern proclaims, usually in kerygmatic form, the good news that Jesus Christ brings (1) salvation, (2) sanctification, (3) baptism in the Spirit, (4) divine healing, and (5) the impending arrival of the kingdom of God.<sup>61</sup> Rather than elements of propositional doctrine (formal or material), these patterns form a narrative framework for identifying the centrality of encountering Christ manifested in several underlying experiences of the Holy Spirit.<sup>62</sup> All elements of the Gospel and their reflection in contemporary Pentecostal theology are more immediately subjected to integration in the narrated experience of the “full” gospel (whether in the four- or fivefold pattern) than in a strict doctrinal framework. One might say that for the practices of the gospel, experience is more hospitable among Pentecostals than their articulation as doctrine. The articulation of Pentecostal theology today continues to be challenged by the integral demand that the doctrines of Pentecostals reflect the hospitality of their experiences.

### *The Catholicity of the Full Gospel*

The order and content of the full gospel is not strictly defined and varies historically and geographically, since the four- or fivefold pattern is not the result of systematic theological reflection or received interpretation of Scripture but functions as a descriptive mechanism of Pentecostal spirituality shaped by a range of personal and communal experiences. The full gospel motif should therefore not be understood in a reductionist fashion as a definitive formula for the content of Pentecostal doctrine.<sup>63</sup> The elements are not logically isolated or adhere to a strict theological sequence, since the experiences underlying the motif have occurred in diverse fashion among Pentecostals.<sup>64</sup> Hence, the greatest challenge of engaging Pentecostal theology ecumenically is a reduction of the full gospel to the propositional ideas of salvation, sanctification, Spirit baptism, divine healing and the coming kingdom, or worst, to merely one of those elements. What is lost in any reductionism is the hospitable character, or catholicity, of the experiences and the ensuing transformation, reflection, and practices, which stand at the core of each element and of the full gospel narrative as a whole.<sup>65</sup> In the sense of this hospitality, Pentecostal theology resists the distinction between the form and content of revelation and its application to doctrine.<sup>66</sup> While salvation is arguably a dominant (formal) theological concern, soteriology is not a central Pentecostal “doctrine” among others but dispersed among the experiences narrated by the full gospel. In turn, the full gospel itself is not an analytical exposition of a Pentecostal order of salvation but rather an open narrative of the way of participating in all events of the gospel.

*The Pentecostal Via Salutis*

The articulation of a *full* gospel underscores the dominance of “salvation” for articulating a Pentecostal theology not merely by its primary position in the narrative but by its distribution throughout. One could say that the full gospel is soteriological from beginning to end: all elements are potential entry points on the way to salvation.<sup>67</sup> In other words, soteriology can be identified as the formal name for a narrative account of Pentecostal theology, which originates from, tends toward, and is supported throughout by the doctrine of salvation. Consequently, when Pentecostals say that salvation marks the beginning and overall direction of their theology, this should not be construed as a definitive Pentecostal *ordo salutis*. The full gospel motif as the framework for Pentecostal key experiences may give the impression that the good news of Jesus Christ as savior, sanctifier, Spirit baptizer, divine healer, and coming king is marked by an uncompromising four- or fivefold order. Indeed, classical Pentecostals have adopted in their history a Protestant *ordo salutis* that obscures the full gospel motif and its hospitality.<sup>68</sup> The global Pentecostal movements accentuate the single importance of salvation for Pentecostal theology, the centrality of Jesus Christ, and the pneumatological orientation reflected in the full gospel. Salvation does function in a sense as the Pentecostal equivalent for the Lutheran emphasis on justification, although the two terms are not identical.<sup>69</sup> However, a much broader palette of soteriological experiences becomes visible among Pentecostals worldwide that suggests that *all* elements of the full gospel are works of grace and thus possible entrance points to the way of salvation (*via salutis*).<sup>70</sup> The concern for the “full” gospel is thus, in the first instance, a concern for the fullness of salvation made available through the gospel and its proclamation and practice in the church.

## **Conclusion**



The distinction between full gospel and pure gospel reflects a complicated historical and rich theological development, which undoubtedly impacts official conversations between Lutherans and Pentecostals. However, the two phrases talk at cross purposes and do not simply identify a shift in perspective on the same object: pure gospel is an attempt to condense the notion of the gospel to a central core in the effort to protect its form and content in the church's proclamation; full gospel is an attempt to extend the notion of the gospel in the effort to protect the hospitality of all possible experiences narrated by the Gospel. On the other hand, the different emphases do not mutually exclude one another: full gospel is an attempt to protect the purity of the gospel by showing the consistency between the Gospel of Christ and its appropriation by the church; pure gospel is an attempt to identify with a singular principle the entirety of the biblical message and its proclamation by the church.

Nonetheless, the two perspectives operate on two radically different presuppositions. Pure gospel signifies a principle of doctrine whereas full gospel denotes a narrative of experience. The former contests religious experiences not readily identifiable with the form and content of the gospel, while the latter struggles with theological doctrines not readily observable in (or contradicting) religious experiences. When Lutherans take for granted the reflection of their own theological principles in the formation of Pentecostal thought, the notion of the full gospel is likely to be distorted into the idea that Pentecostalism adds either to the formal principle of the gospel a different standard or to the material principle a different content. When Pentecostals expect Lutheran theology to reflect the hospitality of their own experiences, the notion of a pure gospel is likely to become distorted into the idea that Lutherans exclude religious (and charismatic) experiences on principle as a valid source of revelation. Purity and

fullness of the gospel are indicative of how the two groups express their respective experiences of Christ. The future of dialogue between the two traditions will therefore depend initially less on the reconciliation of doctrine than on the mutual sharing of their experiences as valid manifestations of the same gospel.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> *Lutherans and Pentecostals in Dialogue* (Strasbourg: Institute for Ecumenical Research; Pasadena, CA: The David du Plessis Center for Christian Spirituality; Zürich: The European Pentecostal Charismatic Research Association, 2010).

<sup>2</sup> See Kenneth G. Appold, "Lutheran Reactions to Pentecostalism: A U.S. Case Study," in *ibid.*, 58–84; Karen L. Blomquist (ed.), *Lutherans Respond to Pentecostalism*, *Theology in the Life of the Church* 4 (Geneva: Lutheran University Press, 2008); Carter Lindberg, *The Third Reformation? The Charismatic Movement and the Lutheran Tradition* (Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1983); Kilian McDonnell (ed.), *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on Charismatic Renewal*, 3 vols. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1980); Larry Christenson, *The Charismatic Renewal among Lutherans* (Minneapolis: Lutheran Charismatic Renewal Services, 1976).

<sup>3</sup> Won Yong Ji, "The Work of the Holy Spirit and the Charismatic Movements, from Luther's Perspective," *Concordia Journal* 11, no. 6 (1985): 204–13.

<sup>4</sup> See O. Föller, "Martin Luther on Miracles, Healing, Prophecy and Tongues," *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 32, no. 2 (2005): 333–51.

<sup>5</sup> Paul L. Maier, "Fanaticism as a Theological Category in the Lutheran Confessions," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 44, no. 2/3 (1980): 173–81.

<sup>6</sup> Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod (ed.), "The Charismatic Movement and Lutheran Theology: A Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod," (St. Louis, MO: Commission on Theology and Church Relations, 1972), 34.

<sup>7</sup> See Theodore Jungkuntz, "Sectarian Consequences of Mistranslation in Luther's Smalcald Articles," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 4, no. 3 (1977): 166–67.

<sup>8</sup> See "The Pentecostal Baptism Restored," *The Apostolic Faith* 1, no. 2 (1906), 1; "The Church's Privileges," *The Pentecost* 2, nos. 9 and 10 (1910): 14; "Daily Portion from the King's Bounty," *The Weekly Evangel* (January 22, 1916), 9; "Satan and Martin Luther," *The Weekly Evangel* 194 (June 16, 1917), 2.

<sup>9</sup> Alice Reynolds Flower, "The Spirit of Life," *The Weekly Evangel* (January 15, 1916), 10.

<sup>10</sup> "The World's Supreme Need," *The Pentecostal Evangel* 880 (February 19, 1921), 18.

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, the "The Pentecostal Evangel" (1913-), "The Church of God Evangel" (1910-), "Evangelio Pentecostal" (1995-), Evangel University, Evangel Pentecostal Church, Evangel Pentecostal Assembly.

<sup>12</sup> Martin Luther, "Preface to the New Testament," in *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Random House, 1962), 16.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 16-17.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Robert Rosin, "Luther Discovers the Gospel: Coming to the Truth and Confessing the Truth," *Concordia Journal* 32, no. 2 (2006): 147–60.

---

<sup>15</sup> “Disputation of Doctor Martin Luther on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences by Dr. Martin Luther (1517),” in *Works of Martin Luther*, ed. and trans. Adolph Spaeth et al., vol. 1 (Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Company, 1915), 29–38.

<sup>16</sup> “Smalcald Articles,” in *Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, eds. and trans. F. Bente and W.H.T. Dau (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), 453–529 (II, i).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 4.

<sup>18</sup> See Ted A. Campbell, *The Gospel in the Christian Traditions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 43–54.

<sup>19</sup> See Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, V, 3–6.

<sup>20</sup> See Martin William Mittlestadt, *Reading Luke-Acts in the Pentecostal Tradition* (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Walther von Loewenich, “Luthers Auslegung der Pfingstgeschichte,” in *Vierhundertfünfzig Jahre lutherische Reformation: 1517 – 1967, Festschrift für Franz Lau*, ed. Helmar Junghans, Ingetraut Ludolphy, Kurt Meier (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 181–90.

<sup>22</sup> See “Evangelization, Proselytism and Common Witness. Final Report of the Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and Some Classical Pentecostal Churches and Leaders. 1990–1997,” in *Pentecostalism and Christian Unity: Ecumenical Documents and Critical Assessments*, ed. Wolfgang Vondey (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2010), 164.

<sup>23</sup> See Heiko A. Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986), 270–88; Friedrich Kropatscheck, *Das Schriftprinzip der lutherischen Kirche: Geschichtliche und dogmatische Untersuchungen*, vol. 1, *Die Vorgeschichte: Das Erbe des Mittelalters* (Leipzig: Georg Böhme, 1904).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Carl E. Braaten, “Can We Still Hold the Principle of ‘Sola Scriptura’?” *Dialog* 20 (1981): 189–90.

<sup>25</sup> A. Skevington Wood, “Luther’s Concept of Revelation,” *Evangelical Quarterly* 35 (1963): 149–59.

<sup>26</sup> See Bengt Häggglund, *Die Heilige Schrift und ihre Deutung in der Theologie Johann Gerhards: Eine Untersuchung über das althutherische Schriftverständnis* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1951), 77–81, 105–18.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 105–7.

<sup>28</sup> *Formula of Concord*, Solid Declaration, V, 20.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> See Häggglund, *Die Heilige Schrift*, 9–16; Yves Congar, *The Revelation of God*, trans. A. Manson and L. C. Sheppard (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), 154–55.

<sup>31</sup> See Wolfgang Vondey, “Wesleyan Theology and the Disjointing of the Protestant Scripture Principle,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 46, no. 2 (2011): 70–85.

<sup>32</sup> Johann Wilhelm Baier, *Compendium of Positive Theology*, trans. C. F. W. Walther (St. Louis: Concordia, 1877; original 1691), 1, 25.

<sup>33</sup> Johann Philipp Gabler, Review of *Summa theologiae Christianae*, by Christoph Friedrich von Ammon, *Journal für auserlesene theologische Literatur* 5 (1810): 587–600.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 594–96.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 599.

<sup>36</sup> Albrecht Ritschl, “Ueber die beiden Principien des Protestantismus: Antwort auf eine 25 Jahre alte Frage,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 1 (1876): 397–413.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 405–11.

<sup>38</sup> Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod (ed.), “Gospel and Scripture: The Interrelationship of the Material and Formal Principles in Lutheran Theology: A Report,” (St. Louis, MO: Commission on Theology and Church Relations, 1972).

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 23, quoting F. E. Meier, “The Formal and Material Principles of Lutheran Confessional Theology,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 24, no. 8 (1953): 545 and 548.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Clark H. Pinnock and Barry Callen, *The Scripture Principle: Reclaiming the Full Authority of the Bible*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006).

<sup>45</sup> Ritschl, “Ueber die beiden Principien,” 411.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Carl-Heinz Ratschow, “Einleitende Analyse der Themafrage,” in *Sola Scriptura? Ringvorlesung der theologischen Fakultät der Philipps-Universität*, ed. Carl Heinz Ratschow (Marburg: N. G. Elwert, 1977), 4; Paul

---

Gennrich, *Der Kampf um die Schrift in der Deutsch-Evangelischen Kirche des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1898), 1–9.

<sup>47</sup> See See Ig-Jin Kim, *History and Theology of Korean Pentecostalism: Sunbogeum (Pure Gospel) Pentecostalism: An Attempt to Research the History of the Largest Congregation in Church History and the Theology of Its Pastor Yonggi Cho*, Mission 35 (Utrecht: University of Utrecht, 2003); John Fletcher, *The Doctrines of Grace and Justice Equally Essential to the Pure Gospel* (Stockbridge, MA: Herald Office, 1810); Thomas Goodwin, *A Discourse of the True Nature of the Gospel: Demonstrating That It Is No New Law, But a Pure Doctrine of Grace* (London: J. Darby, 1695).

<sup>48</sup> *Lectures on Galatians, 1535, Chapters 1-4*, vol. 26, *Luther's Works* (LW), ed. and trans. Jaroslav Pelikan and Walter A. Hansen (St. Louis: Concordia, 1963), 115.

<sup>49</sup> *Lectures on Galatians, 1535, Chapters 5-6; Lectures on Galatians, 1519, Chapters 1-6*, in LW 27:41–42

<sup>50</sup> Augsburg Confession, 7.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Michael Stoltzfus, “Martin Luther: A Pure Doctrine of Faith,” *Journal of Lutheran Ethics* 3, no. 1 (2003), available at <http://www.elca.org/JLE/Articles/898>.

<sup>52</sup> See Bente and Dau, *Triglot Concordia*, 135 and 503.

<sup>53</sup> Horace D. Hummel, “Are Law and Gospel a Valid Hermeneutical Principle?” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (1982): 181–207.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>55</sup> See C. F. W. Walther, *The Proper Distinction Between Law and Gospel*, trans. W. H.T. Dau (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1928).

<sup>56</sup> Edmund Schlink, *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*, 3rd ed., trans. Paul F. Koehneke and Herbert J. A. Bouman (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1961).

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>58</sup> See Eric W. Gritsch and Robert Jenson, *Lutheranism: The Theological Movement and Its Confessional Writings* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 2–15.

<sup>59</sup> A. B. Simpson, *The Four-Fold Gospel* (Harrisburg, PA: Christian Alliance Publishing Co., 1890; repr. 1925).

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Mark J. Cartledge, “The Early Pentecostal Theology of Confidence Magazine (1908–1926): A Version of the Five-Fold Gospel?” *The Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 28, no. 2 (2008): 117–30; John Christopher Thomas, “Pentecostal Theology in the Twenty-First Century,” *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 20, no. 1 (1998): 3–19; Steven J. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 183; Donald W. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987), 15–23.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Dayton, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, 21–23.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, “‘Encountering Christ in the Full Gospel Way’: An Incarnational Pentecostal Spirituality,” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Association* 27, no. 2 (2007): 5–19.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Kenneth J. Archer, “The Fivefold Gospel and the Mission of the Church: Ecclesiastical Implications and Opportunities,” in *Toward a Pentecostal Ecclesiology: The Church and the Fivefold Gospel*, ed. John Christopher Thomas (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2010), 7–43.

<sup>64</sup> See Matthew Avery Sutton, *Aimee Semple Mc Pherson and the Resurrection of Christian America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).

<sup>65</sup> Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, “Beyond Augsburg: Faith Alone and Full Gospel.” *Lutheran Forum* 41, no. 3 (2007): 45–48.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Wolfgang Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism: The Crisis of Global Christianity and the Renewal of the Theological Agenda*, Pentecostal Manifestos 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 47–77.

<sup>67</sup> See Amos Yong, *In the Days of Caesar: Pentecostalism and Political Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 121–358; idem, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 83–90.

<sup>68</sup> Studebaker, Steven. “Pentecostal Soteriology and Pneumatology,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 11, no. 2 (2003): 248–70.

<sup>69</sup> See Frank D. Macchia, *Justified by the Spirit: Creation, Redemption and the Triune God*, Pentecostal Manifestos 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010). However, see Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality*, 18.

<sup>70</sup> See Kenneth Archer, “Nourishment for Our Journey: The Pentecostal Via Salutis and Sacramental Ordinances,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13, no. 1 (2004): 79–96; R. Hollis Gause, *Living in the Spirit: The Way of Salvation* (Cleveland, TN: Pathway, 1980).