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Abstract

The question of whether or not feminisms can be located amongst Pentecostal and evangelical women has been widely debated in the field of women’s and gender studies (Franks, 2001; Ginsburg, 1997). Yet my research has uncovered that Pentecostal women have a unique brand of feminism through their spiritual power and submission, drawing from a distinctly female spiritual experience of Pentecostalism, when they give submission first to God before all others. Many of these practicing women employ ‘biblical feminism’ (Scanzoni & Hardesty, 1992), an aspect of feminist theology that looks at biblical representations of women through a ‘developing egalitarianism’ approach.

The stories of these women were told to me by them during my ethnographic, cross-cultural and comparative PhD research from September, 2012 to February, 2014. I conducted more than 60 interviews around New Zealand and River City and Fountain City, Missouri (USA), with women in two Pentecostal denominations, the Assemblies of God (AG) and the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI). Their stories are put in conversation with submission doctrine while exploring the social contexts that shape how these women experience God, faith, and themselves. In this religious and social context women’s lives are structurally and systematically different from men’s lives, thereby producing a set of different as well as differently complete knowledges (Wood, 2005: pp. 61-66).

Both lay women and leaders told of the transformative power of their conversions into Pentecost and their sense of purpose through actively applied call narratives to demonstrate the aegis of their God-given authority. They spoke of having spiritual giftings like healing, prophesy, and tongues and interpretation, which they regularly enacted for the benefit of other members in their faith communities. They placed protocols around their giftings to ensure that the gift-bringer was operating under God’s authority rather than her own. Participants revealed the multi-dimensionality of submission and their own cerebral approach to the concept. This placed them in what I call woman space, a place of spiritual power constantly regenerated by the woman’s prayers and the strength of her belief that God works through her. My work uncovered that submission – given always to God before all others- is an inseparable tenet of these women’s spiritual power.
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Glossary

First, a word about mechanics in this thesis:

Citations from both authored texts and interviewee conversations follow the Harvard style, which reads:

5.7 Citing a direct quotation
If a direct quote from a book, article, etc., is used you must:
- Use single quotation marks (double quotation marks are usually used for quoting direct speech) (Imperial College of London, Harvard Style, August, 2016, p. 4)
- I use double quotation marks when writing phrases from interviewees’ vernacular in the Pentecostal lifeworld and sometimes, to emphasise a word of my own. I use single quotation marks for the words of other authors and my own scholarly analysis.

Underlined respondents’ words show emphasis as the interviewee’s own, unless otherwise stated.

Pronouns for God – Male pronouns are used in accordance with interviewees’ words or those from other sources. The pronoun ‘you’ is also used for God in the same instances.

Apostolic – pertaining to the apostles. Those who claim the label of being “Apostolic” follow the apostles’ doctrine. The UPCI claims this through its water baptism in Acts 2:38, baptising the way the apostles did in the name of Jesus throughout the book of Acts. When this term is used in the thesis, it is in the context of the UPCI only.

Backslidden - When a person makes decisions that seem to the group as though they have turned away from their salvation experience or the good in their lives that “God has done.” Also, if members see a person being non-compliant on basic doctrinal stances (e.g., a UPCI woman who cuts her hair), they may consider that person to be “backslidden.”

Being “used” of God: to be used in ministry. E.g., I always had a desire to be used or God is really using her.

Biblical feminism, evangelical feminism – these terms are used interchangeably throughout the thesis and are explained in depth in the Introduction.

Bringing (or giving) a word: The speaker “brings” or gives a message to the group or another individual as God moves on her to do so. This may be in the context of tongues interpretation, prophecy, or word of knowledge.

Classical Pentecostalism or Pentecostals - Churches and denominations that trace their heritage from 1901, when Agnes Ozman first spoke in tongues and especially from Azusa Street, are called “classical Pentecostals.” Some of the original leaders from both the AG and UPCI were in fact, at Azusa Street or can trace their lineage from Charles F. Parham who laid hands on Agnes Ozman. He is considered the founder of the Pentecostal Movement. Both denominations – AG & UPCI - are known as “classical Pentecostals” for reasons enumerated in chapter three.
Deputation - Also called “furlough,” this is the practice where missionaries will return to their country of origin to travel from church to church, raising funds for their missions work. Deputation can take a few months up to three years and sometimes longer, depending on various factors, such as how well-established the work is and how long the missionaries can reasonably expect to be away; how much funding is needed for the work, etc.

Discipling - or to be ‘discipled by’ is part of Pentecostal lexicon; a (secular) synonym might be ‘mentored by.’ This is someone in the church who may come alongside a new convert and disciples them, answering their questions, making themselves available for bible study, phone calls, and coffees outside of regular church services to help the new convert receive a solid grounding in the Pentecostal faith.

“Heaven or hell” issue - This phrase names a common debate in the UPCI and is always used in the context of meanings members make of positions the organization may take on any given matter and the interpretation of scripture which underwrites that stance (e.g., I Corinthians 11:2-16 as being a mandate for women to keep their uncut as an expression of submission). If the member has a decidedly different stance on a matter which the organization has taken a clear stand for or against, the concept of whether or not this is a “heaven-or-hell” issue is then invoked. It is a question of whether or not the member’s noncompliance with the denominational stance on that matter could “send them to hell,” or, “keep them from making heaven.” This may be any variety of issues from salvation doctrine to body adornment and women’s uncut hair, or matters of theology.

Heritage Pentecostal family – I use this terminology to connote a woman’s family lineage in Pentecostalism, especially when some said they could trace their Pentecostal lineage back three and four generations.

Holy Ghost – UPCI lexicon for ‘baptism of’, ‘visitation of’ or ‘under the authority of’ the Holy Ghost.

Holiness – based on any texts about Holiness, but probably most directly from the text of I Peter 1:16, "because it is written, “Be holy, for I am holy.” Holiness standards may involve modesty codes for both women and men that include prohibitions on drinking, drugs, and sex outside marriage, and any variety of other rules against behaviours and dress that are deemed “unholy” like theatre-going, organised sport, makeup and jewellery. These are all in effort to remove “worldliness” from members’ lives so Holiness can stand.

Holy Spirit – AG lexicon for ‘baptism of’, ‘visitation of’ or ‘under the authority of’ the Holy Spirit.

Inerrantists – those who hold to the inerrancy of scripture.

Manifest - in this context, meaning to demonstrate or make one’s presence (or a presence) evident in distinctive ways

Message in Tongues or Tongues and Interpretation – A message in tongues is first brought under the aegis of the Holy Spirit which “quickens” (see definition) the person to speak in a loud voice raised for the assembly to hear. The message the person brings is in tongues, a language they have never studied. The interpretation of the message is then brought either by
the bringer of the message in tongues or another member of the congregation under the aegis of the Holy Spirit. The interpretation is given in the dominant language of the congregation. The message may begin or end with an identifier such as, “It is I, the Lord, your God who has spoken to you this day” or something similar but not always. According to Clark (2007), the A/G NZ is engaging less with tongues-interpretation and more with prophecy during services. The UPCI in both countries, however, still uses tongues-interpretation.

Quickening - means to be spiritually stirred up or roused.

Revivalist - This term is used interchangeably with ‘Pentecostal’ and ‘evangelical’ and is explained in the Introduction.

Slain in the spirit – This is when a member is so overcome by the power of the Holy Spirit or Holy Ghost that they fall prostrate while lost in prayer or meditation in a deep contemplative state. This is also called “resting in the Spirit” (Csordas, 1994:p.32).

Unitarians - Not to be confused with Unitarian Universalists, the term “Unitarian” in this context is always in reference to belief in the Oneness Pentecostal doctrine.

Wilderness experience – This is my own description for an experience that connotes a time of deep soul-searching in a person’s life in which they may take stock of their relationship with God and ministry in the context of life events that may have brought them to this point. It often involves a crisis of faith but once a person reaches the other side of their wilderness experience, there is usually a sense of resolve and strength.

The world or worldliness - refers to the realm outside the lifeworld of Pentecostalism and is considered the polar opposite of living a life of Holiness. This phrase usually describes life searching or engaging in activities Pentecostals would not sanction, like using drugs, partying, non-attendance at church, etc.
Scriptural References Used In This Thesis

Throughout this thesis the reader will encounter footnotes of scriptures which correspond to this Scripture Key, comprised of texts accessed on biblegateway.com.

- The academically accepted New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) is used only as long as the passage(s) include interviewees’ exact - or nearly exact – words. Throughout interviews, participants spoke ‘scripture as conversation’ so scriptures reflect their words (see the methods chapter for more about this).
- Interviewees’ scripture quotes usually reflected the King James Version (KJV) and New King James Version (NKJV) thus demonstrating that these versions were widely used amongst them.
- Occasionally, texts are given in more than one version in order to provide comparisons, definition and context.
- Whole chapters, other than I Corinthians 12 and 14, are not included.
- All punctuation and italicised words are from the scripture reference and are not my own.

**Genesis 1:26-28 (NRSV):**
26 Then God said, “Let us make humankind in our image, according to our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the wild animals of the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.”
27 So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them.
28 God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.”

**Genesis 2:18, 20 (KJV):**
18 And the LORD God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.
20 And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him.

**Genesis 2:18, 20-24 (NRSV):**
18 Then the LORD God said, “It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper as his partner.”
20 The man gave names to all cattle, and to the birds of the air, and to every animal of the field; but for the man there was not found a helper as his partner.
21 So the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; then he took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh.
22 And the rib that the LORD God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man.
23 Then the man said, “This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called Woman, for out of Man this one was taken.”
24 Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and clings to his wife, and they become one flesh.

**Genesis 3:16 (NRSV):**
16 To the woman he said, “I will greatly increase your pangs in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children, yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you.”
### About Huldah:

**II Kings 22:14 (NRSV):**

14 So the priest Hilkiah, Ahikam, Achbor, Shaphan, and Asaiah went to the prophetess Huldah the wife of Shallum son of Tikvah, son of Harhas, keeper of the wardrobe; she resided in Jerusalem in the Second Quarter, where they consulted her.

**II Chronicles 34:22 –**

22 So Hilkiah and those whom the king had sent went to the prophet Huldah, the wife of Shallum son of Tokhath son of Hasrah, keeper of the wardrobe (who lived in Jerusalem in the Second Quarter) and spoke to her to that effect.

### About Miriam:

**Exodus 15:20-21 (NKJV):**

20 Then Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took the timbrel in her hand; and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances.

21 And Miriam answered them:

“The horse and its rider
He has thrown into the sea!”

**Numbers 20:1 (NRSV):**

1 The Israelites, the whole congregation, came into the wilderness of Zin in the first month, and the people stayed in Kadesh. Miriam died there, and was buried there.

**Numbers 26:59 (NRSV):**

59 The name of Amram’s wife was Jochebed daughter of Levi, who was born to Levi in Egypt; and she bore to Amram: Aaron, Moses, and their sister Miriam.

**Deuteronomy 24:9 (NRSV):**

9 Remember what the LORD your God did to Miriam on your journey out of Egypt.

**I Chronicles 6:3 (NRSV):**

3 The children of Amram: Aaron, Moses, and Miriam. The sons of Aaron: Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar.

**Micah 6:4 (NRSV):**

4 For I brought you up from the land of Egypt, and redeemed you from the house of slavery; and I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam.

### Numbers 6:1-21 (NRSV):

1 The LORD spoke to Moses, saying:

2 Speak to the Israelites and say to them: When either men or women make a special vow, the vow of a nazirite, to separate themselves to the LORD,

3 they shall separate themselves from wine and strong drink; they shall drink no wine vinegar or other vinegar, and shall not drink any grape juice or eat grapes, fresh or dried.

4 All their days as nazirites they shall eat nothing that is produced by the grapevine, not even the seeds or the skins.

5 All the days of their nazirite vow no razor shall come upon the head; until the time is completed for which they separate themselves to the LORD, they shall be holy; they shall let the locks of the head grow long.

6 All the days that they separate themselves to the LORD they shall not go near a corpse.

7 Even if their father or mother, brother or sister, should die, they may not defile themselves; because their consecration to God is upon the head.

8 All their days as nazirites they are holy to the LORD.

9 If someone dies very suddenly nearby, defiling the consecrated head, then they shall shave the head on the day of their cleansing; on the seventh day they shall shave it.
10 On the eighth day they shall bring two turtledoves or two young pigeons to the priest at the entrance of the tent of meeting,
11 and the priest shall offer one as a sin offering and the other as a burnt offering, and make atonement for them, because they incurred guilt by reason of the corpse. They shall sanctify the head that same day,
12 and separate themselves to the LORD for their days as nazirites, and bring a male lamb a year old as a guilt offering. The former time shall be void, because the consecrated head was defiled.
13 This is the law for the nazirites when the time of their consecration has been completed: they shall be brought to the entrance of the tent of meeting,
14 and they shall offer their gift to the LORD, one male lamb a year old without blemish as a burnt offering, one ewe lamb a year old without blemish as a sin offering, one ram without blemish as an offering of well-being,
15 and a basket of unleavened bread, cakes of choice flour mixed with oil and unleavened wafers spread with oil, with their grain offering and their drink offerings.
16 The priest shall present them before the LORD and offer their sin offering and burnt offering,
17 and shall offer the ram as a sacrifice of well-being to the LORD, with the basket of unleavened bread; the priest also shall make the accompanying grain offering and drink offering.
18 Then the nazirites shall shave the consecrated head at the entrance of the tent of meeting, and shall take the hair from the consecrated head and put it on the fire under the sacrifice of well-being.
19 The priest shall take the shoulder of the ram, when it is boiled, and one unleavened cake out of the basket, and one unleavened wafer, and shall put them in the palms of the nazirites, after they have shaved the consecrated head.
20 Then the priest shall elevate them as an elevation offering before the LORD; they are a holy portion for the priest, together with the breast that is elevated and the thigh that is offered. After that the nazirites may drink wine.
21 This is the law for the nazirites who take a vow. Their offering to the LORD must be in accordance with the nazirite vow, apart from what else they can afford. In accordance with whatever vow they take, so they shall do, following the law for their consecration.

Numbers 18:28 (NRSV):
28 Thus you also shall set apart an offering to the LORD from all the tithes that you receive from the Israelites; and from them you shall give the LORD’s offering to the priest Aaron.

Deuteronomy 22:5 (NRSV):
5 A woman shall not wear a man’s apparel, nor shall a man put on a woman’s garment; for whoever does such things is abhorrent to the LORD your God.

Joshua 24:15 (NKJV):
15 And if it seems evil to you to serve the LORD, choose for yourselves this day whom you will serve, whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the River, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land you dwell. But as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD.”

Judges 13:4-5, 7 (NRSV):
4 Now be careful not to drink wine or strong drink, or to eat anything unclean,
5 for you shall conceive and bear a son. No razor is to come on his head, for the boy shall be a nazirite to God from birth. It is he who shall begin to deliver Israel from the hand of the Philistines.”
7 but he said to me, ‘You shall conceive and bear a son. So then drink no wine or strong drink, and eat nothing unclean, for the boy shall be a nazirite to God from birth to the day of his death.’”

1 Samuel 15:22-23 (NKJV):
22 So Samuel said: “Has the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to heed than the fat of rams
23 For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because you have rejected the word of the LORD, He also has rejected you from being king.”

Psalm 3:3 (NRSV):
3 But you, O LORD, are a shield around me, my glory, and the one who lifts up my head
Psalm 84:2 (NRSV):
2 “My soul longs, indeed it faints for the courts of the LORD; my heart and my flesh sing for joy to the living God.”
Psalm 92:13 (NRSV):
13 They are planted in the house of the LORD; they flourish in the courts of our God.
Psalm 119:50 (KJV):
50 This is my comfort in my affliction: for thy word hath quickened me.
Psalm 119:50 (NRSV):
50 This is my comfort in my distress, that your promise gives me life.
Psalm 119:93 (KJV):
93 I will never forget thy precepts: for with them thou hast quickened me.
Psalm 119:93 (NRSV):
93 I will never forget your precepts, for by them you have given me life.
Psalm 127:3-5 (NRSV):
3 Sons are indeed a heritage from the LORD, the fruit of the womb a reward.
4 Like arrows in the hand of a warrior are the sons of one’s youth.
5 Happy is the man who has his quiver full of them. He shall not be put to shame when he speaks with his enemies in the gate.

Ecclesiastes 4:12 (NRSV):
12 And though one might prevail against another, two will withstand one. A threefold cord is not quickly broken.
Ecclesiastes 9:10 (NRSV):
10 Whatever your hand finds to do, do with your might; for there is no work or thought or knowledge or wisdom in Sheol, to which you are going.

Isaiah 53:5 (NKJV):
5 But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; The chastisement for our peace was upon Him, And by His stripes we are healed.
Isaiah 55:8 (NKJV):
8 “For My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways My ways,” says the LORD.
Isaiah 58:8 (NRSV):
8 Then your light shall break forth like the dawn, and your healing shall spring up quickly; your vindicator shall go before you, the glory of the LORD shall be your rear guard.
Isaiah 62:9 (NRSV):
9 But those who have gathered it shall eat it, And praise the LORD; Those who have brought it together shall drink it in My holy courts.”
Ezekiel 10:18-19 (NRSV):
18 Then the glory of the LORD went out from the threshold of the house and stopped above the cherubim.
19 The cherubim lifted up their wings and rose up from the earth in my sight as they went out with the wheels beside them. They stopped at the entrance of the east gate of the house of the LORD; and the glory of the God of Israel was above them.

Ezekiel 22:30 (KJV):
30 And I sought for a man among them, that should make up the hedge, and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it: but I found none.

Joel 2:28-29 (NRSV):
28 Then afterward I will pour out my spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions.
29 Even on the male and female slaves, in those days, I will pour out my spirit.

Joel 2:28-29 (NKJV):
28 And it shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions.
29 And also on My menservants and on My maidservants I will pour out My Spirit in those days.

Zechariah 3:7 (NRSV):
7 “Thus says the LORD of hosts: If you will walk in my ways and keep my requirements, then you shall rule my house and have charge of my courts, and I will give you the right of access among those who are standing here.

Malachi 3:8-15 (NRSV):
8 Will anyone rob God? Yet you are robbing me! But you say, “How are we robbing you?” In your tithes and offerings!
9 You are cursed with a curse, for you are robbing me—the whole nation of you!
10 Bring the full tithe into the storehouse, so that there may be food in my house, and thus put me to the test, says the LORD of hosts; see if I will not open the windows of heaven for you and pour down for you an overflowing blessing.
11 I will rebuke the locust for you, so that it will not destroy the produce of your soil; and your vine in the field shall not be barren, says the LORD of hosts. 12 Then all nations will count you happy, for you will be a land of delight, says the LORD of hosts.
13 You have spoken harsh words against me, says the LORD. Yet you say, “How have we spoken against you?”
14 You have said, “It is vain to serve God. What do we profit by keeping his command or by going about as mourners before the LORD of hosts?
15 Now we count the arrogant happy; evildoers not only prosper, but when they put God to the test they escape.”

Matthew 3:13-17 (NRSV):
13 Then Jesus came from Galilee to John at the Jordan, to be baptized by him.
14 John would have prevented him, saying, “I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?”
15 But Jesus answered him, “Let it be so now; for it is proper for us in this way to fulfill all righteousness.” Then he consented.
16 And when Jesus had been baptized, just as he came up from the water, suddenly the heavens were opened to him and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him.
And a voice from heaven said, “This is my Son, the Beloved,[a] with whom I am well pleased.”

Matthew 11:28-30 (NRSV):
28 “Come to me, all you that are weary and are carrying heavy burdens, and I will give you rest.
29 Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me; for I am gentle and humble in heart, and you will find rest for your souls.
30 For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.”

Matthew 15:14 (NKJV):
14 Let them alone. They are blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind leads the blind, both will fall into a ditch.”

Matthew 17:20 (NRSV):
20 He said to them, “Because of your little faith. For truly I tell you, if you have faith the size of a mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, ‘Move from here to there,’ and it will move; and nothing will be impossible for you.”

Matthew 18:3 (NKJV):
3 and said, “Assuredly, I say to you, unless you are converted and become as little children, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven.

Matthew 28:19 (NKJV):
19 Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

Mark 1:23-26 (NRSV):
23 Just then there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit,
24 and he cried out, “What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God.”
25 But Jesus rebuked him, saying, “Be silent, and come out of him!”
26 And the unclean spirit, convulsing him and crying with a loud voice, came out of him.

Mark 5:7-12 (NRSV):
7 and he shouted at the top of his voice, “What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me.”
8 For he had said to him, “Come out of the man, you unclean spirit!”
9 Then Jesus asked him, “What is your name?” He replied, “My name is Legion; for we are many.”
10 He begged him earnestly not to send them out of the country.
11 Now there on the hillside a great herd of swine was feeding;
12 and the unclean spirits begged him, “Send us into the swine; let us enter them.”

Mark 8:22-25 (NRSV):
22 They came to Bethsaida. Some people brought a blind man to him and begged him to touch him.
23 He took the blind man by the hand and led him out of the village; and when he had put saliva on his eyes and laid his hands on him, he asked him, “Can you see anything?”
24 And the man looked up and said, “I can see people, but they look like trees, walking.”
25 Then Jesus laid his hands on his eyes again; and he looked intently and his sight was restored, and he saw everything clearly.

Luke 7:36-50 (36-38, 47-50 included here) (NRSV):
36 One of the Pharisees asked Jesus to eat with him, and he went into the Pharisee’s house and took his place at the table.
37 And a woman in the city, who was a sinner, having learned that he was eating in the Pharisee’s house, brought an alabaster jar of ointment.
She stood behind him at his feet, weeping, and began to bathe his feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair. Then she continued kissing his feet and anointing them with the ointment. …

Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; hence she has shown great love. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little.”

Then he said to her, “Your sins are forgiven.”

And he said to the woman, “Your faith has saved you; go in peace.”

Luke 10:19 (KJV):

Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you.


But he who did not know, yet committed things deserving of stripes, shall be beaten with few. For everyone to whom much is given, from him much will be required; and to whom much has been committed, of him they will ask the more

Luke 15:7, 10 (NRSV):

Just so, I tell you, there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance.

Just so, I tell you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner who repents

John 3:5 (NRSV):

Jesus answered, “Very truly, I tell you, no one can enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and Spirit.

John 10:10 (NRSV):

The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy. I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly.

John 10:27 (NKJV):

My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me

John 16:13 (NKJV):

However, when He, the Spirit of truth, has come, He will guide you into all truth;

John 17:16 (NKJV):

They are not of the world, just as I am not of the world.

Acts 2:1-4 (NKJV):

When the Day of Pentecost had fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.

And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting.

Then there appeared to them divided tongues, as of fire, and one sat upon each of them.

And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

Acts 2:16-18 (NKJV):

But this is what was spoken by the prophet Joel:

And it shall come to pass in the last days, says God, That I will pour out of My Spirit on all flesh;

Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, Your young men shall see visions, Your old men shall dream dreams.

And on My menservants and on My maidservants I will pour out My Spirit in those days;

And they shall prophesy.

38 Then Peter said to them, “Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.
39 For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all who are afar off, as many as the Lord our God will call.”

Acts 5:29 (NRSV):
29 But Peter and the apostles answered, “We must obey God rather than any human authority.”

Acts 17:29 (KJV):
29 Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.

Acts 18:2-3, 18, 26 (NRSV):
2 There he found a Jew named Aquila, a native of Pontus, who had recently come from Italy with his wife Priscilla, because Claudius had ordered all Jews to leave Rome. Paul went to see them.
3 and, because he was of the same trade, he stayed with them, and they worked together—by trade they were tentmakers.
18 After staying there for a considerable time, Paul said farewell to the believers and sailed for Syria, accompanied by Priscilla and Aquila. At Cenchreae he had his hair cut, for he was under a vow.
28 He [Apollos] began to speak boldly in the synagogue; but when Priscilla and Aquila heard him, they took him aside and explained the Way of God to him more accurately.

Acts 21:9 (NRSV):
9 He [Philip the evangelist] had four unmarried daughters who had the gift of prophecy.

Romans 1:5-7 (NKJV):
5 Through Him we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among all nations for His name,
6 among whom you also are the called of Jesus Christ;
7 To all who are in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Romans 1:20 (NKJV):
20 For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse,

Romans 1:28 (KJV):
28 And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient

Romans 1:28-32 (NKJV):
28 And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a debased mind, to do those things which are not fitting:
29 being filled with all unrighteousness, sexual immorality, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, evil-mindedness; they are whisperers,
30 backbiters, haters of God, violent, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,
31 undiscerning, untrustworthy, unloving, unforgiving, unmerciful;
32 who, knowing the righteous judgment of God, that those who practice such things are deserving of death, not only do the same but also approve of those who practice them

Romans 8:28 (NKJV):
28 And we know that all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are the called according to His purpose.

Romans 11:29 (NKJV):
For the gifts and the calling of God is without repentance.
Romans 11:29 (NRSV):
29 for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable.

Romans 12:3-8 (NKJV):
3 For I say, through the grace given to me, to everyone who is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, as God has dealt to each one a measure of faith.
4 For as we have many members in one body, but all the members do not have the same function,
5 so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and individually members of one another.
6 Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, let us use them: if prophecy, let us prophesy in proportion to our faith;
7 or ministry, let us use it in our ministering; he who teaches, in teaching;
8 he who exhorts, in exhortation; he who gives, with liberality; he who leads, with diligence; he who shows mercy, with cheerfulness.

Romans 13:1 (NKJV):
1 Let every soul be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and the authorities that exist are appointed by God

Romans 13:7 (NRSV):
7 Pay to all what is due them—taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due.

Paul’s greetings to women
Romans 16:1-16 (NRSV):
1 I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deacon of the church at Cenchreae
2 so that you may welcome her in the Lord as is fitting for the saints, and help her in whatever she may require from you, for she has been a benefactor of many and of myself as well.
3 Greet Prisca and Aquila, who work with me in Christ Jesus,
4 and who risked their necks for my life, to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles.
5 Greet also the church in their house.
6 Greet Mary, who has worked very hard among you.
7 Greet Andronicus and Junia, my relatives who were in prison with me; they are prominent among the apostles, and they were in Christ before I was.
8 Greet Ampliatus, my beloved in the Lord.
9 Greet Urbanus, our co-worker in Christ, and my beloved Stachys.
10 Greet Apelles, who is approved in Christ. Greet those who belong to the family of Aristobulus.
11 Greet my relative Herodion. Greet those in the Lord who belong to the family of Narcissus.
12 Greet those workers in the Lord, Tryphaena and Tryphosa. Greet the beloved Persis, who has worked hard in the Lord.
13 Greet Rufus, chosen in the Lord; and greet his mother—a mother to me also.
14 Greet Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, and the brothers and sisters who are with them. 15 Greet Philologus, Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints who are with them.
16 Greet one another with a holy kiss. All the churches of Christ greet you.

Philippians 4:2-3 (NRSV):
2 I urge Euodia and I urge Syntyche to be of the same mind in the Lord.
3 Yes, and I ask you also, my loyal companion, help these women, for they have struggled beside me in the work of the gospel, together with Clement and the rest of my co-workers, whose names are in the book of life.
I Corinthians 1:26 (NKJV):
26 For you see your calling, brethren, that not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called.

I Corinthians 2:12 (NRSV):
12 Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit that is from God, so that we may understand the gifts bestowed on us by God.

I Corinthians 6:8-10 (NKJV):
8 Nay, ye do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren.
9 Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind,
10 Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.

I Corinthians 6:19-20 (NKJV):
19 Or do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own?
20 For you were bought at a price; therefore glorify God in your body[a] and in your spirit, which are God’s.

I Corinthians 7:1-5 (NRSV):
1 Now concerning the matters about which you wrote: “It is well for a man not to touch a woman.”
2 But because of cases of sexual immorality, each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband.
3 The husband should give to his wife her conjugal rights, and likewise the wife to her husband.
4 For the wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does; likewise the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does.
5 Do not deprive one another except perhaps by agreement for a set time, to devote yourselves to prayer, and then come together again, so that Satan may not tempt you because of your lack of self-control.

I Corinthians 7:13-15 (NKJV):
13 And a woman who has a husband who does not believe, if he is willing to live with her, let her not divorce him. 14 For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; otherwise your children would be unclean, but now they are holy.

I Corinthians 7:17 (NKJV):
17 But as God has distributed to each one, as the Lord has called each one, so let him walk. And so I ordain in all the churches.

I Corinthians 11:2-16 (NKJV):
2 Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things and keep the traditions just as I delivered them to you.
3 But I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of woman is man, and the head of Christ is God.
4 Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonors his head.
5 But every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, for that is one and the same as if her head were shaved.
6 For if a woman is not covered, let her also be shorn. But if it is shameful for a woman to be shorn or shaved, let her be covered.
7 For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man.
8 For man is not from woman, but woman from man.
9 Nor was man created for the woman, but woman for the man.
For this reason the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.
Nevertheless, neither is man independent of woman, nor woman independent of man, in the Lord.
For as woman came from man, even so man also comes through woman; but all things are from God.
Judge among yourselves. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?
Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him?
But if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given to her[1] for a covering.
But if anyone seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.

I Corinthians 9:19-23 (NRSV):
For though I am free with respect to all, I have made myself a slave to all, so that I might win more of them.
To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews. To those under the law I became as one under the law (though I myself am not under the law) so that I might win those under the law.
To those outside the law I became as one outside the law (though I am not free from God’s law but am under Christ’s law) so that I might win those outside the law.
To the weak I became weak, so that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all people that I might by all means save some.
I do it all for the sake of the gospel, so that I may share in its blessings.

I Corinthians 11:2-16 (NRSV):
I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions just as I handed them on to you.
But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the husband is the head of his wife, and God is the head of Christ.
Any man who prays or prophesies with something on his head disgraces his head,
but any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled disgraces her head—it is one and the same thing as having her head shaved.
For if a woman will not veil herself, then she should cut off her hair; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut off or to be shaved, she should wear a veil.
For a man ought not to have his head veiled, since he is the image and reflection of God; but woman is the reflection of man.
Indeed, man was not made from woman, but woman from man.
Neither was man created for the sake of woman, but woman for the sake of man.
For this reason a woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.
Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man or man independent of woman.
For just as woman came from man, so man comes through woman; but all things come from God.
Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head unveiled?
Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair, it is degrading to him,
but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her for a covering.
But if anyone is disposed to be contentious—we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.

I Corinthians 12 (NKJV)
Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I do not want you to be ignorant:
You know that you were Gentiles, carried away to these dumb idols, however you were led.
Therefore I make known to you that no one speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus accursed, and no one can say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit.
There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.  
There are differences of ministries, but the same Lord.  
And there are diversities of activities, but it is the same God who works all in all.  
But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to each one for the profit of all:  
for to one is given the word of wisdom through the Spirit, to another the word of knowledge through the same Spirit,  
to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healings by the same Spirit,  
to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits, to another different kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues.  
But one and the same Spirit works all these things, distributing to each one individually as He wills.  
For as the body is one and has many members, but all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ.  
For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free—and have all been made to drink into one Spirit.  
For in fact the body is not one member but many.  
If the foot should say, “Because I am not a hand, I am not of the body,” is it therefore not of the body?  
And if the ear should say, “Because I am not an eye, I am not of the body,” is it therefore not of the body?  
If the whole body were an eye, where would be the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where would be the smelling?  
But now God has set the members, each one of them, in the body just as He pleased.  
And if they were all one member, where would the body be?  
But now indeed there are many members, yet one body.  
And the eye cannot say to the hand, “I have no need of you”; nor again the head to the feet, “I have no need of you.”  
No, much rather, those members of the body which seem to be weaker are necessary.  
And those members of the body which we think to be less honorable, on these we bestow greater honor; and our unpresentable parts have greater modesty,  
but our presentable parts have no need. But God composed the body, having given greater honor to that part which lacks it,  
that there should be no schism in the body, but that the members should have the same care for one another.  
And if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; or if one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it.  
Now you are the body of Christ, and members individually.  
And God has appointed these in the church: first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, administrations, varieties of tongues.  
Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles?  
Do all have gifts of healings? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?  
But earnestly desire the best gifts. And yet I show you a more excellent way.

I Corinthians 13:1-2 (NRSV):
If I speak in the tongues of mortals and of angels, but do not have love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal.  
And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing.

I Corinthians 13:12 (KJV):
For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known

I Corinthians 14 (NKJV):
Pursue love, and desire spiritual gifts, but especially that you may prophesy.
2 For he who speaks in a tongue does not speak to men but to God, for no one understands him; however, in the spirit he speaks mysteries.
3 But he who prophesies speaks edification and exhortation and comfort to men.
4 He who speaks in a tongue edifies himself, but he who prophesies edifies the church.
5 I wish you all spoke with tongues, but even more that you prophesied; for he who prophesies is greater than he who speaks with tongues, unless indeed he interprets, that the church may receive edification.
6 But now, brethren, if I come to you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you unless I speak to you either by revelation, by knowledge, by prophesying, or by teaching?
7 Even things without life, whether flute or harp, when they make a sound, unless they make a distinction in the sounds, how will it be known what is piped or played?
8 For if the trumpet makes an uncertain sound, who will prepare for battle?
9 So likewise you, unless you utter by the tongue words easy to understand, how will it be known what is spoken? For you will be speaking into the air.
10 There are, it may be, so many kinds of languages in the world, and none of them is without significance.
11 Therefore, if I do not know the meaning of the language, I shall be a foreigner to him who speaks, and he who speaks will be a foreigner to me.
12 Even so you, since you are zealous for spiritual gifts, let it be for the edification of the church that you seek to excel.
13 Therefore let him who speaks in a tongue pray that he may interpret.
14 For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my understanding is unfruitful.
15 What is the conclusion then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will also pray with the understanding. I will sing with the spirit, and I will also sing with the understanding.
16 Otherwise, if you bless with the spirit, how will he who occupies the place of the uninformed say “Amen” at your giving of thanks, since he does not understand what you say?
17 For you indeed give thanks well, but the other is not edified.
18 I thank my God I speak with tongues more than you all;
19 yet in the church I would rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue.
20 Brethren, do not be children in understanding; however, in malice be babes, but in understanding be mature.
21 In the law it is written:
   “With men of other tongues and other lips
   I will speak to this people;
   And yet, for all that, they will not hear Me,”
   says the Lord.
22 Therefore tongues are for a sign, not to those who believe but to unbelievers; but prophesying is not for unbelievers but for those who believe.
23 Therefore if the whole church comes together in one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those who are uninformed or unbelievers, will they not say that you are out of your mind?
24 But if all prophesy, and an unbeliever or an uninformed person comes in, he is convinced by all, he is convicted by all.
25 And thus the secrets of his heart are revealed; and so, falling down on his face, he will worship God and report that God is truly among you.
26 How is it then, brethren? Whenever you come together, each of you has a psalm, has a teaching, has a tongue, has a revelation, has an interpretation. Let all things be done for edification.
27 If anyone speaks in a tongue, let there be two or at the most three, each in turn, and let one interpret.
28 But if there is no interpreter, let him keep silent in church, and let him speak to himself and to God.
29 Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others judge.
30 But if anything is revealed to another who sits by, let the first keep silent.
31 For you can all prophesy one by one, that all may learn and all may be encouraged.
32 And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.
33 For God is not the author of confusion but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints.
34 Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says.
35 And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church.
36 Or did the word of God come originally from you? Or was it you only that it reached?
37 If anyone thinks himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write to you are the commandments of the Lord.
38 But if anyone is ignorant, let him be ignorant.
39 Therefore, brethren, desire earnestly to prophesy, and do not forbid to speak with tongues.
40 Let all things be done decently and in order.

I Corinthians 15:36 (KJV):
36 Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die:

I Corinthians 15:36 (NRSV):
36 Fool! What you sow does not come to life unless it dies.

II Corinthians 6:14 (NKJV):
14 Do not be unequally yoked together with unbelievers. For what fellowship has righteousness with lawlessness? And what communion has light with darkness?

II Corinthians 9:7 (NRSV):
7 Each of you must give as you have made up your mind, not reluctantly or under compulsion, for God loves a cheerful giver.

II Corinthians 10:5 (NKJV):
5 casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ

Galatians 3:28 (NRSV):
28 There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus

Galatians 5:22-23 (NRSV):
22 By contrast, the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. There is no law against such things.

Ephesians 2:1, 5 (KJV):
1 And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;
5 Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)

Ephesians 2:1, 5 (NRSV):
1 You were dead through the trespasses and sins
5 even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ—by grace you have been saved—

Ephesians 3:7 (NKJV):
7 of which I became a minister according to the gift of the grace of God given to me by the effective working of His power.
Ephesians 4:1 (NKJV):
1 I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you to walk worthy of the calling with which you were called.

Ephesians 4:11 (NKJV):
11 And He Himself gave some to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.

Ephesians 4:14-16 (NKJV):
14 that we should no longer be children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the trickery of men, in the cunning craftiness of deceitful plotting,
15 but, speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him who is the head—Christ—
16 from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by what every joint supplies, according to the effective working by which every part does its share, causes growth of the body for the edifying of itself in love.

Ephesians 4:29 (NKJV):
29 Let no corrupt word proceed out of your mouth, but what is good for necessary edification, that it may impart grace to the hearers

Ephesians 5:1-2a (NKJV):
1 Therefore be imitators of God as dear children.
2 And walk in love, as Christ also has loved us and given Himself for us

Ephesians 5:21-33 (NKJV):
21 submitting to one another in the fear of God.
22 Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord.
23 For the husband is head of the wife, as also Christ is head of the church; and He is the Savior of the body.
24 Therefore, just as the church is subject to Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything.
25 Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself for her,
26 that He might sanctify and cleanse her with the washing of water by the word,
27 that He might present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish.
28 So husbands ought to love their own wives as their own bodies; he who loves his wife loves himself.
29 For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as the Lord does the church.
30 For we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones.
31 “For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.”
32 This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church.
33 Nevertheless let each one of you in particular so love his own wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband.

Ephesians 5:21-33 (NRSV):
21 Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ.
22 Wives, be subject to your husbands as you are to the Lord.
23 For the husband is the head of the wife just as Christ is the head of the church, the body of which he is the Savior.
24 Just as the church is subject to Christ, so also wives ought to be, in everything, to their husbands.
25 Husbands, love your wives, just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, in order to make her holy by cleansing her with the washing of water by the word,
26 so as to present the church to himself in splendor, without a spot or wrinkle or anything of the kind—yes, so that she may be holy and without blemish.
In the same way, husbands should love their wives as they do their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself.

For no one ever hates his own body, but he nourishes and tenderly cares for it, just as Christ does for the church,

because we are members of his body.

“For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two will become one flesh.”

This is a great mystery, and I am applying it to Christ and the church.

Each of you, however, should love his wife as himself, and a wife should respect her husband.

Ephesians 6:9-18 (NRSV):

And, masters, do the same to them. Stop threatening them, for you know that both of you have the same Master in heaven, and with him there is no partiality.

Finally, be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his power.

Put on the whole armor of God, so that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

For our struggle is not against enemies of blood and flesh, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers of this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places.

Therefore take up the whole armor of God, so that you may be able to withstand on that evil day, and having done everything, to stand firm.

Stand therefore, and fasten the belt of truth around your waist, and put on the breastplate of righteousness.

As shoes for your feet put on whatever will make you ready to proclaim the gospel of peace.

With all of these, take the shield of faith, with which you will be able to quench all the flaming arrows of the evil one.

Take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.

Pray in the Spirit at all times in every prayer and supplication. To that end keep alert and always persevere in supplication for all the saints.

Ephesians 6:12 (NKJV):

For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this age, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places

Philippians 1:21 (NRSV):

For to me, living is Christ and dying is gain.

Colossians 2:9 (NKJV):

For in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily;

Colossians 2:13 (KJV):

And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

Colossians 2:13 (NRSV):

And when you were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made you alive together with him, when he forgave us all our trespasses,

Colossians 3:18-19 (NKJV):

Wives, submit to your own husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.

Husbands, love your wives and do not be bitter toward them.
I Thessalonians 5:12-13 (NKJV):
12 But we appeal to you, brothers and sisters, to respect those who labor among you, and have charge of you in the Lord and admonish you;
13 esteem them very highly in love because of their work. Be at peace among yourselves.

I Timothy 2:9-14 (NKJV):
9 in like manner also, that the women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with propriety and moderation, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly clothing,
10 but, which is proper for women professing godliness, with good works.
11 Let a woman learn in silence with all submission.
12 And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence.
13 For Adam was formed first, then Eve.
14 And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.

I Timothy 3:1-7 (KJV):
1 This is a true saying, if a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.
2 A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach;
3 Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous;
4 One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;
5 (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)
6 Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.
7 Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

II Timothy 1:6 (NKJV):
6 Therefore I remind you to stir up the gift of God which is in you through the laying on of my hands.

Titus 1:6-9 (KJV):
6 If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly.
7 For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not selfwilled, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre;
8 But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate;
9 Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers

Titus 2:3-5 (NKJV):
3 the older women likewise, that they be reverent in behavior, not slanderers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things—
4 that they admonish the young women to love their husbands, to love their children,
5 to be discreet, chaste, homemakers, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God may not be blasphemed

Titus 2:3-5 (NRSV):
3 Likewise, tell the older women to be reverent in behaviour, not to be slanderers or slaves to drink; they are to teach what is good,
so that they may encourage the young women to love their husbands, to love their children,
to be self-controlled, chaste, good managers of the household, kind, being submissive to
their husbands, so that the word of God may not be discredited.

Hebrews 13:17 (NKJV):
17 Obey those who rule over you, and be submissive, for they watch out for your souls, as
those who must give account. Let them do so with joy and not with grief, for that would be
unprofitable for you.

James 3:13-18 (KJV):
13 Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him shew out of a good
conversation his works with meekness of wisdom.
14 But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the
truth.
15 This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish.
16 For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work.
17 But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be
intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.
18 And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace

1 Peter 1:16 (NKJV):
16 because it is written, “Be holy, for I am holy.”

1 Peter 2:24 (NKJV):
24 who Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, having died to sins,
might live for righteousness – by whose stripes you were healed.

1 Peter 3:1-7 (NKJV):
1 Wives, likewise, be submissive to your own husbands, that even if some do not obey the
word, they, without a word, may be won by the conduct of their wives,
2 when they observe your chaste conduct accompanied by fear.
3 Do not let your adornment be merely outward—arranging the hair, wearing gold, or putting
on fine apparel—
4 rather let it be the hidden person of the heart, with the incorruptible beauty of a gentle and
quiet spirit, which is very precious in the sight of God.
5 For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned
themselves, being submissive to their own husbands,
6 as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are
not afraid with any terror.
7 Husbands, likewise, dwell with them with understanding, giving honor to the wife, as to the
weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life, that your prayers may not be
hindered.

1 Peter 3:7 (NLT):
7 In the same way, you husbands must give honour to your wives. Treat your wife with
understanding as you live together. She may be weaker than you are, but she is your equal
partner in God’s gift of new life. Treat her as you should so your prayers will not be hindered.

I Peter 3:18 (KJV):
18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to
God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

I Peter 3:18 (NRSV):
18 For Christ also suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, in order to
bring you to God. He was put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit,
I Peter 4:10 (NKJV):
10 As each one has received a gift, minister it to one another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God

I Peter 5:1-7 (NKJV):
1 The elders who are among you I exhort, I who am a fellow elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that will be revealed:
2 Shepherd the flock of God which is among you, serving as overseers, not by compulsion but willingly, not for dishonest gain but eagerly;
3 nor as being lords over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock;
4 and when the Chief Shepherd appears, you will receive the crown of glory that does not fade away.
5 Likewise you younger people, submit yourselves to your elders. Yes, all of you be submissive to one another, and be clothed with humility, for “God resists the proud, But gives grace to the humble.”
6 Therefore humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time,
7 casting all your care upon Him, for He cares for you.

I John 4:1 (NRSV):
1 Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are from God; for many false prophets have gone out into the world.
Scriptures for Holiness standards prohibiting makeup and adornment (UPCI Manual)

I Kings 9:30 (KJV):
30 And when Jehu was come to Jezreel, Jezebel heard of it; and she painted her face, and tired her head, and looked out at a window.

Jeremiah 4:30 (KJV):
30 And when thou art spoiled, what wilt thou do? Though thou clothest thyself with crimson, though thou deckest thee with ornaments of gold, though thou rentest thy face with painting, in vain shalt thou make thyself fair; thy lovers will despise thee, they will seek thy life.

Ezekiel 23:40 (KJV):
40 And furthermore, that ye have sent for men to come from far, unto whom a messenger was sent; and, lo, they came: for whom thou didst wash thyself, paintedst thy eyes, and deckedst thyself with ornaments,

I Peter 2:9 (KJV):
9 But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light;

I Peter 3:1-4 (KJV):
1 Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives;
2 While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear,
3 Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel;
4 But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.

I Timothy 2:8-9 (KJV):
8 I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.
9 In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array;

Revelation 17:4 (KJV):
4 And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication:

Deuteronomy 22:5 (Holiness standard prohibiting trousers) (KJV):
5 The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the LORD thy God.
Scriptures encompassing Holiness in general (UPCI Manual):

Deuteronomy 7:6:
6 For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.

Philippians 4:5 (KJV):
5 Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand.

1 John 2:15-16 (KJV):
15 Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.
16 For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.

Titus 2:11-12 (KJV):
11 For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men,
12 Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world;

1 Peter 1:15-19 KJV:
15 But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation;
16 Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.
17 And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear:
18 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;
19 But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:

1 Peter 2:21-23 (KJV):
21 For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps:
22 Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth:
23 Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously:

Hebrews 12:14 (KJV):
14 Follow peace with all men, and Holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord:
Chapter 1 - Studying the Pentecostal Lifeworld

This thesis engages with the concept of women’s spiritual power in two major locations of the worldwide movement of Pentecostalism – the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI) and the Assemblies of God (AG) in New Zealand and Missouri (USA). My methods were ethnographic and my thesis draws on fieldnotes and interviews with 61 women in these denominations. Along with understanding the development of their spiritual power through conversion and calling narratives, I also explore the manifestations of this power as it is expressed and embodied in spiritual gifts and changed lives, and also through the complex and diversely performed practice of submission. While it is generally accepted that women are the driving force of Pentecostalism (Hallum, 2003:p.171) (through numbers and also, as this thesis shows, through historical experience and via intergenerational support and transmission of the faith), women’s position and vocations within the Church do not always reflect such power. My thesis investigates and attempts to explain this conundrum by listening attentively to women’s descriptions of their spiritual lives and values and by adopting a feminist standpoint analysis that validates these women’s experience of their spiritual power. I argue that the women in these conservative, relatively secluded communities engage in biblical feminism as a form of spiritual power, and I support this with the interview material. But before we get to that, I define below some key and important terms, beginning with my working definition of feminism in general, and unpack a variety of feminisms in order to create a grounded framework for biblical feminism as it is used and defined in this thesis.

I use feminism in this instance as Graham (1995:p.13) defines it, as a ‘body of theory and politics’ which seeks to rectify women’s exclusion and subordination in every form and holds that the intersection where ‘society,’ ‘self,’ and ‘knowledge’ converge is a vitally contested space for feminist theory. Streams of feminism today are encompassed under third wave feminism whose formational period was from 1991 to 1995 (Heywood, 2006:p.xv) and is inclusive of an array of perspectives, including radical feminism and its offshoots of liberal, Marxist, socialist and cultural feminisms, as well as black, Latina and Asian, postcolonial, babe or lipstick feminisms (pp.xx-xxi), and biblical feminism, just to name a few.

For instance, radical feminism, which was the basis for feminist theory during much of the second wave, holds that patriarchy and male supremacy are the fundamental systems of dominance crossing all societal boundaries, and that in order for women to be freed from
oppression requires a total restructuring of society. Radical feminists may also advocate for
total gender segregation but have been critiqued by other feminists who hold that men should
be allowed a place at the table (Willis, 1984). Liberal feminism takes an individualistic stance
and holds women’s struggle for liberation also as its end goal, but states that any choice a
woman makes is, by definition, feminist because choosing is a feminist act (Mehat, 2015).
Marxist feminism holds that women’s oppression stems from capitalism and therefore, the
capitalist system must be overthrown (Howie, 2006:pp.50-52), while socialist feminism,
described as a ‘marriage’ between Marxist and radical feminisms, focuses on both the public
and private spheres of women’s lives and argues that liberation can only be achieved by
bringing to an end both the economic and cultural sources of women’s oppression. Socialist
feminists argue that when women must place their financial dependence on men, they are
unable to be free due to an imbalance in wealth (Ehrenreich, 2016; Buchanan, 2011). Cultural
feminism, created as a depoliticisation of radical feminism, holds that there is a ‘female
nature’ or ‘female essence’ that has been undervalued. It is a feminist theory of difference that
upholds the positive aspects of women and that women’s world has virtues and values that are
to be embraced and upheld rather than despised (Alcoff, 1988). Black, Latina and Asian
American feminisms critique all feminist waves as being for, by and about white women who
have historically disregarded the specific needs and cultural and ethnic stance of non-white
women. These feminists advocate for themselves in ways that they believe mainstream
feminism did not do or has not done (Hurdis, 2006:pp.23-25; Whetstone-Sims, 2006:pp.39-
42; Hooton, 2006:pp.190-92). Perhaps as a response to this, postcolonial feminism works to
develop its explanations from women themselves and breaks down binaries by recognizing
the differing meanings of feminism in non-Western cultures. Postcolonial feminists focus on
matters in the developing world and work towards the empowerment of women and their
children who are severely affected by insufficient food, the increasing cost of living, declining
services, and eroding economic and environmental conditions (Mack-Canty, 2006:pp.250-52).
In contrast, babe (or lipstick) feminism (a term coined by Anna Quindlen) describes
predominantly young, heterosexual, white middle/upper class women who promote a sexy
and fun empowerment. In a backlash (Faludi, 1992) against what young women perceived as
Puritan sexual ideals and compulsory lesbianism amongst second wave feminists, babe
feminists argue against ‘victim feminism’ of sexual violence, beauty ideals and economic
inequality (Thrift, 2006:pp.26-27). Finally, poststructuralism holds that the individual is
purely a social construct with little authority or choice in the matter of identity and who one
is, since we are constructed, ‘overdetermined,’ even, by social discourses and cultural
practices. Poststructuralism theorizes the construction of subjectivity, including as the
‘mechanisms of sexist oppression,’ or the construction and social discourse of specific gender categories, and asserts that the subject is in fact, a cultural product. Poststructuralism deconstructs the mechanisms standing in the way of social progress (Alcoff, 1988).

Having discussed this variety of feminisms, I now turn to the topic of biblical feminism, which is where my work resides. Biblical feminists, like other feminists of faith such as Islamic feminists (Regan Wills, 2006:pp.185-87), use scripture and faith beliefs to empower themselves and other women in the expansion of women’s rights. These women draw on the strong pro-woman history of Islam and Christianity, respectively, to support the empowerment of women within cultural, religious and family networks, rather than seeking independence from them. They reinterpret the Qur’an or the New Testament of the Bible, and argue that the canon specifies men’s and women’s equality in God’s eyes who gave legal and marital rights that significantly improved the lives of women. This thesis focuses on biblical feminism as a stance of Pentecostal participants’ lives in this research. It argues that these women practice a brand of submission that is subversive because it flies in the face of other feminisms where submission is seen as demeaning to women, but the women of this research use submission as a political and spiritual tool by which to achieve spiritual power both for themselves and their families. Though the dominant culture may not view them as feminist since they may not be found agitating for the empowerment of all women, they are feminist because they are working instead around their own gendered relations in marriage and the church, and balancing these by sacred power achieved in their spiritual lives.

I argue that participants found a clever way of managing this by using what I call ‘subversive submission.’ These women do not see their agenda as a political one in the everyday world but seek instead to improve women’s position in their organisations. Just as feminists do in the worldly sphere, older women in these faith communities teach the younger, and the women nurture one another in developing their skills in the spiritual gifts and in submission to God and hierarchical or mutual submission, respectively, to their husbands and to some extent, to their pastors. While not a broad human rights-based movement, biblical feminism is in the vein of feminist writing around women’s religious experience such as in the writings of Mary Daly (1985) or Sarah Coakley (2002). The writings of these two women and the broader field of biblical feminism is discussed in the section below, entitled, “Biblical Feminism and the Re-Conceptualisation of Submission.”

Of course as a general part of their worldview, revivalist women often do not call themselves “feminist” and usually distance themselves from feminism. Indeed, in interviews and social conversations during this research, many women declined even the label of “biblical feminist,” yet conceded that they had many of those traits. Revivalist women’s
knowledge production about submission and the spiritual power that flows from it demonstrates that they do not prioritise the feminist label but work within it. They are, I will argue, what some scholars call ‘de facto feminists’ (Weiss, 2008:p.187) because whether or not they identified as feminist, threads of feminism were clearly interwoven throughout their stories. De facto feminism (Misciagno, 1997) is a concept to describe women who may hold ‘disapproval’ of mainstream feminism for its leave-taking of traditional expressions of female identity, but who will still practice feminist ideals. The ideology of patriarchy invokes traditional gender models as the ‘pattern that necessarily should be followed.’ Yet, de facto feminists establish their autonomy in practice, and in doing so erode the foundation of opposing ontological claims that would limit their freedom of action, thus bringing about a debate concerning feminist identity (p.55). Their stance places patriarchal ideology on a ‘seaside structure’ (p.76) that is precarious, on stilts, and having a foundation that is eroded by the tide of change and what is real. While de facto feminism may not be the same as other organized forms of feminism, it has constituted a strong base of support for feminism that has gone largely unacknowledged (p.67). De facto feminist women ‘do’ feminism even while ‘bracketing’ the ideology and concept. Theirs is therefore not an ideological approach, but one of praxis (p.83).

For its part, patriarchy, generally understood as a male-dominated power structure with a systemic bias against women, is referred to in this thesis as that defined by Valdes (2013:p.162-63). He writes that Euro-American patriarchy socially constructs gender as immutable and ‘deduces gender exclusively from sex’ [emphasized by author’s], viewing such deduction as indestructible and unassailable. It seeks to control not only the regulation of gender, but also of ‘socio-sexual identities,’ by conflating sex (genitalia), gender (socially ascribed on the basis of sex as ‘masculine’ or ‘feminine’ ways of being or doing), sexual orientation (sexual or affectional desires and interests as directed towards members of the opposite or same sex, or both), and sexuality (signifying both sexual orientation and behavioural conduct). It is both heterosexist and androsexist. This system stands in direct contrast to other forms of patriarchy; for instance, the ancient Greek or Native American systems, which view sex as foundational to human identity, and gender as a basis for [egalitarian] social organization. Lerner (1986:pp.15-35) traces this type of patriarchy that regards women’s subordination as universal, God-given, and therefore natural, immutable and unquestioned, to the second millennium BCE in the Middle East where gender relations shifted to the center of the story of civilization. She writes that before this development, male dominance was not a generally featured part of human society. Lerner roots patriarchy and its development in history and anthropology, rather than in nature, and by doing so, she flips the
script. She concludes that if patriarchy was a cultural creation, then it can be overturned by a new culture (Napikoski and Lewis, 2016).

Such a system of patriarchy requires strategy by those whom it rules over. For instance, a participant I have named Vianna spoke of being strategic about where and when she became vocal concerning her feminist politics and beliefs. As a tenured faculty member at a Christian university, Vianna kept her feminist ideals out of the classroom until she had a full time teaching contract in hand, but at the same time, spoke of being willing to “put herself out there” for the sake of students who she knew were searching. Another interviewee, Jerrie, saw feminism as an analytical “tool.” “It is not a fix-it-all tool,” she explained, but “a tool for a certain kind of leverage” for equality which, she felt, could be found just as easily in Jesus’ ministry.

My research, therefore, sought to understand this tri-corner intersection in Pentecostal women’s lives of submission, their spiritual power and feminism as a type of ‘situated knowledge’ (Haraway, 1987:p.88) through talking with the women themselves and by hearing their stories. Following feminist theologian, Coakley (1996:p.xv), this research sought to answer the question of how submission can coexist with the call for women’s liberation. I argue that when they step out in spiritual authority and by their own agency in submission to God’s giftings and callings placed on their lives, these women dissolve the societal narratives that they are “anti-feminist and limited,” and demonstrate instead how fully feminist and unencumbered they actually are.

**The Feminist Foundation of this Research**

Feminist standpoint theory provides an analytical framework for this project because it holds that other standpoints are equally valid (Franks, 2001:p.44). This is the heart of ‘transversal politics,’ which are situated in standpoint epistemology and encompass ‘difference by equality.’ Defined, this means that notions of difference should not replace notions of equality but should encompass them (Yuval-Davis, 1999:p.95). Therefore, the feminist standpoint makes room for evangelical or biblical feminism as the feminist philosophy of some conservative Protestant women who embrace egalitarian ideals of mutuality in marriage and church life, and in their relationships with men, but who may not subscribe to mainstream feminism. Another facet of transversal politics is that an advocate need not be a member of the community in question, but must bring reflexive knowledge of their identity and positioning, a process called ‘rooting,’ and should also try to put themselves in the situations of members of the community, known as ‘shifting’ (p.96). As a former Apostolic woman, I was no longer a member of the ‘epistemological community’ (Assiter,
1996, via Yuval-Davis, 1999:p.96), but by returning to it and putting myself into these women’s situated experiences and collecting their stories, and self-reflexively presenting them in this thesis, as the researcher I ‘rooted’ and ‘shifted’ in ways defined by transversal politics. This is what Yuval-Davis calls the ‘politics of belonging,’ the participatory, dialogical ‘dimension of citizenship’ and what that entails (2011:p.3). I will talk more about my own personal standpoint in chapter two.

Feminist theory is a process which appropriates the standpoint as essential to political action and can only be reconciled by a collective subject, or in Gramscian terms, a subaltern group, which may be defined those whose social mobility has been unjustly restricted (Hartsock, 1998:p.82). Standpoint theorist Haraway (2004:pp.84-85) states that it is imperative for feminists to insist on a better account of the world, drawing from an ‘earthwide’ network of connections to translate members’ situated knowledges, or situated imagination (Stoetzler and Yuval-Davis, 2002:p.320), among varying ‘power-differentiated’ communities. The imagination, argues Stoetzler and Yuval-Davis, is ‘fundamental to why, whether and what we are ready to experience, perceive and know in the first place’ (p.325, emphasis the authors’). They hold that between the situated experience and the situated knowledge sits the notion of a situated imagination that provides particular meanings to our experiences (pp.325-27). Without ‘specific social agents’ to construct and point out certain analytical and political features of the lifeworld, those on the outside would be unable to distinguish them (Yuval-Davis, 2006:p.203).

Therefore, standpoint theory engages in the power of modern critical theories of bodies and how meanings about those bodies get made in order to give them a chance for life (Haraway, 1988:pp.578-581). It also holds that giving an account of the ‘social positioning of the social agent’ is vital (Stoetzler and Yuval-Davis, 2002:p.315). Harding (2007:p.50) writes that the feminist standpoint examines systems of domination, calling attention to the perceptions of the oppressors. No matter how perverse or false those perceptions may be, they are nevertheless made real because the oppressors and those they rule are forced to live in structural institutions that serve the oppressors’ sense of society and self. Therefore, by seeking to understand both the oppressors and the oppressed, a standpoint exposes dual levels of reality (Stoetzler and Yuval-Davis, 2002:p.319; Hartsock, 1998:pp.107-108).

Subjugated standpoints are preferred standpoints because they seem to promise more sustained, transforming accounts of the world (Haraway, 2004:p.88) and with their specific situatedness, ‘privileged access to truth’ (Stoetzler and Yuval-Davis, 2002:p.315). Standpoint theory posits and proves the claim that women’s lives are structurally and systematically different from men’s lives, thereby producing a set of differently complete knowledges. The
standpoint emerges through struggle and an informed understanding of the location and the experiences within it (Wood, 2005:pp.61-66). These structures place women in subordination to men in ways that seem natural and right (Haraway, 2004:p.88). Therefore, asking critical questions about the social order should start by looking at marginalised lives (Harding, 2004:p.130).

Feminist standpoint fits this research because, while many Pentecostals may consider Paul’s writings on the “natural” order of woman and man as infallible truths,1 if only women are expected to submit rather than all members of the home and church submitting to one another, this sets up an autocracy of men over women. Daly (1985:p.159) discusses how the rhetoric of ‘God’s plan’ invokes such reverence and awe from a devout audience that God, they assert, could not propose anything unreasonable or unjust. Haraway (2004:p.88) calls this the ‘god-trick,’ dazzling the subjugated with why they ‘should’ submit, why they ‘should’ allow themselves to be marginalised, why this is good for them and, in its dazzling, brings blinding illuminations. New Zealand minister Deans (2001:p.151) calls women’s submission to men without intellectual or moral assent a ‘cosmic given,’ arguably God-ordained and a ‘brilliant ploy’ to make life easy for men.

Next I discuss where this research fits within its fields of study.

**Contributions to the Field**

This study makes a contribution to the field of feminist anthropology of religion, Pentecostal Studies and transnational American Studies. This research utilised the method of multi-sited, comparative ethnography to free the voices of women in Pentecostalism, a conservative religious tradition. In this study, they were privileged and heard. Brasher (1998:p.88) writes that in spaces governed by male authority, women’s stories of spiritual power are often not made part of the congregation’s ‘public history’ but they emerge when the ‘right’ questions are asked at the ‘right’ time. By recording and relaying Pentecostal women’s stories of their own social and spiritual experiences, a real-life glimpse is provided of the ways in which Pentecost, and especially Pentecostal women, handles complicated nuances of gender inclusivity. Their narratives allow us to explore the complexities of contested-ness and conflict that are part of their lived daily realities in the Pentecostal lifeworld. Seen as a way of hearing women to speech (Morton, 1985:pp.127-29), several leading recent studies of religious women have significant ethnographic components to them (Ingersoll, 2003; Franks, 2001; Brasher, 1998; Griffith, 1997; Brusco, 1995). Ethnography is therefore, a way of

---

1 I Corinthians 11:3.
connecting feminist anthropological research to real-world concerns (Stockett & Geller, 2006: p.13).

This study also contributes research to the role of religion in human social life with a focus at looking at what women really do, as opposed to what men historically have said they do (Moore, 1988: p.2). This study blocks ‘male bias’ (Ardener, 2006, 1975) by actively seeking women’s own account of the world, un-muted and un-muffled by dominant male language structures and discourses. Yet by allowing religious women to be heard, they are able to extricate their own stories and present them as equally valid to men’s. Often, men’s narratives have been collected at the detriment to women, as well as being superimposed over women’s and deemed representative for all (Eiesland, 1997: p.100; Moore, 1988). This work also troubles the universality of the category of ‘woman’ by not pre-supposing the ‘appropriate’ behaviour associated with women, whatever those behaviours might entail (Stockett & Gellar, 2006: pp.10-11; Moore, 1988: pp.11-12).

This study also picks up the postmodern challenge of exploring ‘insider/outsider’ boundaries (Lewin, 2006: p.25; Ingersoll 2003: pp.142-43). The researcher was formerly a member of one of these Pentecostal denominations (UPCI) and, when returning to it after nearly a decade, found the borders between malleable and yet permanent in the women’s insider experiences as viewed through the researcher’s insider/outsider phenomenological and anthropological lens. What one can learn about the ‘Other’ in one or a few conversations troubles these boundaries but one can never know everything about another’s experience. Therefore, while the language and behaviours of Pentecost were familiar and known to the researcher and participants, ‘sameness’ was not assumed (Moore, 1988: p.10; Ammerman, 1987: pp.9-14). This study provides a useful counterpoint of cognisance by viewing how the work gets shaped by the values and perceptions of both the researcher and those whose stories became part of the research, while keeping the author visible rather than ‘omniscient’ (Lewin, 2006: p.25). In feminist ethnography, the embodied experience of the researcher (as well as her body) becomes data in itself (Kosut & Moore, 2010). Accordingly, both the women and the female researcher of this study were situated in patriarchal institutions of religion and academe, respectively, and moved amongst male language structures.

Though it seeks to free the voices of those who have been marginalised both by secular feminism and by patriarchy, this is a feminist anthropological project that does not assume the universal subordination of all women. Those in this study demonstrated that they had access to the resources of Pentecostalism and actively used them. They controlled the conditions of their work by purposefully living lives in which they could readily listen for and hear God’s voice, while acting on God’s guidance in their ministries, spiritual giftings, and
decisions. Finally, they controlled the products of their labour when they operated under their spiritual giftings for the benefit of their faith communities. Therefore, in the economy of spiritual authority and gift-exchange of Pentecostalism, these women are not dependent on men for resources. On the contrary, while men may try to undermine women’s autonomous status by blocking their ministries or giftings, women circumvent these blocks by making their rightful claim to the gender-neutral tokens of their economy, including scriptural interpretation, submission to and their relationship with God, and especially their Spirit-driven authority to move under the aegis of God’s calling. In Pentecostalism, production of resources in terms of spiritual gifts and ministry is ‘owned’ communally, thus placing members of the society on equal terms in distribution (with varying levels of equality) and fostering egalitarianism in the form of mutual submission. Women may seem subordinate in this subculture but because they control the means of their own production, they in fact hold great (spiritual) power (Moore, 1988:pp.3-38).

This study presents women as persons and is an enquiry into the cultural construction of Pentecostal women’s identity. Because women participate in the Pentecostal socio-political domain men regularly occupy and do so with particular ways of knowing and operating within it as active agents in their own woman-centric spheres of power, they hold full personhood. By demonstrating the empowerment of revivalist women when secular feminism regards them as disempowered, this study reveals the strength of difference between women and sources of empowerment (Moore, 1988:p.198). Due to the lack of a unified viewpoint between secular and biblical feminisms, there is fragmentation, and from these disconnected spaces research emerges from shared concerns about identity and difference (Stockett & Gellar, 2006:pp.11, 17). This research writes against homogeneity in feminisms and ways of being women, seeking instead competing and alternative viewpoints and truth claims that are diametrically opposed.

Finally, this is a study about heteronormativity in a religious space that is hostile to homonormative narratives and lives lived. Indeed, feminist anthropology has been critiqued by queer theorists for its reliance on the man::woman binary in its explorations of sexuality and gender (Stockett & Gellar, 2006:pp.15-16). This study uncovered heteronormative stances of the sexes of man and woman being complementary and in ‘right’ relationship with each other to the exclusion of other sexualities. Homophobic references throughout the research fieldwork by members of the Pentecostal lifeworld further reinforced this heteronormative stance, thus exposing the oppression of homosexual, third or multiple gender voices (discussed further in the methods chapter). Heteronormativity brings the structuralism of gender stratification into stark relief but marginalises the voices of those who do not fall
within the man:woman binary. Only one interviewee in this research identified as a lesbian and that was Jerrie, but she framed her sexuality as a “demon” from which she had been delivered and had lived a celibate life for nearly thirty years by the time of our conversation. Mollenkott (1992:p.81) writes that in the face of such Christian homophobia the preservation of ‘heteropatriarchy’ is at stake. While homo-narratives are not actively presented here their absence can be read as a political statement in the lifeworld, and their silence in this study though troubling, is taken for granted in the matrix of members’ lives.

This thesis also contributes to the fields of Pentecostal and American Studies, especially as it applies to transnational research in American religion. Though there is doubt that Pentecostalism was American-born (Johnson, 2014:p.274; Cartledge, 2010:p.2), it became a powerful, explosive force on American soil and from there was exported to the world. Therefore much can be gleaned from the study of contemporary Pentecostalism and women’s experiences within it. This study contributes to contemporary, transnational women’s involvement in Pentecostalism in both New Zealand and the USA and women’s status therein. This comparative approach presents new questions to the field about conservative, religious women, how they conceptualise submission and how it is synonymous with liberation theology in a postmodern, neoliberal, rapidly changing world. Csordas (2009:pp.3-5) writes that any study which looks at the globalisation of religion must consider ‘what travels well’ geographically and culturally across religious spaces. He calls this the ‘portable practice’ of rites easily learned that are applicable in any cultural setting, as well as the ‘transposable message’ which can be reordered while keeping its original nature. In other words, musically metaphorically speaking, it can be performed in a different key between geographic and cultural locations. This research uncovered that women’s submission and spiritual power in Pentecostalism is indeed both portable and transposable across denominations and countries (Alexander, 2005). Herein, women’s shared language arises, Pentecostal New Zealand and American women’s voices, energetically united in “submission,” “consecration,” “authority” and “servanthood,” words in a collective lexicon, situated in the women’s Pentecostal experience, with the researcher participating. The study places women in the centre of what happens when an American-originated denomination is absorbed into the national culture and women’s experiences in another country across continents and seas; what gets taken on board and what does not.

Next, I discuss certain terms of note and their meanings used in this thesis.
Unpacking Key Terms

There are certain terms in the Glossary that beg elaboration for how they are used in this thesis. I use the word ‘revivalist’ interchangeably with ‘Pentecostal’ and ‘evangelical,’ in accordance with their practices of expressive worship and their focus on ‘the call.’ The term ‘revivalist’ can be traced back to eighteenth century Protestantism and the Great Awakening when participants sought to stir up passion in American Christianity, breathing into it new life by holding revivals and encouraging public individual conversions. Glossolalia and other spiritual practices, along with holy living, punctuated revivalists’ lives. Revivalists privileged the call as providing ordination and being the authorising force for ministry, often allowing those called to circumvent seminary. This worked especially well for women who often found themselves barred from access to seminary by the patriarchy. Those with a call received a sense of mission in serving God and being sent to the lost and Pentecostals today still privilege the call (Payne, 2015:pp.11-12). Franks (2001:p.10) also chose the term ‘revivalist’ to describe her respondents, as opposed to the word ‘fundamentalists’ which, for her, carried pejorative connotations and insinuated zealous anti-intellectualism. For all these reasons, the term ‘revivalists’ is used in this thesis.

The terms ‘fundamentalist’ and ‘evangelical,’ as well as ‘Pentecostal,’ are notoriously difficult to define. Fundamentalists are often known as inerrantists, holding to the inerrancy of scripture, and are suspicious of institutions outside the church and family as being worldly and not having the “whole truth” as they do. Evangelicals, on the other hand, may be seen by fundamentalists as “sell-outs” for their more mainline, rather than far-right, stance in theology and politics. Evangelicals are more well-known, however, for their conversionism, crucicentrism (Christ’s atoning work on the cross), biblicism, and activism (Bebbington, 1989:pp.2-17). Pentecostals are known for their eschatology, adherence to glossolalia and dispensational pre-millennialist pneumatology, which they relate to contemporary times (e.g., the early cultural mantra that the “rapture” will happen soon and Pentecost was given for these “last days” in an effort to save as many souls as possible from the coming apocalypse) (Payne, 2015:p.11; Lineham, 2011:pp.75-104; Ward, 2009; Wacker, 2003:p.26; Ammerman, 1987:pp.1-6, 17-20). The term ‘fundamentalism’ in its American context was introduced into mainstream American religious culture with a series of pamphlets written by religiously conservative authors and published as The Fundamentals from 1910 to 1915. It was distributed to Protestant pastors globally (Hawley & Proudfoot, 1994:pp.11-15; Ammerman, 1987:p.21). While fundamentalism has been defined as ‘militantly anti-modernist Protestant evangelicalism,’ ironically, fundamentalist groups have proven themselves masters of
technology and ‘organizational sophistication’ (Hawley and Proudfoot, 1994:pp.11-15) in bringing their message and mission to the world.

Religious historian Lineham (2011:p.94; 2006:p.7), writes that while at its origins in 1927 the Assemblies of God in New Zealand was ‘proudly Fundamentalist,’ present-day Pentecostals in New Zealand mostly identify as ‘Pentecostal.’ Synan (1997:p.208) wrote that while most early Pentecostals considered themselves fundamentalist, the fundamentalist movement, which came of age alongside Pentecost, refused to fellowship with them. In 1928, the World’s Christian Fundamentals Association (founded in 1919) issued a statement condemning the Pentecostals for speaking in unknown tongues and for ‘fanatic healing.’ In both countries, writes Lineham, theological challenges have arisen to premillennialism, and some denominations and institutions no longer adhere to it in their mission statements. Amongst New Zealand Pentecostals, there is much debate on ‘Kingdom theology’ (2006:p.7). Still, there are those fundamentalists who attack theological enemies in ‘activist, transformative and anxious’ ways because, Lineham writes, fundamentalists consider themselves the ‘last defenders of Christianity’ (p.8).

Nevertheless, any church or individual can claim any or all of the aforementioned definitions for themselves as part of their Christian ethos, a statement which shows how difficult it is to pin these terms down. Ammerman writes (1987:pp.6-9, 21-24) that similarities may come from shared moral ideologies and corporate worship rather than by keeping the same faith tenets, but geographical location (e.g., churches in the North may hold varying beliefs to churches in the South) can also determine both similarity and difference. Lineham (2006:p.6) writes that the boundaries between fundamentalists, evangelicals and Pentecostals have become blurred, demarcating them as conservative denominations that are ‘far more dynamic’ than churches in the mainstream, such as Presbyterian or Anglican. This is due to their excellent marketing, vivid youth culture, and embracing of modern business methods, he writes. Most relevant to this research, however, is Lineham’s note that the view of treating women as second-class citizens in conservative Protestantism has, in Pentecostalism, given way to the ‘powerful’ position of the pastor’s wife (2006:p.8; Poloma, 1989:p.110). Lineham (2006:p.8) notes that there is a definite thread of feminism amongst ‘strong women’ in New Zealand evangelicalism and he places New Zealand Pentecostals amongst evangelicals. The respondents of this study are considered Pentecostal because they were actively sought from two Pentecostal denominations and from numerous churches affiliated with those denominations in the countries of New Zealand and the United States. All respondents self-identified as members of those churches. The term ‘evangelical’ is also used in this literature review in accordance with the subjects of other studies.
Another use of lexicon important to note is that of “Holy Spirit” and “Holy Ghost.” These terms are not interchangeable. The phrase “Holy Spirit” was used amongst AG respondents, and “Holy Ghost” amongst UPCI respondents. These are the terms each denomination recognises in its individual lexicon. At times in this thesis I may reference the “Holy Spirit” and not in accordance with any respondent. This represents my own preferred academic use of the term as the more mainstream of the two.

In the next section are some comparisons the work uncovered between the two countries of this research.

**Comparisons between New Zealand and the United States**

There are of course many differences as well as similarities between the countries of New Zealand and the United States. Some of the broad differences include that the USA is part of a continent while New Zealand is an island country. The population of New Zealand, 4.6 million (according to the 2013 census), is similar in number to the states of Louisiana or Kentucky for population. New Zealand is a Commonwealth country under the auspices of Great Britain, while the USA emancipated itself from British rule in the late eighteenth century. There are similarities, however. Both countries already had a long-established indigenous society of Māori and Native Americans, respectively, when white Europeans first arrived. The first European settlers in the American colonies in the seventeenth century were pilgrims and Puritans from Great Britain seeking freedom of religious expression, and the Europeans credited with first going ashore in New Zealand were also British, an exploring expedition led by Captain James Cook in the eighteenth century. Both countries were frontier societies and have historically struggled with their shared Eurocentric histories of taking lands from indigenous peoples. Both countries are capitalist democracies valuing individualism, liberty and rights of personhood. For instance, New Zealand was the first self-governing country to obtain suffrage for women (1893) in which South City activists were instrumental in making women’s suffrage into national law (Cooper, Olssen, Thomlinson & Law, 2003). New Zealand (2013) and the USA (2015) became the thirteenth and twenty-second countries in the world, respectively, to legalise gay marriage during the time of this research. The Pentecostal communities in both countries were fraught with the politics of these laws, and it became a surprisingly difficult aspect of my field work (discussed in the methods chapter).

Each country saw a gold rush during the nineteenth century, bringing to local regions where gold was located new flavours of society, establishing universities, churches and ethnic groups that are still present to this day. South City, where the New Zealand phase of this research was based, became solidly established due to the 1861 gold rush and, from its
origins, still remains Scottish, Presbyterian and academic, reflecting the ethnicity, religious and educational values of the Europeans who first arrived. River City, Missouri, home of the US phase of this research, takes for itself the French Catholic influence, reflecting Europeans who first settled the region in the late seventeenth century, establishing cathedrals, seminaries and universities. The first and subsequent European explorers of these cities also struck alliances with the local indigenous peoples already in those regions. All of these factors and others provided long-lasting effects on national and local histories, religions and economies in each country’s social framework and in the two cities that were the home base for this research.

Similarities and differences between the Pentecostal faith communities in these countries were subtle and overt by turn, including language, ways of communicating and addressing members. Pentecostalism fits well into both countries, because it too values individualism in keeping with having a personal relationship with God and receiving a calling of one’s own. And, with an emphasis on the prosperity gospel, individuals are encouraged to trust God in their finances so that material blessings will follow. Still, Pentecostalism values community and while conducting comparative ethnography, there came a sense that the Pentecostal movement was unhinged from ‘place’ and that the ‘field’ of fieldwork was unable to be reduced to one locale (Norman, 2000:pp.136-37). Instead, women’s bodies became an important ‘place’ to render apparent comparisons and contrasts in both countries in terms of dress, hair and adornment between the AG and UPCI and their varying embodied denominational doctrines and beliefs. For instance, the UPCI stance on women’s uncut hair and the way it was approached in both countries provided a useful contrast in keeping with both sets of national values and communication. The doctrine of uncut hair was taught as a personal decision between the woman and God in New Zealand and almost never preached from pulpits, whereas in the USA it was presented as women’s “duty” in obedience and often preached from pulpits, disseminated at the corporate level to women in the congregation. In each country, the women also taught it to each other. But these were not without their situated complications and in each place, this was an example of how language was communicated through the situatedness of Pentecostal values, a sense of “what works best.” These are perhaps extensions of the framework the first settlers in each country arrived with: freedom of religion, which created more rules (or individuals governed by them) in the USA, and exploration that led to valuing personal decision-making in New Zealand.

Similarly, informalities in titles of address in both countries and denominations were presented as well. The trajectory of Pentecost is related to micro-social factors like family and is a movement in which fictive family relationships hold great importance (Butler, 2007;
Hallum, 2003). This is demonstrated in the ways Pentecostals show one another warmth and respect and as fictive family members, greet one another with hugs, handshakes, or placing a hand on the other’s shoulder or back in embodied expressions of friendship, warmth and compassion (Csordas, 1983). They may also use fictive family titles like “Brother” and “Sister” with the person’s surname or first name, a practice from Pentecostalism’s beginnings (Miller and Yamamori, 2007:p.143; Alexander 2005; Lawless 1988b:p.47). The custom of using “Brother” and “Sister” was, according to one A/G NZ pastor’s wife, an American formality not in keeping with more informal Kiwi traditions. This practice was, in fact, done away with by the AG in both countries. However, the UPCI in both nations continues it. Therefore, each denomination created its own traditions and informalities situated in national culture. There was however disgruntlement with American missionaries, expressed by at least one A/G NZ leader, for their propensity to enter the field believing they held “all the answers,” rather than listening to those they had come to serve. This sentiment was not expressed to me amongst UPCI-NZ members, although it may have contributed in their history (discussed in the chapter on the history of Pentecostalism). Another UPCI-NZ member said she knew of at least three pastors in New Zealand who had departed the UPCI due to its “unfriendliness to other organisations.” It is a more closed denomination than many others and uninterested in liaising with organisations that do not hold their Oneness doctrine, theology or ideals.

Another example that highlighted sameness and difference was the address for pastors’ wives of “First Lady.” While this phrase is used in the UPCI in both countries, AG members in neither country seemed to practice it. And in addressing pastors, the UPCI-NZ and USA almost always utilised the title of “Pastor” followed by surname (in the USA) or more informally, title with first name (in New Zealand). The AG was more laid-back about this in both countries, and either the title of “Pastor” was used or simply the person’s first name.

In summary, while Pentecostalism itself, as well as women’s bodies, emerged as the ‘real’ place of this research, making geographical places appear non-distinct by comparison and almost interchangeable (Norman, 2000:p.139), there were some differences as highlighted here. In fieldwork, navigating the nuances between each country was a dynamic experience.² Next, I review literature from both sides of the spectrum concerning women’s submission to men, biblical feminism, and the spiritual authority under which women work.

² For comparisons on New Zealand’s and the USA’s religious political structures, see religious historian, Peter Lineham’s, “The Fundamentalist Agenda and Its Chances” (2006), and especially Fairness and Freedom: A History of Two Open Societies: New Zealand and the United States (2012) by David Hackett Fischer.
Literature Review

Pentecostal practice enables women to exercise leadership and autonomy outside the domestic sphere as preachers, evangelists, and healers through the acquisition of gifts of the Spirit. It can also create an equal marital balance of power in the home, when women gain autonomy with their husbands (Rabelo, Mota and Almeida, 2009; Butler, 2007; Brusco, 1995). Yet the matter of women’s oppression in the home and church has also been well-documented (Nadar and Potgieter, 2010; Hawley and Proudfoot, 1994; Brown, 1994; Hardacre, 1993; Daly, 1985). One aspect of that oppression has been the oft-contested tenet of female submission to male headship. This literature review looks at authors of studies on both sides of the matter as to submission’s dis/empowering aspects. The questions of whether or not women are free agents or victims of determinism; whether they are rational subjects or products of dispassionate institutions; or how women respond to the restrictions fundamentalism places on them are all relevant and posed as part of this research (Weiss, 2008). Many feminist scholars have considered the question of why, in a contemporary postmodern world, women choose revivalisms where submission to men is an expectation (Ellis, 2012; Ingersoll, 2002; Franks, 2001; Brasher, 1998; Eiesland, 1997; Griffith, 1997; Hardacre, 1993). Other authors bypassed this however, since fundamentalist women are often taught to consider submission as an important aspect of their womanhood and an example of the perception of the oppressors (Nadar and Potgieter, 2010; Joyce, 2009; Balmer, 1994). I explore these in turn.

Gender & Oppressions

Ortner (2006:pp.63-86) asks, ‘Is female to male as nature is to culture?’ and points out that because culture takes over, controls and transforms nature, men are seen as having rights of control over women and ‘superior’ to them. Ortner argues that this supposition is rooted in biological determinism, where males are seen as genetically more ‘dominant’ and females ‘naturally subordinate.’ Biological determinism renders women ‘happy’ with their position, affording them protection and allowing them to engage with maternal pleasures, the ‘satisfying’ experiences of life. Woman’s physiology and childbearing situate her in natural processes so that she is considered more nurturing and able to build intimate relations better than men, which is a ‘lower’ form of relating while a morally ‘higher’ position. Three data types provide evidence that women are valued less than men: explicitly, through role placement where less prestige is accorded than what men receive; symbolically, an ‘attribution of defilement’ which implicitly makes an inferior valuation; and structurally where women
are excluded from positions which carry the ‘highest powers’ of the society (p.63). Pertaining to my study, the first data type, explicit, aligns with pure hierarchical submission, wives to husbands; next, the symbolic data type may concern women who are called a “Jezebel” or “rebellious” when they lead and make decisions on their own authority rather than men’s; and thirdly, structurally, where women with callings on their lives to preach or pastor are barred from pulpits because they are women. These feminine symbols complicate this ‘polarized ambiguity.’ Ortner’s study along with Ardner’s (1975) article, ‘Belief and the problem of women’ were among the first to provide the field of anthropology with a strong framework for studying the cultural problem of women’s subordination, its interrelatedness with biological determinism, and the demarcation of spaces as domestic vs. public (Moore 1988:pp.14, 21).

Similarly, scholar of gender and fundamentalism, Brown (1994:pp.175-76, 197) emphasises the ‘Otherness’ of religious women when fundamentalism seeks ‘to control the fearsome mute power of the flesh’ that is close to nature. Brown writes that fundamentalism emerges from societal stresses that provoke a need to control women’s ‘dangerous’ power. Women therefore become symbolic of everything in societal life that seems out of control. Pentecostal theologian Johns (1993:pp.153-55) writes that women’s oppression is an expression of ‘human sinfulness’ and a cultural universal, even though women’s liberation was ‘paid for at Calvary.’ Barring women from full participation and opportunities that men have in religious spaces, or even choice in education, marriage and divorce denies women dignity and full adulthood.

Folklorist and researcher of Pentecostal women, Lawless (2003:pp.61-73), utilising Jean-Francoise Lyotard’s (1984, 1979) writings about the ‘master or grand narrative,’ argues that the master narrative holds that because God is male and Jesus was male so should clergy also be. This renders women unrecognised as spiritual authorities who can speak. While laywomen who testify from the pew may subvert the master narrative (Lawless, 1988b), a woman preacher is ‘radical’ in doing so. Her presence in the pulpit reading and preaching the Word of God, praying, and invested with both power and authority not only ‘shatters the embedded religious male icon,’ but radically transforms the face of God (2003:p.61). Though there is an injunction against women preachers in the Pentecostal lifeworld, Lawless points out that women still preach because of the Pentecostal ideal that God can speak through anyone. A woman testifying or preaching claims this authority for herself, so who are others to question? Therefore, the religious master narrative conflicts with actual religious beliefs and practices and acts invisibly, which requires both women and men to recognise their culpability in maintaining it. Otherwise, the master narrative remains fully in place.
Pentecostal women preachers may insist they are not feminists and often decry the feminist movement; yet, their life’s work and actions demonstrate inherent feminist tendencies in the ‘alternative lifestyle’ they have chosen (Lawless 1993a:p.49; 1988a:p.66). Therefore, these women meet with resistance and pain, especially when quoted the Pauline writings by other members that they should keep silent in the churches\(^3\) (1988a:p.85). Women preachers may rebut these assertions with Joel 2 and Acts 2 that ‘your daughters shall prophesy’ and ‘upon my handmaidens I shall pour out my spirit’ (1983:p.437).\(^4\) Scholar Weiss (2008:p.187) calls this ‘rescripting,’ so that when a woman acts within her faith tradition with subconscious feminism as a ‘faithful adherent,’ she sublimates her feminist affiliations while rescripting her life. This rescripting, however, can bring rampant conflict when women attempt to reconcile Bible teachings with what they know to be true concerning their own identities and callings (Ingersoll 2002:p.166). Balmer (1994:p.49), scholar of gender and fundamentalism, writes that submission is expected of fundamentalist women who must not demand any authority in the home or church and are expected to find ‘liberation’ in serving men. In such an environment, women are denied full personhood.

Henderson (2012), pastor and scholar on leadership, writes in his study of Christian women leaders that when women’s access to leadership roles and giftings (e.g., preaching, healing, prophesying, teaching, etc.) in their faith communities is made unavailable based on gender rather than granted due to talents and gifts, everyone loses. Johns (1993:p.155) points out that, if women are blocked from these specific types of platforms simply because they are women or when a woman must work twice as hard as a man in order to see her giftings and spiritual callings realised, there is a deep and pervasive misogyny in place. Hardacre (1993:pp.140-41), scholar of religion and gender, writes that the persuasiveness of the fundamentalist message for men seems obvious since they are provided with a ‘divine mandate’ and little interference or restraint when exercising authority over women and children. Men give up no personal independence or autonomy, comfortably exercising power and privilege, situated in a biological determinist framework which assures them that women’s happiness and existence lies in serving them. Small wonder that men are attracted to fundamentalist doctrine, but it is harder to comprehend reasons women are. Hardacre, along with other feminist authors, asks why women accept and become such ‘staunch advocates’ of fundamentalist creeds that only deepen their subordination and require them to relinquish power and authority to men.

\(^3\) I Corinthians 14:34-35; I Tim. 2:11-14.
\(^4\) Joel 2:28-29; Acts 2:16-18
These studies demonstrate that women’s life choice in being evangelical, fundamentalist or Pentecostal is complicated, fraught with tension but not without strategy or negotiations with the patriarchy. They navigate a system of gender apartheid, since those who are numbered less (men) establish a firm system to (attempt to) check the autonomy of those who are numbered more (women). Men who interpret scripture in ineffective, inequitable, indeed, ungodly ways make themselves as ‘God’ over women, decreeing when (if ever) a woman shall speak and when she will be rendered silent. Kimball (2002:p.41) writes that ‘authentic’ religious truth claims which are inflexible and exclusive, are in fact corrupt, because they do not acknowledge the ‘liberating awareness’ that humans are limited in searching for and articulating religious truth. I contend that in Pentecostalism, a world movement rooted in the work and labour of women, male usurpation of authority takes away women’s space. Barred from prominent positions of leadership as licensed ministers, pastors, elders and bishops, women are shut out from where decisions get made and must navigate the patriarchy in strategic ways in order to see their giftings and callings actualised.

This section has explored women’s disenfranchisement in Pentecostal and fundamentalist spaces. Next I discuss the historical situatedness of the hierarchy.

**Headship & Submission**

Studies and the lifeworld show that Pentecostals and evangelicals embrace cultural constructs concerning male headship and female submission (Griffith, 1997; Brasher, 1998; Franks, 2001; Mate, 2002; Maddox, 2013; Gallagher, 2004; Aune, 2006). In fact, the concept of ‘headship’ is absent from the Bible, yet evangelicals have still managed to create a headship-based theology (Aune, 2006:p.646; Brasher, 1998:pp.130-31; Ellis, 2012). Gill and Cavaness (2004:p.91) write that I Corinthians 11:2-16 in its discussion of authority and coverings has been used as a biblical basis for headship, in that the husband is considered the wife’s ‘covering’ and authority over her. Some, they write, have even suggested from this passage that unmarried women must find a man (most often their pastor) to be their covering. Aune (2006:p.653) defined headship as being a concept flexibly moulded by postfeminists to produce interpretations of marriage that were simultaneously conservative and feminist. Gallagher (2004:pp.228-29), citing the Religious Identity and Influence Survey (1996), writes that 90 percent of American evangelicals believe in the ideal of husbands’ ‘headship,’ and that 85 percent hold that the husband is ’spiritual leader’ in the home. For 53 percent of these, the husband also has final authority in decision-making. Two-thirds consider feminism ‘hostile to Christian values,’ yet 87 percent also agree that marriage should be a ‘partnership of equals.’ In Great Britain, Aune (2006:p.646) conducted a study amongst evangelicals and examined
four models of headship: 1) husband as ultimate authority; 2) husbands consult with wives, thus making decisions together with husband casting the ‘tie-breaker’ vote (but it almost never happened); 3) applying to society and church where ‘only men can lead’ and, 4) evangelical feminism, which calls for marital mutuality and eschews the cultural construct of ‘headship’ (see also Gallagher, 2008:p.159; Ingersoll, 2002). Bowie (2006:p.121) writes that in societies where men are dominant and women are subordinate at all societal levels, there is usually an emphasis on a male godhead. This term appears in the New Testament three times.5

Ammerman (1987:pp.134-146) writes about fundamentalist Baptists at a church on the east coast of the United States which she calls ‘Southside.’ In this bible-believing congregation, the biblical order of husbandly priesthood and wifely submission was observed. Marrying one’s ‘God-chosen mate’ was the ideal so as to avoid being unequally yoked (p.135).6 Some women became ‘priests’ (spiritual guides) over the family because their husbands were ‘unsaved,’ yet the women still maintained their roles as submissive wives and homemakers. Some couples credited their fundamentalist faith with showing them ‘how to be married’ (p.142), while others held that marriage is God-ordained and tried to work through their problems in order to stay out of divorce court. Southside, therefore, had a very low divorce rate, but this was not necessarily a measure of success. Many of the women were in troubled marriages and were greatly compromised, but were counselled by the pastor, other members and their own interpretations of scripture, to remain. Church members argued that they did not suffer from divorce or unhappy homes, because their way of following God’s plan for marriage, having a clear division of labour and authority, worked. Wives of Southside agreed that decision-making was part of the husband’s role in the home, and wives navigated an uneasy balance by keeping husbands from making unwise decisions without appearing to usurp their authority. Southside wives also believed that submission encompassed using their ‘full creative powers’ in bearing and rearing children and so rarely used birth control (p.141). Therefore, while the family was a source of great power for wives, several members indicated it was also disempowering when family planning was out of their hands. Submission, therefore, was a constant, uneasy construction between couples, and tension between their own fundamentalist values and ideals of individuality and equality surrounded them in the dominant culture.

In Australia, at the annual Colour Your World women’s conferences of Sydney’s Hillsong Church (flagship church of the Australian branch of the AG), the prosperity gospel meets submission. Maddox (2013:pp.20-26) writes that Hillsong uses a ‘princess motif’ in
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6 II Corinthians 6:14.
many of its themed conferences where attendees wear plastic tiaras, address one another as ‘Princess,’ and enjoy makeovers, receiving overt (and subconscious) messages about beauty and body image. Through the princess metaphor, as well as in Hillsong co-pastor and pastor’s wife Bobbie Houston’s writings and speaking topics, Hillsong women receive an array of messages. These include compulsory heterosexuality (to the point of remaining in abusive marriages as a scriptural commandment as Ammerman’s participants spoke about), gender complementarity, a commercial interpretation of femininity, and women’s positioning as ‘a male God’s desired ‘sweetheart’’ (p.25). Similar to formenism (discussed below), ‘right submission’ is viewed as liberating. Maddox found a prosperity gospel in reverse where, unlike their husbands, Hillsong women are urged not to make money but to spend it on clothes, diet, exercise and makeovers to enhance their body image (though encouraged to still give of their financial resources at church). With ‘an aura of sanctity,’ Hillsong’s rhetoric restricts women’s autonomy and limits their life choices as a way to empowerment (p.25).

Pentecostal scholar and theologian Grey (2015:pp.77-82) also writes about the ‘princess myth’ perpetuated at Hillsong’s Colour Your World women’s conferences and its minimising aspects to women. Grey and Maddox agree that while it may be meant to build women’s self-esteem, instead the prosperity gospel message of princess theology conveys that markers of blessing are physical beauty, an immaculate appearance and the adoration of husbands and children. But when these are not exhibited, women may question the validity of their Christian walk. Grey unhinges princess theology from women’s worth using Genesis 1:26-28, in which women and men are both made in God’s image and women’s worth and identity already ascribed at creation. Grey mixes the metaphors and writes that as daughters of the Creator-King, they are already ‘princesses’ (p.81). However, rather than passively waiting to be rescued by men, Grey writes, as humans created in God’s image and as members of God’s family, women are called to be active participants. I continue to engage with these writings on princess theology and the prosperity gospel in the next few paragraphs.

Joyce (2009) writes about headship and submission as an evangelical strategy for Christian world dominion in her study of the Quiverfull Patriarchy Movement in the Midwestern and southern USA. ‘Quiverfull’ takes its name from Psalm 1277 and contends that, since the number of arrows a bowman may often carry is 30, women are encouraged, compelled in fact, to have as many children as God ‘allows’ them. Any attempts made by women to control their own bodies, the Lord’s temple,8 are seen as a seizure of divine power. Women are encouraged to consider their bodies as not their own, and as one leader and
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7 Psalms 127: 3-5.
8 1 Corinthians 6:19-20.
Quiverfull wife bluntly declares, family planning is ‘the mother of abortion’ (pp.134-35). Wives are expected to make themselves sexually available to husbands at all times. Families number from four children to more than 20, home schooling them, cultivating family gardens and following conservative biblical interpretations of headship and female submission. Men are highly esteemed as God’s ‘appointed authority,’ leaders of large, devout families, husbands of submissive wives, and fathers of future church leaders (p.206). A wife’s failure to submit to the husband is failure to submit to God, unless she is being asked to sin.9 Showing biblical submission, therefore, is how wives demonstrate their sacrifice for Jesus and their salvation, following the teachings of Titus 2,10 in managing their households, in bringing up leader sons and submissive daughters. One Quiverfull author, New Zealander Nancy Campbell, who emigrated to Tennessee and is well known by conservatives in both countries (and some scholars in New Zealand) for her women’s periodical Above Rubies, holds that God’s design for women is that they are born to serve men (Lineham, 2011:pp.99-100; Joyce, 2009:p.154). Other leading women authors write that they are ‘owned’ by their fathers until that ownership is ‘transferred’ to husbands (pp.223-26). This anti-individualism within Quiverfull is an example of submission as ‘non-personhood.’ The mothers of Quiverfull consider their children as an army they are building for God by which to have dominion, ‘infiltrating’ every area of government and other societal sectors in order to conduct ‘war’ on the home front (pp.134, 223). Maddox (2013:p.23) also writes that Australian Hillsong Church’s messages of submission hierarchy are couched in military language. Submission places women in Jesus’ army as ‘warrior princesses’ seeking to bring about the eventual ‘cosmic triumph of Christians over non-Christians.’ This is the flip side of Hillsong’s emphasis on women’s submission to men, since it places women as warriors. There is no opting out of this ‘revolution’ for women without turning from the faith (Joyce 2009:p.223).

Similarly, Mate (2002:pp.558-566) writes that amongst Pentecostals in Zimbabwe, headship in the home and marital sexual relations are taught as God-given to ensure fidelity and long-lasting, happy marriages. However, unlike Brusco (1995) (below) who found Colombian men ceased having extramarital affairs after conversion, according to Mate, born-again Pentecostal men in Zimbabwe continue to have them. Men’s philandering is met with sympathy since they look for ‘alternatives’ when wives ‘fail’ to meet husbands’ sexual needs. Women are therefore taught to bear many children as a sign of the husband’s virility and the couple’s ‘sexual fulfilment’ (p.565). Like Quiverfull, both groups see childbearing as a woman’s ultimate work for God, and Zimbabwean Pentecostals reconceptualise women’s

9 I Samuel 15:23 is often quoted to keep women from being “rebellious” and “unsubmissive.”
10 Titus 2:3-5.
wombs as ‘God’s laboratories’ (pp.559-60). Fertility, therefore, secures marriage, a woman’s self-esteem and women’s conformity. Similar to Maddox’s (2013) findings at Hillsong Australia, Mate’s study also showed that wives are taught to keep themselves beautiful, their children and homes in order, and to only take jobs outside the home if necessary. Therefore, Zimbabwean Pentecostal teachings on submission are connected to prosperity doctrine where children are their parents’ wealth. Yet the concept is built on the submission and wombs of women, as a conservative version of modernity.

Feminist scholars Nadar and Potgieter (2010:pp.142-50) study the Pentecostal Worthy Women’s Conference (WWC) in South Africa. This is a movement where submission is an outgrowth of existential anxiety over the loss of white men’s power in post-apartheid South Africa. Formenism, a word coined by these authors, like masculinism holds to the superiority of men over women, but unlike masculinism, created by men for men, formenism is created by women for men as a form of liberation theology. Formenism holds that women, by giving their husbands a place over themselves, their bodies, their children and their homes, free men to have increased responsibility while relieving the greater burden of the home from women’s shoulders. Women’s submission therefore liberates both women and men. Consistent with patriarchal bargaining (Weiss, 2008:p.187), these complementary role distinctions come from being ‘equal but different.’ Nadar and Potgieter argue that formenism is in line with the Foucauldian theory that it is easier to accept the subordinate position when one is not feeling ‘forced’ to adopt it but sees it as a desirable position for the family. Formenism is viewed as a way for God to restore order to the church and by extension to South Africa, because God has ordained men as prophets, priests and kings and also women as their willing subjects. In exchange, the burden of being healers of marriage, the country and even men’s egos is placed squarely on women’s shoulders. Formenism fulfils the first data type Ortner discusses above in that it reinstates the ‘natural order’ of gender that men are superior to women.

In a study that parallels formenism, Daly (1985:pp.151-177) dissects the myth of the ‘eternal feminine,’ as created by von le Fort (1934), in the Catholic Church that robs women of creativity and insists on their passivity and dependence on men. This myth, Daly writes, is inculcated within Marian doctrine and, when applied to contemporary women, keeps them strictly within the categories of virgin, bride, and mother. Women’s identification to these roles results in the annihilation of their personal identity yet insists that women should inspire men to achieve theirs. While begging the question of how an underdeveloped person can inspire others, the ideology of women sacrificing themselves for men is created by men for men but can be carried out only by women. This again reconceptualises women as non-persons. The myth of the eternal feminine actually harms men in the process because it is anti-
evolutionistic for those who hold it, and by ensuring that women are kept intellectually and socially inferior, it wounds the Church’s structures. In other words, the Catholic Church deprives itself of women’s giftings and insights and causes the patriarchy to become warped in the process.

The studies in this section have demonstrated a servile form of submission which infantilises women by using a gender model rooted in a kind of biological determinism that sees dual sex roles as part of God’s created order or a ‘divine plan.’ Women serve men and are ‘reigned’ over by them. These gender roles are static and fixed, made that way ‘by God’ and negate women’s personhood. These studies also suggest that female submission and male headship are rhetorical constructs, designed to mark boundaries for a faith community which is otherwise indistinguishable from the consumer culture surrounding it. All explore gender complementarity and the strict gender demarcation in evangelical faith communities, maintaining this type of subculture and identity.

Next, I look at how evangelical or biblical feminism is changing these roles.

**Biblical Feminism and the Re-Conceptualisation of Submission**

Scanzoni and Hardesty, the architects of biblical feminism (1992, 1974), built this feminist philosophy on the belief that the Bible, when studied carefully as a whole ‘in the entirety’ of God’s revelation (1992:p.9) actually encourages egalitarianism and gender equality. It is a theology which embraces ‘mutual submission’ as practised between husbands and wives, based on certain scriptures including (but not limited to) I Corinthians 7 and 11; Ephesians 5; Colossians 3, and I Peter 3, among others. Scanzoni and Hardesty (pp.148-60) argue that Ephesians 5 actually laid the groundwork for a new kind of marriage which brought together Old Testament symbolism of the relationship between God and the chosen people, depicted as a marriage. The Old Testament patriarchal structures held that a woman should self-sacrifice for her husband because he was of more value than she. Yet, in the New Testament, Ephesians 5 laid out for husbands the kind of sacrificial love they were required to give their wives as an extension of Christ’s love for the Church – to the extent that the husband is to give himself up for the wife.

This was a new way of relating between husbands and wives, transforming the Old Testament pattern of marital headship/subjection, with wives and husbands submitting mutually, as all believers do to one another. Husbands were to love their wives to the extent that they would lay down their lives for them. The authors concluded that Ephesians 5 created a marriage of reciprocity and mutual respect, rather than fixed with rigid roles and clearly designated duties which hold each spouse in their own place. A top-down model of
submission usually requires the wife to subvert her own ideas, interests, and pursuits in favour of the husband’s, but the authors argue that this is not the biblical way. The main point of Ephesians 5 is ‘self-expending love,’ which means that the wife and husband will just as often each lay aside their own interests for the sake of the other and their family and will support one another, neither requiring one to do or give more than the other (pp.159-60) [emphasis the authors]. The foundation for Christian marriage, as laid out in Ephesians 5 and other scriptures that comprise submission doctrine, was then and now mutual submission, the main premise of biblical feminism.

Biblical feminism is not only a philosophy but a movement that is critical of patriarchy, calling for women’s equality in all areas of family, church and society. Biblical feminists may be found across the reviverist spectrum, from fundamentalist to evangelical. As inerrantists, they utilise traditional, conservative hermeneutical readings of scripture, arguing that ‘properly understood,’ the Bible demands sexual equality and that women are not precluded from ministry. In marriage, mutual submission is expected (Aune, 2006; Gallagher, 2004; Ingersoll, 2002, 2003; Franks, 2001). Evangelical feminism holds that the Greek word kephalē, located in the original text of I Corinthians 11:2-16 and translated ‘head,’ means source of rather than ‘authority.’ Segraves (2009b:3-4), a UPCI minister and theologian, concurs that the word kephalē was rarely used in Greek literature to mean ‘chief’ or ‘person of the highest rank.’ Instead, the Corinthians would have known and defined this word only as ‘source of,’ especially, ‘source of life’ (p.4). Gill and Cavaness (2004:pp.88-89) agree. They write that of the 48 meanings that have been ascertained from the Greek for this word, not one defines kephalē as leader, ruler or denoting superior rank. Paul’s meaning when he used the word was indeed ‘source of.’ Segraves (2009b:p.3) writes that if according to I Corinthians 11:3, Christ is the head of man and the man is the head of the woman, this begs certain questions. Can there ever be a time when Christ is considered the head of a woman? Must a woman always come to Christ through a man? And if God is the head of Christ, is God not the head of men or women? Segraves concludes that the word kephalē, as used in I Corinthians 11:2-16, in fact has nothing to do with female submission to masculine authority but rather with women’s equality, praying and prophesying in the church. Therefore, the interpretation of the word kephalē when reading verses 3, 11 and 12 is not men’s authority over women, because as stated in Galatians 3:28, in Christ there is ‘equality and reciprocity’ between the sexes. Segraves points out that nowhere in the I Corinthians 11 passage is the husband and wife relationship even present and uses the words andros and gynaikos, which may be translated ‘man,’ and ‘woman’ or ‘husband’ or ‘male’ and ‘wife’ or ‘female,’ respectively. These scriptures have, therefore, been interpreted to mean that men in general
have authority over women in general, not only husbands to wives, but also fathers to daughters and pastors to women in their congregations. Whether or not this is in error is still in discussion. I shall engage again with Segraves’ work in chapter seven in the discussion about women’s uncut hair as an expression of submission and spiritual power.

Alongside rightly interpreting the word *kephalē* or ‘head,’ evangelical or biblical feminists also claim marital egalitarianism and mutuality from Ephesians 5. Verse 21 is interpreted as mutual submission between husbands and wives, and while verse 22 calls for wives’ submission to husbands, verse 23 calls for husbands to love their wives (explored at greater length in the chapter on submission.) The practice of marital mutual submission involves husbands and wives making decisions together and running their households in egalitarian ways, distributing domestic tasks according to giftings or who has the time, rather than according to gender.

Some scholars of evangelical feminism find that in the face of spiralling divorce rates, evangelicals and fundamentalists still regard marriage as a ‘holy state’ (Gallagher, 2004; Aune, 2006; Franks, 2001). According to Gallagher (2004:pp.227-28), evangelicals choose their egalitarian ideals from one of two cultural standpoints, evangelical feminism or conservative evangelicalism, both of which favour marital partnership. Accordingly, the evangelicals of Aune’s (2006:p.647) study of four headship models (as aforementioned) held that the Ephesians 5 doctrine of husbands loving and honouring their wives was a ‘crucial brake’ against husbands exerting overly harsh authority. Yet Ephesians 5 was also invoked for men as Jesus’ model of ‘servant leadership,’ in which husbands were encouraged to consult their wives in matters of decision-making to the extent that husbands’ headship was, in fact, negligible. Servant leadership actually produced men who resembled ‘pro-feminist new men’ (2006:p.647; Gallagher, 2004:p.228). What happens in society will inevitably take place in the church, and evangelicals often embrace conservative as well as mainstream ideas and practices when creating partnerships less rooted in hierarchy (Ellis, 2012:p.89; Aune, 2006:p.639; Gallagher, 2004:p.227; Franks, 2001:p.86; Brasher 1998:p.131). Aune (2006:p.641) used a ‘postfeminist’ framework in her study, inspired by Stacey (1987) who found that in Silicon Valley, California, certain women activists for women’s rights during the 1960s and 1970s had converted to evangelicalism. These women approached marriage with a mixture of conservative and feminist ideals and found that, while evangelicalism supported male headship, it also called for men to be engaged husbands and fathers, a balance in which these women felt feminism had failed them. Stacey therefore named this concept ‘postfeminism’.
All feminist theologies are liberation theologies, and Franks (2001:p.25) found a type of feminism inherent within revivalism. But important differences lay between theologically conservative feminists and liberal feminist theologians. The latter start theological exploration from a ‘hermeneutic of suspicion,’ that their studies will uncover patriarchal bias, while the former start from a ‘hermeneutic of faith,’ that the Bible is a book of liberation rather than one of oppression, and insist on following the ‘plain sense’ of the text (p.31). Feminist theologians begin from women’s experience in the promotion of women’s full humanity while biblical feminists desire to build a better world alongside men. With great creativity, evangelical feminists seek out alternative meanings for texts which seem to subordinate women (Weiss, 2008:pp.180-181; Gallagher, 2004:p.216; Franks, 2001:p.31). Evangelical feminism has the daunting task of reclaiming women’s self-identity in an environment where women are characterised as being sinful or having the temptation to sin. On the other hand, feminist theology has to reclaim Christian history and a feminist reading of the Bible in locating women’s stories and their interpretation of the first century Church as egalitarian (Gill and Cavaness, 2004; Franks, 2001:p.31). Ingersoll (2003:p.22) calls this a ‘creative blending’ of traditionalism and feminism by members who often do not believe that they must choose between the two.

In New Zealand, Ellis’s (2012) qualitative research with 20 evangelical feminist women explores how they negotiated their evangelical ideals as women of faith while living in and holding careers in a postmodern secular society. A range of feminist views were presented from ‘liberal’ to ‘post-feminist’ (p.82). Ellis determined that New Zealand evangelicalism is adapting to secular culture as evidenced by participants’ ability to ‘straddle’ secular and evangelical ideals, although these were not without their complications. Ellis found that New Zealand evangelicals’ engagement with the world liberalised them in cultural and theological ways. As postmodern women with an ethos of choice, they actively sought egalitarianism in their homes, careers and ministries, and credited having a relationship with God that facilitated their life decisions. Ellis concluded that feminist women come to evangelicalism because it can ‘order realities’ so that, while evangelicalism and feminism hold great tension, the two are compatible in allowing complex individuality within a communitarian framework (pp.93, 95). In short, evangelical women may control the family finances, assume the role of breadwinner and take advantage of an array of educational and employment opportunities that secular women also have access to. As women of faith, they bridge two worlds.

Griffith (1997) writes about the types of submission practised on the New England and Pacific Northwest Coasts of the USA, amongst evangelical members of Women’s Aglow
Fellowship International (founded in 1967), the largest women’s evangelical organisation in the world, headquartered in Seattle. Griffith’s qualitative and archival study was originally to learn more about women’s prayer lives but soon located submission as being a fluid foundational tenet of prayer that carried a broad ‘repertoire of choices’ (pp.13-14). Griffith traced organisational teachings about women’s marital submission through three decades of Aglow publications and found throughout the 1970s an emphasis on hierarchical submission of wives to husbands that shifted significantly in the 1980s towards mutual submission. Finally, in the 1990s, there was a focus instead on women conducting spiritual warfare through prayer and ‘surrendering to God,’ rather than emphasising submission to men (p.185). Surrender and submission were each an extension of the other, the former given to God and the latter given to one’s husband. Griffith found the overall theme to be a sense of the healing power of prayer and the freedom and transformation submission doctrine brought Aglow women’s lives.

A variety of studies rendered submission as janus-faced for its dis/empowering aspects (Butler, 2007; Franks, 2001; Brasher, 1998; Griffith, 1997; Brusco, 1995; Brown, 1994). In Great Britain and the United States, Franks (2001:pp.2-25, 87-89, 186) conducted comparative research with revivalist women in Islam and evangelical Christianity, using mixed methods of surveying and qualitative interviews. Franks cited mutual distrust and suspicion between the secular women’s movement and revivalist women, with the former considering the latter ‘anti-feminist,’ as one reason for undertaking the work. Yet among her participants, Franks found women who chose revivalist movements because they had not found a solution in Western feminisms, and who brought either an overt or closet feminist agenda, respectively, to it. Franks compared these feminist agendas across both faiths and found that defining the term ‘anti-feminist’ was increasingly difficult to use constructively. The word “submission” appeared quite often in participants’ lexicon, with a range of positions on this concept concerning how they negotiated power relations within marriage. Franks found that women traded off autonomy when choosing a revivalist faith, yet at the same time, engaged in the ‘social ideal of choice’ (Fitzgerald, Legge and Park, 2015:p.25). Rather than revivalist women ‘abandoning open choice,’ as Franks suggests (2001:p.187), it could be argued that there are ‘frameworks of choice’ with which evangelical and Pentecostal women engage that may or may not be understood as autonomous choice, since the very word ‘choice’ may cover complex and fixed moral reasoning (Fitzgerald, Legge and Park, 2015:p.25). For instance, some of Franks’s participants took issue with the word “obedience” because it connoted following blindly, while submission was something one chose to do.

Participants frequently practised dual submission to God and men, placing greater importance
on the former while practising varying degrees of the latter in both marriage and religious leadership.

Another form of empowerment submission brought was that of ‘gender strategy’ (Gallagher, 2004:p.216). In Colombia, Brusco (1995:pp.3-9, 117-148) writes about Pentecostal conversion as it ‘domesticated’ men and improved home conditions by eradicating effects of the ‘machismo complex.’ Brusco found that, unlike modern feminism, rather than positing women as part of a male world, evangelical conversion in Colombia ‘elevated’ domesticity for both men and women. It reinvented gender roles, as men who were converted out of machismo now exhibited comparative submission and obedience. In Colombia’s sexually segregated society, home is central to Colombian women’s lives and Pentecostal services are often situated in home churches. Machismo disrupts this when men spend family resources on drinking, gambling and womanising. But evangelicalism and Pentecostalism forbids these activities and upon conversion the men’s social, public worlds align instead with the women’s private, domestic realm. The machista male and Pentecostal man are diametrically opposite, with the former encouraging aggression and self-indulgence and the latter, peace-seeking and self-restraint. When men opt out of machismo as a result of conversion, they experience a great transformation that also impacts their wives and brings peace to the home. Brusco writes that conversion of both husband and wife improves the material and monetary circumstances in the household, because partners are now of one mind in marital decision-making concerning how money and time should be spent, thus improving the family’s economic situation. Therefore, conversion in the Colombian Pentecostal context is a gender strategy.

Brown (1994:pp.173-77) looks at gender strategy in hierarchical structures in rural Florida among Afro-Baptist women, where both women and men frame women’s role as being a ‘helpmate.’ Brown studied a Florida community called Zion, in which lived descendants of maroons (fugitive slaves), freed slaves and Seminole Indians. Matrifocal, matrilineal descent from the original maroons and founding families of Zion brought ‘insider’ status through the women. Still, Afro-Baptist women of Zion claim that they subscribe to headship doctrine and, according to one Baptist leader, ‘to be a Baptist minister you must be two things: you must be born again and you must be a man’ (p.173). It is therefore a paradox that, in this matrifocal, matrilineal community, Baptist women in fact, enjoy greater prestige in the home and church and their submission is voluntary. In the church, the (always male) pastors served at the pleasure of women in the congregation. While conservative renderings of the Pauline epistles may often keep women from church leadership positions, studies suggest that African-American women desist from ‘competing’ for religious leadership with men ‘in
order to elevate their brothers’ status in society,’ which, Brown writes, is an ‘African-derived’ conception (p.174). This is a form of gender complementarity in which women’s support of male leadership is balanced by men’s recognition of women’s prestige in the home and church. This was also found by Mate (2002) in Zimbabwe, as mentioned previously, and Higgenbotham (1993:p.2) writes that the black church is both ‘product and process’ of men’s and women’s interactions. Brown analysed six years of sermons, songs and prayers in this woman-centric faith community and found not one reference to women in a ‘carnal, evil, or negative sense.’ The devil was always male, there were no sermons on ‘original sin’ or Eve, or even about Jezebel and Delilah (p.182). I will discuss Brown’s work further in the section on women’s agency and spiritual authority.

Another gender strategy the literature uncovered was that women who employed submission found they were ‘left alone’ by men in their faith communities. In her study of women in the Church of God in Christ (COGIC), the largest black denomination in the world, Butler (2007:pp.38-39, 62) wrote that during the early twentieth century, statements like ‘women should not usurp the authority of the man’ (p.62) kept recurring in COGIC meeting minutes. Women who did so stepped outside the gender complementary boundaries that allowed them to do their work unhindered by men. Therefore, the best strategy was to not actively challenge men, who in turn would not stand in women’s way. COGIC women used biblically-sanctioned sexual polarity to their advantage (described below) by insisting that ‘women teach, men preach’ (p.38). As teachers, women did everything men did as preachers. As long as it was called by a different name, the men (and thus the women) were unbothered (see also Wacker 2003:104). I will discuss more about the ministry work COGIC women performed when I return to Butler’s work in the section on women’s agency.

The women of Brasher’s (1998:pp.131, 149) study from two fundamentalist churches in Southern California expected that in return for their wifely submission, husbands would shoulder responsibility for the well-being and happiness of the family and would stand accountable before God. If any family member suffered under his headship, the husband must answer to God for failing in the proper exercise of his authority. Therefore, according to this rationale, the husband’s responsibility was far greater than the wife’s. Respondents trusted that as long as the husband loved the wife as outlined in Ephesians 5, the wife should do her duty to submit. Therefore, those in God’s ‘higher status’ held authority limited by scriptural teachings and were not free to determine their own behaviour towards those in the lower ranks. This was a distinctly evangelical feminist stance which denied men full authority.

Another way submission empowers evangelical women is that while many eschew the label of ‘feminism’ itself, they in fact build ‘sisterhoods’ through gatherings in friendship,
prayer and transformative story-sharing, not unlike feminist consciousness-raising. In doing so, they create an environment in which to foster greater spiritual power (Joyce, 2009:pp.58-59; Eiesland, 1997; Brusco, 1995:pp.129-34). Along with the women’s conferences of Australia’s Hillsong Church (Grey, 2015; Maddox, 2013) and Women’s Aglow (Griffith, 1997), came the enclaves in the Southern California churches of Brasher’s (1998) study. These were all-female groups which ran congruently with mixed-sex congregational services and other activities. Brasher witnessed a strict gender-ordering in both church and the home, where there was a ‘sacred canopy’ or ‘covering’ provided by the men and between the sexes, a ‘sacred gender wall’ (p.12). Men claimed congregational authority under the sacred canopy, and women found ways of involving themselves in services, singing and playing instruments on the platform or in testifying. But the women’s enclaves in the form of Bible study, prayer and support groups excluded men by using the same system of ‘sexual polarity’ by which men claimed dominance when justifying their reign over congregational life (p.64). Women marginalised men with the sacred gender wall, and their ministerial social networks provided them spiritual agency and institutional strength. The same biblically-sanctioned sexual polarity the women used, however, was that which they also recognised as providing men sexual dominance in headship over the home and church. Some men, however, expressed frustration at the extreme gender demarcation that deemed them the better at leading but barred them collectively from the spiritual power that the women clearly tapped into (p.120).

Eiesland (1997:pp.94-105) writes about a group of women in suburban Atlanta, Georgia, who came from male-dominated careers and converted to classical Pentecostalism when they were all over age 40. At the time of conversion, the women all were undergoing significant changes in their kinship networks such as divorces, widowhood, or adoption of grandchildren, and all shared a sense of isolation, given their life circumstances (see also Brasher, 1998:pp.42-45). Therefore, members of the group fostered a strong sense of identification and friendship, drawn to Pentecostalism, for the women’s spaces, stories, intimacy, and ‘Southern gender identity’ (1997:p.94). Eiesland writes that a common greeting amongst congregants of their church was, ‘‘what is God doing in you today?’’ In response, the women crafted stylised, chronological meta-narratives, locating God’s ‘invisible hand’ in their life stories, recasting their lives as beginning at conversion and directed by God (p.103). Eiesland found that in their male-dominated careers these were ‘token’ women and sex segregation had resulted in isolation, whereas Pentecostalism’s sex segregation provided nurturance of women’s spaces and support systems. Women ran their own Bible studies,
conducted a women’s prayer chain, and organised their own social activities, thus creating an empowering ‘female culture’ (p.105; Brasher, 1998:pp.136-37).

In summary, the janus-faced dis/empowering aspects of submission create a divide into which evangelical feminism steps. While evangelical feminists are a distinct minority, they have still managed to make some inroads in conservative evangelicalism, especially concerning marital egalitarianism. A ‘subculture within a subculture,’ evangelical feminism has thus far failed to displace the theology of husbands’ headship (Gallagher, 2004:pp.215,231-233). Yet when both Franks (2001:pp.164, 185) and Brasher (1998:pp.170-175) applied theoretical concepts of rational choice and empowerment to women’s experiences, their informants revealed a sense of empowerment and life enrichment from choosing the religions they did. Rational choice theory regards women as agents rather than as passive victims in religious spaces considered to be ‘anti-woman,’ thus contradicting the notion that women join such movements out of passive compliance with male demands. Franks’s and Brasher’s studies agreed that women choose revivalist movements for material, emotional, and spiritual needs (Franks, 2001:p.163; Brasher, 1998:p.47). Other studies revealed women do so because of Pentecostalism’s emphasis on direct religious experience, spontaneous, ecstatic worship and opportunities for spiritual empowerment and social support (Tangenberg, 2007; Eiesland, 1997; Griffith, 1997).

Next I look at women who weave submission into their spiritual authority and claim agency.

**Agency: Women’s Spiritual Authority**

While most studies focused on women’s submission to men and its dis/empowering, complicated aspects, there were some that highlighted women’s spiritual authority. Women transcend or use submission as a strategic tool in these spaces, rolling it into the spiritual authority they claim and operate under in their homes and faith communities (Weiss, 2008; Butler, 2007; Franks, 2001; Griffith, 1997; Brown, 1994; Lawless, 1988a and 1988b).

Butler (2007) writes of church mothers’ spiritual authority in the African-American Church of God in Christ (COGIC), which at six million adherents and counting is the largest Pentecostal denomination in the USA. Sanctification is ‘a quest for personal meaning,’ gained and maintained via spiritual disciplines of prayer, fasting, scripture study, sexual abstinence if unmarried, and other prohibitions used to create moral and spiritual authority (p.3). Sanctification fuels the spiritual power of church mothers who, under their Holy Ghost power, exert extraordinary agency in chastising the pastor when he has incorrectly interpreted scripture or by operating as ‘spiritual avatars’ to church members and determining the extent
to which they have adhered to sanctification. The title of ‘church mother’ is the ‘seed of leadership and eldership’ (p.2), where the women impart COGIC doctrine through Bible Bands (groups established for learning scripture, principles of sanctification, and tongues-speaking), train up young preachers, plant churches which men then take over and pastor and meet the needs of the underserved in their communities. Although COGIC women are denied ordination, they exercise tremendous power and authority because, as women, they work unbounded. The church mother works alongside the pastor as he ministers the Word. While usually unmarried to each other, together they ‘parent’ and lead the congregation.

Sanctification provides church mothers ‘religious agency’ (p.12) and spiritual authority through their relationship with God, their ability to hear God’s voice, and the consecration of their lives to service.

Brown (1994: pp.179-84) writes of Afro-Baptist church mothers that they ‘raise’ a song to ‘call down’ the Holy Spirit and ‘raise [the Holy Spirit] up’ for the congregation. The church mothers of Brown’s study prepared communion, led prayer bands and home meetings, and prayed for the sick. Many were elected as Mother of the Church after age 70, or sometimes the eldest woman after the church mother died was elected and she served for life. The church mothers served their birth, marriage and church families and often considered themselves community midwives who attended births, both physical and spiritual, seeing especially to the baptisms of women when they were ‘born again.’ Both COGIC and Afro-Baptist women expressed preferences for men preachers, although women in both faith streams will ‘teach’ rather than ‘preach’ (Butler 2007: pp.38-39, 44). Brown compared Afro-Baptist church mothers to Pentecostal white women preachers in Lawless’s (1988a) study, who called themselves ‘handmaidens’ in rural Missouri (discussed below) where men have the power to undermine them. While black Pentecostal and Afro-Baptist women teach other women ‘how to live in this world,’ the white handmaidens offered ‘spiritual guidance to the other world’ (Brown, 1994: pp.181-182). Butler writes that the church mother has no equivalent in white churches. Use of the term ‘Mother’ contributes to women’s prestige but requires the active complicity of men for its full expression.

In the aforementioned study, Lawless (1993a, 1988a) writes about Pentecostal women preachers in Missouri who step out under God’s authority and their own agency. Although it was mostly males who founded Pentecostalism and who generally dominate its spaces, it is women who dominate the energetic church services. The hierarchy of patriarchal dominance and female subservience persists within Pentecostal homes and the church, which was why the women of Lawless’s study claimed jurisdiction as ‘handmaidens’ of the Lord rather than as ‘preachers’ and relied upon men to make space for them in their pulpits (1988a: pp.8-14).
Lawless found that, when asked how they attained their position, the handmaidens utilised carefully articulated ‘call-to-preach’ narratives that were formulaic in content and structure. They expressed dismay, chagrin, or disbelief that they would receive such a call, and all said that they denied their calling. At first. But after putting God through an elaborate set of tests, upon ascertaining it was God’s voice they heard, they moved forward. Their sermons usually began with some ‘ritual disclaimer’ like, “God made me do this. I did not seek to be here in the pulpit...but I am helpless beside God’s grandeur and His wishes for my life. So, I stand here before you, humbled by God, ready to speak His words through my mouth” (Lawless 2003:p.65; 1993a:p.42; 1988a:p.76; 1983:p.437). Although the handmaidens disclaimed personal involvement, their carefully constructed narratives had to demonstrate that they were selected by God, and as long as the congregation saw God’s spirit effectively working through them then the women’s moment was secure. Thus social capital was ascribed. Many said that they had met at least one woman preacher in their youth, thus helping to situate the call in a ‘context of possibility’ (1988a:p.80). Becoming a preacher was the will of God for their lives and there was nothing they or anyone else could do about it (1993a:p.49; Blumhofer 1993:p.173).

Lawless (2003:pp.62-64; 1988b; 1983) also writes about small, rural Pentecostal churches in a southern Indiana mining community where the women delivered heartfelt, emotionally driven, well-articulated testimonies of how God impacted their lives. As formulaic life narratives, women’s testifying often stretched long into the night, so that the male preacher could not preach his sermon. Thus, in essence, the women were preaching from their place in the pew. They would then claim it just ‘happened’ that way; God led the woman to say what she said, so it therefore, had to be ‘God’s will’ (2003:p.64). Women were meant to listen rather than speak in homes, churches and in the community, yet in every church service women repeatedly subverted this injunction. This is another example of women moving under their spiritual authority and personal agency.

Many of the aforementioned scholars wrote of evangelicalism as a revolutionary, gender-equalising force, and several authors called for a re-examination of feminist theory, to render it inclusive of all women’s voices. Hallum (2003:p.184) writes that feminist scholars must stop ignoring the effects of Pentecostalism on the lives of Latin American women and take it seriously into consideration. Brusco (1995:p.139) calls for a more inclusive ‘female consciousness,’ valuing social cohesion over individual rights and quality of life over access to institutional power. Griffith (1997:p.197) admonishes other feminist scholars that, in seeking respect for all women, they themselves must employ the same respect when writing about religious, non-feminist women. Eiesland (1997:pp.99-100) points out that Pentecostal
women experience a triple marginalisation: first, they may not receive public recognition for their leadership in the church, and secondly, they are often barred by men in their faith communities who exclude them from leadership. Thirdly, their religious experiences are often dismissed by feminist scholars as being anti-feminist or ‘false consciousness’ (see also Ingersoll 2002:p.165). Finally, Brasher (1998:p.181) and Franks (2001:p.186) both agree that, while women’s disempowerment in religious communities is easy to see and document, their empowerment, though perhaps not immediately obvious, is important to acknowledge as well.

Next I look at social and spiritual embodiment of the sacred in Pentecostalism.

**Embodiment of Spiritual Power**

Feminist theory concerns itself with the body and its possibilities as a fluid construct rather than as a permanent given. Participants’ ‘being-in-the-world’ is intimately and exponentially intertwined with meanings made about the body (Price & Shildrick, 1999:pp.3, 9). They are subject to deliberations and various knowledges in any institutional setting (Kosut and Moore 2010:p.10). The meanings placed on bodies become fixed and can impact and shape identities. Women’s embodiment is sometimes difficult to write about, given the erasure of their bodies from patriarchal spaces and their bodies both beget and are given meanings, sexed in gender performative ways. Butler (1990:pp.24, 33) writes that gender is ‘performatively produced’ and that the term ‘woman’ is in process, a becoming with no origination or ending. ‘Man’ and ‘woman’ are ‘political categories,’ not ‘natural facts,’ and if these categories are to be dissolved, the compulsory heterosexuality at their origins must be overthrown (p.115). Sex and gender both are institutionally performative, creating and legislating social realities in the lifeworld in accordance with sexual difference. Aspects of Pentecostal women’s bodies are factors in gender performativity and embodiment, from their manner of dress to how expressive they can be when they preach and still be considered “feminine” or “womanly,” to how well a woman manages the family as a litmus for how well she manages her ministry. Butler (2004:p.3) writes, ‘If I am someone who cannot be without doing, then the conditions of my doing are, in part, the conditions of my existence’ [emphasis the author’s]. If women cannot be Pentecostal without submitting to men, then it is a condition of their existence in the lifeworld. It is gender performativity, as defined by Butler, who discusses whether or not gender can pre-exist the regulations that are placed on it. While gender is a ‘regulatory norm,’ it is produced alongside other cultural regulations (pp.53, 55). Maintaining the framework of sexual difference then is a worthy endeavour, because it brings the political and cultural nature of patriarchal domination into stark definition. Gender permutations will not prevail, because there is a symbolic level that keeps this framework in
place. Yet gender norms bind individuals of the lifeworld together and form the basis of ethical and political contentions.

Scheper-Hughes and Lock (1987) wrote about the ‘mindful body.’ The individual is divided into three bodies: first, the body intricately brings definition to a person’s sense of self; secondly, the social and symbolic body is subject to modifications of culture, and finally, the ‘body politic’ is subject to controls by the individual and collective. These could correspond with Pentecostal conversion in that a person is given a new ‘self’ in the born-again experience (Csordas, 1994). The body is then subject to cultural modifications of dress, adornment and behaviour subject to what a born-again adherent ‘does’ in the lifeworld. Finally, the body is continuously built and controlled in favour of exercising God’s authority and gaining social capitol. In the anthropology of religion, the body is seen as a symbol, and identity is dynamic, never static. It is the locus where social truths and contradictions connect with the individual’s ethos of resistance, creativity and struggle.

In Pentecost, the act of wholly giving one’s self in prayer and worship creates an embodied experience, melding the spirit and body and taking over the whole person in social and spiritual ways. Jaye (2003:pp.82, 85) defines embodiment as ‘the lived experience of one’s own body’[emphasis the author’s] as it mediates, interprets and interacts daily in physical and social worlds. Lawless (1988b:p.52) writes that it is not uncommon for Pentecostals to fall out or swoon in the Spirit, have public displays of tongue-talking, singing in tongues, or becoming ‘drunk’ in the Spirit. They may go into trance or take off running, dancing, ‘jerking,’ shouting praises or speaking in tongues with arms raised while others hover, praying over them in tongues with the laying-on of hands. Rabelo, Mota and Almeida (2009:p.5) agree with Lawless (2003:p.63), whose subjects all believed that men were more logical and less emotional than women, who could better receive giftings of the Spirit. Lawless writes that Pentecostal women may sing for hours, dancing in the Spirit, moaning and praying aloud in tongues, crying, hugging each other, going into trance, falling out and having ‘spirit-filled body spasms’ (p.62). Embodiment, therefore, applied as a theoretical construct of Pentecostal worship experience, is thus ‘exercising the anthropological imagination’(Jaye 2003:p.98).

Jaye (2003), medical anthropologist of religion, writes about her study of Pentecostal faith healing in New Zealand as a symbolic journey towards wholeness and transformation, which realigns believers with church soteriology while strengthening their relationship with God (p.97). In Jaye’s study, healers and those who sought healing spoke of embodied sensations mediated through touch that included heat, tingling, and feelings of joy, peace and a sense of ‘connectedness’ (pp.96, 98). One interviewee told of biting into a sandwich which
had a wasp within and experiencing excruciating pain while his tongue swelled. That evening, though he could not speak, he went to church and felt a spiritual ‘call’ that God would heal him during communion (p.96). When he took the communion bread, the Christian symbol of Jesus’ body considered the source of healing\(^\text{12}\) and applied it to the afflicted part of his own body, the tongue, he was instantly healed. The swelling dissipated, the pain disappeared and he could speak again. The sacred met the profane and was mediated by this believer’s spiritual gifts of faith and discernment, freighting the knowledge that God would heal him. He also experienced a transformation of the mind when he said, “from that point on, I had no doubts about God being present in the communion” (p.96). It was the strength of his belief which brought healing from physical pain and also from the affliction of doubt. These experiences are embodied knowledge of faith healing.

From the United States’ eastern seaboard came the studies of Csordas (1994), who wrote about sacred healing in Charismatic Catholic and Pentecostal groups in New England, and from suburban New Jersey that of Meredith McGuire (1988) who wrote about healers and healing groups, including Christian faith-healers. These studies looked at alternative faith healing systems, and the authors discovered that faith healing is often used as a complement to formal healing practices rather than being solely relied on. In all cases, they said, rich symbolic imagery, ritual, and language was used. Csordas (1994:pp.viii- ix, 3-4, 46, 273) wrote that Charismatic healing is about the self, which encompassed the symbolic meanings of healing for both the healer and the healed. The self in this healing framework, Csordas found, is made up of four components: imagination, language, emotion and memory. This phenomenological study was about how a sacred self is culturally constituted, how the self symbolises healing (semiotics) and what the healer experiences while undertaking the healing process (phenomenology). Csordas writes that healers may use glossolalia or speaking in tongues as a means of opening and surrendering themselves to the healing power and divine action to bring healing to supplicants. Glossolalia is an authentic force when coupled with the intention to pray, which includes the laying on of hands in faith healing. Glossolalia reinforces the spiritual power inherent in healing prayers and when supplicants submit to divine authority and power, and yield to the gift of tongues or the laying on of a healer’s or minister’s hands, in essence, they place themselves in God’s hands (1983:pp.352-53). Glossolalia is considered to be divinely inspired with power found lacking in common vernacular, thus creating new kinds of spiritual meaning, and pointing to a divine and unshakeable cosmological order (p.355).

\(^{12}\) Isaiah 53:5; 1 Peter 2:24.
McGuire (1988:55-56, 168) wrote about a hierarchy of powers to cause illness or effect healing. In the case of Christian faith-healers, they were considered to be an intercessor between the afflicted and God. The power of the person, according to certain participants, was actually the person’s spiritual gift of healing. Although in most cases, regardless of whether they held Christian, metaphysical, or Eastern philosophical belief, most healers in this study believed that the effective path was to help the afflicted tap into their own power to heal themselves. The effects of this healing often had various manifestations, and McGuire writes about the placebo effect that spiritual healing can bring. These stories about healing and healers were about faith and belief (Good, 1994), all of which required some form of sacred power.

Rabelo, Mota and Almeida (2010) explored embodiment amongst poor Pentecostal women in Salvador, Northeast Brazil, and how they engaged with the sacred in emotional, sensory and motor experiences. When the women sought to make themselves a ‘vessel’ or ‘instrument’ to be ‘used by God’ through their sincere, ‘non-mediated’ relationship with God, they opened themselves to spiritual gifts (pp.5-7). The authors define the gifts as ‘a socially acknowledged set of abilities’ including (but not limited to), healing, tongues interpretation and revelation (p.7). Crentes (‘believers’) subject themselves to constant prayer, attempting to (temporarily) empty their minds of daily concerns and shame. Preachers and church workers help them mediate these experiences, so that their bodies are freely offered up to the Holy Spirit’s control as evidenced by laughing in the Spirit, weeping, jumping and shouting.

Crentes report three sensations and ‘dimensions’ of possibility when overtaken by the intense power of the Holy Spirit: joy and lightness, a burning sensation in the body, and a feeling of spiritual bliss and bodily gratification (pp.9-10), similar to what Jaye (2003:pp.96, 98) reported her participants experienced. Tension is played anew each time, however, in maintaining the fine line between remaining open and spontaneous in giving the self over to the Holy Spirit and being mindful of losing full control, which suggests demon possession. The Holy Spirit and its free expression does not conform to social ‘rules,’ so the body must be a disciplined vessel on its way to self-transformation, in order to break with the world.

Embodiment also intertwined with submission as self-abnegation. The Christians in Franks’s (2001) study said that submission was one way to achieve kenosis (‘self-emptying’), empowerment through the Holy Spirit. The roots of kenosis lie in the Crucifixion and Resurrection, the symbols of death and renewal where baptism (symbolic of death) leads to a fuller life and self-regeneration. By becoming an ‘empty vessel’ (p.105), a woman empties self to take in more of God. The less she is, the more she is perceived to be used by God, as aforementioned in Lawless’s (1993a; 1988a) study of women preaching the words that God
places in their mouths. Because having the Holy Spirit is a power with which no believer can argue, self-emptying and submission are considered means of empowerment and embodiment (Franks 2001: p. 34). In her chapter about kenosis, subversion and vulnerability, Coakley (1996: pp. 3-39) writes that emptying of the self is not a negation but a transformation in which the self expands into God. In self-emptying and waiting on God, a new self struggles to birth, and into that space comes transformation and empowerment. This is an apt description of the life change that transpires upon conversion and happens at the times when a woman waits on God to fill her again with the godly presence that produces her giftings. For the woman who complies, in exchange for ‘giving’ her own power by kenosis, she is promised something else in return: spiritual or sacred power.

Finally, comparable with the UPCI doctrinal beliefs about the power of women’s uncut hair, came Obeyesekere (1984: 33-37), who examined the lived beliefs of six women ascetics in Sri Lanka, drawing on Western psychoanalysis concerning each of the women’s phallic, snake-like, matted locks. Obeyesekere identified three levels of symbolism concerning the women’s matted hair: first, the symbol’s origin; secondly, persona meaning for the individual, and thirdly, the sociocultural message or meaning of the symbol. Connecting with UPCI doctrine, the first symbol, origins, corresponds with the scriptural interpretation of I Corinthians 11:2-16, and the perceived spiritual power and angelic protection (especially from verse 10) that a woman has when she keeps her hair uncut. The second symbol of persona meaning, would connect with the divine ‘revelation’ from God that some women receive or ‘instructions’ from leadership not to cut their hair in order to receive spiritual power. The third symbol, the sociocultural message, corresponds to the social capital women receive when their prayers are answered and they claim that it is because they have not cut their hair.

Obeyesekere found that everyone outside the women themselves held the matted hair in revulsion and fear, and this compared with UPCI women when others may register shock or dismay at their ‘superstitious, works-based, legalistic’ beliefs. According to Obeyesekere, the hair was manipulatory, used by the women in worship. Similarly, UPCI women may often let their hair down in prayer and claim the spiritual power of their obedience while asking God to move on theirs and others’ behalf. It is expressive, a symbolic performance, where the inward and outward states of being unite. The intangible belief in spiritual power begets the embodied, tangible evidence of a woman’s long, uncut hair, framed in poststructuralist theory. These women found their bodies a site for personal identity, gender politics and autonomous creations that changed the Sri Lankan ascetic / Western Pentecostal discourses about women’s bodies.
These challenges also extended to black and white Pentecostal women’s hair. Historically, hair between white and black women - more so than men - has been a point of departure in terms of beauty and body image. The straighter and less kinky the hair and the lighter the skin and closer to whiteness, the more accepted a black woman is. This beauty standard includes the time of slavery, dating back to 1619 when the first Africans arrived in the American colonies (Patton, 2010:pp.350-354). From 1905, when Madame C.J. Walker’s hair products for African-American women began gaining great popularity until today (Rooks, 1996:pp.51-74), these notions of beauty and body image prevail. Black women with long, straight, or even wavy hair are considered to have ‘good’ hair and kinky hair is regarded as ‘bad’ hair (Patton, 2010:p.356; Rooks, 1996:pp.1-21). Enter the UPCI dictates, where long hair is a woman’s crowning glory, her achievement and her testimony. The longer her hair, the greater her spiritual power and social capital. The shorter her hair, the more there is suspicion that she is cutting it and the less her spiritual power and social capital. Regardless of whether a person is black or white, embodiment, biology and physiology often dictate whose hair can grow long when left uncut. This embodied, gendered hierarchy is played out in the UPCI lifeworld. When black women take on and embody the teachings of I Corinthians 11:2-16 as the UPCI interprets this passage of scripture and do not cut their hair, they like other women may whole-heartedly believe that their spiritual power is present through their obedience to God. Yet, they must walk a minefield of others’ unbelief in them, such as white women in their congregations, and especially pastors’ wives, who often believe black women congregants are cutting their hair because it may not grow as long as their own. These social dichotomies and constructions of the body have long roots and make black women less valued for their spiritual giftings and ministries of prayer, wisdom, faith healing or preaching and more (or less) accepted by how long their hair is. In the UPCI, black women’s hair may cause discomfort for white women and, given the racial imbalance of the denomination, black women’s ability to have access to places of spiritual prominence and be used in ministry rests in the power of white women. In the UPCI, as in the dominant culture, white women’s body image sets the standard for black women’s. Patton (2010:p.359) writes that the twenty-first century saw a shift in the ways African-American women culturally produced their own standards of beauty as being individual and not driven by Euro-Americans. So it was with the African-American women of this research, who embodied their own beliefs in spiritual power that was theirs if they did not cut their hair and ceased comparing themselves to women whose hair grew longer. They challenged the boundaries between body, race, hair and the interlocking sexism that would keep all women marginalised and they emerged in the truth of

13 For definition, see Glossary.
their own relationship with God. This brought them to the ‘visible invisible centre’ (p.361) of their spiritual power and godly liberation. I discuss this subject at greater length in the chapter on the power of uncut hair.

In the final section, I provide a chapter outline for this thesis.

**Chapter Outline**

This chapter has been an overview of the field literature in order to provide a solid foundation for the feminist theoretical structure of this thesis. Chapter two provides my fieldwork methods and methodology for collecting Pentecostal women’s narratives in two denominations and two countries. In chapter three, I discuss women’s experiences in Pentecost and their access (or lack thereof) to opportunities for exercising their giftings and callings.

With the structure of this “house” firmly in place provided by chapters one through three, chapters four through seven are the bricks and mortar. Therein I explore the women’s stories of identity transformation, brought on by their conversions and callings into ministry (chapter four), their spiritual gifts and how they identify and enact them for the benefit of their faith communities (chapter five), their ideology and theology regarding submission to God and men (chapter six) and, finally, UPCI (and some AG) women’s perspectives on the power of uncut hair and submission as interpreted through I Corinthians 11:2-16, as well as denominational teachings on the subject (chapter seven). With the house purposefully built, chapter eight provides the lighting by pulling together the strands of discussion where I argue that identity, submission and biblical feminism provide Pentecostal women with their spiritual authority and agency which I conceptualise as woman space. Finally, chapter nine provides the back porch of this house in the form of a conclusion.
Chapter 2 - Sundays with the Pentecostals: Methods & Methodology

Olesen (2003: p.312) writes that feminist qualitative research is ‘diversified, dynamic and challenging,’ and so it was with my fieldwork and methods for this study. Bestor (2010: p.22) writes of choosing a ‘network not a neighbourhood’ for ease of access and knowledge-building. My ‘network’ was of Pentecostalism, where I researched the social and spiritual experiences of women’s lives in the ‘neighbourhoods’ of two denominations, the AG and UPCI in New Zealand and Missouri, USA. My time as a member of the UPCI afforded me knowledge of language, dress and behaviour which helped me to gain access. In this chapter I discuss the myriad aspects of navigating the simple and the complicated, the personal and the political while conducting research with proselytising groups, anti-feminist women and conservative religious systems. I begin with the theoretical framework for my approach to methods and discuss the project itself, its enrollees, how I gained access and the challenges and complications which characterised this work, exploring each in turn.

Conducting Phenomenological Research

This project was phenomenological, situated in the participants’ lifeworld, exploring their lived experiences, which is today’s standard approach to the anthropological study of religion (Holstein and Gubrium, 1998). This phenomenological method is an amalgam of two theories, one produced by Immanuel Kant to describe what is known from experience and the other by Edmund Husserl to describe the world in which we live (Bowie, 2006: p.4). Holstein and Gubrium (1998: pp.137-40) write of Schutz (1964), who, following Husserl, examined the ways in which the experiential world is constructed and interpreted within themselves by individuals. Schutz argues that members approach their lifeworld with a stock of knowledge [emphasis the author’s], a sense of familiarity and acquaintance about which the ethnographer records words and language as the ‘building blocks’ of daily reality and social interactions which construct and convey meaning. I will return to the concept of ‘blocks’ later in this chapter. Spickard and Landres (2002: p.2) call ethnographers who utilise this method ‘particularizers,’ because they present the minute details of religion and its effects on small numbers of individuals and the way they make sense of their lifeworld. Lawless (1991b: p.51) argues that a person’s lived experience is phenomenological, because it can be felt but by reflecting on the event or re-imagining a conversation, then it becomes text. According to this definition, my research conversations themselves were the phenomenological lived
experience for both me and my interviewees, while their recollections and stories were text because they were reflections of memory.

The challenge of phenomenology is for the researcher not to write him or herself out of the fieldwork. Some anthropologists and ethnographers have argued that a politics of ‘self-erasure’ in the name of objectivity goes too far and complicates the reader’s ability to place the researcher (Griffith, 1997; Franks, 2001). There are theoretical frameworks, however, such as feminist standpoint theory that not only provide a space for the researcher to ascertain and situate themselves in the published work, but demands that they do so in order to maintain the integrity of the work. This combats contested truth claims, thus articulating the biographical aspects of the research for the reader to evaluate (Franks, 2001:p.41). The phenomenological approach then when mixed with this type of theoretical framework situates the researcher appropriately, and it is this combination which structures my study.

My personal standpoint is what Abu-Lughod (1991:p.137) calls a ‘halfie,’ Collins (1998:p.5), the ‘Outsider within’ and Wulff (2000:p.149), an 'ex-native,' because I fully lived the life of an Apostolic woman. I was a longstanding member of the UPCI, departing the year I turned 30, and I was away nearly eight years by the start of this research. I know and intimately understand Pentecostal Apostolic language, doctrine, beliefs and rites but am no longer part of them. Collins (1998:p.5; 1986:pp.14-32) coined the term ‘Outsider-within’ to describe social locations and borders occupied by power-differentiated groups in which identities are gained or lost depending on their placement. It is a space of contradictory, privileged double-consciousness since the Outsider-within can move fluidly between the marginalised group and the dominant culture, understanding facets of the lifeworld that might be inaccessible to those who are wholly insiders or outsiders (Harding 2007:p.46).

Being an Outsider-within is not without its complications, and I argue that Pentecostal women also exist in Outsider-within space. Because patriarchal leanings and doctrines so infuse these women’s lives, those who are not gendered male are ‘Othered’ and under submission to those who rule. Therefore, Pentecostal women must negotiate for themselves a gendered space in which to co-exist with the men they are born to, married to, and eventually give birth to. They must find and create their own agency.

This research was also reflexive in its knowledge-creation which is the heart of feminist qualitative research (Oleson, 2003; Luff, 1999; Lawless, 1993b). Oleson (2003:p.315) writes that the questions of whose knowledges, where and how obtained, by whom and for what purpose, all should drive feminist research into feminist knowledges. Keeping these questions in mind, I designed my research concerning whose and what type of feminist knowledges I sought, but also I wished to mitigate the objectifying gaze. Abu-
Lughod warns of the dangers ‘of treating selves and others as givens’ (1991:p.139). There is the possibility that my interviewees will not agree with my analysis but I hope they will see me as - and that I have been successful in - not treating them as givens. A secular scholar also studying the UPCI (albeit in a different field), whom I once met at a conference, shared that he had received the Holy Ghost and was slain in the Spirit while conducting fieldwork. This is an example of the ‘shadow side’ of ethnography of the sacred, when the researcher is empathically drawn into a bond with members created by their beliefs and struggles (Csordas, 2007:pp.108, 112, 114). I asked my colleague if he felt that receiving the Holy Ghost compromised his objectivity, and he said he believed the concept of objectivity to be a complete myth. Indeed, Franks (2001:p.41) writes that feminist theory has rendered objectivity an ‘unattainable phantasy.’ Avoiding the objectification of women as research subjects is therefore a primary goal but is complicated when members are the means by which the researcher constructs an academic self (p.42). Other feminist scholars write of tactically collaborating with interviewees by sending back transcripts and requesting permission to use their words. While some degree of objectivity is unavoidable in the work, they find that collaboration helps to manage or moderate it and disrupts the objectifying gaze (pp.43-44). Franks also points out that while secular feminists may doubt that religious women can be ‘sufficiently’ feminist situated as they are in patriarchy, the same could be said of feminists within Women’s Studies departments in universities that are dominantly patriarchal and hierarchical. The idea that feminist research is altruistically for women by women however has its limits, because to an extent the research is also for the researcher (p.45).

This has been a discussion of the feminist theoretical framework for my study; next I discuss the project, the participants and fieldwork in general.

**The Project Information**

I received approval from the University of Otago Ethics Board before any interviews were sought. Each interviewee was given a demographics questionnaire to complete at the start of the interview (see Appendix 2). All transcripts were typed verbatim either by me or by paid transcribers. Field notes were often typed or handwritten after interviews and conversations, prayer groups and activities. In every church service and at conferences, I took handwritten notes, writing song and sermon titles and observations on sermon content. While I sometimes felt self-conscious about writing during various parts of the service, note-taking

---
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has long been an accepted practice amongst congregants and so I was not out of place. Sermons were often accompanied by multimedia or PowerPoint depicting the scriptural text and sermon points with pictures or even graphs that the pastor or minister wished to contextualise for the listening audience. For instance, Judith, an ordained minister in this research, preached a Sunday sermon in which she streamed via YouTube a live performance of the song, “Celebration” by Kool & The Gang. This was to highlight the point of her sermon that living for God is - or should be - a celebration of life and freedom. The congregation seemed to enjoy it, complying when Judith encouraged everyone to rise to their feet and clap or sing along. Recent to this, Judith had experienced a brief, episodic, life-threatening illness and had only just been released from hospital when she preached her message; therefore, her sermon about having meaningful life in God seemed to take on even deeper meaning and was indeed a “celebration.”

Because services were often times for disseminating important information to the corporate body, these experiences were also captured in field notes. For instance, one A/G NZ pastor before a Sunday sermon presented in multimedia form, the ways the church had spent all incoming funds during the previous fiscal year. This represented an unusual level of transparency most often reserved for church board meetings and tithe payers; indeed, he was the only pastor I saw do this during a Sunday service in nearly two years of fieldwork.

While church, prayer and cell group meeting attendance comprised a large part of this research, the focus was not on religious doctrine. Although Trinitarian (AG) and Oneness (UPCI) denominations were chosen from which to collect data, this study was designed to explore beyond church attendance and doctrine, while not slighting these important topics. As discussed in the chapter on the history of Pentecostalism, Trinitarians and Oneness believers are often deeply distrustful of one another, and my study sought to delve beneath these divisions and see what in fact, united them. This proved a fruitful method, since interviewees in both denominations and countries regardless of doctrinal beliefs demonstrated the same or similar views on prayer, the spiritual gifts and submission.

Following is the general lay-out of my interview topic guide:
## Table 1. Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversion</th>
<th>What is your conversion story? Were you born into Pentecostalism or brought to it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission</td>
<td>What is your definition of the word ‘submission’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was submission ‘taught’ to you and if so, by whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If married, who submits to whom in the home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Who does what domestic chores? How do these duties get distributed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial Callings</td>
<td>Do you feel a call into ministry? If so, what is that ministry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In what ways do you actively exhibit your call?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Gifts</td>
<td>What does having spiritual gifts mean to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you identified your spiritual gifts? If so, in what ways do you actively exhibit or use them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Blocked</td>
<td>Do you believe one can ever be blocked from following one’s call or utilising one’s gifts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How so?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you ever found it difficult reconciling your Pentecostal beliefs with the national culture you live in or with your ethnicity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>Who are your mentors (in terms of demographics like age, gender, etc.) and how do they mentor you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who and how did they themselves mentor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Being a Feminist</td>
<td>Would you consider yourself a biblical (or other) feminist or having feminist ideals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>(UPCI women) What are your spiritual beliefs concerning hair? Do you cut it or leave it uncut? Do you believe that spiritual or angelic power resides in your hair as the UPCI doctrine of hair outlines from I Corinthians 11:2-16 (especially vs. 10)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## The Women

I conducted semi-structured interviews with 61 women across both the AG and UPCI in New Zealand (26 interviewees) and the USA (35 interviewees) in face-to-face meetings that were either one-on-one or in groups. Per the Interviewee Demographics sheet (Appendix I), I chose pseudonyms for my interviewees on a system where each name from each denomination and country began with the same letter, respectively. These are as follows:

- A/G NZ interviewees’ names begin with “J”
- UPCI-NZ interviewees’ names start with “C”
- AG-USA interviewees’ names begin with “V”
- UPCI-USA interviewees’ names begin with “L”

In finished transcripts I looked for story patterns with common or repeated language and life content using NVivo software, and under analysis such patterns emerged. Without wishing to
pre-empt my findings, there were not many differences in the women’s narratives of spiritual power. Through the naming system listed above, the reader may see patterns emerge from the various women’s stories. Across the denominations and countries of this study, it became clear that the women had similar beliefs and experiences in their life transformation brought by conversion, the life purpose they received from calling, the spiritual power brought by their use of the spiritual gifts, and the strategic empowerment that submission brought their lives. There was one distinctive difference as seen through the UPCI doctrine concerning women’s uncut hair, however, and I have dedicated chapter seven to that topic. My interviews and fieldwork took place in a variety of cities around New Zealand and the USA with members of both the AG and the UPCI (Fig.’s 1 through 3).
Figure 1. Map of places visited during fieldwork in New Zealand.
Figure 2. Map of places visited during fieldwork in the USA.
The women ranged in ages from 18 to 83 (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5).

My research purpose was to interview any woman residing in New Zealand or the USA who wished to participate and was a member of one of these two Pentecostal denominations. As a result, my participants (Appendix 1) were heterogeneous in race and ethnicity, class, age, ordination status, life callings, and spiritual gifts. Participants also represented a diversity of education levels and vocations (Fig.’s 6-9).
Figure 6. Education (NZ)

Figure 7. Education (USA)
The Under-Represented

A plethora of women’s voices were sought, inclusive of race and ethnicity, but non-white women are underrepresented compared to the numbers of Caucasian and Pākehā (New Zealand-born European) women (Fig. 10 and Fig. 11). This is due largely to the predominantly white make-up of these denominations. As discussed in the chapter on the history of Pentecostalism, both the AG and UPCI were born out of racial segregation, a history for which they have been criticised and are slowly seeking to change (Wilson, 2010; Carew, 2009; Klaus, 2007; Synan, 1997; MacRobert, 1988; Kenyon, 1988; Anderson, 1979).

Figure 10. Ethnicity – New Zealand

Another group that is under-represented are young women (Fig. 4 & Fig. 5). In New Zealand, my youngest participant was 29 years old and in the USA, only four ranged from ages 18 to 23. In spite of numerous attempts to enrol young women, I found that they were often too busy with college or university, and many expressed that because they were not or had never been married, they did not see what they could contribute. I had to admit that my project questions did seem to favour women who were living or had lived the married experience, because it was these women for whom submission was such a present reality (Fig. 12 & Fig. 13 for marital status). For young, never-married women submission was something which they knew about and practised toward parents, pastors, teachers, etc., but living submission doctrine purposefully and cerebrally as married women was outside of their experience. Still, the young women who did participate had rich stories and comments to share about submission, their spiritual gifts and ministerial callings. They talked about the

Figure 11. Ethnicity - USA
future marriages which they envisioned for themselves and the relationships and types of submission they expected to share with their husbands.

![Figure 12. Marital Status (NZ)](image1)

![Figure 13. Marital Status (USA)](image2)

**Enrolling Participants**

I quickly learned that having confidence and courage was vital in this work (even when I had to fake them), and so I took Bestor’s (2010: p.23) advice and began to follow the networks provided by my entry point into the field. Placing myself in the path of contacts by attending church services, women’s prayer meetings and conferences, I shook hands and passed out business cards. I sought out pastors, co-pastors, pastors’ wives and ministry leaders to give my project information to, and asked if I could interview them and/or members of their congregations. As church leaders, they were gatekeepers, and I knew the power they held to receive me or send me packing, but in most cases, both I and my research were warmly welcomed. More than 30 churches contributed members to this research, across both countries and denominations. My participant base therefore built quickly as I followed up potential interviewees and scheduled interviews. I sent out texts and emails, using phone calls less, as I found that most people communicated best electronically. In order to boost the representation of young women, I asked faculty members I knew at various universities and bible colleges if they could put me in touch with students who were members of either the AG or UPCI. At the UPCI General Conference in October 2013, I conducted three interviews after meeting participants, and later a Skype interview came out of that conference. There was also a snowballing effect when my interviewees told others and put me in touch with
their women friends and family members. Everywhere I went, I found women who were willing to talk about their spiritual and social experiences in Pentecostalism.

**Fieldwork & Building Rapport**

Methods in this ethnographic study included qualitative data collected through semi-structured research conversations, participant-observation and archival research (Holstein, J.A. & Gubrium, J.F., 1998; Atkinson and Hammersley, 1998). From September 2012 to March 2014, I logged thousands of hours collecting data on Pentecostal women’s social and spiritual experiences by attending Sunday church services, women’s Connect or cell groups, prayer meetings, and social events in both countries. As Brusco (1995:p.165) notes, in order to study evangelicals at close range, one must spend a lot of time in church. Accordingly, I attended Sunday school classes, both women-only and mixed-gender, as well as Sunday and mid-week services and women’s conferences. I attended a Pentecostal church in Southcity, New Zealand, nearly every Sunday for approximately 10 months, and a women’s cell group at that church every other week for the same amount of time. On Sundays in River City, Missouri, I attended an AG church in the morning and a UPCI church at night (most often the same ones) and women’s prayer and Bible study groups during the week, both AG and UPCI.

I heard more men than women preachers speak while enjoying worship and music services more often led by women than men. I interviewed women I encountered using recorded research and field conversations in their offices and homes, in lounges (living rooms) or at kitchen tables, city parks while their children or grandchildren played, cafés, restaurants, in busy conference halls and occasionally in cars as we rode together to destinations. Each research conversation lasted from one and a quarter to four hours, and some participants sat for more than one recorded interview. Interviewees were Pentecostal leaders and lay people and most or all participants contributed to their churches and faith communities as teachers, singers, musicians, “labourers” and regular church-goers.

I was hopeful that field sites would be open to a researcher, but I assumed - expected in fact - not to be received by some members. Because the UPCI is less a mainline denomination than the AG is, I was especially nervous (read: terrified) of approaching them given the way I had left nearly a decade before, even though I literally built my research on the supposition that I would be received. But from my first phone call to the wife of the UPCI-NZ Superintendent in May 2013, I was set at ease. Contacting her when I did was fortuitous, for she invited me to attend their National Ladies’ Conference in Tamihana (Fig. 1) the very next week. When I arrived, she introduced me to the more than one hundred women gathered there during the day service and told them that she had been praying for me. After I
shared with them about my research, I was welcomed into the faith community and warmly received.

My worries flared anew, however, when I shifted to River City to seek out members of the UPCI. I decided to go right to the top gatekeeper, the Ladies’ Ministries president and highest ranking woman in the UPCI. I made an appointment with her office at headquarters where I sat and shared my research with her, which she gladly received. It was in keeping with her own writings about women in ministry, submission, and the exercise of spiritual gifts. She endorsed my work, not officially but informally, so I was free to tell others that she had seen my project information and was happy for me to continue. From there, I was deeply grateful to experience the same reception in homes and churches of the UPCI-USA as I had received in New Zealand. Other researchers have also written about approaching gatekeepers in the fieldwork and the pros and cons of doing so (Foster & Kemper, 2010:pp.14-15).

There were a number of challenges during the fieldwork of which building rapport was an important one, so I purposely made mutuality and reciprocity the framework for my approach and interactions with participants. Without a doubt, the acquaintanceships I built with women I encountered helped to shape the interview experiences, including our exchanges before and during the interviews, their interpretation of the interview questions, and their level of engagement and trust. If they had publications, PhD theses, or web bios, I often looked those up and read them beforehand in preparation for our meetings. I came to use the phrase ‘research conversation’ interchangeably with ‘interview.’ The former highlighted the reciprocal relationship in interviewees and I shared, while the latter implied a hierarchy and formality that was simply not there (Goldman, 2002:p.152). Participants held a degree of control in that they chose when and where we would meet. Our encounters were amiable, even pleasurable, although sometimes there was an underlying awkwardness that came from being ‘more than a visitor, less than a friend’ (p.161). There were boundaries to be negotiated for what I termed the ‘relationship of the now’ that we created together. Their stories provided multiple dimensions to our relationship in that moment, though with some exceptions, we retained a respectful distance as acquaintances. Still, there were moments of grand rapport; when I attended a tangi (Māori funeral) in June 2013, I stayed with the widow of the deceased, her sisters and daughters. For nearly a week, this household of women warmly welcomed me, a foreigner among them, honouring me with the name “Putiputi,” meaning “flower” in Māori. I was deeply humbled by their gracious hospitality and the friendship these women willingly offered.

Some participants chose to be interviewed with others in their families or faith communities, thus allowing them to exchange and ‘cue’ one another’s ideas. Cuing was the
way to unlock a woman’s thoughts about her experiences. Because spiritual gifts are such a part of the lifeworld embodied and actioned, members may not see them as “story-worthy” or even remember them. But, because I was interested in the mundane aspects of their lives and the social and spiritual actions they daily performed, I found that interview questions rightly worded helped cue participants. To begin the women’s stories and our conversations, my first question was about their conversion experiences. This situated us immediately in their Pentecostal life story and provided a useful ‘before and after picture’ of their lives and perspectives. Thinking about ways they and women of their families and acquaintances demonstrated submission, embodied the spiritual gifts or enacted their ministries in the faith community, once cued, their stories flowed (Bestor 2010: p.30). I found that most were happy to talk about themselves and parts of their stories were already cultivated as testimonies that they were used to sharing and Lawless too wrote about this (1988b; 1983). Sometimes as we talked, my participants and I cooked meals or did domestic tasks alongside one another, and a few times, I even babysat. I helped to wash dishes and clean kitchens after church dinners and once even attended a church clean-up day, painting walls while chatting with the women around me. Another time, I went door-knocking and our group passed out church leaflets in nearby neighbourhoods, talking with those who came to the door and even praying with some. Finding ways to be involved helped to build rapport in the field (Bestor, 2010).

Sometimes at participants’ requests, husbands came along for the interviews. One husband sat on the other side of the wall in the kitchen under the guise of preparing and eating his breakfast as his wife and I sat in their lounge. We could hear him chuckling during key moments of the stories she shared, and occasionally they conferred about this or that aspect but always with the wall between. Another husband and pastor was unabashedly curious and engaged as I interviewed his wife at a restaurant after the Sunday morning service. Still another husband was present twice. When I met with his wife in a café at a local mall, he took a seat near us but seemed quite uncomfortable to be there. The next time his wife and I met at their home and he sat in the lounge and busied himself with his work while we sat at the dining room table. One more husband wished to participate and was quite affirming of my work. He actively sought not only to be present during his wife’s interview, but he wanted me to interview him as well. I explained that I did not have ethics approval to interview men and that it was his wife’s decision for him to be present. I did, however, sincerely appreciate his enthusiasm for this research and said so. It was heartening when Pentecostal men were openly interested in and supportive of this work.

Participants understandably wanted to know what my location was to Pentecost. As noted above, I self-disclosed that I had been a member of the UPCI for nearly 30 years and
that while I was no longer associated with any particular Pentecostal denomination, my openness was so that I could maintain objectivity. It was also so that when I wrote positively about the denominations and my participants, I would not be seen as “compelled” to say those things. Most interviewees seemed to accept this. Some asked if I had ever been baptised or had spoken in tongues, and I was happy to share my own conversion experience of first speaking in tongues at a summer children’s camp at age 10 and a few days later, being baptised by full immersion at our church. In fact, at one women’s cell group, the evening’s topic was for us each to share our conversion stories. Because the women did not know me very well, I found the topic and timing quite fortuitous. Upon sharing my own conversion story, I sensed an almost imperceptible shift to approval and acceptance among them. Throughout the research, the fact that I was no longer a practising Pentecostal seemed not to be the barrier I had feared. I intimately knew Pentecostal language, belief systems, doctrine, styles of worship and dress and especially ways women and men relate to one another in Pentecostalism, or at least I was obviously seeking to understand better these ways of relating. Having such ‘insider’ knowledge helped me greatly during interviews, so that participants already knew that they did not have to start at square one (Ammerman, 2014:pp.198-201). Though my ‘native perspective’ may appear differently through the anthropological lens it remains a useful touchstone for theorising in a reflective fashion (Wulff, 2000:pp.153-54). So too, a more prescient concern for the community being researched is that they may be misrepresented. Therefore, a researcher who may give a favourable report of the group and thus improve public relations is to be welcomed (Foster & Kemper, 2010:pp.16-7; Franks, 2001:p.54).

One consistent challenge and aspect of this research was how to address women who were three and four decades older than I was. My generational upbringing held that to call older people by their first names especially when I often met or saw them only once was disrespectful, and I feared it would be a barrier to building rapport. As mentioned in my Introduction chapter, in the UPCI in both countries where everyone is referred to by the fictive family titles of “Sister” and “Brother,” this was not a problem, and I used them. Members in turn called me by my first name and a few called me “Sister Sherrema,” perhaps as a way of welcoming me into the community or honouring the fact that I had once been a member of it. However, in the US-AG which long ago dropped fictive family titles, members call one another by first names. And, in New Zealand society where hierarchy gets flattened (though still exists) and everyone calls one another by first names rather than titles, this created a personal conundrum. I got around this if the AG woman was ordained, and I could call her “Reverend” or “Minister” or occasionally, “Pastor.” At times I tried using the more
formal “Ms.” or “Mrs.,” most often in emails, but women would usually sign off with their first names anyway. Finally, one member in US-AG leadership who was my age said he got around this by calling much-older women in the faith community “Sister,” because he knew they remembered a time when that was “appropriate.” Equipped with this bit of rationale I too tried it, and the women smiled and said they had not been called “Sister” in years, and while they appreciated my efforts they insisted I call them by first names. While I was never able to fully dislodge my unease with this practice (upbringing can be so intractable), I complied but only after their invitation to do so.

As mentioned in my first chapter, I was uncertain about asking interviewees if they considered themselves feminists, although 18 participants talked about it. Had I not been hesitant, many more would likely have done so. My cautiousness remained, however, until I framed the word in the following way in my project information:

- Would you consider yourself a biblical (or other) feminist or having feminist ideals? (e.g., biblical feminists are those who hold, among other beliefs, that there should be a mutuality of submission between women and men; that scripture does not bar access to ministry or gifts based on gender, etc.)

I used this carefully worded question late in the research but found that using and explaining the term ‘biblical feminist’ made the “F” word far more accessible. It also garnered varying responses. Some still demurred, while others read the question, a thoughtful smile playing over their lips. A few said they had never heard of the term biblical feminist, but had to admit that they indeed held these beliefs.

Of those who participated, many expressed their appreciation at being interviewed. They said that our conversations gave them clarity and a firm sense of identity. For example, sometime after our interview, Verity approached me and said that our conversation was for her like “building an altar” as was done in the Old Testament when Abraham, Jacob and others built altars in places where they had experienced spiritual renewal. Her description was deeply humbling and served to remind me that collecting women’s narratives was not just about research. These exchanges were not one-dimensional, and some even considered them a life investment for the understanding it rendered of their own stories. Whether in ways same or different, our conversations were a life investment for me as well, as shown by the solid friendships I built with some interviewees in each country.

This has been a discussion about the project, participants and the fieldwork. Next I look further at the aspects of urban anthropology and my name for it, ‘projectile research.’
I came to call my field work ‘projectile research’ because of its unplanned, sometimes disorganised, aspects when it literally felt as though I was ‘projectiling’ around any field work city. Between snowballing and handing out business cards, I often found I conducted interviews soon after sharing my project information or, occasionally, right then. Reaching churches, prayer groups, conferences, archives and scheduled interviews required travel around every city or between cities, sometimes with very little notice or even on my way to or from another fieldwork site. I utilised the church locators found on their websites for both the AG and UPCI in each country. In every city I used public transportation to get around: buses or subway systems and, when travelling between cities, I most often went by bus but occasionally flew. I learned bus schedules on the run in the cities I lived in or visited, and quickly memorised or printed bus route or Google maps. Sometimes I walked if the destination was three miles away or less, and especially if the bus schedules did not fit my schedule. A lifelong fitness walker, I utilised walking as an excellent way to get my bearings if I was in a new city or good thinking time after leaving an interview, church service or other research conversation I needed to process (Lee and Ingold, 2006). There were times when walking had its hazards, however, as I found once when I was hit by a car after leaving a Sunday church service. Though unhurt, I remained shaken for days.

Commuting and travel, essential aspects of this work, afforded comparative ethnography anew. In each city and often in various sections of cities, public transport yielded a wealth of information about who commutes on which systems (bus or train), going from where and to where (Pardue, 2010). These were what I called ‘portable communities’ made up of riders of various ethnicities, races, classes and genders, some of whom knew one another by sight and conversed while riding to various destinations. Occasionally, as with any community, we were even privy to one another’s pain. On a Sunday subway ride in River City, I exchanged pleasantries with a woman who received a phone call during our conversation that her mother had died. Two other women and I, strangers all, who had been enjoying light conversation from our separate seats, immediately surrounded her to offer comfort. Another time, while travelling on Greyhound Bus to Queen City from River City, I prayed with my seatmate, a man who was travelling from Alabama for the sentencing of his son-in-law who had killed his teenage step-son, this man’s grandson. On another trip, my Greyhound bus stopped at a minimum security prison to pick up parolees, one of whom took the seat next to me. He had been incarcerated three years for selling marijuana to fund his daughter’s university education, expenses which he could not meet on a plumber’s pay check. He was returning to his family and starting life anew. Hearing the stories of others and
offering a listening ear was an honour, regardless of whether I did so as an anthropologist or simply an empathetic stranger. In either framework, it was our shared humanity and the public transportation which facilitated these exchanges.

And yet it was the ethnographic fieldwork which presented the most challenges in terms of time and finances. Because I relied solely on my monthly income in New Zealand dollars from my University of Otago Doctoral Scholarship and Department of Anthropology & Archaeology grants, due to conversion rates, it took more New Zealand dollars to meet my expenses in United States dollars. Therefore, throughout the US phase of my research, the money did not go far enough in meeting research and personal expenses; thus the situation required a great deal of ingenuity on my part. Some extraneous costs were the gifts I gave interviewees for their time, as well as transportation and transcription expenditures. The latter two represented by far the greatest outlay.

As a gift of appreciation I gave interviewees a NZ$10 (USD $8) koha\(^\text{16}\) in the form of drinks or meals when meeting at coffee shops and restaurants, or brought to our interview a special gift of chocolate, a journal notebook, or something else I thought they might like when meeting in their offices or homes. Usually the cost would come to more than the koha so the difference was out-of-pocket. In addition, because I was only a visiting scholar in River City, Missouri, I was ineligible for the transportation vouchers allotted to students at the university where I was based. Since my fieldwork took me almost daily around the city and transport day passes cost USD $7.50 (NZD $9.20 at the time), shortfall added up quickly. Thus, travelling by bus between cities and tapping my network to stay with friends, colleagues or family while travelling on fieldwork, or staying at hostels most often were the sensible choices in financial terms.

Recorded interviewing also requires transcribing and, while I handled the first eight to ten transcriptions myself, with snowballing and the rigours of the road, it became apparent to both me and my supervisors that I would have to hire transcribers if I wished to remain on schedule for my thesis completion date. The transcriptions averaged around NZD $130 each, and there were many tens of them. Paying research and personal expenses as well as ongoing monthly bills in United States dollars from my New Zealand bank account demonstrated that I was on shaky ground financially speaking. While finances presented a challenge during the New Zealand phase of the research too, spending New Zealand dollars in New Zealand provided relative stability. Other scholars have written about the expense and labour of anthropological research, and my fieldwork revealed this was true (Foster & Kemper, 2010:pp.5-19).

\(^{16}\) Māori word that means “offering or gift.”
This has been a discussion about the project, participants, and challenges in the field. Next I talk about the reflexive aspects of this feminist, anthropological study.

**Doing Reflexive Anthropology**

This project took a grounded theory approach situated in reflexive anthropology (Luff, 1999; Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Hufford, 1995; Lawless, 1991b). Standpoint theorist Hartsock (1998:pp.107-108) notes ironically that the postmodern claim that verbal constructs ‘do not constitute members’ daily realities’ arose at the same time that women and non-Westerners began to speak for themselves, thus silencing oppressed peoples. Scholars have noted that feminist researchers seek an equal relationship with participants, which makes the research experience reciprocal and collaborative with dialogue that is emergent rather than fixed (Lawless, 1993b; Ingersoll, 2002; Franks, 2001). Reciprocal ethnography has many layers, writes Lawless (1991b:p.39), with a balance of text and interpretation. Luff (1999:p.688) writes that feminist research emphasises the need to remain attentive to unconscious assumptions and highlights the importance of the researcher’s own self-reflexivity.

My study built in reflexivity and collaboration from the start in the form of a box on the consent form which interviewees could check:

I would like to receive the researcher’s analysis and interpretation from our interview as written about in the PhD thesis.

Every interviewee checked this box, and via email each received drafts of the results chapters from the work we did together. They also received my researcher’s analysis of their words, as well as how they were showcased and used. Their feedback was varied, though mostly positive. According to Abu-Lughod (1991:p.142), because halfies identify with subcultures both within the West and outside it, educated members of their communities call them to account for what they say and write. I found this to be true when the highest-ranking members in each denomination in both countries gave the most critical feedback, which held me to account. Abu-Lughod warns that feminists and halfie anthropologists must face head-on the politics and ethics of our representations. When halfies present the Other, they are also presenting themselves and so speak from a position of complex awareness. Lawless (1991b:p.37) writes that reciprocal ethnography seeks a ‘true discourse’ in order to humanise the ethnographic work. Some interviewees wrote back that having read the results chapters, they could “see” themselves through the way their words were situated and they experienced again the vividness of their recollections. This feedback suggested that interviewees’
“essence” had been captured. This was an example of the reciprocal work we did together, of women working out their identities (Lawless, 1991b:p.50). This reciprocity grew out of rapport developed from the point of first contact and certainly in the interview; it would not have existed otherwise.

Lawless (1991a:pp.60-64) termed interviewees’ accounts, ‘spiritual life stories’ based on their personal experience and spiritual tradition. These are formulaic narratives consistent with each telling, a personal history developed into a ‘fiction.’ Similarly, the women with whom I conversed engaged in open discourses and shared rich spiritual life stories of conversion that involved the first time they repented, spoke in tongues and were baptised. Their descriptions of going down into the water and coming up cleansed evoked a powerful imagery of shedding the person one had been but now no longer was, after emerging from the river, ocean, or baptistery. They told of the sense of purpose and the new identity their conversion brought, which Cartledge (2010:pp.63-80) also spoke of.

While reciprocity and mutuality were actively fostered in this work, so was the importance of interviewee safety. For instance, Chantelle’s conversion narrative included her repentance about the abortions she’d had. While I could be fairly certain she had told and retold this story, honed into her testimony of the life “God had saved her out of,” I could not know this for sure. Given the staunch pro-life stance in these faith communities and even though “Chantelle” was a pseudonym, I did not want to risk revealing such sensitive details in my writings. Therefore, Chantelle was given that section of the Conversions and Callings chapter before anyone else to ensure that she was happy for me to send it in the results others had received. She responded that it was indeed fine to do so. She was not alone; there were nearly a handful I did this with. In another example of maintaining safety, one participant shared her testimony publicly at a church we were both visiting of how God had saved her out of the lifestyle of an “adulteress.” Her husband was not present then, but at her request he was when I interviewed her a few weeks later. I had hoped to delve deeper into this aspect of her testimony but was hesitant to do so with him there, and so I had to leave it. Interviewee safety was a paramount concern, and it sometimes trumped “getting the story.”

Participants’ narratives were deep in exploration, nuanced with meaning, and peppered with what I came to call ‘scripture as conversation.’ Scriptural references abounded throughout the women’s stories almost like vernacular. They were usually given without a scriptural citation but expounded on a spoken belief or their interpretation of an event. For instance, Judith said, “The way that God treats us is the way that we should actually live life out.” Though she gave no scripture citation, it was in fact a reference to Ephesians 5:1-2 that teaches the reader to be an ‘imitator of God and walk in love.’ There were many instances like
this in which interviewees demonstrated their exegesis and fluid life application of scripture. However, it begged the question if one reason they did not cite chapter and verse was due to ‘unwritten guidelines’ that, as in many quarters of Pentecostalism, a woman can teach or speak as long as it is not called “preaching” (Butler, 2007:pp.37-39; Wacker, 2003:p.104). To cite chapter and verse would be akin to preaching. Perhaps another reason why they did not cite was that they likely believed that the listener (me) knew that this was a reference to scripture and that I did not need it explained. And given our shared Pentecostal histories and theological readings, I did recognise and was able to extricate parts of speech that were scripture-inspired even if they were not direct quotations. This was the ingraining of the canon and becomes social capital; having no citation in fact demonstrated that scripture was “picked up” via osmosis in the Pentecostal lifeworld. For the women of my study, God was – and is – very real and the Bible is infused with supernatural power by which to define one’s life.

Participants talked about the ‘blocks’ they received as women from the patriarchy ‘blocking’ them in their individual ministries, and I found that the ambivalence of this word worked well. A block can be an impediment but also something one can build on (Lawless 1991b:p.42). The women’s stories built in blocks of ideas, words strung together that expressed joy, private pain, hopes of ministry and other life callings un/fulfilled. The patriarchal blocks of spiritual abuse, sexism from men and that internalised – and used - by other women, and the subsequent invalidation of their ministries that many interviewees experienced, brought pain that morphed into pragmatism. They told of turning patriarchal blocks into foundational ones on which they rebuilt or continued to build their ministry, albeit with a different mind-set than before the block had taken place. For instance, when Jael was called a “Jezebel” by her former pastor because she made sound administrative decisions under her own authority and position in church leadership, it cast her into a wilderness experience that was 12 years in the making by the time we met. She did not engage again in church ministry in spite of changing churches. Yet she built on that block by going into a secular counselling career which she considered her personal ministry.

This work called Pentecostal women to claim, notice and give account of their own narratives as the ‘religious subject’ (Lawless, 2003:p.62), speaking into tangibility what was unspoken, elusive, intangible. Submission, scriptural interpretation, patriarchal blocks, conversions, callings, and identity are intangible subjects. But by hearing women to speech (Morton 1985:pp.127-29), their narratives came alive with vivid intensity; they are included in the ‘collective record’ and fit with the master narrative about women’s experiences in religion (Lawless, 2003:p.63). When religious (indeed, all) women tell their stories, they
knowingly or not acknowledge that the master narrative endorses ‘isms’ and phobias including, sexism, racism, homophobia and male-driven exclusive policies. Rather than an entirely new master narrative, they call instead for agreed-upon guiding principles, including the de-centring of power and authority within their homes and churches. They then embrace difference and diversity, imbuing them with meaning (p.73).

Goldman (2002:p.146) writes that vivid personal details are often given when speaking of spiritual commitment. Lawless holds that one reason for this is that the narrator is involved in the supernatural world, which allows for stories of visions and healings that would be met with laughter or disbelief in any other context (1988b:p.65). In interview conversations, sometimes a surprised, delighted look registered in participants’ eyes when they made connections to current beliefs they had fluidly picked up and which stemmed from a particular, unexamined moment in their past until my question, asked in a certain way, suddenly made the connection clear. Perhaps the moment had been disregarded or deemed irrelevant until now, but brought up by my probing they could see its connection to their lives, belief systems and the content of our conversation. It was an “Aha!” moment.

Concerning belief, Griffith (1997:p.23) who was raised Episcopalian, declined to say whether she thought the ecstatic experiences her interviewees reported were ‘real’ and of divine origin but chose instead to focus on what was ‘human.’ My approach was somewhat similar yet different, perhaps due to my Pentecostal background. During the three decades I was a member, I readily and frequently performed and participated in ecstatic worship and came away believing that what I experienced in the Spirit was very real. Still, it was the strength of my belief. And that is where my analysis rests; these women experienced life transformation, deliverance, self-management, joy and a host of other factors on the power of their belief. It is a woman’s belief that makes her experience a profound, transformative reality.

This has been a discussion on the importance of reflexivity in anthropological, feminist research. Next I talk about complications and ‘push-backs’ - and how I am using that phrase – which I received during fieldwork.

Complications and Push-Back

There were many challenges and complications to this work, among them my own identity and standpoint as the researcher which was at times in a state of flux. I constantly had to re-evaluate who I was in relation to my interviewees in order to maintain my own identity. There were also the challenges that are a natural extension of working with proselytising groups, anti-feminist women and religious conservatives. These included the push for the
researcher to convert, which I surprisingly never received, navigating UPCI conservative beliefs about women’s dress, push-back from both Pentecostal and feminist scholars, and especially interviewees’ beliefs about divorce and the homophobia many exhibited, seemingly without provocation. I will go over each in turn but first, a word about how I use the phrase ‘push-back.’ Though it is a modern colloquialism, I recapture it to demonstrate that my interviewees and I did not always see the same way on a given topic. Metaphorical push-back was given in language by my interviewees to me and occasionally, I to them. It complicated rapport and at times brought a distinctive ‘me vs. them’ aspect to the research. Examples of this are especially seen in my descriptions below of homophobia.

The reality for the Outsider within, halfie or ex-native is that while many anthropologists may choose a particular field site and group of people, coming with no prior knowledge other than focused learning and training to enter the lifeworld (Gmelch, 2010; Spickard and Landres, 2002:pp.1-14), our whole lives before the research were unconscious training grounds. From such a social location, objectivity is a myth, and the personal indeed becomes political because we are returning ‘home,’ a concept with shifting meanings. My home was ‘away’ for another; put differently, the Pentecostal world may seem impenetrable, even alien to an outsider for whom it is not home (Wulff, 2000:pp.149-150). There is a growing tendency in anthropology to study one’s own culture rather than the ‘exotic other’ (Leibing 2007:p.141). When Abu-Lughod (1993) entered her field site for the first time, she was accompanied by her father, who ‘presented’ her to his Bedouin kinship clan in Egypt’s western desert. Only later did she realise that they would not have accepted her without his escort and introduction. Likewise, I found that mentioning my parents’ long-standing and current history with the UPCI, even though mine had ended, “escorted” me into spaces that may otherwise have been difficult or even closed.

Csordas (2007:p.116) writes that we do service to ethnography when we give attention to its ‘shadow side.’ Given the circumstances of spiritual and marital abuse under which I departed from the UPCI, I knew that I needed to safeguard myself and my research while conducting interviews, collecting stories and attending church services, all of which carried deep and often troubling memory. Therefore, as preparation for my PhD research, I went to University Student Health and spoke to the Director of Counselling. I explained my project and my story and asked to be matched with someone who could provide specific counselling so that I could be certain of emotional protection during the fieldwork. Thus began work with a psychotherapist who had also left a fundamentalist faith years before near the same age I had. Our work together helped me lose the sense of ‘militancy’ I had unconsciously acquired as an outgrowth of life events. This could have overshadowed the research by manifesting a
selective attitude through which I could have cast participants’ particularities in a light refracted by my own experiences. Abu-Lughod writes (1991:p.140) that violence is inherent in the process of creating the self in opposition to the Other, and Leibing (2007:p.142) writes that the act of looking back and ‘lifting out’ can bring a formulation of new insights and positioning. I lifted (myself) out of my own experiences in order to see them from other points of view and lose (or at least assuage) the militancy that could have eclipsed my work.

If I was at all successful in the field, the emotional work this therapist and I did together was one important reason vital to my training. Our undertaking was a way of honouring the shadow side of ethnography and it underscored the intensely personal experience that is ethnographic fieldwork (Gmelch, 2010:p.38; Leibing, 2007:p.141; Ingersoll, 2002:p.172).

I entered the research not only with concern for myself and my interviewees but about them as well. I was apprehensive that members of these faith communities would try to convert me or ‘save my soul,’ a factor other researchers who have worked with evangelical or Pentecostal groups said complicated their own (Franks, 2001; Jaye, 1998; Griffith, 1997; Ginsburg, 1997; Brusco, 1995; Lawless, 1988a, 1988b; Gordon, 1987). Surprisingly, this in fact never happened to me, and it may have been due to the active worship I engaged in while attending church services. I would sing the songs flashed onto large multi-media screens which most churches had, clapping my hands and lifting them in worship and finding that this expressiveness came quite naturally to me after my three decades spent as a Pentecostal woman. As a result, it took some months into the research before I noticed that no one had yet tried to convert me. I realised that this was probably due to my own worship, and although it was for me and my own spiritual sustenance, an unintended benefit was that apparently, my worship was also for them. Still, there were ways that I tried to maintain distance. At one Sunday night service, Leah, an evangelist whom I interviewed, prophesied over various members of the congregation before her sermon. She went to each person and gave a specific message from God while the entire congregation stood listening to what was said and watching to see whom she would approach next. Finally, Leah turned, microphone in hand, and looked directly at me. I cast my eyes down. To be prophesied over felt too much as though I was a member of the faith community, and I was not. I also felt that it could compromise my objectivity. Moreover (and probably most honestly), I was trepidatious about what she might say publicly. Leah moved on. When she did so this begged the question as to whether or not she had a word for me at all, as she would have had to obey God and give the word regardless of any reluctance on my part to receive. The fact that she turned and approached someone else, however, suggested that she did not, but what might have happened had I maintained eye contact? Obviously, I will never know. But it was fascinating to see my
interviewee’s spiritual power in action as she boldly and fearlessly offered her gifting to her faith community.

Another possible reason why my interviewees did not try to convert me was that we spoke fluently the language of Pentecostalism together. There are certain phrases and words that are peculiar only to Pentecostalists and evangelicals and are not found in the language of the dominant culture.¹⁷ For instance, in one recorded conversation, Verbena began to describe a time when she had been slain in the Spirit, and she stopped to ask if I understood what that term meant. I appreciated her concern and assured her that I knew exactly what that meant and looked like. Therefore, perhaps due to my worship and knowing the language, I did not have the experience of participants trying to convert me during field work.

Still, while I was able to worship alongside my interviewees in open and honest ways, I did experience the sense of ‘deception and disguise’ that some scholars have written about as they conducted research with proselytising groups and tried to fit in while remaining true to who they were (Gordon, 1987: p.268). One challenge of literal ‘disguise’ that occurred almost daily during my field work had to do with my clothing and hairstyles. Every morning I would ask myself, “Who am I seeing and where am I going today?” If the answers to either of these questions included UPCI members or churches, I would dress according to UPCI standards. This meant no jewellery, makeup, trousers, short sleeves, or low necklines. Instead, I wore long skirts (at least past my knee), blouses or shirts with three-quarter length sleeves or to the wrists, and if the neckline was low, I usually wore a chemise underneath or pinned a scarf inside to bring the neckline to just below my collarbone which is considered respectable. This is the accepted way UPCI women are expected to dress in their daily lives, not just at church. On days when I expected to see AG members, however, I could wear clothes that were more a reflection of who I am, since the AG does not follow strict prohibitions on women’s dress (more on this in the chapter on the power of uncut hair). On my first Sunday evening visit to one UPCI church, I wore a skirt just above my knee which I had worn that morning to an AG church and had neglected to change. While the members welcomed me warmly, I knew I had to be more careful if I wanted to “blend.” I wore my hair up in the US-UPCI community to make it less obvious that it had been cut. When one interviewee said there was a time when she would never wear her hair down because it grew only to her shoulders and she was concerned other members would think she had cut it, I knew exactly what she meant.

These boundaries were rigid, never fluid and to demonstrate the challenge that dress presented during my fieldwork, I quote the following from my field notes, dated Wednesday, 18 September 2013:

¹⁷ See Glossary for just a few examples.
I constantly walk between boundaries of dress and religion. For instance, today I wore a skirt down to my ankles with a multi-coloured blouse that goes off the shoulder and a chemise under it. I wore a pair of purple earrings. I planned to change the shirt later on in the day since I was going to do field work at a UPCI church this evening. So I brought along [to my office] a purple tank top to wear under a modest cropped black jacket that buttoned and had three-quarter length sleeves. I knew the off-the-shoulder blouse I was wearing would be inappropriate, as were the earrings, but those could be removed.

I [sometimes] go through the day wondering if I’ll run into any UPCI folks...out and about around town. If I do, what will they think of me and the way I am dressed? It is stressful, feeling like I’m living two lives, one in which I can dress the way I choose, the other in which I...dress according to rules I no longer live by. I like wearing earrings. But if a UPCI member were to see them on me, they would take that as a sign that I surely need to be ‘saved.’

Finally, it happened. While out shopping just before Christmas on a day off from the field, I ran into a mother and daughter from the UPCI church I frequented. I happened to be wearing jeans and jewellery. Realising that I was seconds away from being spotted, I took a deep breath, plastered on a smile, and prepared to greet them as they headed my direction. We chatted for a few moments and then went our separate ways, but the encounter and the surprise in their eyes left me feeling deeply disconcerted. These women had only ever seen me in UPCI “uniform,” because I had dressed out of respect for their doctrinal beliefs concerning what women wear. Now, faced with my preferred style, I worried that they would “read” what I wore while attending their church as “deceitful” when I had meant only to be respectful. In essence, I felt as though my cover was blown. Unsure if I should let it go or address the issue, I opted for the latter and spoke to the mother a few weeks later. I found that while my manner of clothing was certainly noticed, they more or less did not hold me in judgement. Still, I worried that they and other members would now be wary of me.

Another complication was the push-back I received from other feminist scholars, both within and outside the Pentecostal realm. From the former, push-back came from highly educated Pentecostal women when I presented at a public talk that I was not engaging with the whole array of submission experiences there are to choose from (e.g., focusing on hierarchical rather than mutual submission). They could not “see” themselves or the particular aspect of marital submission they practised. At the end of one presentation, a woman publicly demanded to know my personal standpoint on submission doctrine. At an academic conference, I presented from the data the tool for empowerment that submission actually is for these women in their faith communities. One scholar approached me later and introducing herself as the daughter of Pentecostal pastors, said that, because these women were so empowered, perhaps we could not call them “Pentecostal.” Such conversations served to help
me think more deeply about submission and my findings but were also push-backs to this research. I took comfort, however, from Abu-Lughod who wrote (1991:p.159) that, as halfies, our work will not be received by members of either community the same way and from Marie Griffith who, in personal conversation, once told me to expect these kinds of responses as a researcher and presenter on submission doctrine, especially if I was doing my work well. The ‘bifurcation’ of feminism (Franks, 2001:p.6), in this context a feminist conducting work with anti-feminist women, brought the hazard that my study could be misconstrued as anti-feminist (Ginsburg, 1997; Luff, 1999). However, I see this research as a bridge to those on the outside from revivalist, Pentecostal women, a way of sense-making about their nuanced and multi-layered perspectives concerning submission and what they define as empowerment.

There were inevitably times, however, when working with anti-feminist women confounded me, such as the woman who washed her husband’s feet. Foot washing is an old tradition in Pentecostalism (as well as other faiths), based on John 13 where Jesus washes the feet of the disciples at the Last Supper. It is an ordinance that may be considered on the same level as the sacrament of communion (Synan, 1997:p.77). It is a humbling act usually used in churches or at conferences for its aspects of community-building. Viviana said that she had witnessed this act at a wedding once where the bride and groom washed one another’s feet during the wedding vows. Still, it was a surprise when Laney shared that whenever she began to feel “unsubmissive” towards her husband and there was a “disruption” in her spirit, she would wash his feet. After that she said the disruption would cease and she and her husband were of one accord again. She said she had performed this ritual at least three or four times.

As a feminist researcher familiar with foot-washing and its meanings, I did not know how to analyse Laney’s act of submission. Having participated in the foot-washing ritual myself as a Pentecostal, I knew the power of it. But removing foot-washing from the framework of the church and placing it in the home, centring in the marital relationship with the wife performing it for her husband, made this a servile act I found very disconcerting. Laney was a highly educated career woman who knew that servility was not required of her as a wife. It was therefore a deeply intrinsic choice she made to do this. Did her husband reciprocate in kind, I asked? She said that he had asked to but that this was something she believed God had given her for him. Perhaps then he reciprocated in other ways, but being unable to observe them in their home and to view their marriage up close created a limitation, as scholars have said of urban anthropology (Foster and Kemper, 2010). Still, while I respected her faith in the practice and its ability to restore harmony to their marital relationship, I did not quite know what to make of it.
Another challenge that presented itself in this research was whether or not to share about my divorce, a divisive topic. Sixteen women spoke of having experienced divorce or separation in their marriages. One participant shared that she had received her ministerial license after her divorce nearly 20 years before. But if she were to remarry, she said, it was unlikely she would be able to retain her credentials. I found this baffling, because she had divorced her husband after he had been unfaithful and then had tried to kill her. It seemed that circumstentially, her ordination should be protected. Similarly, another missionary whose ministry was with prostitutes and sex-trafficked women, was divorcing her missionary husband due to his domestic abuse. At the time of our interview, she faced losing her license and her ministerial fiscal support from the AG-USA.

In both the UPCI and AG, the circumstances for seeking ministerial licensure when one has been divorced are on a case-by-case basis. If the issue is due to unfaithfulness, it must have occurred on the part of the other spouse. A person seeking licensure must give a full statement of what happened and the court documents are ordered up, while witnesses are called to corroborate the testimony. Even then, licensure is not a guarantee. The UPCI recommends that a divorced minister not remarry. In the AG, the only issue for resolution that has come before the General Council more often than the issue of women’s ordination is divorce (UPCI Manual, 2014:pp.36, 53-54, 168; Clark, 2007; Blumhofer, 1993:pp.121-22).

Given these circumstances, I chose not to mention my divorce to my interviewees. Disclosing that I had left my marriage at the same time I had departed from Pentecostalism felt like too much, and by the time of my fieldwork, I had already been divorced several years. My supervisor Ruth Fitzgerald shared that ironically, she was able because of her divorce to connect with Mormon women whose lives she had studied. Surprisingly, many of the Mormon women she met had experienced the same thing. I marvelled at that. Still, perhaps this was my own barrier. Had I been brave and tried to make more of a connection on this topic, perhaps I would have been able to delve even deeper into their stories. The few to whom I revealed my story received it with empathy, especially if they too had been divorced (which was usually why I divulged in the first place). The aforementioned missionary and I shared our mutual bafflement at “who gets to stay and who has to go.” Although she had been unfairly cast adrift, she was determined to find other fiscal means to keep her ministry going.

Another serious challenge came in the form of homophobia. One UPCI-NZ woman shared with me as we sat over dinner that her lesbian colleague and the colleague’s life partner were trying to have a baby through artificial insemination. Her colleague confided in the UPCI-NZ woman that they had tried three times already, and each time her partner had become pregnant, she had miscarried. Due to the financial and emotional expense of artificial
insemination, the two women’s hopes and their finances were low, and they were becoming discouraged. The UPCI-NZ woman told me that she knew her colleague’s life partner had miscarried because she had prayed each time that it would happen. She justified her prayers for the woman’s miscarriages by declaring that it was not “God’s will” for any child to be raised in a gay relationship. She did not explicitly take credit for her prayers being “answered,” but it was clear that she felt some sort of justice was being done by both her prayers and the miscarriages. Silently, I was horrified. Hiding my revulsion and keeping my tone even, I asked this woman what her perspective was on abortion. She said with some surprise that she was against abortion. I pointed out that actively praying for the death of the foetus seemed almost an equivalent to being for abortion; what was the difference? She seemed taken aback, as though she had not quite thought about her prayers that way before (see also Brasher, 1998: pp. 138-39).

An A/G NZ interviewee asked me point blank as we sat down to order our cuppas in a coffee shop before starting our interview what my stance was on gay marriage. Though I was taken aback by the directness of her question as we had only just greeted one another, I tried gamely to answer her. I said that God is Love and that I did not believe any expression of true love is something God would be displeased with. She pinched up her face and said, “Well, I think it’s unnatural.” I simply smiled and asked her what I could get her to drink. I placed our orders and the interview began with no further homophobic references.

During an A/G NZ women’s bible study, 1 Corinthians 6:8-10 was read. Immediately after, Felicity, a member of our group who was in her early 20s, asserted, “I don’t like that verse,” speaking of verse nine. When asked why, she said, “What if people who were on that list came to Christ? Are they still on ‘the list’ or do they get taken off it?” Furthermore, she asked, did the women really believe that homosexuals would go to hell? One of the women said somewhat impatiently, “Read the Word! It says it right there.” She added, “I like One Corinthians six because it makes it so easy. It’s easy to walk with God when you know where the boundaries are.” Felicity tried to assert her point, but another woman joined the first – both in their 50s and 60s – and began quoting texts from Leviticus and Romans 1 that homosexuality is an abomination, that it is not what God would want for any person, and that anyone who practises it has been turned over to a reprobate mind and would surely go to hell. Finally, Felicity politely but firmly checked out of the conversation, “shouted down” as it were by the two older women who quoted scripture to get their point across. It was clear that Felicity had been studying this on her own, approaching the question quite cerebrally by examining scripture, turning the words over and looking underneath. In this manner, she was giving scripture its due respect. I saw that, in fact, her challengers were not giving scripture its
due by simply lifting the words off the page and taking them at face value, without studying the rich historical, socio-cultural heritage each verse was situated in. By quoting scripture in answer to Felicity’s honest questions, the older women revealed that they themselves had no depth to apply to the matter.

A UPCI-US woman who was German, living in the United States and married to an American pastor, commented in a social conversation how beautiful she had heard New Zealand is and then said, “But New Zealand is very wicked.” While her first comment on New Zealand’s beauty is one I hear quite often, her second was a definite first. In surprise, I asked her what she meant. She backtracked and said, “Maybe not the country as a whole but the political system when they passed homosexual laws.” I knew she was referring to New Zealand becoming the thirteenth country in the world to legalise gay marriage just that year, on 17 April 2013, and before that passing the Civil Union Act of 2004 which allowed gay partners the same rights as spouses. I deflected the conversation to our shared, expatriate experiences of living in foreign countries instead.

As mentioned in my Introduction chapter, because gay marriage became law in both New Zealand and the USA during the time of this research, variations of the “God’s plan for marriage is one man and one woman” variety were oft-reiterated from pulpits. In many services I attended in both countries, ministers read prepared statements about the church’s stance against gay marriage or wove these messages into their sermons. Repeatedly in interviews and social conversations, conversants volunteered their homophobic stance on gay and lesbian lifestyles and especially gay marriage. Some, like the aforementioned, were overtly homophobic, while others simply made passing references in our conversations, taking for granted that their belief in its “wrongness” was right and that I would feel the same way. I found that simply being still during interviews while keeping an open look on my face and then smoothly diverting their attention towards another theme with a well-placed question or directional statement like, “Okay, so you said earlier…” usually worked. But my frustration mounted. As faith-filled women they knew what it was like to be shut out from having full citizenship in the Pentecostal Church based on highly-politicised interpretations of scripture; men in their faith communities had been doing the same to them and their sisters for generations. Yet they exercised this same exclusion towards gay people. This is where ‘moral reasoning styles become highly politicized truth discourses’ (Fitzgerald, Legge & Park, 2015:p.2). The dangerous dichotomy heard in the oft-quoted mantra in these faith communities, “hate the sin, love the sinner,” devalues personhood. When this saying gets unpacked, it becomes far more complicated and inapplicable when the issue is a person’s embodied identity, and in essence the believer is told to “hate” while at the same time trying
to “love the way Jesus loved.” It is impossible to apply both at the same time. This was not the way Jesus loved according to my reading of the scriptures; it is a hetero-normative social construction and a god-trick (Haraway, 2004:p.88) and one that caused me considerable discomfort throughout the fieldwork.

After about a year of this I could take it no longer and confided in my thesis supervisor, Ruth Fitzgerald, who has worked with Mormons in both the United States and New Zealand and has much to offer on her own experiences in faith communities. She provided some insight as to why I was facing such homophobia, suggesting that it could be one way my interviewees were trying to place me. I was a single woman in her late thirties, travelling around two countries interviewing only women, with no husband or children in tow. It was possible that they wondered about my sexual orientation and used these comments to test the boundaries of their relationship with me. It was a point I had never even considered but I had to admit that it made sense, and I appreciated her discernment. The homophobia continued, but after that my decision to move beyond it was stronger (see also Brasher, 1998:p.202).

Finally, there were occasions in the field (or during the PhD overall) when I could not bear to introduce my project, or myself to one more stranger, or projectile to one more interview or church service. Often in New Zealand (and at times in the USA from internationals) I faced yet again someone’s anti-American sentiment. When not in the USA, I was often asked, “Where are you from?” a fraught question that is both personal and political, since what often follows is an anti-American diatribe. Indeed, given that I am an American PhD student at a university overseas, any given day could feel like a multi-layered, complicated anthropological experience in “the field.” While New Zealand became a (partial) home for me, these disturbing encounters illuminated “the other” which I already was by living abroad. Anti-American sentiment (as well as the question “where are you from?”) illuminates differences between us and creates an uneasy dichotomy between my ‘home and other places,’ making me the field others come to in order to muscle-flex and test out their hypotheses about an inept USA. As Norman writes, ‘it is a strange thing being both a field and a field worker’ (Norman, 2000:pp.133, 140; Leibing, 2007:pp.146-147).

Scholar of religious sacred rituals, Birckhead (2002:p.140), writes about the ‘tenuous fieldwork self,’ of being one self with his academic friends, another self with the southern American Holiness snake-handlers of his PhD research, many of whom he befriended, and still another self with the Australian Aborigines amongst whom he currently worked. Similarly, I too found my various selves of being an Outsider-within and former Pentecostal woman amongst the Pentecostal women of my research (some of whom I also befriended), as
well as an American expat and PhD student, were identities that polarised and overlapped in turn. In addition, I became a Quaker during this work, a spiritual journey that started before I began my PhD and an identity that my fieldwork helped solidify. It also helped to create an emergent self. Balancing my tenuous selves and sublimating one to “be” another, or taking one “off” to put “on” another required mental calisthenics, which encouraged an awareness at all times of who I was with and who to “be” with that person or group. This required me to draw from different language and knowledge sets. Maintaining balance felt like political performance art, negotiating how much to disclaim or disclose in each particular social and religious setting while remaining true to a core “self” that seemed constantly to be reframed. Yet foundational values like kindness, empathy and transparency I found could fit into any mould, and these I tried to unequivocally incorporate, though not always successfully. Each self, therefore, was made-up of ‘performative honesty.’ I returned from the field more an ex-native than ever, yet at peace with my identity as a halfie and Outsider-within. Though I studied members of a community that I once called “home,” as a researcher, I (re-)entered a world different from the one I now occupy as an expatriate academic. My work with Pentecostal women had an acute effect on my identity as an Outsider-within and a feminist. Jacobs (2002:p.99) writes that after her research with members of a community similar to that in which she was raised, she strengthened her attachment to her heritage and resonated with the sense of ‘longing for connection’ she had located in both herself and her participants. Still, she found elements of difference between them and herself, and so it was with me and my participants. When it all became too much, however, I would retreat to the space in which I was staying and immerse myself in journaling, watching a film or reading a good book. After a short time, I would usually come aright and was back ‘out there’ again (Foster and Kemper, 2010:p.13; Gmelch, 2010:p.41).

**Conclusion**

I learned much from these Pentecostal women about resilience, courage and all the forms submission can take, yet I necessarily remained outside their world (Griffith, 1997), which maintained my Outsider within status. It was impossible for me not to engage in spiritual expressions while attending church services and having conversations about spiritual gifts with my interviewees and others in the faith communities I visited. These women shared so generously their stories and the colours, the tears, the heartaches, the tensions and the triumphs of it all. While their belief systems and narratives were different or similar, they redefined themselves through their conversion stories, the enactment of submission and the spiritual gifts in their lives. They embodied submission as a strength, using it sometimes
strategically, sometimes humbly, but always in accordance with their beliefs. The women’s strength of character, their seeking for answers to life’s questions and their love for and commitment to pursuing peace, harmony and truth as they defined it, demonstrated for me all the worthy ways it is to be human. In the pages to come, I will write about the variety of embodied forms that submission and consecration takes for these women, as they pursue intimacy with God.
Chapter 3 – God-fearing and Spirit-filled: The History of Women in Pentecostalism

It is accurate to speak of ‘pentecostalisms’ within the Pentecostal movement (Johnston, 2010:p.2), spanning a variety of expressions within Catholicism and Protestantism - classical, charismatic, Trinitarian and Oneness pentecostalisms, with much class and racial diversity. The Pentecostal movement has now reached more than 520 million people and, adding nearly 20 million members annually, it boasts the highest population of religious adherents in the world after Roman Catholicism (Knowles, 2014:pp.235-36; Cartledge, 2010:pp.2-3; Johnston, 2010:p.159; Synan, 2004:p.153; 1997:pp.279-288; Cox 1995:p.xv). The AG (established 1914) and the UPCI (established 1945) are two of these denominations, and some of their members are the focus of this study. Claiming 64 million adherents, the AG is the largest Pentecostal denomination in the world. The UPCI claims more than 4 million members worldwide and is the largest Apostolic Holiness\textsuperscript{18} denomination in the world.

Pentecost has flourished where social dislocation is greatest since it provides an instant cosmological worldview and supportive social network, as well as dignity to those whom society ‘despises’: the poor and unemployed, as well as women of all class standings (Eller, 2007:pp.211-12; Qualls, 2010:p.27; Synan, 1997:pp.203-205). Douglas (1996:p.89) writes that Pentecostalism is how the societal fringes express their marginality. However, while Pentecostalism has been able to compromise and to accommodate the dominant culture, it is often in ways that have created tension and directly impacted the lives of women (Qualls, 2010:p.28), as the literature review in chapter one also noted.

In this chapter, I explore the historical position of women in both of the denominations mentioned above by giving a brief history of Pentecostalism and its tenets with specific attention to the origins of the AG and the UPCI in the United States and New Zealand. I conclude with an examination of their engagement with women’s inclusion in ministry.

A History of Pentecostalism: Situating Salvation & Authority

Pentecostalism’s strong Holiness traditions, which involve strict taboos and religious regulations, stem from John Wesley’s eighteenth-century doctrine concerning sanctification and Holiness which gave birth to the Methodist Church. Wesley’s teachings of ‘Christian

\textsuperscript{18} For definition, see Glossary.
perfection’ in the form of sanctification as a ‘second work’ of salvation, became foundational tenets of Methodist belief. Wesley was profoundly impacted by certain writers of the day but none more so than by his mother Susanna Wesley, who wrote the family devotions. Self-taught and raised in theology expressed by her father, Mrs. Wesley believed that the Holy Spirit more than the Church, was the authoritative voice by which to live one’s life. She imparted this belief to all nineteen of her children and the many believers who came to her home-based Sunday afternoon services to hear her teachings (Qualls, 2010:p.73). While John Wesley at first practiced the Pauline injunctions against ‘suffering a woman to speak,’ he eventually came to the conclusion that if ‘women’s hearts were strangely warmed by the Spirit’ to preach, then who was he to withstand God (p.75).

In the same century, Methodism found its way from Wesley’s home country of Great Britain to the fledgling American colonies. Wesley’s teachings that salvation is for every woman, man and child became part of the optimism and search for perfection that was part of the growing American consciousness in rejecting Old World religious norms (Synan, 1997:pp.9-11). It was a ‘fiery Methodism’ (p.11) that took to the frontier camp meetings and church services where people were ‘justified’ or converted and ‘sanctified’ as a second work of grace. Methodism quickly became the nation’s leading Protestant faith but eventually Wesley’s brand of Methodism came to be seen as cold and outdated. Thus was born the Holiness movement in July, 1867 at a camp meeting in Vineland, New Jersey.

The foundational tenet of the Holiness movement was that a person could be justified and sanctified at the same time, a ‘double cure’ of conversion to distinguish itself from the Methodist belief that sanctification came after justification. Along with this came doctrines which discouraged ostentatious dress, adornment for women (and in some quarters, neckties for men), dancing, card playing, theatre going, drinking, attending carnivals and a host of other lascivious ‘sins’ that were not part of the sanctified, Holiness life. Where Methodism spoke of purity, the Holiness movement spoke of power, with some adherents speaking of both purity and power (Wacker, 2003:p.2). The benefits of living a life free from avarice and sin proved to be a major draw. By 1894, lines were drawn, and many Holiness advocates and believers of the Methodist Church parted ways (Synan, 1997:pp.39-40). Into this fragmentation entered the Pentecostal movement.

In 1895, a Holiness preacher named Rev. Benjamin H. Irwin founded a denomination, ‘Fire-Baptized Holiness Church,’ that preached a third experience subsequent to justification and sanctification. Irwin called this experience the ‘baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire,’ during which recipients in his church services and camp meetings spoke in tongues and testified that their bodies literally felt as though they were burning. A future founding leader
of both the AG and UPCI, who would become the latter’s first General Superintendent, Rev. Howard A. Goss, claimed this experience at the age of 19 when he was converted under Rev. Charles F. Parham in Galena, Kansas. Parham, who was arguably the ‘Patriarch of Pentecost,’ became a mentor and spiritual father to Goss (Johnston, 2010). Irwin’s teachings and the experience itself spread across the Holiness movement; however, leaders of the latter denied this teaching, having always believed that the ‘second blessing’ of sanctification was also the ‘baptism with the Holy Spirit.’ For them, a third experience was unnecessary, and speaking in tongues was unscriptural. The doctrine and strange happenings in Irwin’s church services put off many in the Holiness movement, and in 1900, Irwin was forced to resign in disgrace as General Overseer of the denomination he had founded. His teachings, however, carried on by Charles F. Parham himself, became a foundational tenet of Pentecost. Speaking in tongues was regarded as evidence of having received the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and Pentecostals saw themselves as continuing the apostolic work from the book of Acts (Clark, 2007:pp.10-11; Blumhofer, 2006:p.394; Synan, 1997:pp.1-83, 112; Lawless, 1988b:pp.25-26).

Pentecostalism marks its official birth on January 1, 1901 (Clark, 2007:p.11; Wacker, 2003:pp.5-6; Synan, 1997:pp.83-106; Blumhofer, 1993:pp.1, 56) and notably originated in the religious experience of a woman, 29-year-old Agnes Ozman, a student at Bethel Bible College in Topeka, Kansas. Surrounded by her classmates, Principal Charles Fox Parham, laid hands on her and prayed. She raised her hands and began to speak in tongues as the Spirit gave utterance. This was the experience spoken of in Acts 2 and the group of students led by Principal Parham had been actively seeking and now finally received this experience. Glossolalia was not particularly new, with earlier recorded instances in 1831 in Regent’s Square, London when the wife of an Anglican lawyer spoke in tongues during a house meeting (Christenson, 1975:p.26) or in 1800-1801 during a revival at the University of Georgia (Synan, 1997:p.13). Reports of tongues in worship gatherings across the 1880s and 1890s were also noted but with little emphasis. What happened at Bethel Bible College was significant because speaking in tongues until this time had not been sufficiently or routinely evidenced. While until that point, some believed that tongues could be evidence, the Bethel Bible College students noted that in Acts whenever a person received a visitation of the Holy Spirit, they would speak in tongues. They concluded this was the true and biblical evidence of the Holy Spirit, and for this reason the entire school of forty students began earnestly seeking to receive ‘the gift,’ which Parham believed was necessary to meet the challenges of a new century (Synan, 1997:pp.90-92; Blumhofer, 1993:pp.50-52).

19 The practice of laying on of hands was a relatively new development and began to replace the practice of “tarrying” in prayer around a person until the Holy Spirit arrived.
Parham began to minister widely around the southwestern United States and arrived in Houston, Texas, in 1905, where he held a short-term bible school. A black Holiness preacher named William J. Seymour attended Parham’s classes and accepted Parham’s teachings about Holy Spirit baptism. When Seymour received an invitation extended by a Holiness congregation in Los Angeles in early 1906, he preached this new doctrine there. Although not well-received at first, eventually Seymour’s meetings grew in attendance and new meeting venues had to be found. The first African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church built in Los Angeles at 312 Azusa Street, had been converted to a livery stable and then fallen into disrepair. This became the Azusa Street Mission which convened its first meetings on 14 April 1906. Such an unpretentious and humble place proved suitable for the thousands of people; many races, nations, and creeds came over the next three years from around the world to hear Minister Seymour preach about the gift. Prayer meetings in which salvation experiences, speaking in tongues and divine healings occurred took place night and day.


The years between 1906 and 1914, however, were a time for establishing doctrine. The deepest schisms in the entire history of the movement took place during this time and that concerning sanctification as a ‘second work’ of grace was the largest. In the early days of Pentecost, all of the leaders and other adherents had adopted the Wesleyan view that sanctification, a ‘second blessing’ after repentance, cleansed inborn sin and prepared the new believer to receive the Holy Spirit. When the Pentecostal movement exploded onto the scene, many converted who were not from the Wesleyan Holiness tradition and took on the doctrine introduced by William H. Durham. In 1907, upon receiving the tongues experience at Azusa Street, Durham began to preach a doctrine which held that sanctification occurred at the moment of conversion. It was a ‘finished work,’ based on the finished work of Christ at Calvary. One was therefore ‘perfected’ at conversion. Wesley, on the other hand, had preached that because of a ‘residue of sin’ in the believer, sanctification was necessary to cleanse after the initial justification. This doctrine proved polarising and divided the Pentecostal movement into two camps. Those who followed the finished work theory said that sanctification had no scriptural basis, while those from the Holiness movement charged that Durham was attacking their doctrinal foundations. Still others, like the Church of God in Christ (COGIC, established 1895), a Holiness denomination that became the largest black Pentecostal denomination in the world, simply added the tongues experience to sanctification and created a three-step process of salvation rather than two (Johnston, 2010:pp.92-97; Synan,
Out of this doctrinal divide came a call for a unified (and unifying) organisation to provide a denominational home for the independent and unorganised churches around the country that held to the finished work theory. Thus was born the Assemblies of God (AG). Led by Eudorus N. Bell, Howard A. Goss, Daniel Opperman and others in Hot Springs, Arkansas, in April, 1914, the AG separated themselves from their Wesleyan forebears and created the first formalised doctrinal division in the Pentecostal movement (Johnston, 2010:pp.109-12; Fudge, 2003:pp.58-59; Synan, 1997:pp.153-56; Blumhofer, 1993:pp.113-24; Anderson, 1979:pp.167-68; Hollenweger 1972:pp.29-43).

The doctrinal divide within the AG which eventually gave rise to the UPCI came in 1913 in the form of the ‘New Issue’ or ‘Jesus’ Name’ revelation, that a person should be baptised in Jesus’ name, following the way the apostles baptised in the book of Acts, rather than in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit (Johnston, 2010:pp.98-101, 113-20; Synan, 1997:pp.156-57; Blumhofer, 1993:pp.127-35; Anderson, 1979:pp.176-77; Hollenweger, 1972:pp.31-32). Until that time, Parham and others had baptised with the formula, ‘in the name of Jesus, into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost’ (Fudge, 2003:p.129). Some declared, however, that the Trinity was a Catholic construction by the Nicene Council and that there was only one personality in the Godhead, namely, Jesus Christ the Son, while the Father and the Holy Spirit were merely titles. Conversely, Trinitarians believed the Trinity was three distinct entities in the Godhead and accordingly, they baptised in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.20 According to Oneness theology, the only way to be saved was to repent of one’s sins, to be baptised in Jesus’ name with the words, ‘in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ’ spoken over, as was done in the first century Church according to the book of Acts. It was also necessary to speak in tongues. Without this salvation experience composed of three essential elements, an adherent could not confidently claim salvation (Fudge, 2003:p.58; Anderson, 1979:p.180). Frank J. Ewart, Howard A. Goss and Andrew D. Urshan had been with William Durham and were among the first ministers to preach the new Oneness doctrine. All were eventually founders of the UPCI, thus establishing Durham as the ‘original theologian’ of the Pentecostal movement (Hollenweger, 1972:p.25),

---

20 Oneness churches followed Acts 2:38-39 while Trinitarians claimed the scripture of Matthew 28:19, also known as the ‘Great Commission.’ However, to Oneness adherents, because “Father, Son and Holy Spirit” are all “titles” of the one God which is Jesus, Acts 2:38 is considered the “fulfilment” of Matthew 28:19 (Fudge, 2003:pp.126-135; Anderson, 1979:pp.180-182).
which covers both Trinitarians and Unitarians. The AG as Trinitarian accepted the ‘two-stage’ doctrine, claiming that the tongues experience, although ‘initial evidence’ of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, is not essential for salvation (Blumhofer, 1993:pp.105, 135-37; Hollenweger, 1972:pp.32-33, 71). Each side found the other’s doctrine heretical; thus, the lines were drawn and as this controversy swept the AG within its first year, the 1915 and 1916 General Councils held in St. Louis, Missouri, were called to settle the matter. Eventually, the AG established a strongly Trinitarian ‘Statement of Fundamental Truths’ which ‘declared the propriety of calling the Godhead a ‘trinity or as one Being of three persons’’ (Synan, 1997:p.160; Poloma, 1989:p.39). This stance set the belief for much of the Pentecostal movement, and just one-fifth of all Pentecostals today are Oneness or Unitarian, mostly finished work persuasion and, at the time of the schism, focused mainly in the urban American Midwest (Synan, 1997:p.160; Anderson, 1979:pp.185-88). Authors agree that internal and external criticisms and opposition brought growth as Spirit-filled Oneness believers grew in number, and controversy strengthened the Pentecostal movement overall, thus helping it to thrive (Synan, 1997; Lawless, 1988b; Anderson, 1979).

The Oneness camp, consisting of more than 150 ordained ministers and their families, left the AG and in 1917 merged into the already existing Pentecostal Assemblies of the World (PAW). Eventually they were led by Garfield T. Haywood, who was once the AG’s pre-eminent black pastor. The PAW was almost equally bi-racial, white and black, until 1924 when the white ministers, influenced by Jim Crow laws, came to believe that blacks and whites could not evangelise the world together and segregated themselves. Their AG brethren, who were ordained in the African-American COGIC from 1895 under Bishop Charles Harrison Mason, also segregated themselves when they established the AG in 1914. Those who departed the PAW organised into the Pentecostal Ministerial Alliance (PMA), and then the Pentecostal Church, Incorporated (PCI). In September, 1945 a General Conference in St. Louis, Missouri, was convened to merge the PCI with the Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ (PAJC, established 1931), to form the United Pentecostal Church (‘International’ was added to the name in 1972). Rev. Howard A. Goss was elected the first General Superintendent, and the merger created what would become the largest leading Apostolic Holiness movement and Oneness denomination in the world (Manual, 2014:p.181; Johnston, 2010:pp.132-138; Fudge, 2003:pp.60-74; Synan, 1997:pp.156-61).

This meant that both the AG and the UPCI were born out of doctrinal and racial schisms. These historical and racial divides have served to keep white and black Pentecostals separated, though from 1906 at Azusa Street until 1924, they were interracial. Frank
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21 For definition of the term “Unitarian”, see Glossary.
Bartelman, a future AG minister and eyewitness at Azusa Street and chronicler of those events, famously stated of whites and blacks worshipping together at the Azusa Street Mission during the time of Jim Crow laws, ‘The color line was washed away in the blood’ (Bartleman, 1980:p.54). Racial segregation, however, has continued to characterise Pentecostalism globally. It occurs in New Zealand as well between Māori, Pākehā and Samoan (Knowles, 2014; Moetara, 2012; Carew & Troughton, 2012; Carew, 2009; Lineham, 2011). While doctrinal and racial divides are not a focus of this research, they are an important, foundational part of the movement’s history (Johnston, 2010; Alexander, 2005; Knowles, 2000; Synan, 1997:pp.156-86; Lawless, 1988b:pp.24-34; Anderson, 1979:pp.176-94; Hollenweger, 1972:pp.31-32).

**Pentecostalism in New Zealand**

**The A/G NZ**

In 1922, former plumber and Yorkshire evangelist and missionary Smith Wigglesworth arrived in Wellington, bringing with him the modern-day Pentecostal message. With fiery boldness he demonstrated the gifts of tongues and interpretation as he preached. Thousands came, and many were healed while many more were given the gift of tongues. Wigglesworth’s crusades from 1922 to 1924 led him to Christchurch, Dunedin, and Auckland with the same results, and Pentecostalism firmly took root in New Zealand, directly birthing the AG there in 1927 (Clark, 2007:pp.15-19).

Wigglesworth departed from New Zealand without appointing any leaders to head the new Pentecostal movement, save for ordaining one man. Therefore, leadership for the new movement came out of the ad hoc committee assembled to organise his campaigns, and on 2 March 1923, the Wellington City Mission was established. It was later renamed the New Zealand Evangelical Mission, and officially it became the first Pentecostal church in New Zealand. The Mission began networking with missions in other cities around the country in order to establish and spread the Pentecostal message, and took on the task of setting an agreed set of standards for ministers in the movement. This was vital since members came from various faiths including Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Salvation Army, Congregational, Baptist and Open Brethren, as well as others who had no church affiliation at all (Knowles, 2014:pp.24-25; Clark, 2007:pp.21-22).

On 5 and 6 November 1924, the first New Zealand-wide conference was held to determine how the new movement would be governed, and the constitution for the Assemblies of God in the United States, with the help of Rev. A.C. Valdez from the USA-
AG, was extensively re-drafted to fit the New Zealand context. A.C. Valdez and his parents, especially his mother Suzie Valdez, were filled with the Holy Spirit at the Azusa Street Revival in 1906, which launched their evangelistic ministries. When he and his mother both received the call from God instantaneously several years later that A.C. was meant to go to Sunshine, Australia, the A/G NZ became a direct part of the Azusa Street lineage when A.C. made his way to New Zealand from Australia and helped to establish the AG there (Clark, 2007:pp.24-25; Alexander 2005:pp.98-103). Five of the twenty-six delegates to the November conference were women and at a second conference held six weeks later on 27 December 1924, twenty-six of the sixty-one delegates were women (Lineham, 2011:pp.94-95). Elders and trustees were appointed, an official Statement of Faith was endorsed, and individuals were ordained. The name was also changed from the New Zealand Evangelical Mission to the Pentecostal Church of New Zealand. The new movement experienced a split, however, over governance. Finally, on 29 March 1927, New Zealand Pentecostal leaders from around the country formally inaugurated the Assemblies of God in New Zealand (Knowles, 2014:pp.19-35; Clark, 2007:pp.20-24, 31-33).

The A/G NZ has seen several phases since its inception in 1927. Tensions over autocratic governance of the Pentecostal Church of New Zealand led to schisms, and several members seceded to AG churches. The A/G NZ then and now allowed its churches autonomy to govern locally while having association with a like-minded national group. For its part, the AG tried to adapt and create a New Zealand mode of governing from the American governance style it inherited and struggled in the early years. By the 1930s, the AG was lamenting its loss of zeal and power which had not been recaptured since the early days of Wigglesworth and Valdez who had by then both departed. The Apostolic Church movement, which had emerged from the 1904 Welsh Revival, arrived in New Zealand from Great Britain in the 1930s. It brought a well-established doctrine, order and discipline that helped to satisfy hunger for the ‘power of Pentecost’ that the AG was still trying to establish. Anyone could join the Apostolic Church, and many did, becoming ordained as apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers. This was a blow to the AG who declined in membership, while the Apostolic Church emerged as the leading Pentecostal denomination in New Zealand for more than 35 years. The situation caused divisiveness and bitter mistrust (Knowles, 2014:pp.52-57; Clark, 2007:pp.49-51).

The Charismatic Movement of the 1960s, however, challenged these deep divisions, and eventually they were replaced with fellowship and mutual acceptance. On both sides of the Pacific, Pentecostals found it difficult to accept that Roman Catholics and members of other denominations could speak in tongues but not leave their churches to attend Pentecostal
ones as Pentecostals had been doing since the beginning of the twentieth century.
‘Charismatics’ stayed in their churches to bring revival and new life to them, and the
Charismatic doctrine of the ‘fullness of the Spirit’ was not in keeping with the staid standards
of being doctrinally correct and living Holiness, all of which seemed heretical to Pentecostals.
In New Zealand, the Charismatic movement revolutionized the Pentecostal movement by
bringing warmth and understanding to places of scorn and mistrust. Gaining momentum by
the end of the 1960s, people began flocking to Pentecostal churches. The A/G NZ and its
leadership saw these unprecedented changes as opportunities to break out of their marginal
status, drawing on the evangelistic outlook of their leaders, the relative youth of many A/G
NZ ministers and their lack of commitment to traditions, mistakes and earlier struggles. In the
next 15 years they spread out in all directions and touched every level of society to make the
AG the largest Pentecostal denomination in New Zealand (Knowles, 2014:pp.114-28, 161-64;
comprise approximately 55 percent of the total and according to the Pew Research Forum
(2006), Pentecostal women in the USA comprise 56 percent of total Pentecostals. Below are
numbers taken from the New Zealand census of those who identify as Pentecostal and as
members of the A/G NZ (numbers taken from Knowles, 2014:pp.251-65; New Zealand
Census):

| Table 2. Census Records of Pentecostals in New Zealand and in the A/G NZ |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------|-----------|
|                                  | (40,572 are female) |                   |             |

In the more than 250 churches affiliated with the A/G NZ as of 2003, the ratio of
credentialed ministers to church members is 1:51 (Clark, 2007:p.255), but the movement’s
growth has slowed greatly since the 1960s. Authors agree that this is caused by the changing
political climate towards secularisation in New Zealand and the increasing age of the
constituency. Overall church attendance has plummeted in New Zealand since the 1960s, and
Pentecostals grieve over laws passed in Parliament that have ‘eroded traditional family values
and morals’ (Clark, 2007:p.255), such as partial access to legalised abortion, the legalisation
of prostitution and of gay marriage. The Pentecostal movement has always claimed to be pre-
millennial in preparation for Christ’s return and holds that in the last days there will be an
increase of ‘evil.’ These policy trends confirm not only the rise of secularisation but also Pentecostal eschatology.

Other reasons for declining church attendance in New Zealand include a worldwide movement of ‘believing, but not belonging,’ holding a belief without attending a concomitant faith institution; the rise of ‘cottage Christianity,’ or the house church movement, and conversely, the rise of mega-churches in city centres responsible for the closure of other smaller churches (Knowles, 2014:pp.154-57; Clark, 2007:pp.253-55). Other reasons include New Zealand’s strong, hypermasculine rugby culture and the internet’s influence on the island country which not only displaces community but provides exposure to alternative spiritual paths (Vaccarino, Kavan & Gendall, 2011:pp.87-88). Furthermore, New Zealand has one of the highest global rates of ‘no religion;’ approximately 35 percent of the population identifies as ‘religion-less,’ which has increased from 29 percent of participants surveyed in 1991 to 40 percent in 2008. Nevertheless, in the 2006 census, nearly 50 percent of New Zealanders self-identified as ‘Christian.’ There is evidence, scholars write, that New Zealand is experiencing a revolution of spirituality without central authority, which probably means that those who tick ‘no religion’ on the census are likely to mean, ‘no organised religion’ (2011:p.93). Many Pentecostals in New Zealand possibly identify themselves as ‘Christians not further defined,’ which means ‘Christian but with no denomination specified’ (2013 New Zealand Census; Lineham, 2006:p.11).

**UPCI-NZ**

In 1969, the first UPCI missionaries, Loretta and Lloyd Moreau, landed in Auckland and were assisted in the 1970s by missionary couple Rev. and Sister Clark, who started a church in Wellington. When Rev. Robert and Sister Judy Addington arrived in 1986, the UPCI-NZ already had a firm foothold in the world UPCI movement. The Addingtons originally pastored a UPCI church in Muscatine, Iowa, ironically, the birthplace of Charles Fox Parham. Indirectly, it can therefore be argued that they too brought the lineage of Azusa Street to New Zealand. They took over the work based at Christchurch and established a church there and others in the North Island. However, after nearly ten years during which Rev. Addington’s responsibilities as General Superintendent took him to Auckland and around the North Island at least twice a month, they found it easier to relocate to Hamilton. This focused the UPCI largely in the North Island where there were ten growing and vibrant churches. The UPCI-NZ is seemingly the only Unitarian or ‘Jesus Only’ Pentecostal group
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22 Because there are no books specifically about the UPCI/NZ and only occasional brief mentions in print, this section is created from conversations with the UPCI leadership unless otherwise indicated.
out of more than 20 active Pentecostal denominations in New Zealand (Knowles 2014:pp.122, 253, 263-265).

The UPCI Foreign Missions Division keeps an account of the UPCI-NZ population in terms of numbers and licensed ministers, but not in terms of a gender break-down.23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. (Some) Denominational Numbers for the UPCI-NZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1995, the UPCI-NZ suffered a split, or “parting,” as one leader prefers to call it, when Judy and Robert Addington were given an ultimatum by Auckland UPCI Pastor Ringataki Heihei who is also a Māori chief. There was discord concerning the (white) American missionaries’ methods which were seen to be not in keeping with Māori ways. Rev. Heihei, with the backing of many of the UPCI-NZ Māori Pentecostals which were numerous in number, told the Addingtons just before they were to return to the United States on deputation24 that he was leaving the UPCI-NZ and taking most of the Māori Pentecostals with him. They did so and established the UPC-NZ. This was a massive blow to the work, and the Addingtons saw it as a coup d’état. They returned to New Zealand two years later after their deputation in North America was complete and rebuilt the work. The UPCI-NZ is now largely Pākehā, with some Māori and Asians, while the UPC is mostly Māori, with other Pacific Islanders and Africans.

Through the years there was rancour between the two factions and their leaders. Finally, in 2009, Rev. Robert Rodenbush, Regional Director of the work in Europe and the Middle East for the UPCI, came to New Zealand and met with leaders Rev. Wayne Goodare and Rev. Robert Addington, giving them what he believed was a “word from the Lord.” He told them that it was time to rebuild and that the UPC-NZ and UPCI-NZ needed to lay aside the rancour and misdeeds of the past and come together in unity. In 2013, the two denominations held a combined Christmas General Conference, with the featured speaker being the General Superintendent of the UPCI in North America, Rev. David K. Bernard.

On 15 June and 6 July 2013, respectively, I attended planning meetings for the end-of-the-year conference in Auckland. These were the third and fourth meetings in a series, with 50-60 ministers and laypeople present of which more than 60 percent were women, all of
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23 Multiple emails were sent to the UPCI Foreign Missions Division, as well as the UPCI-NZ leaders to obtain the latest numbers but no replies were received.
24 For definition, see Glossary.
whom contributed their skills and knowledge to planning the conference in acknowledgement of the bridge-building happening between them. I detected no undercurrent of rancour. Instead, I sensed good-hearted intention and unity in the work to bring this conference to pass. I observed the ways members worked together, UPC-NZ and UPCI-NZ, Pākehā, Māori and Pacific Islander, and all were supportive of one another. It seemed an indication of the healing that the prophetic word had brought.

Rev. Wayne Goodare told me there was no Executive Board or constitutional governance put in place for the UPCI-NZ. Unlike the A/G NZ, which had redrafted the AG-USA constitution and adapted it from the beginning and thus nationalised the denomination, the UPCI-NZ used the infrastructure put in place by the UPCI Foreign Missions Division, headquartered in St. Louis, Missouri. Rev. Goodare therefore drafted an ordinance to implement a New Zealand-based Executive Board that included himself, Rev. Addington, and three other (male) ministers. The ordinance was passed in 2004. Rev. Goodare then began to write a training program to identify and train new leadership to step in once the Addingtons retire by 2018. In addition, this training program was created with a vision of nationalising the UPCI work in the future. To be nationalised, according to Rev. Goodare, a denomination must be three things: self-governing, self-perpetuating, and self-funding.

I now turn in the next section to women’s enactment of their giftings and callings in Pentecostalism generally and the AG and UPCI, specifically.

The History of Women’s Ministry in the AG and UPCI: Situating the Spiritual Gifts

AG and UPCI members share a historical legacy and lineage through the persons of Howard A. Goss and Daniel Opperman, leaders at the founding of each denomination. From the beginning, women made a strong contribution to Pentecost, such as Agnes Ozman and the women of Azusa Street (Alexander, 2005). It was Pastor Lucy Farrow who introduced William J. Seymour to the doctrine of speaking in tongues and to Charles Fox Parham; Pastor Julia Hutchins invited him to Los Angeles from Farrow’s church in Houston and another woman, Neely Terry, suggested that invitation (2005:p.181; Cox, 1995:p.50). Women were the first to receive their ‘Pentecost,’ the gift of speaking in tongues in the early days of the Azusa Street Revival and worked side by side with Seymour, including his wife Jennie Owens Seymour, Lucy Leatherman and Rachel Sizelove, the latter two of whose ministerial efforts contributed to the founding of the AG. Lucy Farrow, fresh from Azusa Street, conducted a revival in Texas in August 1906 and laid hands on the future AG and UPCI founder, Howard A. Goss, who immediately received his Pentecost, speaking in other tongues
Yet, Pentecostalism (particularly in its present-day format) is still patriarchal. As a result, from the beginning women have navigated the patriarchy while claiming their own agency. While gender and racial distinctions prevail, there is usually equality in worship and prophecy as well as faith healing, a centre point of Pentecost from the beginning. Women often dominate Pentecostalism’s energetic services and have spirit-filled encounters with the Holy Ghost through speaking in tongues and ‘falling-out’ experiences, long elaborate testimonies, anointed and talented singing, while supporting the minister who brings the sermon. Women are also sometimes given the opportunity to exercise pastoral leadership (Lawless, 1993a:pp.41-42; 1993b; 1988a). As a denomination, the UPCI is more closed than the AG, with accordingly a smaller amount of published literature, mostly with a focus on soteriology (Johnston, 2010; Fudge, 2003; French, 1999), although Lawless (1988b; 1983) has researched UPCI-USA women’s social and spiritual experiences. The AG on the other hand has had a relatively large amount written about it, with several scholars focusing on women’s experiences (Payne, 2015; Oleson, 2011; Qualls, 2010; Alexander, 2006; Blumhofer, 1993:pp.120-22, 164-79; Benvenuti, 1995; Johns, 1993; Lawless, 1988a).

Pentecostalism has from the beginning been situated in a pre-millennialist framework that Christ’s return is imminent, and thus the Pentecostal outpouring is given for the last days as in Joel 2:28-29 and Acts 2:16-18. These passages of scripture state clearly that women shall prophesy and that anyone operating under the auspices of the Holy Spirit can speak in the assembly. These beliefs provide agency for women, and therefore they cannot be silenced in the Spirit. Anyone who speaks, be they woman, man or child, is received as having a word from God (Wacker, 2003:p.104; Synan, 1997:pp.190-91; Benvenuti, 1995:p.231; Lawless, 1988b). However, conservative social conventions prevail that may restrict women’s ability to speak and perform in ministry, even though patriarchal ways are overruled by scripture (Chaves, 1997:pp.91-101; Blumhofer, 1993:p.121). This over-ruling is seen in both the Old and New Testaments and by scores of contemporary women, some of whom are represented in this thesis.

As previously mentioned in the Introduction chapter, one very important aspect of the Pentecostal lifeworld is that of the call. The Greek word kaleo means to call and is found in the New Testament, especially in the books of Luke and Acts. Paul writes that at the moment of justification (conversion) and sanctification, God calls believers into service and implores them to walk in a way worthy of their calling into a specific life vocation with assignments

26 Romans 1:5-7; Romans 8:28; I Corinthians 1:26.
given by God.\textsuperscript{27} Only God can make a person worthy of their calling, and in Ephesians 4:11 certain aspects of leadership are laid out.\textsuperscript{28} The concept of call is used in the Old and New Testaments about 700 times (Oleson, 2011:p.19). Paul addresses specific greetings to fellow laborers Phoebe, Junia, Syntyche and to Priscilla in the Early Church, among other women.\textsuperscript{29}

In the Old Testament Deborah rose to her vocation as a judge and prophet of Israel, Esther as a queen who saved the Jewish people, Huldah a minister and prophet and Miriam, sister of Moses and leader of Israel’s women.\textsuperscript{30} The call and how one lives in response to it varies according to the individual (Payne, 2015; Oleson, 2011:pp.19-43; Gill and Cavaness, 2004).

In fact, in the UPCI the concept of ‘calling’ to ministry is life-defining, as the UPCI considers ministry to be the highest office on earth (Manual, 2014:p.53). For Maria Woodworth-Etter, who began to plant churches in the 1880s at the age of 36, the call was paramount. Having left her husband after praying in vain for his support of her ministry, and having searched the scriptures for women whom God used in leadership, Woodworth-Etter became an evangelist, pastor, faith healer and author in a ministry that lasted more than forty years. A founding member of the AG, Woodworth-Etter concluded that, by the same logic that first century Church leaders realised that Gentiles also could become Christians, so too could women minister. In her autobiography, she asks how a woman can answer the call on her life without moving forward under the aegis of her call in obedience to God, and how can a woman (or others) doubt her calling when God confirms it with miraculous power as her ministry clearly demonstrates? Woodworth-Etter concludes that the church ought not make it difficult or stand in the way of women being obedient to God (Gill & Cavaness, 2004:pp.97-98). Put another way, Benvenuti (1995:p.235) writes that it is vital for women to know that the validity of their call and foundation of their ministry rests in scripture rather than ‘in spite of it.’

To shore up a person’s call, at conversion the believer receives spiritual gifts to strengthen and aid one in fulfilling it. From the early days of Pentecostalism, adherents’ initiation and acceptance into the faith community came through manifestation of their spiritual giftings as bestowed on them by God (Blumhofer, 1993:p.12).\textsuperscript{31} The giftings are given only to Christians and are given for the edification of the faith community in care of
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\textsuperscript{27} Ephesians 4:1.

\textsuperscript{28} Ephesians 4:11.

\textsuperscript{29} Paul’s greetings to women can be located in Romans 16:1; Romans 16:3-5; Romans 16:7; Philippians 4:2-3; Acts 18:2, 18, 26.

\textsuperscript{30} In the Old Testament, the story of Judge Deborah is located in Judges 4-5, the story of Queen Esther in the Book of the same name, Prophetess Huldah is told in II Kings 22:14 and II Chronicles 34:22 and prophetess Miriam is told in Micah 6:4, Exodus 15:20-21, Numbers 12, 20:1, 26:59, Deuteronomy 24:9, I Chronicles 6:3. For a rich discussion about Deborah and the way early AG minister Maria Woodworth-Etter claimed her as a framework and imagery for her own ministry, see Payne 2015:41-50.

\textsuperscript{31} The Book of Acts, Romans 11:29, Romans 12:3-8; I Corinthians 7, 12, 13 & 14; Ephesians 3 & 4:4-16, I Peter 4, just to name a few, are scriptures that underscore the spiritual gifts.
members for one another. William J. Seymour and other early Pentecostal leaders taught that the spiritual gifts resided in the Holy Spirit and when the Spirit dwelled within the human heart, the gifts were then resident there as well (Alexander, 2006:p.79). Only those who have the Spirit can claim the authority of the gifts. For instance, according to Christian scholar and author Wagner (1994:pp.69-70), intercessors often pray more frequently and longer than others do for the personal enjoyment they receive from prayer. They will often see more dramatic results from their prayers, hearing from God more frequently and accurately than others. Furthermore, he writes, in studies conducted on this subject, eight out of ten intercessors are women.

Of how many gifts a person may receive, Wagner writes that many Christians have multiple gifts, what he calls a ‘gift-mix’ (1994:p.31). Love undergirds the gifts and placement of the ‘Love Chapter,’ I Corinthians 13 between I Corinthians 12 and 14, suggests that love has priority over the spiritual gifts and is necessary in their exercise (Bernard, 2012a:p.89). Wagner (1994:p.32) writes that, according to I Corinthians 12:7, where Paul writes that the gifts are distributed to ‘each one for the profit of all,’ in this context, ‘each one’ refers to women as well as men. Bernard (2012a:p.219), the General Superintendent of the UPCI in North America, agrees and writes that in corporate worship, each member’s responsibility is to the scriptural guidelines, the Holy Spirit’s direction and that of the pastor or worship leader. According to I Corinthians 12:13 and Galatians 3:28, by one Spirit are individuals baptised, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, class or creed and in Joel 2:28-29, both sons and daughters prophesy. From these scriptures, we may therefore understand that no one gender is above another in terms of embodying and moving under the influence of the gifts. There is room for everyone according to the Apostle Paul, who wrote, ‘For in fact, the body is not one member but many.’

Due to the emphasis on calling and the spiritual gifts, by the mid-twentieth century, Pentecostalism had more women ministers than any other branch or denomination of Christianity (Knowles, 2014). However, it would be a mistake to believe that equality is the rule. For instance, as of 2014, the AG-USA had 8,451 credentialed women ministers, representing 22.9 percent of the AG’s 36,884 credentialed ministers overall (AG Statistics USA, 2014a, 2014b). After nearly eighty years of ordaining women, however, in 2014, only approximately 600 senior women pastors were numbered among the 12,849 AG-USA churches (4.7 percent) (Strang, 2014). Similarly, at the UPCI’s inception in 1945, approximately 29 percent of ordained ministers were women (Bernard, 2012b:p.6). Yet, in
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33 I Corinthians 12:14.
2009, out of 9,002 licensed UPCI-USA ministers, only 301 (3.3 percent) were women (Hawks, 2009).  

Blumhofer (1993:pp.3, 121-122, 164-179) writes that from the beginning, Assemblies’ leaders took issue with women preaching since their interpretation forbade women to instruct men. Believing that Galatians 3:28 and its attendant theme that in Christ ‘there is neither male nor female’ did not apply to ministry, male leaders preferred I Timothy 2:12 as a guiding framework that women were under subjection and must not usurp men’s authority. Still, they decided that prophesying was gender-neutral, because it did not involve the intellect but consisted of a person speaking under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit. Outside the pulpit, women filled a host of positions including teaching, editing, evangelising and administering, all of which were considered ‘long-established, appropriate women’s spheres’ (p.173). Pentecostals were prolific writers and published periodicals for evangelism and education, as well as for indoctrination, healings and visitations of the Holy Spirit in revival services as they happened, and notified readers of upcoming revivals. Print media was an excellent way to unite believers in various geographical regions (Alexander, 2006:pp.70-72). Published periodicals provided women opportunities as editors and contributors but could also undermine their ability to minister. The former Southern Baptist Eudorus N. Bell and AG chairman firmly believed that God did not want to bother women with the burdensome responsibilities of leadership. Instead, the right person every time for church leadership was a man, since God especially designed the ministry for masculine shoulders. Bell often wrote in the Assemblies of God magazine, the Pentecostal Evangel his theological beliefs concerning the restrictions on women, who could become licensed as evangelists but not as pastors. Opponents of women preachers maintained that they were not belittling women. Bell’s brand of benevolent sexism, buttressed by public rhetoric urging female submission, elevated Christianity’s masculine attributes and shaped the AG’s theology concerning women in ministry (Payne, 2015:pp.19-37; Qualls, 2010; Blumhofer, 2006:p.402).

In April, 1914, the AG’s founders were a group of women and men who represented as many as twenty US states and other countries. While it is unclear how many actually attended, the extant list has the signatures of 110 ministers, 22 of whom were women (Qualls, 2010:p.150). Yet the first order of business, after electing a chair (Eudorus N. Bell) and secretary (J. Roswell Flower), was to restrict voting rights to men (Blumhofer, 1993:p.118). Pentecostalism held that anyone could speak under the influence of the Holy Spirit, but by
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34 Emails requesting information on updated minister and pastoral statistics according to gender in the UPCI were not responded to.
35 Scriptures often used to support this include I Timothy 2:11-14; 3:1-7; I Corinthians 11:3, 14:34, Ephesians 5:22-23, Titus 1:6-9.
immediately excluding women the men showed a precedent-setting ambivalence concerning the future of women’s involvement and the recognition of men’s authority (Qualls, 2010:p.150; Poloma 1989:pp.106-09). After some deliberation, the men voted that women should be in ministry under the watchful eye of male ministers. They also extended licensure to female evangelists and missionaries but precluded women from the pastorate and from any administrative positions which put them in authority over men. Women were not independent leaders, Bell contended, and were relegated to the station of being men’s helpers. Even though licensed, they were disallowed performing baptisms, marriages and burials unless there was no man present to do the job. There is no evidence in the existing records of any dissenting views presented by the women (Blumhofer, 1993:pp.120-21; Poloma, 1989:pp.106-08). A second meeting of the General Council in November, 1914, was attended by more than 500 people. The 150 mature women believers and credential holders present were given formal recognition as advisory members but were still not allowed to vote. For the next six years, although some women gave opening addresses and were elected to Boards during General Council meetings, they were disallowed voting privileges and were recorded as auxiliary members only - when recorded at all - until 1920 (Qualls, 2010:p.169). The year US women received suffrage under the 19th Amendment, the AG General Council granted them full voting privileges. The women’s silence in the recorded minutes was quite likely a reflection of their position in the dominant society where they were also not allowed the vote. This is in keeping with other scholars who have pointed out that, as discussed in the Introduction, Pentecostals are products of their environment (Maddox, 2013; Ellis, 2012; Aune, 2006). Even so, numerous women evangelised, pioneered churches and headed to the mission field, taking God’s call as their authority rather than any status (not) bestowed by their organisation (Qualls, 2010:p.159; Alexander, 2005).

The 1935 US Assemblies of God Constitution and Bylaws gave women full ordination, though that has been re-interpreted over time. Also in 1935 it was decided that AG-USA women age 25 or older who have a developed and acceptable ministry of the Word may be ordained as evangelists and missionaries. Men, however, do not have these restrictions placed on them and may become preachers at any age since their acceptable ministry is presumed (Blumhofer, 2006:p.403; 1993:p.174). There is an assumption that Pentecostal women’s callings, regardless of the denomination, should be channelled through the social expectations of both wifehood and mothering as well as biblical injunctions (Blumhofer, 1993:pp.173-75). Both Butler (2007:pp.50-52) and Blumhofer (1993:pp.121-22) write of Pentecostal women who contributed greatly to both the COGIC and AG from the beginning, pioneering churches which grew from Bible studies in homes or from tent revivals
and storefront churches, situations where women were much involved in public ministry. Women pastors led struggling congregations who could not afford a male pastor and relied on men only in certain circumstances.

Qualls (2010:p.33) writes that the role of women in the AG rests at the crux between what is possible and what is acceptable. This tension is behind the reasons why fewer women seek ordination. AG minister and administrator Oleson (2011:pp.160-61) discovered in her study that AG women report few places to serve as associate or senior pastors. During the ordination process, young women are often interviewed by boards of elderly men which contributes to a broad cultural and generational disconnect. Some women reported little access to training due to financial constraints, and Oleson calls for church districts to support them. Women also reported a climate of anti-intellectualism which blocks them from seeking ordination, as well as a patriarchal, rather than egalitarian approach to leadership. Accordingly, many young women do not see a place for themselves in the leadership matrix.

The A/G NZ has had a long and considered history with the ordination and work of women (Clark, 2007:p.106). In 1962, the AG General Council voted that women, usually only the wives of pastors, would receive Licenses to Preach rather than credentials as ordained ministers. This was a change from the A/G NZ’s original practice of ordaining women. Given that the women’s movement was underway and women were taking leadership which men traditionally had held, this conservative decree was highly controversial and certainly a step backward. Chaves (1997:pp.79-82) writes that while conflicts over women’s ordination may happen with or without a women’s movement, when such conflicts erupt within the context of the latter, they can indeed be seen as conflicts about the principle of gender equality. Still, the farther away from the women’s movement a denomination is, the less likely it is that women’s ordination is understood in terms of gender equality, although it is still the underlying premise. Poloma (1995:p.247) calls this a disparity between the ideal and the real. Ideally, she writes, there would be equal gender roles but the reality is much more complicated. Nadar (2004:pp.360-364) writes that locating the emancipation of women in scripture calls for a holistic understanding of the Spirit and how the Spirit ‘reads’ scripture. If as suggested by John 10:10, women too are called into ‘fullness of life,’ when denied this fullness in ministry, the question must be asked if the church embraces a spirituality for fullness of life or is it one which denies the full humanity of women. This stance taken by the A/G NZ proved unfulfilling for many highly qualified women who had callings on their lives to be ordained ministers and who wished to have access to the fullness of ministry that licensing would bring them. The A/G NZ held this limiting position on women preachers until the 1980s. There was however an allowance made at the 1971 General Council meeting held
at Lower Hutt, which affirmed women’s rights to ordination, albeit not unanimously and with limitations. The Council endorsed the statement in the AG Constitution under the section entitled ‘Rights and Offices of Women’ that read, ‘we recognise their God-given right to be ordained, not as elders, but as evangelists after being duly approved according to the Scriptures, and that they serve as Pastors’ Assistants, Missionaries or as Evangelists.’ The decision was to issue ‘a special Women’s Credential for approved and qualified women ‘within the limits of the Constitution’’ (Clark, 2007:p.136). There was also discussion concerning the language of ‘Pastors’ Assistants’ since the original recommendation held the reference of ‘Assistant Pastors.’ In this regard, however, the conservatives won out and the language was switched to ‘Pastors’ Assistants,’ the lesser responsibility- and status-bearing of the two.

Clark (2007:p.169) writes that in 1977, ‘Reference to the ministry of women was omitted from the revised constitution,’ a statement which seems to suggest complete erasure of women from the highest document in the A/G NZ. This omission was challenged by Pastor Claire Chapman who led a small congregation in Tauranga and later in Taupo, and continued to raise the matter of full ordination for women into the 1980s. However, her requests were repeatedly declined on the grounds that concessions had been made for women to be assistants to pastors (p.170). At the 1979 General Council, there was much debate, with those in favour arguing that the Assemblies of God in Australia, Great Britain, and the United States had all granted AG women full ordination as ministers of the gospel. They argued that Christianity should not treat its women members as second class citizens even if other world religions did so. Therefore, the criteria for appointing ministers should be the same for both women and men. Those who voted in favour were, however, outvoted by the wide margin of 78 to 16 (p.174).

During the years in between meetings, Claire Chapman inundated her Executive Council with requests for ordination not only for herself but for other women whom she mentored, pastored, or otherwise knew. Convinced of her correct understanding of the New Testament, for years she and her husband both maintained the requests for endorsement (p.190). At the 1985 General Council meeting in Waikanae the ministerial list for the AG included five who held Women’s Credentials, and at the 1986 Ministers’ Conference the Executive Council adopted a measure which grudgingly gave women purchase in the debate concerning ordination. Noting that normally God’s pattern is to raise up a man, in ‘exceptional’ cases, God may raise up a woman as evidenced by her fruits of labour. Only such a woman’s application would be considered for ordination (p.197). This dubious honour held for just one year until the 1987 General Council meeting when it was proposed to abolish
the Women’s Ministry credential, thus restoring women’s ordination as it had been up to 1971 (p.201). This was overwhelmingly approved, and the Executive then granted full ministerial credentials to three women, including Claire Chapman whose inexhaustible efforts had helped bring this moment to pass. Her struggles were reminiscent of those undergone by Mae Eleanor Frey who wrote time and again to the AG-USA General Council throughout the early twentieth century, imploring them to credential her. Frey’s voice, lifted in frustration and shared by many women, ‘At this last Council I felt like a criminal as they brought up this foolish woman question again’ (Qualls, 2010:p.2), continues to echo through the halls of time.

In 1997, the first A/G NZ National Women’s Conference was held in Tauranga, and women’s conferences both regionally and nationally have continued to take place with success. At the 2002 General Council meeting held at Tauranga, the Council voted to remove the reference to man from the list of qualifications for those serving as Executive Presbyters, which opened the door for women to be considered for election to these positions as well. In 2012, the first woman, Rev. Mina Acraman, was elected to the A/G NZ Executive Council (Clark, 2007:p.28). While this demonstrates that women can and do become ordained in the A/G NZ, women’s access to senior pastor positions is rare, and the same is true for the UPCI/NZ. While women are encouraged to become licensed, very few have. This is the nature of the stained glass ceiling; even though a denomination may say that women can be ordained, what its churches and believers actually do may look very different (Poloma, 1989:pp.109-13).

In the UPCI-NZ and UPC-NZ, both take their governing structure from the North American Manual: United Pentecostal Church International, Articles of Faith, Constitution, Judicial Procedure, Position Papers. I explore this publication for both the USA and New Zealand context. Unlike the AG, the UPCI has no specific bylaw in their constitution concerning the ordination of women. Instead, in the 10-page section of the Manual (2014:pp.46-55) entitled, ‘Article VII: Ministry,’ within Sections 1-9, all descriptions of those seeking licensure and ordination are gender-neutral, with such words as applicants, members or ministers. At no place within the first nine sections are any male or female pronouns used. However, in Section 10 entitled, ‘Moral Obligations’ at the end of Article VII are two points, each of which cites scripture verses with no contextual framework. Point 1 lists I Timothy 3:1-7 and Point 2, Titus 1:6-9. In both, Paul describes a bishop as ‘the husband of one wife,’ texts which are often cited by Christians who reject the ordination of women (Poloma 1989:p.120). Therefore, while there is no gender-specific language in the rest of Article VII, it is disconcerting to see these two scriptures given full reference with no accompanying analysis as to how they should be interpreted. This, coupled with no direct bylaw on women’s
ordination leaves much room for ambiguity and little specificity about who can be a licensed minister in the UPCI. Given the percentage gaps cited above between licensed men and women ministers in the UPCI, this ambiguity allows men’s dominant role to be assumed.

One manifestation of this I witnessed while attending the 2013 UPCI International General Conference in River City, Missouri. During the open minister’s meeting on the third day of the conference in which elected positions and resolutions were voted on and/or filled, in a stadium holding nearly 3,000 ministers, I counted less than a few dozen women. The ministers’ wives’ breakfast was held at the same time in another part of the conference complex. The two meetings are in fact, held annually and concurrently at the General Conference. Therefore, women who are both ministers’ wives and licensed ministers themselves must choose between joining the men as a very small minority, or remaining with their sisters to handle ‘women’s business,’ while being away from the major decision-making forum. Still, minister’s wives who may or may not be ministers themselves hold great influence over which way their husbands may vote. Conversations I had with ministering couples revealed that they discuss with one another and decide their vote before the General Conference, since the agenda resolutions are sent out months in advance from Headquarters to all UPCI licensed ministers. Whether or not husbands actually carry through with the vote they agreed on together with their wives (and often with their church ministerial staff), or vice versa, if the wife is licensed and the husband is not, would be a matter for further research. During the conference one woman preached an evening service in tandem with her husband who went after her. Weeping throughout her sermon, she assured the audience that she is known as the ‘Weeping Preacher.’ It was clear that by having this minister preach with her husband rather than solo while engaging in a hyper-feminine act such as weeping, she was in no danger of usurping a man’s authority. Therefore, she was safe for conference planners to use to preach at one of the well-attended evening services of the General Conference. Interestingly, however, while the realm of operating audio and video equipment for church services and events tends to be male-dominated, I noted that the audio and video recording division at the General Conference was managed by a man and staffed entirely by women. Throughout the audience, women videographers sat on raised platforms behind video cameras wearing appropriate UPCI dress (long skirts and dresses), as they recorded each service and meeting. It was one more indication of the behind-the-scenes role that many women may play.

The matter of women in ministry in the UPCI continues to be a divisive topic. The September 2012 issue of the Pentecostal Herald, the UPCI’s official magazine for disseminating doctrinal faith stances and denominational beliefs and events, was entirely
devoted to the issue of women in ministry. The lead article, written by General Superintendent David K. Bernard, begins with the words, ‘The United Pentecostal Church International has always recognized the ministry of women, including ordination to the preaching and teaching ministry’ (2012b:p.6). Bernard writes of his own mother, a licensed minister for fifty years who pastored a church while her husband, Bernard’s father, concurrently pastored another church, both in Seoul, Korea, where they were missionaries. It is in fact due to his mother’s influence that Superintendent Bernard has done more for women to become credentialed ministers in the UPCI than any other general superintendent before him. Bernard writes that scriptures which are often invoked to keep women silent were circumstantial for the situations of which Paul wrote and not absolute teachings against all women in all times. Otherwise, he points out, women would also not be able to sing or teach Sunday school. Bernard writes that Paul’s teachings gave women freedom to speak during public worship so long as they did so with respect for authority, a guideline for both women and men (2012b:p.7).

UPCI pastor David L. Fauss (2012:pp.12-14) tells of when his daughter Shelaine Fauss-Everhart, music minister in their church, came to him and said she had a call on her life to preach. He wondered how their church would feel about it since it had been many years that a woman had ministered in his church, although his father and grandfather (the latter, a founder of the UPCI), had invited numerous women ministers to preach from their pulpit. Fauss writes that while ministers may often be thought of only in the male gender, in I Corinthians 11:5 prophesying means not only foretelling but also declaring while under the Spirit’s inspiration. He ends the article, ‘Without a doubt, it is God’s plan to use women in ministry today. I embrace it!’ Sister Shelaine Fauss-Everhart (2012:p.14) does not tell her own story, although she writes in two short paragraphs in an aside at article’s end that it took her several years to gain the courage to reveal to her father her calling into ministry, as she had no idea how he would respond. However, she committed her life into God’s hands and was thankful when her father supported her, joining with her in praying about what the future might hold.

Pastors Lisa and Mel Reddy (2012:pp.16-17) provide a ‘his and hers’ account of Sister Reddy’s journey to ordination. Rev. Lisa Reddy tells how she received her calling to preach at the age of 16 and preached her first message at Bible college some years later about giving life dreams to God and finding fulfilment in God’s calling. Her pastor came and supported her and then requested she preach the same message for their church the following Sunday. Rev.
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Reddy writes that her pastor’s blessing gave her permission to submit to God’s dreams for her life. Still, she learned to keep her calling to herself, ministering only to youth and other women due to unspoken guidelines that she should, yet held ‘God-confidence’ in her calling as a single woman. Upon her engagement to be married, however, another minister’s wife advised her that her calling could bring shame and limit her husband’s ministry, because people would not support her in the pulpit. She must be careful never to let her own giftings overshadow her husband’s, she was told, and so it was best she step back from her calling.

Rev. Reddy wrote that she began to tune out God’s call in her life but quietly wrestled with it and what she believed God’s dreams were for her. Rev. Reddy’s husband encouraged her by saying, ‘Isn’t God’s calling on your life bigger than who accepts us or rejects us’ (2012:p.16)? Finally, Rev. Lisa Reddy moved forward and became credentialed. Another author in this issue, Payne (2012:p.32), writes of the importance of exploring the uncomfortable feelings that a person has when God chooses to use a woman. Payne cautions against allowing cultural stereotypes to dominate congregational thought, and calls the reader to consider whether or not ‘God will rebuke us one day because instead of stirring up the gifts, we demanded that they remain dormant.’

Other articles in the same September 2012 issue of the Pentecostal Herald include three biographical sketches of woman ministers, all of whom managed to properly care for their families while preaching revivals, pastoring churches or ministering overseas. Also included is an interview with leading UPCI scholar, Rev. David Norris, in which he shares about his grandmother, a teacher at a UPCI bible college, who firmly believed that ‘God uses a woman until he can find a man.’ However, since she was an ‘anointed teacher’ for many decades, Rev. Norris conceded that if God really wanted to find a man, that task could probably have been accomplished (Micko, 2012:p.23). Miller (2012:p.35) agrees with Oleson (2011) that Paul’s salutations to women in the New Testament as fellow labourers in the gospel make it clear they were indeed part of the five-fold ministry of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers in the first century Church.

The women’s stories in this magazine issue are a resonant sampling and hold common refrains of women’s fears about not being received by family and their faith community and about holding onto one’s calling for many years in claustrophobic silence until the voice and nudge of God can no longer be ignored. They show that when a woman steps out she does so into uncertainty, with the fear of bringing shame upon the minister men in their families and with an expectation to be publicly shunned by some in their faith communities. The unwritten
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guidelines that women must not action their ministerial callings *because* they are women, robs them of confidence, trust and courage. From the beginning of Pentecostalism, women have worked under the aegis of their spiritual authority bestowed on them by God but the history has often rendered them silent in favour of men’s stories. In a magazine issue devoted entirely to the subject of women in ministry, these women’s stories are presented in a framework where the father of one spoke for and about her (Sister Fauss-Everhart) and the husband of another spoke with her (Rev. Lisa Reddy). Though the women’s stories were entirely their own, they had to be validated by men to pave the way for them to be received by other men in the reading audience. This built-in framework of protection by the magazine’s editors demonstrates pre-emptive damage control for a potential backlash not only against the women and their families, but against the *Pentecostal Herald* as well. These editors and authors knew the topic was long overdue, but in 2012 still could not forecast how the edition would be received in UPCI readership. The strategy of leading with an article by the general superintendent, who wrote about his mother in ministry and other women pastors he had known in his home state of Texas, also provided legitimacy, not only for the women and their individual ministries, but for the topic itself. Obviously, in a male-governed denomination these measures would not be necessary for a magazine issue about male ministers nor would the stories male ministers present require a framework of properly caring for their families while exercising calling. The unwritten guidelines of a woman keeping her calling to herself, which Rev. Lisa Reddy and Sister Fauss-Everhart referred to, indicate the insidiousness of sexism and backlash.

Bernard (2012b:pp.6-7) recognises, along with other authors in this issue of the *Pentecostal Herald*, that the aforementioned texts are often cited by the patriarchal order to keep Apostolic women from ministering over men from church pulpits. Chaves (1997:pp.83, 101) argues for a sociological interpretation such as Bernard and Miller gave, and writes that the scriptures have enough ambiguity to make it possible for those who claim the inerrancy of scripture to allow freedom for women to pursue their life callings in the ministry. Allowing women ordination while holding to an inerrantist stance on scripture becomes increasingly difficult in Protestantism due to the anti-modernity implicit within fundamentalism, which makes opposition to women in ministry and the elevation of individual rights part of the antimodern stance (Blumhofer, 1993:p.12). Bernard therefore, calls the UPCI into modernity on this topic. And yet inerrancy alone does not provide denominational and individual barriers to the ordination of women. While Pentecostal and Holiness groups have been more open to women’s ordination than other Protestant groups were, and much earlier as I have previously
noted, it would be a mistake to think that these groups practise gender equality (Lawless, 1993a:p.49).

There is much variance even among denominations. For instance, women in the AG-USA were not granted rights to ordination until 1935, yet in the Church of the Nazarene, the Salvation Army and Church of God (Anderson, Indiana), women were given ordination from the beginning. Pentecostal denominations, un-integrated into fundamentalism yet committed to scriptural inerrancy, are more apt than others to ordain women (Chaves, 1997:pp.114-115; Lawless, 1993a). According to Oleson (2011:p.172), between 1951 and 1978 in the USA, Protestant women who received credentialing increased by 178 percent, compared with a 62 percent increase amongst male clergy. Two-thirds of these women were in Pentecostal denominations, as well as the Salvation Army.

Women’s callings and giftings are real, and women often have a unique spiritual connection to God. While ordination may take place on paper and sometimes is even actually bestowed, the dis/empowering injunctions that many Pentecostal men place on Pentecostal women demonstrates an insidious patriarchal blocking. This is what Qualls (2010:pp.141-142) calls the difference between institutional and cultural authority. The former is when ordination and credentials are bestowed, while the latter is when women are actually allowed spheres of authority, such as being children’s or women’s pastors or evangelists. Sometimes one may obscure the other, especially when the call is valued more highly than formal credentialing is. Since autonomy is given to the local churches to decide how they will carry out the official stance of the organisation, women seeking ordination and pulpits from which to preach are left to the mercy of local pastors. Benvenuti (1995:p.231) writes that in early Pentecostalism, servanthood rather than authority was the focus of one’s ministerial calling, with the Holy Spirit holding absolute authority and providing anointing to whomsoever the Holy Spirit would. Benvenuti calls for a return to an understanding of authority that is defined not by position, but by the degree of one’s servanthood.

**Holiness Standards in Pentecostalism**

Holiness standards for women’s dress place ‘women’s bodies at the crossroads of belief and identity’ (Butler, 2007:p.67). The Holiness movement that birthed Pentecost, as already noted established standards of dress for men and especially for women. Makeup, jewellery, trousers and bobbed hair were seen as signs of modern, unconsecrated bodies and unfitting for those whose bodies housed the Holy Spirit. Such activities were considered sinful and thus prohibited. Butler (2007:pp.47-152) writes about how sanctification impacted COGIC women’s dress and adornment until 1945. For members, sanctification was a process
of cleansing visible signs of sin from a believer’s life through dress, belief and behaviour. Mother Lizzie Robinson, first General Supervisor of the Women’s Department from 1912-1945, set the standard of conservative dress with long, ankle-length black skirts, long-sleeved white blouses or long white gowns. Makeup, jewellery and trousers were prohibited for all church mothers and other COGIC women. Their hair was to remain unprocessed, which meant uncut, un-permed and never straightened. To Mother Robinson and COGIC church mothers, the fashions of modernity posed a challenge to Pentecostal teachings since Holiness encompassed both the body and Spirit, linking the two. By cultivating a plain appearance, churchwomen’s dress emphasised Holiness and, more importantly, removed a stumbling block for church brethren. Church standards of dress and modesty were a constant source of struggle but when new leadership of the Women’s Department was instated in 1945, women’s dress changed nearly overnight. Rather than seen as a sign of Holiness, plain dress demonstrated backwards thinking. Fashionable dress became a sign of leadership, and COGIC women leaders of auxiliaries and churches began to dress in smartly tailored suits. Soon their sisters in the church pews began to accentuate their appearance so as to be more attractive while keeping with denominational modesty codes. It was a new standard of Holiness, and today COGIC women are well-known for their fashionably tailored dresses and suits in bright, rich colours, hats and adornment.

In her book about the narratives that constructed the ministries of AG founder, Maria Woodworth-Etter and popular pastor Aimee Semple McPherson in the early twentieth century, Payne (2015:pp.63-80) discusses how both of these pastors decorated their bodies and used fashion as a framework for conveying their messages. Woodworth-Etter portrayed herself as both a mother and a general of war after the prophet Deborah, while McPherson considered herself a ‘bride of Christ. This latter image was ‘immensely popular’ amongst Pentecostals then and now to describe the relationship between Jesus and the church (Payne, 2015:pp.52, 57-58). Both used highly-stylised rhetoric, church architecture and clothing to accomplish their goals. Woodworth-Etter dressed in floor-length white gowns and taught that those who were saved dressed appropriately in clean, modest clothing, a sign of purity. In so doing, the believer was always ready to enter God’s presence (Payne, 2015:p.69). McPherson, on the other hand, embraced contemporary fashions, bobbing her hair (which caused a church split) and styling herself after Hollywood star Mary Pickford, and other well-known celebrities of the 1920s and 30s. Because her church, Angelus Temple, was located in Los Angeles, McPherson used the services of Hollywood costumers, appearing in dresses that
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were form-fitting, sequined, long and flowing, with trumpet sleeves, usually white in accordance with her framing narrative as a bride of Christ. McPherson perfected the illustrated sermon in the style of popular films of the times, often conducting her sermons in costume in order to tell a story. The biblical character of Rebecca or a Southern belle set in Antebellum times, a farm girl portraying McPherson’s modest Canadian roots, or a police uniform complete with motorcycle when she drove down the church aisle, disembarked, held up a white-gloved hand and shouted, ‘Stop! You’re going to hell’ (Payne, 2015:p.77; Synan, 1997:p.201)! A protégée of William Durham and his finished work theology, McPherson gave the Pentecostal movement its first celebrity preacher and helped the dominant culture to better accept Pentecostalism in general (Payne, 2015:pp.70-80; Synan, 1997:pp.193, 200-02). Though originally credentialed with the AG, McPherson founded her own denomination in 1923, the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, which during her lifetime surpassed all other churches except the Salvation Army, in ordaining women (Synan, 1997:p.193; Blumhofer, 1993:pp.164-67). Each in her own style, Woodworth-Etter and McPherson both personified the tensions inherent in Pentecost then and now concerning women’s dress.

Along with the AG and COGIC, other Pentecostal denominations such as the Church of God (Cleveland, Tennessee) also officially revoked its Holiness standards on makeup, jewellery and women’s hair in 1988 (Bernard, 1998:p.21). One possible reason for the renunciation of Holiness standards was that by the 1940s amongst adherents, there was a sense of growing unease about the isolationism of the church (Gallagher, 2004:p.222). Doing away with those rules in order to attract outsiders allowed them to be ‘all things to all people.’ Yet some Pentecostal denominations, like the UPCI and PAW, have maintained Holiness standards from their inception, and women have had by far, the greater burden of keeping their bodies within rigid parameters of Holiness dress and adornment (Butler, 2007:p.7). Stemming from the idea that worldly trappings hinder believers from giving themselves over to God fully in worship, the preoccupation with women’s bodies keeps them restricted through discipline and prohibitions. They are unbounded in worship yet bounded by behaviour, appearance and beliefs (Butler, 2007:pp.75-77; Rabelo, Mota & Almeida, 2009:p.6). I found this to be true in corporate worship between UPCI and AG churches during field work in both countries, where congregations of the former were more expressive and unhindered while churches of the latter were more formalised and contained. Poloma (1989:pp.184-206) attributes this to the shift from the prophetic tradition of early
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Pentecostalism to the priestly tradition, and regulations concerning embodiment in guarding against inauthentic expressions of the Spirit taking over members’ bodies. At least one well-known minister in the UPCI, Reverend Lee Stoneking, does directly relate the freedom of ecstatic worship and levels of spiritual power in many UPCI churches to whether or not women cut their hair (@Naycrumors, 2014; Jasinski, 1995:pp.51-52). While Apostolic men can easily blend with men from the majority culture, Apostolic women are easy to spot on the street, with their long hair, skirts, dresses and unadorned bodies confirming their degree of consecration for themselves and the group. Holiness dress marks believers from unbelievers.

**Pentecostalism and Feminism**

The population that has emerged as the face of Pentecost is women, whose numbers make an estimated two-thirds majority of all Pentecostals (Hallum, 2003:p.171).

‘Pentecostalism,’ Hallum writes, ‘has inherent characteristics of a women’s movement’ (p.176). Brusco (1995:p.137) calls it a movement based on ‘women’s strategic interests,’ due to Pentecostalism’s global reach and women’s significant involvement. Colombian Pentecostalism, writes Brusco, may bear little resemblance to a feminist movement but can be viewed as a ‘strategic woman’s movement’ because it elevates female status and reforms gender roles. It is therefore, ‘a form of female collective action’ (p.135). In Western feminism, men’s roles may not automatically transform, and women still end up working a double day or second shift. In Colombia where the home is an important base of male and female social interactions, evangelical conversion brings male and female household values in alignment with one another. Indeed, feminist anthropologist Rosaldo (1974:p.41) as cited by Lewin (2006:p.10), stated that the most egalitarian societies are those where the domestic is valued and participated in by men. Hallum (2003:pp.175-180) echoes Brusco’s argument and enumerates reasons why in Latin America women have departed Catholicism and are choosing Pentecostalism. Usually the primary caregivers in their families, women may seek out faith-healing, a cost-effective and available means of medical attention. Pentecostal churches also provide a place through which women can carpool, share childcare, and provide financial and emotional support to one another, making Pentecostalism a type of welfare organisation accessible by the poor (p.176). The practice of tithing is also a basic theological belief for many Pentecostals because they believe that the monies they cheerfully give will come back to them in other ways. And, because Pentecostals’ strict obedience to their interpretations of scripture means a healthier lifestyle overall due to less consumption of

alcohol and risky sexual behaviour, it is a lifestyle within which one can maintain good health (p.176). Pentecostalism is, therefore, a principal organisation of the poor.

Pentecostal women past and present like Maria Woodworth-Etter, Aimee Semple McPherson and the women of Azusa Street and beyond, came to their ministries on a quest for power – spiritual power. Most were not driven by women’s rights or even feminism but by a yearning to follow the call of God and enact ministries by which to see souls saved, bodies healed, and broken lives put back together (Alexander, 2005:pp.179-80). Theirs was what Alexander calls a ‘practical feminism’ (2005:p.179), working side by side with their brethren in gender and racial equality for the sake of the gospel. Numerous women came to Azusa Street with already-established ministries or left with them (Alexander, 2005). Many of their names have been lost due to being misspelled, incomplete or listed in the style of the times as “Mrs.” followed by her husband’s name. Many were given only brief mention if named at all (Blumhofer, 2006:p.398; Alexander, 2005:p.16). Sometimes members themselves eschewed identification, preferring to remain unnamed so that all accomplishments were seen as being directly from the Holy Spirit (Alexander, 2005:p.183). When they were rejected by the dominant culture as Pentecostals and by Pentecostal men as women worthy of offering their talents, they spoke truth to power by living their ministerial callings, embodying their giftings and stepping out in submission to God over all others. While Hallum (2003:p.173) has called for Pentecostalism to be labelled a women’s movement, she and other authors have taken feminist studies to task for its silence on the subject and the propensity of labelling Pentecostal women as anti-feminist (Franks, 2001; Knowles, 2000; Ginsburg, 1998; Brasher, 1998; Lawless, 1993a).

Conclusion

Pentecostalism, with its emphasis that anyone can speak as the Spirit gives utterance, provides women the opportunity to move under the aegis of God’s authority on their lives. Shaped and reshaped by patriarchal interpretations of scripture, Pentecost as an institution made way for women from the beginning through such scripture texts as Joel 2:28-29, but culturally they have had to navigate the patriarchy by making room for themselves under the aegis of their calling. Established churches or denominations have not always provided women these opportunities or they have done so with constraints. Though Pentecostal women’s perspectives concerning male authority in the church and home may seem quite anti-feminist on the surface, these women navigate the gender line in strategic ways as discussed here and as the following chapters in this thesis will show. They are fully aware of what they are up against, and the responses that they make in ways large and small, known
and unknown to such marginalisation can, I argue, be termed feminist in the sense that their strategies work to further the empowerment of women. However, Pentecostal women in general do not see themselves as feminist and tend to reject the term while recognising that patriarchy exists, as does sexism and misogyny. Finding ways to subvert the system by exercising agency is Pentecostal women’s task, and I turn in the next four chapters to the ways in which the Pentecostal women of this study chose to exercise and display their spiritual power while navigating a disadvantageous social field.
Chapter 4 – “And that was the end of me”: Identity Transformation through Conversion & Calling

In this chapter, I address the conversions into Pentecost of the women in my study and their experiences of the supernatural, including tongues, baptism, and their life questions which caused them to seek transformation. These spiritual life stories (Lawless, 1991a:pp.60-64) reveal the sense of identity and purpose that the women reported receiving, a point that relates to my research question in two ways. First, they provide a map for the reader to see clearly where the women’s sense of authority and empowerment comes from. Secondly, conversion and the purposive callings that each of the women located and pursued in their lives can be understood through a liberation hermeneutic viewing the Holy Spirit’s role in the spiritual agency they worked under. Nearly all 61 interviewees shared stories about their conversion experiences when their Pentecostal life stories and sense of becoming a Pentecostal woman began. Twenty-two participants said that their conversions happened around a life matter or crisis that caused them to seek out new dimensions of God when their identity was in a state of flux or transition. The process involved a “seeking heart,” and someone, often another woman friend or family member in the Pentecostal faith community, shared her testimony which helped the woman mediate her own conversion experience. The conversion encounter itself often began with a prayer of repentance and then segued to baptism while seeking the supernatural experience of tongues. Thirty-eight interviewees spoke of having “multiple” conversion experiences in that they could pinpoint the first time they came to Pentecost or spoke in tongues but personal change in its various forms continued to be brought about in their hearts. These situated knowledges solidified for them the power of God they now tapped into. Therefore, conversion involved a sense of transformation, provided a life purpose that translated into calling and bestowed spiritual authority. For all the women, their conversions were a means of “ordering” life, of marking their paths to transformation and all that came after.

In this chapter, I position the conversion narratives first and then transition to the calling narratives. I have placed them together in the same chapter because while the conversion narratives transformed identity, the calling narratives established it.
Small Transitions, Large Transformations: Childhood and Youth Conversions

Thirty-seven interviewees converted in their childhood or youth, 25 of whom said mothers, grandmothers, aunts or other women in the church were influential in their conversion experiences (Fig.’s 14 and 15).

Interviewees told spiritual life stories of the direction, clarity and purpose conversion provided them. Judith, formerly Catholic and 14, was at a camp meeting and could still remember the text the preacher based his sermon on, Philippians 1:21. “The preaching was full of life,” she said, and she “wrestled” with the question, “how do I know that this is real?” But, “I did the crossover and I went forward. It is almost inexplicable isn’t it, that moment when you know that you know that God has confronted your life. That is what it was like.” She said of her conversion, “It was a total immersion experience into Christ. And then the journey begins, of course.”

Some made a definitive conversion choice around the time they went away to university. Jacquelyn, formerly Anglican, said that her worldview changed when she left home at age 17 to pursue a teaching degree, and this transition caused her to do some deep soul-searching. One night, while visiting a Pentecostal Bible study with a friend, “The [group leader] asked, ‘Does anyone have any prayer needs?’” Jacquelyn replied, “‘Yes, please, I want to be baptised in the Holy Spirit. Will you pray for me?’ And so they did. And I was.” Her economical recounting understates the identity transformation that took place in her life. Similarly, when Vera was 18, she had what she called a “crossroads moment” that determined the course the rest of her life would take. “So that summer, I did at church make a decision that I am going to follow Christ,” she said. Her bags, which were packed and ready for her departure to university went to bible college instead. One month later, she experienced tongues for the first time and said, “So I felt God was leading me.” Vera said, “There comes a
point where you have to decide, is this the way you want to follow or [do] you want to do something else and be like most of the world?” Vera, one of the oldest members of this study, shared this introspective approach with the youngest member, Lexie. Although her first tongues experience was on her seventh birthday, at age 18, Lexie too had come to a personal decision that “this is really what I want to do.” She said thoughtfully, “I want to live a good life, and I want to live a life that is fulfilled. And literally, this is the only way.” She said, “I know that everything I do, all my steps [are] ordained by God. I know that he has a plan, and so it just makes life pretty great and stress-free.”

These narratives were typical of those who converted in their youth. Judith’s recalling of the Philippians text given at her conversion decades before, showed yet again the formulaic recitation of the circumstances surrounding conversion that become one’s testimony. These stories are often framed with scripture involving, even mirroring the first century faith community since scriptures are often (but not always) from the New Testament. Her introspective question, “How do I know that this is real?” and the cerebral response, “I did the crossover and I went forward,” demonstrate the mental calisthenics surrounding conversion. It is process-oriented and sometimes episodic, but always decisive. In using Pentecostal lexicon (“when you know that you know”) Judith drew from specific linguistic capital that she has access to as a member of the faith community. Judith’s description of how she viewed the world around her very differently after her conversion is a physical rendering of the spiritual changes participants found after their conversion. Her immersion experience suddenly brought her world new meaning. Similarly, Jacquelyn had clearly made an identity decision as evidenced by her use of Pentecostal language, “I want to be baptised in the Holy Spirit,” declaring her decision to the faith community, although her embodied experience of being baptised in the Holy Spirit went undescribed. This was perhaps in keeping with Clemency’s grandmother’s words (story ahead a few sections) that each person’s faith experience is “between them and God” and so was kept private in her description. Or, it may be that I as the researcher would understand what “receiving the baptism of the Spirit” meant and no further elaboration was needed. Vera’s statement, “So I felt God was leading me” demonstrated certainty about her life direction. She considered her crossroads moment, the life choice of where she would study and her first tongues experience a month later, both as conversion moments. It was a decision that set the course for the rest of their lives.

Next I discuss interviewees’ baptism stories.
Life-defining Moment with Baptism: Transformation through Water

Pentecostal doctrine teaches that baptism requires full immersion in water and is a necessary component of salvation. Forty-one interviewees told their stories of experiencing, in Valerie’s words, the “believer’s baptism.” They revealed that this was a key definitional and fully embodied moment in their lives. Carmella, whose mother took her children to Sunday school when they were young, is a good example of the 24 women who converted in adulthood, 16 of whom said they were led to Pentecost by other women. Her mother shared with her one day that Carmella’s children wanted to be baptised, and Carmella responded, “Mum, my children haven’t got into the world yet; they are still babies.” To which her mother replied, “Mind your own business. It is God’s business!” Her mother’s command represents the spiritual influence Pentecostal women have to directly impact one another’s and their children’s spiritual lives – something that emerged repeatedly throughout this research. Carmella deferred to her mother, and her children were prepared for baptism. Carmella spontaneously made the decision to be baptised as well. Like Celeste, whose story is told in the next section, Carmella indicated that she was “searching” for something.

I got into the tub and I remember saying very clearly [dropping her voice meaningfully] ‘the answer must be in that water.’ It had to be in that water. I remember…down the water I went…the most awesome experience. I didn’t feel the water, it was like I was in space. I felt much loved and then I saw the white ray, from my toes it came right over. [heavy sigh, praying], ‘Oh Father, it is a different experience altogether.’ Then I was brought out of the water, looked around, I could say words, but I started to put one foot forward and that is when I suddenly looked for my mother. ‘Mum, come here, come here! [whispering] I’m naked.

[sing-song shout] Cover me!
[whispering] I’m naked.’

By declaring that she was “naked,” Carmella spoke of the vulnerability and spiritual cleansing that comes with baptism. As she shared her story, her daughter Courtney, who was also in our interview, said, “You were weeping for days before your baptism.” To which her mother replied, “That is right; that is right.” Carmella said that she spoke in tongues at the next church service.

As Carmella’s story reveals, baptism holds its own embodied, transformative power, and for Julia it was connected with womanhood. One of 19 interviewees of this study who
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45 This is in keeping with Jesus’ own baptism of full immersion by John the Baptist (Matthew 3:13-17) and throughout the Gospels, especially the Great Commission given in Matthew 28:19 (foundational to AG salvation doctrine), Acts 2:38 (foundational to UPCI salvation doctrine), and John 3:5, that one must be born again of water and spirit.
were from a heritage Pentecostal family, or who indicated having Pentecostal parentage before they were born, Julia could trace her Pentecostal lineage to a late-nineteenth century New Zealand itinerant evangelist. She was also the only interviewee who told the story of literally becoming a woman the day she was baptised. Julia first spoke in tongues at the age of eight, while her mother prayed with her at their kitchen table. She did not feel ready to be baptised, however, until the age of fifteen. That day, church members came with picnic lunches to witness and celebrate her baptism and that of others in the river that wound through her family’s farm. But, just before Julia went down into the water, she realised that her menstruation had started for the first time. “The amazing thing is I became a woman - exactly on that day,” she said. “I wasn’t just coming as a young teenager, I was coming as a young woman...so I can never forget.” Of her baptism, she said, “I remember coming up and feeling joy and just this freedom [of] life.” She exclaimed, “When I look back I can see how precious that experience is and [the] significance of it all.”

That sense of joy was also spoken of by Cami who said she was deeply excited when she came up out of the water and that her skin literally felt “soft, silky and clean,” for three days afterwards. She called her baptism a “beautiful spiritual experience.” She too was baptised with others and said, “The Lord blessed us because we [were] obedient to his word.” Conversely, Charis indicated that the purposefulness by which Cami sought baptism was not present for her at first. She was one of four women who shared they were baptised on the impetus of others before they had full understanding of the doctrine of full-immersion baptism. “My baptism was not a true baptism as far as I understand it...I didn’t follow it because I loved the Lord,” she said. “I followed...because I wanted to honour my husband.” After their baptism, members of the faith community began “taking me through the Word, which I really needed. That is when faith and truth came into my heart.” Until then, the Holy Ghost which she had already received “did not feel true.” Her conversion, Charis explained, was gradual; “it took me a long time to get there,” she said. But now, decades later, she can tell others, “You have to be real, and not do it for anybody else but do it for yourself,” demonstrating that faith (and a new identity) may arrive circuitously.

That sense of revelation and obedience brought six participants to have multiple baptisms. Vanni said that, as a fundamentalist Baptist in her youth, she asked to be re-baptised “every time I got saved!” It was a total of six times. She explained, “Because I figured, if I wasn’t saved before, then I was baptised mistakenly and...I was taught that’s the next step of obedience, to show the world the change that has occurred in you.” But when Vanni entered Pentecost as an adult, she did not get water baptised again, deciding that her baptism had been fulfilled in childhood and that her new identity as a Pentecostal woman could begin. Cami,
Caroline and Vanessa among others also told of being re-baptised as a reflection of new and changing beliefs in God.

Again, the theme of “community” wound through participants’ stories, because the women told of being baptised with other people at the same time or were celebrated by members who were present. The communal element of the Pentecostal experience is integral to its life force, and there is strong cultural capital that comes with baptism and speaking in tongues. Although her decision to be baptised was made spontaneously, Carmella’s was a ‘conversion in the making’ that she had already been grappling with. Most participants too spoke of such an “inner drawing” to identity transition. Baptism is an episodic experience witnessed by others, and the narratives are shaped into testimony, to be told and retold time and again. They are also used to teach others. All participants spoke of physical sensations as an embodiment of the value and authenticity of the rite.

In the next two sections are the deliverance narratives when women spoke of being delivered from fear and oppression at their conversion.

**Deliverance: Facing Down Fear to Achieve Identity Transformation**

Fourteen said that they received total deliverance from fear, anger, drinking and drugs, domestic violence or abusive relationships and pain in their bodies, at the time of their conversion. Participants’ narratives about fear included being afraid of the pastor himself, being watched while prayer-seeking, or being delivered from panic attacks. Some intuitively realised that their lives would change away from drugs and abuse and paradoxically resisted the change even while they sought it. All were delivered from fear through conversion.

Clemency said that when she was four years old she was afraid of her pastor because he chastised her. This caused her to fear being baptised by him when she was six, but she bravely told herself, “You’ll be okay, you’ll be fine; there’ll be lots of people around.” Years later, however, when it was revealed that her pastor had ethical issues concerning women, she asked her grandmother, “Grandma, because he was ‘thus and so,’ does that invalidate my baptism?” Her grandmother said, “No. God saves on our faith, and he looks at us, and what other people do is between them and God.” Her grandmother’s response demonstrates the view that the pastor could still broker Clemency’s identity transformation through baptism because God works independently of the moral significance of the person who administers the sacrament. She maintained her faith and helped her granddaughter do the same.

For some, fear of being watched while prayer-seeking or being baptised was a hindrance to conversion. Those who have yet to convert are encouraged to “seek” conversion...
at the altar or at a prayer meeting, where other members gather around, lay hands on and pray for them. Jewel, an adult convert, said that she had wanted to be baptised “quickly,” lest her fear of having an audience watching got the better of her. Virgie said that as a shy child, she wasn’t sure if she wanted her first tongues experience to happen “in public” and later received it at home. Clarabelle too said she had a difficult time receiving the Holy Ghost for the same reason, and she finally did so about seven years after she first joined. She said that after one church service, “They took me into a separate room [with] this other young guy. They prayed for us in the quietness of that room, and we both got the Holy Ghost. Because I knew that nobody was watching me!” Conversion is a community experience, and its performative aspects are part of a process mediated by others on behalf of the seeker.

Jewel said that upon her conversion she was completely delivered from panic attacks. “I was a very fearful person,” she said, “and dying was my biggest fear.”

I’d go outside because I used to think, if I was outside, I couldn’t die there. I’d be at the table with the kids…but it would just come over me so I’d have to get up and I’d just go and sit outside...So it would pass over. At the movies I’d think, ‘I can’t die here because I’m at the movies.’

Jewel was on a variety of prescription drugs to control her fear, and she would often call her doctor or her parents in the middle of the night for reassurance.

So when I became a Christian, the very first night that was the greatest thing, my fear of death went. That very first night. I went and slept like I’d never slept in my life...[While] I’m still not a good sleeper, I don’t fear. I go to sleep every night knowing that God’s watching over me.

Jewel’s description reveals that peace replaced fear, and the sense of God’s watchful eye of protection helped her to continually perform her testimony.

The fear some women spoke of was from overall discontent with life which caused them to begin searching for spiritual fulfilment. They explained that their conversion experience helped them, as Jerrie put it, to “change their paradigm,” even though they resisted at first (Jerrie’s story to come in the next section). Celeste and Cassia, best friends who were interviewed together, both said that they had come from abusive marriages and were using drugs and alcohol at the time they received the Holy Ghost in the same church service. Celeste said, “I’d had enough of that type of living [and] enough of life.” However, “seeds had been sown into me,” she said, from conversations in the past, and she decided, “I would try to seek the Lord and see what this God [was] all about.” Celeste began “experimenting...looking for God,” attending religious services in other faith denominations and religions. “They catered to my intellect or they catered to my heart, but none of them
catered to both,” she said. Finally, one Sunday, Celeste visited her aunt’s church, a woman whom she had observed for years. “She was always a very godly woman,” she said. “There was something different about her...she just did her walk, her daily living.” When Celeste arrived, she said the service was in “full swing,” a euphemism to describe the exuberant, ecstatic worship in a typical Pentecostal church meeting. She was too “fearful” to enter and so tried again the next Sunday. Again, she arrived late, but this time she was determined.

They are on the inside, so I am on the outside again [laughs]. I am waiting, and I am scared just walking from the car. Every step seemed like it took forever to get to that door. I was really, really fearful...[But] as soon as I walked in those doors, I just started [weeping]. The presence of the Lord just met me face to face.

While Celeste had visited other denominations and religious places of worship and had not felt such fear, “I didn’t know at the time but it [was] those things attached to me keeping me back...from wanting to get any closer to the Lord...to experience or take that step of faith.” Celeste said that she continued to attend her aunt’s church but that her mind and thoughts were still “worldly.” “Situations would come up,” she said, “and I would automatically revert back to the way of the world. That conversion had to take place gradually.”

Celeste’s is a narrative likely told before, honed and shaped into her testimony. Her use of a gardening metaphor, “seeds had been sown,” and “see what this God [was] all about,” demonstrated the folksy, poetic language that is fluidly segued into the Pentecostal lexicon in order to convey the spiritual. Her description of being on the “outside” of the church while her family was on the “inside” is also a metaphor that they were part of the Pentecostal lifeworld while she was not. Her statement of weeping and “the presence of the Lord just met me face to face,” demonstrates the personal, embodied aspects that Pentecostals embrace as possible in a relationship with God. It encompasses all of the senses, and the spiritual power is often more than the human body can take without having a release, as evidenced by Celeste’s sudden tears. Her reference to “things attached” that were “keeping me back” conveys an image of baggage embodied, weighing her down, that made a physically short walk seem spiritually long. Here was a church where she could finally lay down the things she wanted to let go of but still carried. However, they were familiar while Pentecost was unfamiliar. She said, “It was pretty much the devil, hindering me to not want to go there, putting that great fear upon me.” The devil she was saved from was fear of change from the drugs and abuse, which were only symptoms of the real problem. Each of these interviewees demonstrated faith to overcome fear that could staunch the transformative flow of the power that they sought in their lives. Pentecostal narratives often define fear as the absence of transformative faith.
In the next section, I discuss stories of those who were instantly delivered from inward and outward concerns.

**Deliverance: Episodic Miracles at Conversion**

Continuing the section above, the following narratives indicated total and complete deliverance upon conversion from internal factors like anger and swearing, as well as external factors like drugs and domestic abuse. A few examples of internal factors include Vesta’s story of being completely delivered from a swearing problem and Virginia’s deliverance from anger. Virginia said that she grew up in a heritage Pentecostal home and, when she was just five years old, “One day after doing something awful, I just broke in the presence of the Lord. I said, ‘God, I’m a life out of control – you’ve got to save me!’” Finally, “I came to the altar – in the little church my Mom and Dad pioneered – I gave my heart to Jesus.” Her mother, who was playing piano during the altar service, was told by people around, “Oh, you’ve got to come and see Virginia!” She left the piano to find her daughter, “tears streaming down my face, lost in the presence of the Lord, speaking in tongues. So that’s when I got saved. I was five years old, got filled with the Holy Spirit, and it changed my life.”

Vesta’s and Virginia’s stories are examples of deliverance that involved instantaneous mind and behaviour changes, leaving peace. Vesta said that she “really repented,” and her swearing problem disappeared. Virginia demonstrated a level of reflection much older than the five years she was at the time of her life crisis. Her dramatic language, “God, I’m a life out of control – you’ve got to save me!” is a spiritual life story, honed and shaped into a testimony. The sense here is of submission, of asking God for help with her temper. At age five she discovered a difficult truth about herself, identified the problem and sought a solution in being “saved,” which involved community and her mother who helped to mediate her life change. These were examples of internal factors.

An example of an external factor was when Judith was delivered from her father’s domestic abuse.

When I got saved at 14...and went home from that camp, my dad had been drinking. He went to hit me; he raised his hand and it did not come down on me. He could not touch me after that...he was stopped...and he never, ever laid a hand on me again. It [was an] amazing, very powerful thing for me.

Coral too was delivered from external factors. She said that for eight months she attended church and, though faithful in her attendance, she continued to use drugs.

Suddenly, [I] would hear, ‘You need to be baptised, you need to give yourself to the Lord.’ And I simply said, ‘No, no I am not good enough yet...I couldn’t possibly be
baptised because I am a drug addict.’ And no one could explain to me that ‘you don’t have to get good to get God. You get God to get good.’

Coral said during that time, the drugs were not only getting harder but were becoming available for free. Finally, late one night while out at the club with a friend after many hours of drinking and doing drugs, “I heard the voice of the Lord say, ‘You would choose this over the love I can give you?’ And I just went home. I went home, and I thought, ‘I have had enough of this.’” At the next church service, Coral told the congregation that she wanted to be baptised.

And from that moment on the Lord just delivered me from drugs…when I declared I wanted to be baptised, the drug addiction just went. I don’t even remember when I realised I was no longer addicted to drugs. It just was not there. And so it was total deliverance.

Another example of deliverance from an external factor was Cheyenne’s story of being kept a prisoner in her own home by an abusive partner, holding her infant daughter while cut off from the world and her support network. That was when she prayed her first voluntary prayer to God.

And the first thing I actually asked the Lord was, ‘Lord…I know I don’t deserve it; if you would do this, if you would save us…If you think I don’t deserve it, save my baby…[long pause] If you save her then I will be so grateful. But if you save me and my baby, one day we will serve you’ [crying quietly]…And I just had to sit there and believe that it was going to happen.

Cheyenne sat in the gathering darkness watching her sleeping daughter lying safely in her crib, and the next morning she was awakened by a knock at the door. Her parents, from whom she had been estranged from the start of the abusive relationship had come to see her. They took in the conditions in which she was living and immediately asked if she wanted to come home. She knew then her prayer was answered. She said, “That was the first time that I really prayed to the Lord voluntarily, because I needed it. And it was answered straightaway, overnight.” Her faith strengthened, she said, “I really believed that God was real, because he answers prayers. From there I did not look back.”

Judith’s, Coral’s and Cheyenne’s stories demonstrate a spiritual shield of protection formed through a person’s faith. Judith no longer feared domestic violence, finding that the spiritual power within which infused her created a shield around her that became part of her testimony. Coral used drugs for decades before her deliverance but did not require rehabilitation or even therapy. So definitive and transformative was the power of her belief that its strength lifted her out of drug and alcohol addiction. Her faith and complete
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46Psalm 3:3.
immersion in her newfound community gave her the change she sought. Her colloquialism, “get God to get good” is a linguistic device used in Pentecostal lexicon to indicate the conditional element of one’s testimony, a ‘folk truth’ that only God can “make” a person good. Cheyenne’s prayer demonstrates how unworthy she felt, while at the same time showing remarkable shrewdness and a sense of authority as she negotiated with God. As a mother, she called on God to make her child safe but as a woman who recognised her agency, she promised God her life. Each of these participants had a spiritual, mystical experience of total deliverance that made God very real to them. They became more aware of their lives and their loved ones, of a sense of protection and spiritual power that was theirs at the point when they first believed.

Next I shall discuss the conversion experience and identity transformation as it was received at home.

Seeking Identity Transformation in Domestic Spaces

Eleven interviewees shared conversion experiences that were situated in domestic space, and the stories below involve the elements of water, wind, earth and fire. Like others, Jerrie came to her conversion experience during a time of seeking and life crisis. After she had nearly drowned while kayaking and friends nearby had not come to her rescue, she decided she had had enough of betrayal. Safely home again, dripping wet, her Pentecostal mother happened to call, and Jerrie told her all.

And Mum is on the phone and she says, ‘Well, dear, you will just have to find yourself some Christian friends.’ [long thinking pause –]

And I go, ‘Oh…Christian friends…ladies in paisley dresses and Sunday roasts and all that? Oh…’ [sounding distressed; she really did not want to have to make “Christian friends.”]

The year was 1980, and until this point Jerrie, a prominent New Zealand artist, was a noted leader in the 1970s New Zealand women’s rights movement. A radical lesbian feminist separatist, she said it was her tempestuous relationships between herself and other activists, as well as her mother’s prayers that slowly led her to seek change and conversion. The day of her near-drowning was a crossroads in her life.

So I get off the phone and go down to the shower. And while I am in the shower I go, ‘God, if you are really there please show me, because I am at the end of my tether. I can’t stand this anymore!’

Jerrie said that was the start, and she began to speak words of repentance: “Lord, forgive me, for I am a sinner and there is no good in me. Cleanse me and help me.” Next came her
supplication: “God, you have got to show me that you are here. I have got to believe in you…Please, if you are there, help me!” Suddenly Jerrie felt a “great feeling of joy and a huge infilling of the Holy Spirit, a massive sense of God, knowing I’d had enough and I was sorry for how I had lived…It was like I had an astounding sense of God’s presence.” The moment she cried, “God if you are real, show me!” Jerrie said, “At that very instant, I felt a great sense of the presence of the Lord come into me like a fire hydrant.”

Jerrie made herself vulnerable, her shower and the “fire hydrant” sensation both became a baptism by proxy, cleansing her spiritually within and physically without. Visited at home a few days later by two male ministers, one Baptist and the other Pentecostal, who prayed for her, she said, “I remember holding on to this and [thinking], ‘What have I done here? I’m changing,’” she exclaimed. “‘I cannot go back now, and if I do, it is never going to be the same. I am actually changing a whole paradigm in my life.’” She cried, “But my heart longed for the ‘courts of the Lord.’ I longed for Pentecostals like my mother, for people who really know the discernment of the Holy Spirit.” Jerrie soon began a personal exploration of scripture and attended church. “I started to see it, not through a glass darkly but clearly, it was lucid...these instructions for living a holy life were not put in there to be punitive,” she said, but to “protect us from jealousy, strife, envy, backbiting and being a hater of God.” She said she discovered that to be “a lover of God is to be gentle and complicit with things, to be in harmony.”

Overnight, Jerrie left her radical lesbian separatist community and entered a conservative evangelical church, doing what Vera called “a direct right turn into Christianity.” Her new identity, sudden to those who had known her, caused confusion and grief for others. “People think I died back in 1980 when I became a Christian and have never really found out what happened to me afterwards,” she said. “And [they think] that was where the journey ended. But the journey did not end there.” Jerrie sought this transformation because, she said, “I had experienced the courts of the Lord before, and I longed for peace...for a sweetness and an innocence that I felt was being lost.”

Where Jerrie’s conversion involved water, Chantelle’s involved wind and earth. As she hung out her sheets and towels to dry on a sunny, breezy day, she pondered her pastor’s teachings about repentance the previous Easter Sunday. Recently baptised, she had asked the pastor after his sermon about repentance and tongues, and he had said that tongues come only

47 The phrase, “the courts of the Lord” is found in a variety of places throughout the Old Testament, specifically, Psalm 84:2 which is the likeliest verse Jerrie is utilising. See also Psalm 92:13, Isaiah 62:9, and Zechariah 3:7 which also apply to the way this interviewee is using the phrase.
48 I Corinthians 13:12.
49 Romans 1:28-32.
after a heart is penitent, that they were “a godly sign” and a “beautiful experience.” A few days later,

I was talking to the Lord, just reflecting on the Word. And I was at the clothesline, hanging out…towels and sheets and they were flapping in the wind. And for a moment, they weren’t towels and sheets they were nappies [diapers]...and then I realized [that they were] the babies I had aborted. I had four abortions...and I repented...I always regretted doing that, but I didn’t know it was[n’t] a biblical thing to take a life…I always just felt this deep sadness and sorrow about it. So I just cried out to the Lord to forgive me for making those choices. ‘I didn’t know…I didn’t know.’ And I just broke down and sobbed and I was down on the ground, and then I just lifted up my hands and started to worship the Lord. And I knew Auntie said, ‘Just worship him, babe, just worship him.’ I could visualise her coaching me. The sobbing was really deep down. And before I knew it, I wasn’t even making any sense. I was at the clothesline when I received the Holy Spirit. It was a real experience.

Chantelle’s transformation was shared by Jewel, who also had a powerful clothesline conversion. Whereas Jerrie’s and Chantelle’s conversion experiences involved water, wind and earth, respectively, Jewel’s involved fire. Seeking tongues, Jewel said, “I wanted it; I wanted everything that there was to get.” Discipled by another woman in the church who continually prayed for her, Jewel also was “coached” as Chantelle was. The woman who discipled her said, “Open your mouth like you do and just believe God,’ but nothing really happened,” Jewel said, and she fought feelings of unworthiness. Finally one day, three or four months after her baptism, while hanging laundry in wintertime on a clothesline inside her house near the wood-burning stove so that the heat from the flame could dry them:

It was in the afternoon and I was by myself...and all of a sudden I just got an experience like I’ve never, ever had in my life and have not had again to the extent that I was baptized with tongues. I started speaking, but it wasn’t only the speaking in tongues it was the waves and waves…it’s an experience you can’t explain but it was amazing. I was down on the floor. It was the presence of the Holy Spirit washing over me in waves, my whole body it was coming over. And the tongues were just coming out…it was almost like a sexual experience and that’s just the way I could explain it...I couldn’t doubt to anybody. I know what I experienced!

The routine of domestic tasks often done by rote frees one’s mind to go where it will, and each woman was dwelling on spiritual matters that made her open to receive. While their hands worked, their minds went elsewhere. But in an ecstatic experience, the body and mind join to become a fully embodied contact. Both Chantelle and Jewel were overcome and indicated they were down on the ground or the floor, weeping, praying, and speaking in tongues. Neither could rise until God “released” her, and even then the after-effects lasted. Each woman indicated at the end of her narrative how real her experience was.

For definition, see Glossary.
These interviewees took advantage of profane space, ‘a place of their own,’ a shower or clothesline and turned it into sacred space. Jerrie’s concept of changing the paradigm confounded her even as she sought it because the process of identity transformation through conversion required great faith and courage. When Jerrie said that her heart longed for “the courts of the Lord,” she spoke a text that became an organising force by which all else in her life would either fall into place or fall away altogether. This was different from what I have called ‘scripture as conversation’ (for example, her phrase, “seeing through a glass darkly”), since “courts of the Lord” was an actual framework by which to live her life. It was much more than conversation; it was conversion. Both Chantelle’s and Jewel’s spiritual life stories show how sexuality intertwines with spirituality in such a way that they are unable to be extricated from each other. Sexuality and spirituality both provide depth and understanding for the other and are about being in relationship with God and others. These three conversion experiences involved elements meeting the spiritual, such as when Jesus demonstrated power, calming the winds and waves as told in the gospels. The spiritual, therefore, embodies the physical and the elements as well as the sexual. In all cases, the women’s faith and willingness to be open and available brought about life transformation and a new identity.

Next, is what conversion brought participants’ lives, my final section of the conversion narratives.

What Conversion Brings: The Components of Identity Transformation

Thirty-six interviewees spoke of receiving certainty, self-management tools, clarity or life direction through their conversions, including some who had marriages restored. Caroline said that by the time of her conversion her marriage had crumbled, and she and her husband were on the brink of divorce. She said that her conversion was “about me, yes. It wasn’t about our marriage. But, when I knew what I had received, I thought, ‘Oh, he must receive it!’” When her husband converted three days later, she said they saw one another “with new eyes to see” as though for the first time. “All the guilt, the shame, the bitterness, the resentment, the grudges of the past just disintegrated. Like seeing each other with pure eyes...It was just incredible.” Caroline and Catrina also told of the miracle of reconciliation that conversion brought them and their husbands, and both used the phrase “new eyes to see.” This was possibly a reference to Mark 8:25, where Jesus heals a blind man and it was as though he had ‘new eyes.’ It is a spiritual metaphor with physical outcomes to describe the real experience.

51 Mark 8:22-25.
of conversion and the life “truths” revealed to the convert in ways unseen before. Caroline and Catrina made scripture part of their personal language with a metaphorical and literal application to describe their experience.

Another outcome of conversion is the self-management tools which the experience brings and the ability to hear God’s voice. An example is Virginia’s story of how at five years old, she was “cured of anger,” which she attributed to continually hearing God’s voice “on the inside” to help her even as an adult. Jacquelyn heard God audibly calling her name at 16 during a youth rally. That was when she first learned she could have a personal relationship with Jesus, and later after speaking in tongues at 17, she said she realised “more of God” in her life. She said that after conversion the Bible was “open” to her and she “saw things in it.”

Both, indeed all the interviewees in this study indicated that they often hear and know how to recognise God’s voice.

Certainty of one’s Pentecostal identity and independence, interviewees indicated, were another product of conversion. Courtney credited her grandmother, mother and aunt to help mediate her conversion process. “Like Auntie said, she was doing it for other people, not for herself. And because brick wall after brick wall, [I was] doing it in my own strength, on my own terms,” she said thoughtfully. “But always like how Auntie said about Nan [Grandma] and that strong pillar - being consistent. And that’s how I saw my mother - being consistent in the Lord and loving him. I think now I am doing it for me.” Courtney’s words demonstrate the heritage she received from the women before her, the lessons she learned from her aunt’s conversion story and the consistency of her grandmother’s and mother’s walk with God.

Though Courtney was baptised and experienced tongues first as a child, her words demonstrated how the conversion experience may take years to unfold. A woman in her early 40s, she was only now coming into her own with certainty about what her walk with God and her conversion meant. Lacey, who described hers as “a forever conversion story,” agreed. “Because I think we are always changing,” she said, “always converting to what God wants us to be. And so the conversion story, I don’t think it stops until we get to heaven.”

Finally, Judith’s story demonstrates what Leah described as the “ebbs and flows, valleys and peaks” of conversion, the fluidity from one faith experience to another. Converted from Catholicism, she said, “Even as a young child I was always very conscience of the presence of God in my life. Going to sleep at night I would sing to The Presence. I just knew it was there.” Confirmed by age nine, after Confession, Judith would cycle home singing in “another language,” feeling “free and so clean from having said my ‘Our Fathers’ and ‘Hail Marys,’ this language that I used to sing in because I felt so happy…It just flowed out of me!”

Judith said that years later, in the 1970s when she entered Pentecostalism, “we were
encouraged to sing in the Spirit [and it] exploded around the world and I heard tongues. That is when I reconnected and thought, ‘I know this! This is part of my being.’ It [was] like I return[ed] to something.” Her ability to feel the intangible spoke of faith and her embodied sense of connection to God as evidenced by her description of feeling “happy, free and clean” with a prayer language in which she fluidly sang and later returned to. Smiling and with eyes lit up, she said, “What an incredible journey God takes you on.”

This section is summarised by the words of Clara, who said, “I went to a prayer meeting, and the Lord touched my heart and that was the end of me.” Clara was baptised in the ocean with only the minister and her mother to witness after being Spirit-filled late one night. Her mother sang and told her, “All the angels in heaven rejoice because I repented and gave my heart to the Lord.” Clara was ended at that prayer meeting and her new identity as “Clara Jesus.” The “me” Clara was ended at that prayer meeting and her new identity as “Clara Jesus” began. Her words demonstrated how conversion demarcates between the before and after components of one’s life; there is a death and a rising again. Clara’s very personhood changed. From that moment onward, she belonged to Jesus which forevermore dictated her beliefs, thoughts and behaviours. Hers was the power of conversion that the women sought, experienced and spoke about.

Next are the calling narratives, intrinsic to the conversion experience because conversion’s sense of purpose finds fruition in the calling.

Calling Narratives

Fifty-two women in this study talked about having a life call, what it is and what it looks like. In the words of Vianna, “The question of calling is not the same experience as the baptism of the Holy Spirit, or the salvation experience.” Instead, the calling consists of ascertaining and understanding one’s life purpose. The women told of being called to preach, pastor, teach, or become a missionary, a pastor’s wife, or a labourer in ministry. Some said their careers of counselling or painting were their life callings. Many said they had received it as children or were prophesied over by members of their faith communities. Others said they came to it after ascertaining what their giftings were. In the Pentecostal lifeworld where living as one is called is a scriptural mandate, knowing one’s calling is paramount for doing God’s work, and actioning it is tantamount to doing God’s work. As Jodene said, “Your spiritual power really comes from what God’s called you to do.” Following are the conundrums and challenges of the call as told through various women’s stories.

---
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Ascertaining, Actioning and Protecting the Call

Thirty-nine women indicated that, upon ascertaining their callings, they protected them by pursuing necessary training or placed prayer around them until their callings could be actioned. Determining one’s calling while growing up in the Pentecostal lifeworld was difficult, since some said that they were given the distinct impression that God called only certain people to certain positions. Vianna said there were only two choices: “You were either called to pastor, or you were called to be a missionary...these were the offices that you [could] hold.” This, she said, made for “a distinct feeling of separateness: ‘these are God’s people and then there [are] the rest of us.’” She said, “I remember thinking, ‘Who do you have to be for God to call? What does that look like?’” Eventually, Vianna found her talent in public speaking and oratory and, she said, “That is what began to shape my life.” Vianna’s talent eventually took her through university to Washington D.C. and, of her life and job at her state senator’s office, she said, “I was living the dream.” But one day Vianna stood at the base of the stairs to the United States Capitol, less than two blocks from where she lived. In that moment, she felt God say, “I’ve given you everything that you’ve asked for. Are you willing to give it all up and do what I want you to do?” Vianna said, “I remember thinking, ‘You’re kidding me.’ And yet at the same time, ‘This is why I’m so sad.’ Because this wasn’t it after all. This was never it,” she said. “And I had to get there. I had to walk that walk.” Vianna said that although the United States Capitol building was the “altar” where she “worshipped,” she eventually left Washington and made her way back to university to obtain her PhD and became a professor. She articulated how her calling was part of her identity. “I am called to the Academy,” she said, “because it’s the only place where I’ve ever been that I have felt most myself.”

Similarly, Virginia too said only the positions of pastor and missionary were presented to her as a child. She divined her calling by taking mission trips to other countries where she would pray for God to reveal to her whether or not she was meant to stay. When she did not feel led to missions, she ascertained that her calling was to the pastorate. However, she said, “In my young life, I didn’t see a lot of women pastors,” and explained that the only two women pastors she had known pastored a small church that could not afford to support them full time. So they were bi-vocational, having full time jobs as well. These were Virginia’s models and so in order to enact her calling to the pastorate, she strategically became a music teacher. In this manner, she protected her calling and then actioned it.

Another who protected her calling through strategic measures was Violet who, as a young woman of 19 or 20, said her pastor’s preaching helped bring her to the understanding “that Christ had a purpose and a plan for my life, [and] it really blew me away,” she said.
“That you can have a life meaningful and fulfilling and that you matter. So at that point I knew that I was called into some kind of ministry leadership position.” She chose the university where she could action her biblical training, but it was too expensive for her large family to afford. And so, the only woman among men, she worked ten-hour days in the cold and darkness of an iron ore mine to secure that calling. “I knew that was [the] gateway to my future and that I needed to keep going,” she said. “And so I learned a lot of stamina and perseverance, a lot of maintaining sight on my vision and what God had called me to.” Thus, Violet built on her sense of purpose and protected her calling by saving enough to fund her first year of university and begin her training.

These women determined first what their callings were and then took the necessary steps towards actioning them, locating their own giftings of oratory, teaching and leadership, and seeking training to build them. Each ascertained what they were not called to by placing themselves in positions that distinctly demarcated and helped them to identify what they were called to do. They protected their callings with strategic measures to build on and use what they were given in experience and giftings. They put themselves in the way of education and mentorship from others who could grow them into living their respective callings.

Next I look at the stories of women who were prophesied over or received their calling at conversion.

**Receiving the Call at Conversion or Prophetically**

Fourteen told of how the call came after conversion when God revealed a new direction for their lives or through prophecies spoken over them that provided new aspirations. Vesta planned to be a dress designer, Judith an actress, and Lesley was already a career banker. But each had a defining moment when the course of their lives was changed. Vesta began “to earnestly seek to be filled with the Holy Spirit” as a former Nazarene at her AG church. She described what finally happened at one service: “My pastor’s wife came and put her hand on my head, and I began to speak in tongues. And so the Lord blessed me, and...I knew if God baptised me with the Holy Spirit then I [would] serve him.” Vesta found a new sense of resolve and guidance for her life. The night she was filled, she realised she would not be the dress designer she had anticipated becoming. Instead, she said, “I determined...I am going to be whatever God wants me to be.” She decided that meant she would go to Bible college. “I didn’t know what was calling,” she said and told the church her testimony. “I am like Abraham going out, and I don’t know where I’m going. But when he got there, the Lord told him, ‘This is it.’” She anticipated it would be so for her and it was. Vesta became an ordained minister, co-pastor with her husband, and a faith healer.
It was similar for Judith who said that at the age of 17, “when I really got filled with the Holy Spirit, tongues and the whole thing, I felt like I was at a crossroads in God.” Given the opportunity of auditioning for the New Zealand Drama School, she said, “I was an actress and I lived for it.” But at a Sunday night altar call, she consecrated her life to God’s service and that moment, she said, “determined the course of my life.” She prayed, “‘Here is my life...whatever you want, have your own way.’ I could not see anything beyond that stage.” Of her acting career she said, “I gave it all up. I left it [and decided], ‘I will serve God.’” Her “crossroads moment” was a clear demarcation between her past and her future.

Lesley’s crossroads came when she was prophesied over at the age of 13 which foretold, “That I would have a great ministry and that many would come to God and many would be healed.” It would take 30 years, a successful career in banking and finance, and pancreatic cancer, before she finally yielded to the call. “Because I knew,” she said, “It came with a price. I didn’t know if I wanted to pay that price…I wasn’t sacrificing, I wasn’t giving anything up…My life was the way I wanted [it] to be. [But] it wasn’t the way God wanted it to be.” She believed that God allowed her to experience pancreatic cancer and a miraculous healing to build her faith, to action her calling, and to give her compassion for others also in need of healing. In the transition between leaving corporate banking and finance and becoming an evangelist and faith healer, Lesley received a six-figure job offer that she had spent decades working towards and which represented the pinnacle of her career. That very night at a prayer meeting she was prophesied over by a woman who knew nothing of the choice presented. The woman laid hands on Lesley and said, “The devil is dangling carrots in front of you to distract you from your true purpose.” Lesley turned the job down. One prophecy established her calling, while another protected it; both had been spoken over her by other women. Though these women were called away from other career aspirations, they shared that when they gave those aspirations to God they were blessed in return. Each took for granted that she had heard the voice of God, and each acted on the directives given.

Of career aspirations, 13 participants said they considered their secular careers to be ministry. Jacquelyn felt called to her career as a practitioner in the field of education, where often one-on-one she engaged in “interviewing, understanding, working with people who [were] vulnerable.” She said that “became my mission field.” Jerrie, a leading New Zealand artist, said that she was called to be a “prophetic painter,” although she found it difficult sometimes putting her inspiration onto canvas. “It is a really hard job. If one is [a] true speaker of God’s thoughts and mind in Christ, one has to be attuned and one [must] to the letter do what one is told to do,” she said. “It is not about just doing what you feel to do. It is a matter of seeing that the impulse feelings actually line up with what God is requiring of you.”
Her words, which applied to her own and other women’s stories of the call, were profoundly nuanced with meaning. When ascertaining their purpose in life, all the women had to determine if what they felt was indeed “impulse” or in fact, the voice of God. They trusted that God would lead and that they would know God’s voice.

Next, I discuss a very specific calling – that of being a pastor’s wife.

**Called to be a Pastor’s Wife**

The Call to be a pastor’s wife was one that 20 interviewees discussed, either being the pastor’s wife or the pastor herself. Twelve were or had been a pastor’s wife at some point during their ministry. Some embraced it as a calling, while others viewed it with scepticism. The narratives, therefore, revealed this to be a highly contested call. Vianna said, “Good Christian girls marry pastors...but it [is] not about calling; that [is] about solidifying your Christian credentials.” Verina agreed. She was unmarried when she taught at a bible college years earlier and was the same age as many of her students. “It was all about the call,” she said. “Especially the women: ‘I am called to be a pastor’s wife,’” and Verina found this mindset disturbing, because she believed it had no scriptural backing. Instead, she wanted to hear the women say they were called to something of their own. She said that others asked if she was teaching at a bible college to meet and marry a pastor.

I said, ‘Well, if I found a pastor to marry I would marry him if God called me to that, but I am not here looking for one.’
‘Well, don’t you want to marry a pastor?’
‘No, I want to marry a person and if that person happens to be a pastor, that is okay.’

One young man told Verina that she was “a real enigma” and they did not know “what to do with her,” because it did not seem she was there to find a husband. She agreed; she was not there to find a husband; she was there to teach. Like Verina, Constance saw this type of cultural programming in bible college and shared her scepticism but for an entirely different reason: Constance felt called to be a pastor. She told the story of a man who said to her,

‘I want you to marry me. I want you to be my pastoral wife.’
I said, ‘No, I can’t.’
He said, ‘Why?’
I said, ‘I want to be a pastor, not a pastor's wife.’

Constance said that she prayed her husband would be someone “outside the ministry,” because she often “clashed” with Pentecostal men she dated who “had the ministry gifts” and planned to pastor but were “turned off” by her leadership skills. Sure of her calling, Constance
said she wanted no competition in her marriage and knew the strength of her leadership capabilities. I discuss later in this chapter the leadership opportunities that were offered to Constance, but her concern about competition in marriage was real. Eleven participants, some of whom were pastor’s wives, told of subverting their own calling for the sake of their husbands’ ministries. Constance, therefore, approached both marriage and her call with thoughtful strategy.

While some were skeptical of the calling to be a pastor’s wife, others indicated they felt empowered by the possibility. Luca, who felt a call on her life to preach, said carefully, “I feel like I could be a pastor’s wife,” but acknowledged that her future husband did not have to feel that call. “As long as he loves God and has the heart of ministry as much as I do,” she explained. Still, she said, “I’m more called to be a pastor’s wife than anything else. I think I would have to marry somebody [who is] in that type of leadership role to match what I want to do with my ministry.” Vesta agreed and felt that “matching in ministry” was what had guided her choice in marriage, providing strength for both their ministries. She said that when she arrived at bible college, she had no intention of marrying but had kept her sights set on becoming an evangelist. She felt God draw her, however, to marry her husband, a pastor, and said, “So that was my calling to work together with my husband. I accepted that invitation ‘as from the Lord.’” Lavonne, on the other hand, said matter-of-factly, “I never had a calling to be a pastor’s wife, but I have always had the calling to be a labourer for Christ. So does it surprise me that I am a pastor’s wife? No. Because where else can you go? Something is going to happen,” she said. “I might have started a church.” Eventually, she and her pastor husband and their family did start a church, a vibrant, multicultural work. However, her words are an interesting paradox. With her rhetorical question, “Where else can you go?”, it seems that Lavonne was identifying limitations often placed on women because they are women; rather than being the pastor (where else can they go?), they are the pastor’s wife. Yet she believed in the strength of her calling as a labourer which is gender-neutral, and based on that, she could indeed start a church.

Pursuing a full-time career in support of the family while husbands pastored churches was another way some embraced their calling to be pastor’s wives. Nine married women in this study were sole career-holders with husbands who were retired, pastoring or in career transitions; four of the women were pastors’ wives. Among them were Jacquelyn, Verity and Loretta. The former two said they had struggled at first with becoming pastors’ wives. When she realised eight years into her marriage that her husband was indeed going to pastor, Jacquelyn said, “It was horrible, realising that I was going to move into the ministry.” She said that she had “ignored it,” when her husband had told her of his calling to be a pastor.
before their marriage, and “it [became] an uneasy feeling in the back of my mind as time went on.” Verity too said before her marriage, “I [fought] against being a pastor’s wife because what I had seen of pastor’s wives, for the most part - not all of them - was just a different picture to who I imagined myself to be.” Verity said that, after some years, she quit fighting and accepted the call on her life when her husband proposed marriage. Both women said that because they did not aspire to becoming pastors’ wives, when it happened they “knew God was in it.” Jacquelyn said, “[God] knows better and even though I felt inadequate and unwilling, I just needed to make myself willing to be willing.” Both of these participants shared that their marriages were a “team” and a “partnership” in ministry, even though both women held secular careers in order to support their families while their husbands pastor full time.

Conversely, Loretta’s struggle was not with the call but rather with limitations placed on her involvement. Loretta situated her calling within a spiritual gifts framework, using her gifting of “foreknowledge” or prophecy.

At camp meeting one of the young girls my age...who had accepted the call to be a minister came to me and said, ‘I believe that God is calling you to preach.’
And I said, ‘Well, God has never told me that.’
‘Well, are you willing to go out into the woods and pray with me about it?’
‘Yeah, I will go pray about it.’

So we went out into the woods and we prayed for awhile. And when we got up to leave, she said, ‘Well, have you accepted your call?’
I said, ‘No, I am not supposed to be a preacher. I am supposed to marry a preacher and help him.’

Loretta’s admission that God had “never told her that” implies that she took for granted her ability to hear God’s voice and that she had done so by the time she arose from her place of prayer. She met and married her husband two years later, and she too supported the family by working full time while her husband pastored. Now a widow, Loretta said she had been largely uninvolved in the running of their church because of her husband’s wishes, but she wished it could have been otherwise. So instead, she became a published author. Verity and Jacquelyn both said they could not be involved to the extent that they wished to be either, both due to their career work. Verity said, “It would hurt me not to be there, because I feel just as called...to this church plant as he does. We both [said], ‘Whatever it takes,’ and that’s what’s kept [us] here.” Jacquelyn, already a pastor’s wife for two decades, eventually did move into full-time ministry after our interview.

In unpacking the scepticism concerning the call to be a pastor’s wife, respondents named the reality of pressures placed on women in the Pentecostal lifeworld to marry pastors.
This is an old mind-set that assumes that pastors are male and must have wives to support them in their work, rather than women who enact callings of their own to the pastorate. As Vianna astutely noted, marrying a pastor is one way a woman can gain social capital as well as validity for her own ministry. Still, these women ascertained that, while they felt called to be pastor’s wives, they also had a ministry independent of their husbands. Those who felt empowered by the call cautiously embraced the possibility as a means of protecting their own callings to preaching and leadership, while their husbands matched them in ministry. Becoming pastors’ wives therefore was a strategic move that these women could not extricate from their own ministry.

Next I talk about women who negotiated their calling to preach in spite of having few to no models of women who did so in their lives.

**Navigating the Call to Preach While Having Few or No Models**

While I explore this topic in my chapter on the history of Pentecostalism in both countries, the data shows that 21 women in this study revealed the call on their lives to preach or pastor and faced many challenges in enacting it. Some spoke of being anxious to use the very word “preach,” due to social constraints and having few models in their lives of women preachers. Like Virginia in ascertaining and following her call, Luca pursued a teaching degree, but for different reasons. Called to preach from the age of six, she said, “I made my whole life out of teaching because I felt called to preach. So I put teaching around it.” Luca explained, “I kept avoiding that word because I [said], ‘Teaching is more appropriate for women; it’s more socially acceptable for women to teach but not preach.’” She enrolled at a secular college to receive her teaching qualifications but could not quiet God “tugging” on her heart, saying, “No, you need to be...pursuing ministry, and the calling that I’ve placed on your life.” Finally, she put her teaching degree on hold and enrolled in bible college. “And we had a ‘Women in Ministry’ class last semester, [and] that was when I was assured and positive – ‘I feel called to preach, and it’s okay to feel that way!’” Luca said, “I still feel like I should be a teacher as well,” and planned to return and finish her degree. Luca explained, “Because at my church there were never any women involved with preaching; there were never any women on the platform, there were never any women who had that title...It never gave me as a young person the affirmation, ‘Oh, Sister So-and-So can do it – so can I!’” Luca said she wanted to be that model for young girls who also felt the call and needed to see representations of women in ministerial positions.

Similar to Luca, Lacey also hesitated to use the word “preach,” preferring the word “speak,” but now, ten years after receiving her Masters of Theology degree, she finally had
come to an understanding of herself as a woman who could preach and often did. She was licensed the same year as our conversation. That it had taken a decade for her to do so was indicative of the social construction she had to unlearn about women preachers, and it was complicated by other factors too. Though her pastor was supportive of her calling, she encountered resistance from other men in the church who would take her off the preaching schedule, or saw her as “rebellious” when she took authority. Being “rebellious” is a distinctly gendered word, often used to describe a woman who does not wait for a man to give her authority to move, but moves under her own God-given authority. Therefore, not only did Lacey have to work out her own questions about being a woman preacher, she was confronted by others’ questions which were based on the fact that she was a woman.

These narratives were echoed by Judith who said that after she entered the AG at the age of 17 in the 1970s, she wanted to go into ministry but “as women, we were not in the ministry.” Therefore, her mantra became, “If I cannot preach it, I will sing it,” and this determined her path. She directed and developed the children’s drama and music programme at her church to the point that it became well known in her city. She explained that her guiding text was, “‘How will they get the message if it cannot be interpreted?’ So I have always wanted to try and interpret Christ for the masses,” she said. This in itself is a way of preaching, and eventually Judith did become ordained. Julia, who is also ordained, told of being in a minister’s meeting at her church and asking the question, “Can a woman pastor a church on her own?” She was assured that a woman could but she had been given the impression by her former pastor that they could not. Therefore, she said, “it was really freeing to hear that.” However, AG and UPCI women in senior pastor positions in both countries are still very few.

Constance too, said that, while she was drawn to theology courses in bible college and felt a calling to pastor, she had never experienced a woman pastor. She called this her “always struggle” and said that she “always struggled” with what she would do with her theology degree, but sure of her calling, she persevered. Constance said she was spurred on by advice given by a lecturer who said to her class of women one day that, for those who aspired to be in ministry, “Be at the right place. Be there and then, don't fight for it. Let them see the gift that you have, and then God – and people - will use you eventually.” Constance said this advice came at a time when she acutely felt the gender-blocks against women in ministry and was in “ready to fight” mode. Pentecostal men would probably not receive such advice at bible college about waiting and “eventually” being used, at least not based on gender (if ever,
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perhaps based on the economy). But Constance took her lecturer’s words to heart. To protect her call, she went on to obtain both her MA and her PhD in theology. By the time of our interview she had been offered multiple pastorates as well as the UPCI general superintendent position in her home country in Southeast Asia. It is highly likely that if Constance were to take the UPCI superintendent position in her home country, she would be the first and possibly only woman in the UPCI to hold such. The lecturer’s advice “not to fight for it” demonstrates the strategic submission that Pentecostal women engage in and teach one another. It became the foundation upon which Constance was able to enact her calling and highly successful ministry.

Another who stood on her calling in the face of patriarchal blocks was Lashay, who knew from a young age she was called to missions and moved forward in training and university education to action her call. Finally, she was ready but at her ordination service, a minister who had known her most of her life said publicly, “The only reason why you are called is because God could not find a man to go.” Lashay was deeply disheartened and struggled for years, wondering if it were true. But eventually, through prayer, mentorship and her relationship with God, she established her calling and wrote her memoirs as a way of responding. In them, she highlighted her life’s journey and demonstrated that her call was indeed her own. Originally hoping to become a doctor on the mission field, instead she became a missions bible school administrator and was gratified when one day, a student told her he thought of her as his “spiritual doctor.” That was when she realised that all she had hoped for in her ministry indeed had came to pass.

Lydia, on the other hand, had accepted her calling to preach decades before, only becoming licensed eight years before our conversation. She had preached in churches, conferences and camp meetings across the UPCI and in several countries and said matter-of-factly that her ministry was to empower women. Lydia had been in leadership in women’s ministries at district and national levels for more than forty years. She said, “I have always felt that I was in the will of God and doing his will. Every time there was an open door, I walked through it.” Although Lydia too had few models on which to draw, her approach was to have boldness, knowing that God empowered her and put her in high places so that she could in turn, empower other women. She said, “The gifts and calling of God are without repentance. Therefore, we can believe that, if God gave the call, he will open the doors he desires us to walk through. The burden of proof is in our choosing.” Still, Lydia spoke of standing in church pulpits and feeling resistance from men in the congregations. So she would use language at the start of her sermon to demonstrate that, because God had placed her there,
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she had legitimacy. Thus she demonstrated that God’s will overrules the will of the patriarchy. Her powerful words, “the burden of proof is in our choosing,” mean that if a woman walks forward under her calling and does what she believes God is asking her to, God will bring the validation and open doors. Lydia’s was a bold, authoritative stance.

The Pentecostal lifeworld may institutionally provide opportunities for women with the call to preach but they come with cultural qualifications. Participants’ narratives reveal that women preachers may or may not have access to training, pulpits, and even being received and accepted by other members of the faith community. If Pentecostal women are told they can be granted full ministerial credentials but relatively few have historically received them, then why? Although some eventually received licensing, seven participants who had a call on their lives to preach said that they felt licensing was unnecessary because the Call brought the ordination. They were already ministering by preaching, counselling, laying hands on and working in ministry to meet peoples’ various needs. Still, this begged the question: is one reason some did not become licensed or ordained because it allowed them to ‘fly under the radar’? In other words, they could get it done without the title, and some said this was true. Still, others like Julia as well as Cami, Caroline and Coral, said that they were encouraged to apply for licensure by pastors and pastors’ wives and did so. Some, like Lacey, Lashay and Constance, received training but had significant questions to work through concerning their abilities and access to ministry as women. As with Luca and Lacey, what they picked up from the Pentecostal lifeworld, which has relatively few models of women preachers, meant that they did not feel they could even use the word “preach” to describe what they did. They reframed the word as Judith did with singing, Lacey with speaking, and Luca with teaching.

Some told of applying for senior pastor positions in churches and being turned down, never sure if it was because they were women, or because of the reasons given. Others said that they were assured by their leaders that women senior pastors indeed hold positions in the organisation, but they wondered aloud, “Where are they?” Lashay said that in her missionary deputation travels, she had been to 46 US states and 6 Canadian provinces as a guest minister in UPCI churches - three or four every week for two years - and yet, had encountered only three senior pastors who were women. Lani, an assistant pastor in two UPCI churches who now pastored her own was convinced because of what she had been through that the UPCI was not interested in having women pastors, only paying “lip service” without providing them the necessary support. Indeed, fully 40 women of this research shared painful stories of experiencing patriarchal blocks. Thirty women’s narratives clearly indicated the blocks they received were based on gender, while others’ experiences left them wondering if gender was a
factor, but they could not say for sure. Five experienced racial blocks and five more said the blocks they received were not based on gender but other matters, like doctrinal differences or departmental reorganisation. Some approached the gender blocks as Lydia did with boldness and rested in the authority they knew God had given them; others like Vesta, were blocked when they tried to do so. Vianna, an authority on the history of women’s ordination in the AG, said shaking her head, “I don’t understand why this is so revolutionary...why do we have to keep re-visiting this woman question all the time?” Indeed, the woman question limits Pentecostal women from having access which can take many forms or none, and the variables are numerous.

Next is my last and final section of this chapter concerning what one brings to the call.

**Calling & Identity Narratives: What One Brings**

Participants reiterated that regardless of one’s calling, what matters was how one viewed the call and the things one brings to it. For example, Vicki said that she had heard others say, “The need is the call,” meaning that there are always needs to be met and one’s call is to meet them. “But I think over the years,” she said, “my ‘ministerial calling’…the calling to service came in the sense of the scripture, “Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with all your might.” This is a life-defining scriptural framework that helped shape every aspect of Vicki’s ministry, even where she and her family chose to live, relocating to different regions of the country in order to enact her calling. Luca also talked about “the need is the call,” albeit with a different name. “My friends and I talk about an ‘on-call’ ministry,” she said, “meaning that you go to a church and, if they need you to do something, you just do it. Whether that’s cleaning the bathrooms or preparing food for the homeless – anything.” Luca said that although she had the call to preach, “I feel called to be involved with the church – whether that’s preaching, singing, Sunday School – I think ministry is a wide variety of things; it’s not just on the pulpit.” Lavonne, like Luca also felt the call to preach and said, “I have always had a calling to do whatever ministry God wanted me to...It is something inside of me. I just can’t see my life without doing any work for him.” These narratives reveal the women’s willingness and openness to ministry and the opportunities and open doors they believed God had placed before them.

At least seven participants said that they believed God could use everything that transpires in their lives towards their callings. Vera said, “Everything we have, God shapes us; a little bit here, a little bit there.” She explained, “Other than my commitment to Jesus, going
to [university] is what defines me.” The university Vera chose not to attend at 18 she eventually enrolled in after bible college and marriage. It was there, she said, that she “received exposure to a different world” and where she learned how to write. Subsequently, her numerous publications, some 250 in all, have helped to pave the way for her positions in ministry at the district and national levels. She tells of experiencing the historical change in policy for publications by women in the AG. She was told in 1970 by the national headquarters, “We don’t use women for writing adult materials.” Women could write only for other women or children, a stance Vera said was likely based at the time on I Timothy 2:12. So she produced materials for women until the doors opened for her to write for all audiences when the AG’s position on women writers changed in the early 1980s. Vera told of being the lone woman on various boards during the 1970s and early 1980s that convened on the executive floor of the national headquarters. There were no bathrooms for women on that floor, only for men, thus signifying that the AG’s exclusion of women reached even to the architectural level. Vera could only surmise if women’s bathrooms were now instated because in the 1990s, though she held a high position at the national level in women’s leadership, she was considered middle management with little access to upper echelons.

In summary, the women took purposeful steps to ascertain and action their callings, drawing on talents they had been given. Jacquelyn said, “God works through everything, every way and every situation” to use what a person brings. Luca said, “God calls you to be who you are. So he’s not going to call me to be somebody else and pretend to be something I’m not. He’s going to use my personality as I am now and work [from] that.” Luca too views the call as being a natural extension of her identity and builds on the things she brings. Lashay said, “I feel [it] is the same call that I believe my great-grandfather and great-uncle felt. I just feel that I am the person for the time now, even though it has bridged not only the gap but the gender line.” While calling is very personal, Lashay’s words reveal that it is also, in her opinion and the opinion of many others in this research, gender-neutral; anyone can receive a call and action it. At her ordination service when she was publicly told by the minister, “The only reason why you are called is because God could not find a man to go,” she was surrounded after by her seminary friends who reassured her and said, “Lashay, you are a lady, you are a minister, you are God’s calling.” Though it took a long time for her to come out from under the effects of this man’s words, Lashay understood and summarised participants’ perspectives that when following the call, “you are fulfilled. You are happy...you know that everything is going to be okay.” Similarly, Jerrie said, “I don’t work my way into a ministry; I am that ministry.” The sense of purpose all the women revealed through their stories seems to reinforce the identity truths of these statements.
Conclusion

In conclusion, whereas conversion transforms a woman’s identity, the call establishes it. Conversion allows a woman to be “born” (again) into a world of possibilities, mentorship, training and, most importantly, a relationship with God, all of which give her life purpose. The calling frames her purpose, buttressing it and giving wings to her identity. All of the interviewees’ spiritual life stories indicate that they received from their conversion experiences a strong sense of selfhood, clear directives and life-framing mantras as guidance for decision-making. Both conversions and callings were communal; no one found fruition alone. They each had family, friends, pastors and especially other women who came alongside and encouraged them, and all spoke of the ability to feel God close and to hear God speak. Those who had experienced painful blocks to their ministries circumvented them through prayer and reasserted God’s authority in their lives. At conversion, a woman was given new identity and a sense of personhood. Then she discovered her life’s purpose through the call, submitted to it and moved forward.
Chapter 5 – “It put gifts in me that I didn’t have before”: Spiritual Gifts, Spiritual Power

This chapter explores the theology of spiritual gifts, relating to my broader research question about Pentecostal women’s spiritual power and submission in two ways. First, I demonstrate how the gifts are spiritual power. Believed to be given by God at conversion, they are an important aspect of the Pentecostal ‘toolkit’ and are used accordingly. The spiritual gifts include healing, prophecy, teaching, service and helps, administration, and varieties of tongues, just to name a few (see Fig. 12). They are a vital part of one’s cultural capital in the Pentecostal community, since they demonstrate not only faith but active and dynamic membership and are for the edification of others rather than the self. Second, when a woman embodies and actions her giftings, she does so in submission to God over all others. Embodying and enacting the spiritual gifts demonstrates elements of submission and challenge. The gift-bringer steps out under the authority vested in her by God through the spiritual gifts. Therefore, submission to God is privileged over submission to others. Because women too are created in God’s image, they are affirmed as active members in God’s family.

There are protocols as to how and when the spiritual gifts are used. Since giftings are not chosen but are given at God’s discretion, discovering one’s gifts is an important protocol. Giftings may be discovered through conversations and sermons, through finding them at the ready when the opportunity arises, or even by tests and survey instruments administered by religious institutions. My research data makes it clear that nearly all of the spiritual gifts were working in tandem or associated with another gift. These include the gift of tongues with the gift of intercessory prayer, the gift of discernment with wisdom, or the gift of faith with healing. These gift-mixes are also seen in spiritual warfare, exorcism and the practical exercise of listening for and hearing God’s voice. Yet gifts are not without their dilemmas, and sometimes even following protocols is not a protection from an adverse outcome. Woven through each of the following sections is a theme I call the ‘dilemma of responsibility and consequence.’ Some women spoke of the challenge of delivering a “hard” word or tongues’
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interpretation to others in the faith community, how they “brought it,”\textsuperscript{60} and that sometimes there were unforeseen consequences. Others spoke of grappling with the ethical conundrum of giving the word versus not giving it. Some said certain of their gifts had “lifted” and that they prayed for them to return. The gifts could be used for maintaining the purity of the faith community for sexual protection or exorcism of demonic spirits. All agreed that gifts provide a great deal of spiritual power, and for that reason they must be used judiciously.

Below, I begin with a brief introduction to what the spiritual gifts are, followed by an exploration of the ethical dilemmas, protocols and beliefs surrounding the embodiment of giftings. I also discuss how they were used by the women in these faith communities. Social capital accrues the more one hears the voice of God, the more she acts on her gifting for the benefit of others in the faith community, and the more outcomes are seen.

\textbf{Figure 16 - Spiritual Gifts represented amongst all participants, as self-disclosed (incl. both denominations / countries)}

\textbf{Gender-Neutrality & Teaching of the Gifts}

The discussion of spiritual gifts in the history of Pentecostalism chapter underscores that women as active members of God’s family, created in God’s image, are gifted equally as men and around ten interviewees confirmed this. Constance, a theologian, New Testament scholar and leader in the UPCI, argues that if we accept that the Holy Spirit is for all believers to receive, regardless of gender, then we must accept that the spiritual gifts are as well, since

\textsuperscript{60} For definition of this phrase, see Glossary.
they are brought and activated by the Holy Spirit. In other words, she said, “we have to take all of it.” Constance said that ministry is based on “the outpouring of the Holy Spirit” and she is raising questions about how to evaluate in the UPCI the actual practice of delegating places of ministry and enactment of the gifts based on gender. Even Pentecostalism’s foundational texts, including Joel 2:28-29 and Acts 2:16-18 and 39, claim gender neutrality. She also includes Genesis 1:26-28 and Galatians 3:28 in her analysis. Gender specificity in terms of who can minister and enact the gifts, Constance said, is nowhere mentioned in scripture but is given equally to women and men. A different interviewee, Laney, aligned with Constance when she said that receiving the Holy Spirit “put gifts in me that I didn’t have before” and gave her “more power to walk through.”

In another example, Vivien, who was involved in Pentecostal administration said, “God gives the whole package of who we are as Pentecostal women leaders.” She explained, “We have the Spirit’s guidance and empowerment to discern what we should do and the spiritual gifts help us do that, to carry out what he has called us to do.” Similarly, Caroline said, “I believe we have power over the devil, yes! Over serpents, and when you are filled with the baptism of the Holy Ghost, you are a recipient of the use of that gift.” However, “it’s up to the individual,” she said, “if they really do want to be used by it.” She and Vivien were in agreement that the gifts bring the believer spiritual power and Caroline’s word “individual” demonstrates their gender neutrality. Her phrase “used by it,” provided an interesting inversion of the power of the spiritual gifts; does the person have the gifts or do the gifts have the person? It is clear that the gifts bring authority and that the gift-bringer stands on that authority.

As already mentioned, one cannot choose the giftings one receives, so identifying one’s gifts and learning how and when to apply them is an important protocol to learn. In two AG churches I frequented during my fieldwork, one in New Zealand the other in Missouri, great attention was paid to helping members ascertain their spiritual gifts. In New Zealand, one Sunday the pastor asked the congregation to select from a list of spiritual gifts displayed on multimedia and choose the ones each considered their strength. We then filed to the front and dropped our lists into a waiting basket. The pastor compiled the submissions and did a series of sermons expounding on the spiritual gifts as represented in the congregation, explaining with the use of scripture what each gift is, and how it can be used in the faith community. In Missouri, one church I attended ran a series of pre-service sessions on identifying one’s spiritual gifts using a survey instrument. Much like a personality test, we
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rated our own personality traits as 1 or 0, and the scores corresponded with our gifting. Other survey instruments, such as the Spiritual Leader Trait Assessment (SLTA) from the Institute for Spiritual Leadership in Oregon, are also widely used for comprehensive personal and peer evaluations. By implementing these tests, members can identify and understand their own spiritual gifting.

Nearly every member of this study had received training about the spiritual gifts, identified their own and could articulate with clear examples how the gifts were active in their lives. Fifteen participants, most of whom were in leadership, spoke of the training that they imparted to other church members about what the gifts were and the various ways they could be actioned. For example, Cicely shared that she and her pastor husband teach their congregation that the gifts, especially the prophetic word, come through in the course of conversation. This is their interpretation, she explained, of the way the gifts were used by the apostles in the first century Church, which thus illustrates how nuances of the interpretation of scripture can impact how one approaches or uses the gifts. Only a few interviewees had received no training in the spiritual gifts, yet indicated they operated within them. For example, I was the first person who had ever asked Celeste, Cassia or Cheyenne what their spiritual gifts were, they said. After we discussed them, Celeste and Cassia said that the gifts had become a “lifestyle.” For instance, Cassia said that what came naturally to her “would be to awhī62 people” or, to offer comfort, embracing people in the church. This is her technique and her word for what seemed to be the gift of mercy. This example demonstrates that knowledge of one’s own gifting and authority can be developed through osmosis while being in the Pentecostal lifeworld, and developing a sense of God’s power working in one’s life. Respondents spoke of the ways in which gifting contribute to their sense of identity and place within the community, acknowledging that this can be a life-long journey.

Next, I look at the protocols surrounding spiritual gifts.

Grappling with the Gift: Using Technique and the Dilemma of Responsibility & Consequence

Interviewees were respectful of the power of the gifts, and their stories revealed that they took time and technique to hone their use of them. They framed their embodiment of the gifting around instances of hearing God’s voice so that they learned how to choose the right time and place to use them. They then gained confidence under God’s authority. Fully 50 women of this research used some variation of the phrase, “It was God, not me,” when desired
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62 This is a Māori word meaning, “to embrace or to surround.”
outcomes from one’s use of the gifts took place, such as faith healing or deliverance. All participants said that God provided personal direction through prayer as to how they should minister using their giftings. For instance, Laney said that when she was a teenager she laid hands on and prayed for her neighbour who was facing amputation of his arm due to cancer.

I was so scared when I went and asked him to pray, I was almost shaking. But I knew that God could do it, and if I didn’t pray for him that I would feel horrible...later if God chose to heal him. Because I did have that faith as a grain of mustard seed, and sometimes you might doubt if it is going to happen. I always believe that God can do it if he chooses.

The metaphor of the mustard seed is a reference to Matthew 17:20. This text is commonly used in Pentecostal lexicon to give believers strength of faith to pray and ask for anything, even the impossible. While her neighbour did undergo the amputation, Laney rested in the belief that she had submitted to what she believed God would have her do; the actual healing was up to God. Some years later, Laney laid hands on and prayed for another neighbour who was about to undergo an emergency hysterectomy. Afterward, the surgery was cancelled. “God healed her at that point,” she said. Laney’s belief that God could do it if God chose to, carried an unspoken acknowledgement that it was God’s power working through her that could bring about the desired healing, not her own power. In the former story, she demonstrated fear by her body “almost shaking,” but at the same time she embodied her gift of faith by physically laying hands on her neighbour’s afflicted arm, so that her gifting of healing could flow. This also illustrates how the gift-bringer may feel vulnerable when publicly using the gifts. Laney said she believed that while doing so requires boldness, it is important for her to ask others if she can lay hands on and pray for them in order to show them love and allow God to work through her.

As another illustration of a woman attributing good outcomes to God rather than herself, Vanni said, “I have at five to seven different times…prayed for people who [were] childless, and they’ve had babies within the next two years.” She said that her technique was to lay hands on the person and pray aloud for them. One of the women she laid hands on was a family member in a fundamentalist denomination who did not believe in faith healing but had been trying to become pregnant for many years. So, instead, Vanni laid a hand on the woman’s shoulder as they stood together during an altar call and prayed under her breath, “Lord, open her womb.” Within a few months, the woman called and told Vanni that she was pregnant. Vanni also told about a colleague who had prayed and tried for a child with his wife for years but he said they were growing discouraged. “Immediately it broke my heart that he didn’t believe that they could be healed and she could have a baby,” Vanni said. “[Faith
healing] is one of [the] tenets of our doctrine.” She said, “I went back to the vault and said, ‘Please Lord, open her womb.’ And you should have [heard] me scream when he came in and [said] they were expecting! And they were past that ‘danger zone.’ I [said], ‘Wow! Thank you, Jesus!’”

Vanni’s statement, “I went back to the vault” was literal; she worked for an institution which had a storage vault. But it could also be read as a metaphor in that she went back to the “vault” of her healing prayers. Her reference to the “danger zone,” while a literal one in terms of pregnancy, could also be read as a metaphor that perhaps her colleague had moved beyond disbelief. Her exultant cry, “Thank you, Jesus!” demonstrates her belief that this healing and miracle took place through God’s power, not her own, although it affirmed her faith and likely the couple’s as well.

Spiritual gifts provide their own sets of difficulties, and interviewees told of how they grappled with their giftings and sometimes, when or how to bring them. Coral spoke of her conundrum upon discovering she had the gift of discernment of spirits when a member of her faith community was “lying to everybody.” She said, “And all I could think was, ‘[Why] haven’t I got one of those really cool gifts where you go up and tell somebody, ‘You are going to be blessed and this is what is going to happen in your life’ and, ‘Sister, praise God!’’” Coral was laughingly lamenting that she did not have the gift of prophesy. Sincerely, she said, “But no, I get the gift where people are lying to me and lying to others. Why can’t I have a nice gift? And what do I do with this gift?” With her question, she was naming the dilemma of responsibility. She asked, “Why would you show me this, Lord?” She said God spoke to her and said that it is, “to mark that person, to know what that type of person is and to pray for that person. But it is not to go and tell everybody.”

This requires the word of wisdom and 16 interviewees said that they had this gift. Clemency said that God had revealed to her the difference between godly wisdom and the worldly wisdom spoken of in James 3:13-18. “Godly wisdom is easy to be entreated with love and mercy and [is] kind,” she said, while worldly wisdom seeks only its own ends. When it comes to the gifts, it is important to know the wisdom difference, since as Lavonne pointed out, the gift must be used with wisdom so as not to “displease God.” She said, “Because when he gives you a vision or...a word, not every word should be spoken at that particular time. You have to use the wisdom he gave you.” Lavonne uses strategy. She said that it is important to prepare so that when the word is given the bringer is not speaking from a place of bitterness or vengeance, but in love, “because love is what covers the sin. So if you can talk out of love, then you can make a change and make a difference.” This is an example of the protocols of operating the gifts under godly wisdom rather than worldly wisdom.
To further illustrate the technique in communicating and properly framing the word one has been given, both Jewel and Jodene had something to offer. Rather than framing prophecy with the words, “Thus saith the Lord,” each said that a more accessible framework is to say, “I feel the Lord is saying…” This is an example of how interviewees cerebrally unpack and repackage the gift of prophecy for accessibility. Their rephrasing also helps to maintain God’s integrity while demonstrating the humility that is in keeping with how gender roles are enacted in the faith community.

Concerning the gifts of prophecy and word of knowledge, a combined total of 35 participants identified these as their giftings and some said they had both. These gifts sometimes look similar but can come in different forms, as evidenced by Cami’s unique application of her gifting of word of knowledge; she was often given a scriptural chapter and verse for others. She said that upon receiving the scripture,

Normally what I do is open up my Word, and I go to the person. Quite often they’re kneeling…sitting or…standing. And I come right beside them, and I read it to them out loud with my finger under it, showing them where it’s coming from so that they know it’s not me, it’s the written Word. And then I let the Lord anoint my lips with anything he wants me to put in.

The way the subject might be “kneeling, sitting or standing” suggests that they are already in spiritual repose, perhaps at the altar or in a pew and able to receive what Cami may share. Her own embodiment is important, in that she reads the scripture with her finger moving under it to maintain focus on the words. Moreover, by allowing the Lord to “anoint” her lips and provide anything she feels led to say carries the authority of her gifting and the implied, “this is God, not me” narrative. There is a taken-for-grantedness, an ‘of course God is there’ to put words on her lips and she submits to that leading.

A final example of a spiritual gift used in public gatherings is the gift of tongues and interpretation, which five interviewees indicated they had. This is when someone will stand and bring a supernatural message in tongues to the congregation loud enough so that all who are present can hear as the Holy Spirit gives utterance. A “holy hush” falls across those gathered as they listen to the message in tongues and the interpretation that usually follows, either by the bringer of the tongue or by someone else in the congregation.63 The interpretation also is given under the aegis of the Holy Spirit since usually the interpreter may not speak or even understand the language in which the message in tongues was given. Therefore, the person who brings the interpretation depends on God to put the words in their mouth for the benefit of those listening. Caroline said that she had the gift of tongues and interpretation and that, when she gives either, she does so “by faith.” She said, “I just know

63 1 Corinthians 14:5, 27.
that the Lord is fully in my mouth. The words just flow out. And when they’ve all used up…it won’t come out,” and she stops. But if asked, “I wouldn’t remember what it was.” This seemed to be a rare gift amongst participants and Jodene spoke to the shift away from tongues and interpretation in A/G NZ churches and towards bringing the prophetic word and encouragement in services instead. This is due to readings of I Corinthians 14 and concern for others who have never heard the tongues and interpretation brought before. In the AG-USA, there has been a similar shift which limits opportunities for some of the gifts to be brought during public worship. This may have contributed to a relative few interviewees having opportunity to bring the tongue or the interpretation during corporate worship.

These stories demonstrate submission while using the gifts, that this is “God, not me.”

Next I look at another dilemma of responsibility that Cami and other interviewees shared: what to do when the bringing of the word could carry challenging consequences.

The Dilemma of Bringing the Word: Challenges

The dilemma of responsibility and consequence challenges submission because it requires action, not reactive passivity, and frames not only how one acts on the gift but what happens when one has acted. The consequences of acting upon one’s gifts can be positive, in terms of accruing social capital in the church, or they can be neutral or negative. In one example, Celeste told of a time when her pastor was deciding whether or not he should sell his business, and she felt God tell her that he should sell. Unsure of her gifting of the word of knowledge and how it would be received, however, only after she learned he had decided to sell did she disclose to him that God had given her that word too. Her pastor said to her that the Lord had given her the word of knowledge to share and that she should not be afraid to speak it. “He [said] they had been praying for an answer. I could have been that answer but I held onto it,” she said. This was a positive consequence in that Celeste’s pastor affirmed her gifting, but also neutral in that the word was given after a decision had already been made.

In an example of negative consequences, however, Jewel was given a word for her former pastor but felt reluctant to bring it, because it was “a word that was quite strong,” she said. This was during a tumultuous time in Jewel’s church under that pastor, so she was cautious to give the word. But one Sunday another woman in the church came to her and said, “You’ve got a word that you’re supposed to bring and you haven’t brought it.” There was no way she could have known that, Jewel said, “And so I knew what God was saying. I had to go and take the word. Which I did do.” The pastor “just sort of took it and said nothing much really, and I had to leave that with the Lord.” Meanwhile, Jewel led a prayer group of four women members who met weekly at the church to pray. She said that they usually prayed for
the pastor and his family, for church growth and for people to be saved. After Jewel brought
the word to her pastor, however, he met with her one day and said that he believed the prayer
group “might not be praying for the right things” and “pulled us out from having the prayer.”
Jewel was stunned, and it was clear that she still felt hurt by this and could only think it may
have been because of the word she had brought. This example highlights that spiritual
discourses can compete; God may have compelled Jewel to act, but her pastor viewed this as a
challenge, although it could also be argued that the pastor was acting on what God had
revealed to him as well. Thus, at times, gifts can be contested.

To further illustrate the conundrums of bringing the word, Cami said she had received
a “chapter and verse” to give another woman in the church, but when she opened her Bible
and read the text, “it was hard,” she said. “I had no idea whether it was a rebuke or a
correction or what, but it was a hard word.” This brought on a “battle in my head with the
Lord.” She went back and forth on all the reasons why she should not bring the word.

‘Lord, I don’t really know this lady…What’s she going to think of me? She doesn’t
know me. I don’t know what’s going on in her life…How do I even know if this is
right?’ I feel too scared…I can’t go and read this to her.’

And the Lord kept saying, ‘I want you to go and give it to her.’

This inner dialogue is a good example of a testimony, since it presents a quandary and sets up
the possibility for God to prepare the solution. It also demonstrates the mental calisthenics
and the dilemma that responsibility of the gifts may bring. Cami said that, rather than her
usual manner of bringing the word (as described in the previous section), she instead gave the
scripture to the woman on a folded piece of paper as both left the church that Sunday. Nothing
was said afterwards, and Cami eventually forgot about it. Later, Cami was enrolled in a bible
school class about the spiritual gifts, and the woman’s nephew was a fellow student. He rose
one day and told the room a story.

And he was talking about word of knowledge…and he said, ‘I’ll share an example
which concerns Sister Cami.’
And I thought, ‘Me? What have I done?’

And he said, ‘Several months ago now…my aunt was having something go on in her
household. And she was having difficulty with it…One day at church Sister Cami
gave her a scripture…She took it home and read it and she got so angry with Sister
Cami. For several days she took it to the Lord in prayer and kept wrestling with God,
and saying ‘No, no.’ And God was saying, ‘Yes, yes.’

In the meantime, this issue in the family was going on, and it was getting worse
instead of better. She came to a place where she said, ‘Yes, Lord.’ And she obeyed the
scripture…[and] the whole situation changed just like that. The Lord had given Sister Cami the word of knowledge.’

Although Cami had struggled, she submitted to what she believed God was asking her to do. The woman to whom she gave the scripture also “wrestled” with God but eventually submitted, thus bringing resolution. Both women heard and heeded God’s voice. Another aspect that this narrative illustrates was affirmation from the faith community which demonstrates Cami’s accrual of cultural and social capital. She said in rueful tones, “So sometimes it’s been a bit hard to want to actually go and do it…But I’ve…submitted to the word of God.”

To further illustrate the dilemma of responsibility and consequence and teachings provided around bringing the word, Loretta said that she resisted bringing a hard word to a man in her church until God had told her three times. She finally said to herself, “You are going to get in trouble with God if you do not get up and go.” She said that the message was, “You are living a life of sin. If you do not straighten up certain things, I am going to turn you over to a reprobate mind, and you will go to hell.” She said that the man looked at her and said, “You are right on.” “But,” she said, “He didn’t.” Loretta said that after this encounter she asked a preacher who was well-known for his gifts of prophecy and miracles,

‘Brother, if God ever tells you something, do you sometimes make him tell you more than once?’ [chuckling, then makes a strangled sound] Oh, wrong thing to say!

He said, ‘Sister, you don’t! Tell me you don’t! You move the first time…If God is telling you to do something you have to do what God is telling you to do. Immediately…No matter how inconvenient it is for you or how it looks. You just do it. Don’t make him tell you more than once.

The minister’s response demonstrated protocols around the gifts, framed in obedience, urgency and community. He acknowledged the dilemma of responsibility and consequence of the gifts, but most of all, he affirmed Loretta by being instantly present to her question. He advised her on the giftings according to his own experiential knowledge in bringing and offering them to the faith community.

Seventeen participants said they experienced a crisis of confidence at one time or another, often due to fear of being “called out” by others as operating under their own authority rather than God’s, self-doubt or both. Jane said that, due to having been raised in a fundamentalist denomination which did not believe in the spiritual gifts, when she exhibited the prophetic word in that community, she was excoriated. Even though she had joined a Pentecostal church, she now kept the prophetic word to herself, watching things come to pass
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without having shared them. Yet she struggled with her choice, believing she could help others, but said she was still frightened because of her previous experiences. Lallie too said that on three separate occasions she had been given a word for others, but she had been “too timid” to bring it. She watched and observed instead and saw that “things were confirmed.” In other words, like Jane, she watched the word come to pass and knew that it was God who had given it to her. She was trying, she said, to build her courage.

The dilemma of responsibility and consequence in connection with using one’s gifting publicly also extends to tongues interpretation. In bringing the tongue, Caroline acknowledged that there were times when she would “seize up… ‘Should I? Should I not?’” She described the “quickening” she feels to bring the tongue in a loud voice. 65 When she delays, she said, doubt and fear take over and she struggles between her fear and “indebtedness” to God.

I don’t like to displease him, and when I do, I know I have. But I believe it’s those times after asking the Lord to forgive me, [I’m] more determined that when he does quicken me, I don’t delay a second… ‘No, I can’t miss out, I can’t let him down, I’ve got to let it out.’

Her sentence “and when I do, I know I have” is poetic in its rhythm and loaded with meaning. Although she does not say how she knows she has displeased God, it gives her more determination to submit. Her self-talk, “I can’t miss out, I can’t let him down” conveys that both she and God lose out when she does not submit and bring the tongue. Her words encapsulate the women’s dilemma of responsibility and consequence when they feel quickened by God, especially when bringing the gift could mean sacrificing personal comfort and security. But, in the end, for these women, God’s authority must remain unsubverted, and the integrity of the gift must be maintained.

Next I look at how the gifts are applied in the bringer’s and receiver’s lives.

**Discerning the Gifts: Application**

Interviewees indicated that the gifts are often applied in strategic, organised ways. Verity, who with her husband planted a church in Missouri, said that her husband trusted her sense of discernment, and when trying to make difficult decisions, he would sometimes ask her to come along to meetings, even if they were far away. I witnessed this first-hand when I approached her pastor husband on the first occasion that I attended their church and introduced myself and my research. I asked about the possibility of interviewing women in
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their church and also asked to meet his wife. He was immediately receptive to the project information I shared, but he said that his wife would be unavailable that week as she was accompanying him on a trip to another state. Later I learned that the trip took place because he wanted to know what she discerned about a particular pastoral situation and those involved. This is another example of a way in which a woman’s gift contributes to her community.

Indeed, 32 interviewees indicated they had the gift of discernment. Violet said that for her, applying the gift of discernment is a “life-long journey” and that it had helped her understand God’s will for her life. Growing in this gift over time, she said, had come with having “experiences, being sensitive to situations, and being teachable.” Just as Lavonne said about using wisdom to know when to bring the word, Violet said that discernment is about “learning judgment.” The more time spent with God, the more one develops sensitivity while “growing into the gift.” She told of a time when the gift of discernment had brought direction to her life. Originally born in another Western country, she said that when she began looking at colleges in the USA, she met resistance from others; why didn’t she attend college at home? “But I knew that I knew that I knew that was God’s calling for me, and it didn’t matter what anybody said. I discerned clearly that was God’s call on my life.” Violet’s story as to how she actioned this call and the extent she went to see it through by working in an iron ore mine, was shared in the chapter on conversions and callings.

Other narratives that demonstrated how gifts can be applied are stories of faith healing, since ten confirmed they had this gift and fifteen said they had themselves experienced physical or emotional healing. Lesley said that her own miraculous recovery from pancreatic cancer made her realise her gift of faith healing. One Sunday night she was in ICU and her white blood cell count was rapidly multiplying with no signs of stopping. As she was being wheeled into emergency surgery, she said, “It [was] like somebody laid a blanket over me of prayer.” The next morning, two friends emailed from two separate states and each said that their pastors had stopped the Sunday night services, spoken Lesley’s name aloud and told their churches that they “needed to travail” for her. She said, “I truly believe them obeying God is why I am sitting here today.” The pastors had no way of knowing she was undergoing emergency surgery, Lesley said, and both seemingly worked under their spiritual gifts of word of knowledge to have their churches intercede for a miracle.

Later, Lesley was given a clean bill of health, miraculously free from pancreatic cancer. She began to evangelise and to conduct healing services. She told of one in which the church pastor had organised a prayer line for the hundreds who were present and had called two women up to assist her. The healing line lasted for two and a half hours. At one point,
Lesley was faced with a particularly difficult and nuanced request for a man’s physical healing. “I looked up and [said], “Okay, God, we are going out on one of these limbs here. And I am not too happy about this limb. If you are going to touch him, touch him, God. But I don’t like this.” Lesley explained, “All miracles are supposed to be the same, but still there are some that we weigh bigger.”

She later learned that the man and many others were healed, but Lesley continued to grapple with the gift. The sheer numbers of people lining the walls waiting for her to pray over them were a test of her faith. She had heard ministers say before, “We want Sister Lesley up here with us praying for people. When she prays, people get healed.” Healing services were not new to her. But halfway through the prayer line, she said, “the needs hit and it changed me. It changed how I prayed. It revolutionised my life.” This was a new dimension to the gift. Her candid statement to God, “I am not too happy about this limb” demonstrates the pressure she felt from the gifts combined with her burden for the people. God was operating her gift and she knew only God could bring the miracle; yet, she reminded God that she was the vessel and that the faith community looked to her. This dialogue demonstrates the level of trust, relationship and authority her gift gave her, both from the people to her and from her to God. Lesley was surprised to see the pastor and his ministry team assemble at the end of the healing line to be prayed for. Incredulous, she said to the pastor, “What?! You know how to pray,” to which he replied that she “did not know yet what she had.” Though Lesley was still coming in to her own identity as a faith healer, the pastor acknowledged that God’s authority was already fully vested in her gifting.

Similarly, Vanessa had experienced miraculous healing and also had the gift of faith healing, as did her grandmother. She said when she was six years old she suffered an asthma attack. “So my grandmother immediately lays her hands on my chest and my back and starts praying and rubbing…and speaking words of worship and praise to God over me and it left. It just left.” Vanessa emulated her grandmother’s technique later. She said that the healing “conversion experience descended upon me” in church one Sunday. “And my hands started heating up and I [thought], ‘What is going on?’ And I heard the Holy Spirit say, ‘I am activating your gift of healing.’” At first, she questioned it but soon accepted that she had this gift, and she believed that it was a “transfer” from her grandmother. Vanessa said that, after she received the gift of healing in her hands, she began to regularly receive requests from family members as well as others in her faith community for her to lay hands on them. One night the family was in the emergency room supporting her brother-in-law during a panic attack.
Interviewee: He was frantic, even thought he was dying…And the Holy Spirit said, ‘Just walk over to him and put your hand on his face and rub his cheeks upward and place your hand on his forehead.’ I did it like this [demonstrating]…And rubbing his hair.

Interviewer: ...And what happened?

Interviewee: [pause, slight shrug and with a matter-of-fact tone] We went home. The panic attack gently went away and I prayed…My hands are getting warm now [clasping interviewer’s hand].

Interviewer: Yeah, they are.

In Vanessa’s technique of rubbing or caressing the afflicted person’s pain away, her hands heat up when there is a need she can meet with her gift of faith healing or by talking about it, as evidenced above. She submits to the authority of the gift by laying her hands on the person and giving specific healing treatment to the afflicted areas. She also uses her gifting on herself and believes that because she too has faced great sickness and even brushes with death, she is able to compassionately relate to the afflictions of others.

In one final example of discerning the gifts and applying them, Vesta told of holding monthly miracle services on Saturday nights with her husband. On the day of their first service, her husband said, ‘I have no idea what to speak on; you will have to give the sermon tonight.’ And I got, ‘Well, it will have to be on the fourth chapter of Romans then.’” Vesta had the word of knowledge even before she consciously knew it and thought it was “strange” how instant she was with the message. She said, “And people came from the city, people got saved there, and every Saturday night I preached on the miracle service, and he prayed for the sick. That was how it worked. I preached and he prayed.” This is the application of how the gifts mix with and often undergird the ministerial calling; in this case, Vesta’s calling to preach and hers and her husband’s respective giftings of word of knowledge and faith healing.

In the next section I talk about how the gifts are used for maintaining purity and Holiness in the faith community.

**Maintaining Purity in the Faith Community**

Some interviewees shared how their giftings of discernment or dreams and visions assisted them to be protected sexually. Vivien said in the past she had had a colleague about whom she felt “extreme unease.” Trained in the study of ethics pertaining to sexual impropriety in ministry, she sensed that something was amiss but she had no evidence. Two years went by, and she finally said to her husband, “I have to; scripture is too clear. If you sense somebody is overtaking, you have to go to them and gently try to restore them or at least address [the issue].” She would not have been able to live with herself, she said, if “something” was to come out later and she had done nothing.
So [my husband] and I prayed up, and I did. And the person blew up beyond blow up, got so angry with me, turned red and said, ‘If you ever insinuate anything again, I will sue you so fast you will never know what hit you.’ Well, right there, that kind of response should tell you something. Six months later it came out; it had been going on for years, multiple people. It was the most sordid, messed up thing. And the way I did it, I gave the person a chance without accusing. I just did it with such love, I was so prayed up. If the person had wanted an out, they could have [had] an out, but they didn’t.

Vivien said that in nearly 30 years of ministry, her gift of discernment had led her to two such encounters, of which this was the first. The second was well-received; the person thanked her, said they did not realise that what they were doing or saying could be seen in that light, and “never did that again.” Vivien’s testimony demonstrates strategy and courage. Her phrase, “prayed up” is Pentecostal lexicon and it means that one prays about a matter until one feels released to move on it. This was her strategy, and she moved in the wisdom and love that Clemency and Lavonne both said were expedient. Prayer also brought courage, since both of these colleagues were in hierarchy over her, Vivien said. She demonstrated that she had submitted to God over all others by acknowledging her giftings and moving on them, regardless of the outcome.

Another narrative that demonstrates how the gift of discernment can be used to maintain purity was by Constance, who told about a visiting evangelist who preached at their church which her father pastored. Everyone in their faith community, she said, was “in awe” of the evangelist’s ministry, but suddenly she knew, “there’s something wrong with this man.” No one believed her, not even her father. But she insisted, “No, his spirit’s not right. There’s something wrong,” she told them. Some months later they found that the evangelist had ethical issues concerning women. Her father asked her how she knew. “I don’t know,” she said. “It’s like God [was] telling me, ‘Something is not right about that man.’ It was very clear to me,” she said. This also illustrates that the gift of discernment can be lonely.

The gifts could also be used for one’s own sexual protection. Luca said that God gives her the ability to “read” people “or to see right through them.” She told about a man she dated for a brief period of time:

And a lot of people were like, ‘Oh, this is perfect for your ministry, you guys should get married,’ because he was very called into ministry and was already a youth pastor. And I had a lot of leaders and adults telling me this. But I guess my discernment was different than theirs, because I was like, ‘No, he’s not good.’

Luca’s words “my discernment was different than theirs” demonstrates yet again that the gifts can be contested. The emphasis on marriage as a natural step sends a message that being a
single woman in ministry is not desirable, while being married gives her and her ministry a level of validity. But Luca’s discernment protected both. She continued,

    God [gave] me a dream about him, [and] he actually was having issues struggling with younger girls and pornography…I broke up with him immediately. I discerned that he was fake, that he wasn’t what everyone thought he was. So he had all these issues that were hidden; no one else could see, but something in me discerned that something wasn’t right.

Luca trusted in her giftings of discernment and dreams, the latter of which I discuss later in this chapter. She shut out the clamouring voices and surrendered to her own discernment, operating under the authority of her gift.

These interviewees applied their gifting of discernment, which in Luca’s case was mixed with the gift of visions and dreams, to bring sexual protection in their own lives and communities. Each stepped out with courage in the face of public sentiment that was not in their favour but stood strong on what their discernment was telling them.

    Next I discuss how discernment intertwines with the exorcism of demonic spirits.

### Maintaining Purity: Discerning and Exorcising Demonic Spirits

Given how the Pentecostal lifeworld engages with the spirit realm and the supernatural in the form of the spiritual gifts, worship, ministerial callings and beliefs, encountering demonic spirits as well as angelic ones is often expected, if not anticipated. Seven interviewees shared their stories of exorcising demonic spirits out of homes, other people and for some, out of themselves. Chantelle told of a time when they were visited in the middle of the night by a family member who asked for petrol money so he could make a trip with another man. This was highly uncharacteristic of him, she said, both to turn up in the middle of the night and to ask for money. When she went to wake her husband, she said to him, “It’s not Jay. It doesn’t look like him. It’s somebody else in Jay’s body.” The following week, “They had an exorcism,” she said. “The family went up to get [him] and take him out of [the] house because this man was holding him captive in some sort of psychological way.” But, because he had come to her home bringing this man with him, she said, “I just felt there was some evil presence that had come to my home, and I was afraid for my family so I started to seek the Lord.” She said that she had begun having nightmares, but as she prayed peace descended over her home, and the nightmares went away. She said, “My husband knows I’ve always been that sort of a seer or discerning of spirits.”
Another interviewee who drew on the gift of exorcism was Lashay who said that she was once called out to pray for a sick child in the middle of a hurricane in the country where she is a missionary. She drove through a torrential downpour.

I get to the house, I am dripping wet and I walk in the front door, and [the girl] is rolling around on the floor, foaming at the mouth. I am like, ‘No! This is not a sickness, there is something serious going on here.’ Of course, I was trying not to scare them, but I go in and I pray. In my prayer...I start naming certain spirits. And after I got through prayer that child became limp on the floor. They said that she slept all night long and was fine the next day. To them she was just sick.

The description of the child “rolling” on the floor and foaming at the mouth, and then Lashay’s prayers over her with laying on of hands until the child’s body went “limp,” demonstrates that spirits, whether the Holy Spirit or demonic, are manifested with bodily expression.

Another narrative about exorcism came in Jodene’s story. She said that she and her husband, together with a team of pastors, run day retreats for church people once every year or two. They begin by laying a biblical foundation, she said, ministering about repentance and demonic oppression. “The enemy can oppress in different areas,” she explained. “Unforgiveness is one; immorality’s another.” And then the people would come forward to be prayed for. Jodene said, “Sometimes people will manifest; so we just take them privately over and just keep praying.” When asked what those manifestations looked like, she said,

Sometimes they can fall on the floor and hiss; sometimes they can start screaming; they can do all sorts of different things; sometimes it’s not much at all. You can just sense there’s a…heaviness upon them, and you pray, and they’re just released.

Jodene said she prays over them, “Release in Jesus’ name; release in Jesus’ name!” She said, “But it’s very, very real. We have seen people totally set free.” These descriptions demonstrate that the body may succumb under the spiritual power in highly demonstrative ways.

And finally, in a truly powerful and personal expression of exorcism, Caroline, through prayer and fasting, exorcised demonic spirits out of others in her home and herself. She and her husband had only just converted at a UPCI church conference in the island country where they lived (not New Zealand). They had at the time three children and after Caroline and her husband converted, the atmosphere in their home changed very quickly; two of their children began acting strangely. Something was amiss. Caroline’s aunt who is a
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strong prayer warrior called them into a five day prayer and fast, and the senior pastors of the host-church for the conference joined them. Caroline said that, while neither she nor her husband knew anything about praying and fasting, the rapid changes that were happening in their home encouraged them to trust Caroline’s aunt and to do as she advised.

Caroline’s two youngest children, both toddlers were under a house-girl’s care in their home while the eldest was at school. Their house-girl had been with them for a year and a half. Caroline said that she noticed the house-girl had better control over the children than she did herself. When Caroline would tell a child to behave he would not listen to her. But “as soon as the house-girl said, ‘Stop’ and gave him a certain look,” she said, “he’d just stop and then relax.” At the end of five days the senior pastors came to their home and began to pray.

And while they were praying for our children and our house-girl, she manifested…Her eyes rolled back, and our boys, they were throwing our dining-room chairs. And she started frothing at the mouth and squirming in the chair [voice sounds heavy and stressed with the memory].

It was then that they found, Caroline said, “that she had been practicing witchcraft on our children, two of our boys.” While the house-girl manifested, the toddlers showed strength beyond what their small bodies were capable of by throwing around the dining-room chairs. Caroline said in troubled tones,

Until then, I never knew anything was amiss because I was still blinded, I was still in darkness. But when the Lord filled me with his spirit…of light, then all these things just came to surface. I mean, they were already there, but now the veil had been gone, taken away, and I could see for myself that ‘this is not right.’

Caroline’s analogy of “the veil” being taken away could be interpreted as her spiritual gift of discernment asserting itself. She said they prayed over their two sons that none of this they would remember nor be affected by. Caroline said the house-girl left, and they continued to pray for her. Within a few years, she and members of her family eventually “came to the Lord.” But there was yet another outcome from the five days of prayer and fasting. Caroline said that she herself was delivered from what she believed was a demonic spirit of fear.

In the country where they lived, black-outs were a common occurrence. Caroline said, “Of course, with the spiritual warfare that was happening, I still had a great fear of darkness.” She said that she would have “visitations from unclean spirits, to the point that I could physically feel them.” One night, while the household slept, there was a blackout and no moon. She said, “I just froze, I was gripped with fear,” and suddenly, “I could sense this really evil presence...coming against [me].” Caroline said that she reached for her Bible and placed it in her lap.
And the next minute - I don’t know where it came from - but it was from the depths of my belly - out came this authoritative tongue! And I just got louder and louder and louder...and the more I spoke...this feeling of [short pause] it actually felt like a worm, like a wiggly something just [came] out. And after that, I just knew I had so much power. I had so much authority.

Caroline said that she knew, “the Lord had birthed in me a gift. Yes, and he delivered me from fear!” Caroline felt “gripped, numb, frozen [and] paralysed,” to the point that only her mind could move, while her body was rendered immobile. Her story is similar to Jewel’s in the chapter on conversions and callings who said that when she first converted, the panic attacks and fear that had been part of her daily existence ceased. Caroline described her fear as being a demonic presence over which she discovered she had complete authority. The outcomes were the same for both women; the fear was gone and never disturbed either of them again. They each submitted to God by relinquishing their fear and allowing the Holy Spirit to provide deliverance and to make room for the spiritual giftings birthed in them. Caroline submitted to her aunt and engaged in fasting, a ritual that twelve women of this study said was distinctly powerful for them to achieve results and blessings when they prayed. Fasting seems every bit as powerful as the spiritual gifts and is often used in tandem with them.

Next I look at the ways in which intercessory prayer and tongues are used for the benefit of the faith community.

**Intercessory Prayer and Tongues: Spiritual Outlets**

Twenty-five participants indicated they had the gift of intercession and at least four interviewees said that they believe all Christians have this ability to some extent, but they agreed that this gift is when a person is called, even compelled, to pray for others, sometimes without any knowledge of the situation they are praying about. Luca said she was often awakened in the middle of the night with a name to pray for, whether or not she knew the person, and prayed commanding prayers that demonstrated her gift of intercession which I talk about later. Vonda, an intercessor who also was often awakened in the night to pray for others said, “The gift of intercessory prayer is very heavy. It is hard work.” She explained that there is a “burden” or heaviness that comes over her when “God lays somebody on my heart” and sometimes, she said, release does not come. Vonda indicated that her technique is to go over her prayer list of people every day in the same order to ensure no one is left out. She prays for them to receive salvation, healing in their bodies or in life matters and as prayers are answered, she removes people from the list and others take their place. Similarly, Verina said
she can tell when her mother Vera is interceding. “If you want to talk about a ‘disturbance in the Force,’” she said, “I really know when she’s praying for me and when she’s not. And I know that’s true for a lot of people that she keeps in prayer. She has a real gift of prayer.”

Intercessory prayer can be episodic, such as when the pastors stopped their church services and told their congregations to intercede on Lesley’s behalf, but those with the gift of intercessory prayer may frequently have a compulsion to pray. Leah framed her gifting of intercessory prayer with Ezekiel 22:30, “Where God [said] ‘I’ve looked for one to stand in the gap, and I couldn’t find one.’ I remember thinking, ‘I want to be that one.’ I want to be that person who God [says], ‘I know Leah will pray.’” Leah said that her gifting of intercessory prayer helped her to understand her responsibility in the faith community and to be able to bond there with like-minded people since these bonds protect and sanction the spiritual gifts. “I truly believe that it makes a difference. I believe that I’m saved because somebody [was] interceding for me – somebody on the other side of the world was praying for lost souls and it touched me,” she said. “I think intercession is ridiculously powerful.” Leah said that when someone crosses her mind, “If I’m thinking about them, let me pray for them.” These are ways the gift of intercessory prayer gives back to the faith community.

Often those of this study with the gift of intercessory prayer reported that they also have the gift of diverse tongues or are frequently compelled to use tongues as their “prayer language.” Nine interviewees indicated they had this gift. An example is Loretta who said, “[I have] one predominant prayer language, but I can tell sometimes that I change languages while I am praying.” Loretta said that she starts off in English with knowledge of what she is praying for. Once she slips into another tongue, however, she is no longer sure if she is still praying for the same person, situation or need that she started praying for in English. But because she knew what she was praying for before the tongue transitioned, she believes it is the intent behind her prayer that makes her supplication known. Chantelle also spoke of the variety of tongues that were hers to use in prayer language. She explained about the first time she spoke in tongues at the clothesline, as mentioned in the chapter on conversions,

It was like an old, old language. When I speak that way - and that’s not all the time - it will be something deep, when I’m interceding for somebody…But it’s a real deep sorrow…[when] I really ever go back to that tongue.

Lalah agreed, since she also had the gift of diverse tongues and believed that when her tongues changed, it was usually situational, just as Chantelle said.

The gift of tongues can sometimes be interpreted by someone present who actually understands the language being spoken. Lalah spoke of praying at an altar call once and when she was done, a woman near her asked if she spoke Spanish. When Lalah responded that she
did not, the woman told her she had just been praying “in the most beautiful Spanish.” Virgie, a missionary to Africa, said that she easily picks up languages, hearing them “like English.” This had helped her learn several African languages in her missions work with sex-trafficked women. Once while Virgie was on a preaching circuit in Finland, she attended a women’s prayer meeting. “They [were] speaking in tongues but speaking in languages I [could] understand,” she said, including Swahili and Portuguese. One woman was deep in prayer and, hearing the language of Kinyarwanda, Virgie recognised the word for “reconciliation.” She stopped the woman and asked her what she was seeing and for what she was praying. “Rwanda,” was the response. Virgie told her, “I could understand you. You were praying in every dialect. It is like you are moving down the Continent, but you were praying for indigenous peoples in their mother tongue[s].” This was a powerfully impacting moment for both. The woman had the vision of what she was praying for in her mind, and Virgie was able to understand and confirm her prayers. The woman praying could have walked away from that moment knowing only that her intent was to pray for the continent of Africa but never knowing if she actually had. Virgie was able to confirm that she had indeed. This is an example of the power of the spiritual gifts and, again, of their fluid ties in community.

Sometimes discernment also intertwines with tongues, intercessory prayer and exorcism. Leah spoke of a time when she discerned an evil spirit in a man during an altar call. “He was speaking in tongues,” she said, “and…it sounded like metal clanging. It was so mocking and shrill, [and] I remember thinking, ‘Something’s not right with that.’” Leah asked fellow members of the intercessory prayer team what they thought of the man’s display of tongues, and they said it was a “demon.” This interviewee used strategy by not saying anything to the person but by checking in with others whose judgement and giftings she trusted to see if their gifts of discernment had picked up what hers had.

In I Corinthians 13:1 (NRSV), the apostle Paul writes, ‘If I speak in the tongues of mortals and of angels, but do not have love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal,’ and he explains in verse two that without love undergirding the gifts, the gift-bringer is “nothing.” If the man Leah mentioned was mocking, then he did not have love, which is a requirement for operating under the gifts and thus he fulfilled scripture in that he sounded like metal or a cymbal “clanging.” And if indeed he had a demonic spirit, his ability to speak in another language fulfilled scripture as well.67 Tongues are a prayer language acknowledged to be either heavenly or earthly, or as Paul wrote, ‘of mortals and of angels.’ Nonetheless, they are a language one has never learned or studied. Therefore, the gifts are communal and connected
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67 See Mark 1:23-26; Mark 5:7-12; I John 4:1; I Timothy 4:1.
to the first century Church, given to and used amongst members. By recognising fakery, members maintain purity in the faith community.

Next I talk about tongues and interpretation and one interviewee’s ethical conundrum in bringing the gift.

“The Lord is fully in my mouth”

Tongues are usually spoken at conversion, in prayer and worship, or when bringing a message in tongues interpretation to a gathering of the faith community. Caroline began regularly giving messages in tongues and interpretation during church services in the Pacific Islands where she and her family lived. On a trip home to New Zealand, she and her husband attended a church service but not many who were present knew them, so she felt hesitant to bring the tongue. She said, however, that the “quickening of the Lord was so strong that I had to let it out,” and she gave the interpretation also. Suddenly, a male minister stood and yelled, “Women aren’t allowed to speak!” Caroline was dumb-founded. “I felt quite suppressed...but I knew I sought the Lord,” she said. “What the Lord...gave me, I had to give.” Others began weeping from the power of the message she shared and some received the Holy Ghost, so “I knew the Lord had used me for the tongues and interpretation.” Later, Caroline and her husband attended another church conference at which the minister who had challenged her was present. Soon, she felt the quickening again. “There was a [sharp breath in] stillness in the atmosphere,” she said. “The Lord’s spirit, he really wanted to speak. I just couldn’t...quench, I couldn’t grieve the Lord’s spirit. I had to let out...that authoritative tongue.” When she brought it, she said, “After that, I...actually froze.” She had the interpretation but could not give it.

Caroline acknowledged that God was speaking through her and that she “had to let it out.” “Letting it out” happens when the spiritual takes over the physical body, and the mind and the whole person submits to it. Her words, “I couldn’t grieve the Lord’s spirit,” indicate a decision being made. There is a cerebral element to embodying the spiritual, a choice the woman makes to submit to God before all others. Caroline submitted in giving the tongue but stopped herself – and the flow of the Holy Spirit – from bringing the interpretation, because she could feel the patriarchal block in the room from the pastor who had previously shut her down. His words that women must not speak in the assembly rang in her head and tied her tongue. Yet not interpreting is unscriptural; when the tongue is brought, it must be interpreted for the understanding of the hearers.68 On the platform, the guest minister from overseas who

68 I Corinthians 14:13.
preached the sermon at the conference was unaware of the silent dynamics at play which kept
the interpretation from being brought. Speaking from the pulpit, he indicated that he was
aware, however, that “there’s a great spirit of fear in this place.”

Caroline came away from that experience determined not to be shut down again. “To
hear that from the man of God,” she said, “it was a spirit of fear.” However, “today that [New
Zealand] minister knows I’m used of the Lord in this gifting and doesn’t shut me down
anymore…I was being obedient to the Lord…and I didn’t allow it to hinder me or I didn’t
hold it against that person.” She mused as to, “whether it was because I was new or because I
was a woman? I don’t know, or whether they just were used to having one particular person
[bring the tongue].” Caroline said that nonetheless, “It’s all a growing experience, learning
especially by your mistakes and trials.”

What the minister said to Caroline, that “women are not allowed to speak,” was not
scriptural, according to 1 Corinthians 14:39b (NKJV), which says, ‘and do not forbid to speak
with tongues.’ Though the minister was likely staking his claim on 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, it
has long been accepted by biblical scholars that these verses were written about a specific
situation in the church at Corinth and were not meant to include all women then and now
(Bernard, 2012a: pp.215-216). A more recent theory, in fact, has been whether or not these
words were even written by the apostle Paul at all, since they are not consistent with his other
writings in which women featured, nor with the egalitarian values for which the first century
Church was known (Gill & Cavaness 2004:pp.123-40). Finally, this text in its rightful context
is about dialogue, not about when a person is operating under the spiritual gifts, as evidenced
by 1 Corinthians 12:7 and 14:39.

Caroline surrendered to her gifting, submitting to God over all others to bring the
tongue, yet she had a crisis of confidence when she disobeyed the Spirit by not offering the
interpretation, silenced as she was by legitimate fear of a patriarchal block. This represents a
form of ‘competing submissions’: submission to God through her gifting but fearful
submission to the man who challenged her when she operated under God’s authority. Yet, her
gift was affirmed by the community when several began weeping and some were filled with
the Holy Ghost after she brought the tongues and interpretation in the first instance.
Therefore, her submission to God weighed greater than her submission to any man.

Next I talk about hearing and following God’s voice as it pertains to enacting the
spiritual gifts.
Listening to God’s Voice as Strategy

Every interviewee of this study indicated the importance of listening to and hearing God’s voice in order to operate under God’s authority. Clarabelle said that she had the gift of generosity, one of six who claimed this gift, and could discern another’s need; she told of giving supermarket food vouchers to another woman in the church. She wrote out a scriptural text with a note, “The Lord has impressed upon my heart to give you this koha,” tucking it along with the gift vouchers into an envelope and pressing it into the woman’s hand.

And I didn’t even know she was going through problems. She said to me, ‘Clarabelle, we had nothing in the house. I had to wait until next week for my [check].’ [Sighs] I just said to her, ‘Only the Lord knows all these things.’

Clarabelle told other stories of quietly giving when she discerned there was a need but said, “If the Lord impresses upon my heart, I will just go ahead and do it.” Listening for God’s voice then was her strategy and providing a koha her technique. Clarabelle did not wish to use her gifting indiscriminately and so through prayer discerned who should receive a blessing she could give. Violet quoted the text, “My sheep know my voice,”69 and said, “When we spend time with the Lord, we know his voice, so it is a little bit of a crossover between discernment and just knowing God’s voice.” This is what Clarabelle demonstrated.

In another example, Lydia said that she moved under God’s influence to enact her authority of tongues and intercessory prayer while altar working. Once, she said, while in a church service where men and women prayed on opposite sides of the altar, there was a man praying who had sought the in-filling of the Holy Ghost for nineteen years.

And I said to the person standing by me, ‘I wish for five minutes I was a man,’ and I barely got it out of my mouth before the Lord took control. I laid my hands on that man and we both fell to the floor in opposite directions…And in five minutes, he was speaking in tongues.

Lydia was in a gender-segregated context where a woman was not meant to lay hands on a man, while the male pastor and ministers could lay hands on women as well as men. Her statement “the Lord took control” and laying hands on the man indicated her embodied direct line of authority from God. Ironically, Lydia also told a story of casting a demonic spirit out of a man during another altar service. Clearly, her gifting could work both ways: praying a demonic spirit out and praying the Holy Spirit in. Her statement, however, “I wish for five minutes I was a man,” is a nuanced one because she has since held a high-ranking position in the UPCI that has repeatedly put her in board rooms where she is the only woman present. She is not alone in this; other women in this study, including Vera and Lesley spoke of being
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69 John 10:27.
the only women in board rooms or offices full of men. As Lesley explained, “You get to a certain level, there are not many women. You are it.”

Next I talk about when the gifting recedes or lifts and what happens when it does.

**When the Gifting Lifts**

Interviewees contested whether the gifts ever leave or simply recede into the background as other gifts come forward. Three quoted Romans 11:29 to indicate that the gifts are given by God who does not “repent” and will not take them back, but at least five said they believed that certain of their giftings were “resting” or had lifted altogether. Loretta said that, after she had two prophetic dreams foretelling the death of her husband, she frequently asked God to tell her when he would pass. As a result she said, “For several years, I stopped getting any knowledge of anything. And I think it was because I was pushing so hard to find that out...probably trying to misuse it.” Sometimes she felt God still give her directives to “do this or say that to someone” and she would do it, she said. “But as far as a lot of my foreknowledge, it was not working and I [want] it back. I think it is coming back but it is not fully back where it was.” While many believed that one gift may fade to the background for a time or come forward when needed, Loretta said that the loss of her gift came from not following protocol for its use.

Conversely, while Loretta prayed for her gift to return, Luca said that she prayed for her gifting of dreams and visions to be taken from her because of spiritual warfare. From the age of five, she had been able to see with her physical eye demonic spirits and she often had horrible nightmares. She would wake to “warfare going on in my room, the fighting against the realms” in the middle of the night. She made sense of it through scripture. “The Bible says...we don’t fight against flesh and blood, but we fight against powers and principalities.” She was often driven from her bed with someone’s name for which to intercede. Although these were usually names she did not know, once, however, she was given the name of a friend she was led to call in the middle of the night and found that the friend was contemplating suicide; Luca talked her out of it. She told others about her dreams and visions, who said, “That’s a gift!” She responded, “This is not a gift! Not sleeping, being scared to death; that’s not a gift. Are you crazy!?” Finally, she had had enough.

So I prayed, ‘God, take it away, I don’t want this gift.’ And I remember, for a whole year, I didn’t have any dreams [or] nightmares. [I] didn’t see anything – nothing creepy happened, didn’t have anything on my mind, there was no weight on my shoulders. But I also didn’t feel God’s presence for a year.
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70Ephesians 6:12 (NKJV).
She said she lost her connection to and emotion for God; it was a loss which would have created an extreme life adjustment, and she said it was one of the hardest years of her life. “If you pray to God to take that away, he’ll just take it all away. He’s an ‘all or nothing’ God. And I wanted him to take away the negative, so he took it away, which took the good away.”

Luca’s statement, “He’s an ‘all or nothing’ God” was an act of maintaining God’s integrity. For her, the gift was not God’s injustice; she simply needed forbearance and would sacrifice personal security, sleep and peace of mind in order to feel God in her life. She said, “I didn’t see the beautiful side of it where you’re helping people – that’s better than anything else.”

Both of these interviewees recognised the loss of the gift of dreams and visions in their lives and the spiritual power that had been theirs, and both sought to have it back with varying degrees of success. Constance, however, was able to strike a balance between the desirable and undesirable things she could see in the spirit realm by praying specific prayers about what she did and did not want to see, and therefore was able to ‘manage’ her spiritual power. She often feels a chill in her body, she said, when discerning demonic spirits are present.

While the spiritual gifts are given by God without repentance, these are three examples of varying levels of “presence” with the gifts. Loretta believed that she had “misused” the gift and now regrets that it is not as fully present in her life as it had been. Luca specifically prayed for her gifting to depart but her ability to feel God was sacrificed, so she prayed that her gift would return and it did, along with God’s presence in her life. Constance, however, prayed only for a certain component of her gift not to assert itself and, in this way, was able to manage the gift. Since the gifts are irrevocable, interviewees demonstrated the differences between managing the gift or when a gift that was once vibrant and dynamic becomes static due to factors surrounding the gifts or in one’s life.

**Conclusion**

These spiritual gift narratives demonstrate not only the protocols surrounding the gifts and the techniques each woman developed while embodying her giftings, but also how dynamic the gifts are. The women believe that it is God’s presence working through them which brings the power of the gifts; therefore, feeling God’s presence is a state of being. They lay hands on, bring the word of knowledge or prophecy, and pray for others while expecting God to do the rest. They embody their gifts and always give praise to God for the outcomes. In every case and with every interviewee, submission to God was behind the woman’s
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71 Luca’s story was an embodied recognition of the text, Luke 12:48. To her much was given and therefore, much was required.
actioning her gifting, and each one used prayer as a medium every time to action the gifts, even if it carried challenges, dilemmas or consequences. In this manner, a woman submits to God over all others. Regardless of what others may think or say or even if there are negative consequences, when a woman actions her giftings she does so because she is acting under God’s authority.

This is women’s fellowship in Pentecostalism. While it is not always women who are beneficiaries of other women’s giftings – often men may benefit as well – women’s Pentecostal community is dynamic, never static. It is active, not passive. It is engaged, especially when the rules of the spiritual gifts and the authority they hold are carried out and are understood.
Chapter 6 – “There is a keeping power that is part of submitting to God”: Submission & Spiritual Authority

In this chapter I discuss how submission connects with Pentecostal women’s enactment of their callings and their embodiment of the spiritual gifts. The data reveals that submission, given to God before and over all others, undergirds all that they do. Their narratives reveal how submission to God and the patriarchy was used as a strategic tool for their empowerment. Every woman in this study revealed a personal theology of submission. At no time were my questions about submission met with surprise or lack of knowledge or reluctance to respond. On the contrary, each woman seemed open, ready to discuss submission, and gave comprehensive and informed responses, thus demonstrating their deep understanding of the purpose with which submission was actively applied in every life. Interviewees had their own definitions of submission, using words like “surrender,” “humility,” “collaborating” and “willingness,” as some felt the word held too much gender baggage and recreated submission. By redefining the word in their own terms, they demonstrated a personal, cerebral approach with a focus on words that encompassed gendered mutuality and empowerment of their experience of it. In fact, across the board, most of the women who were married reported practising mutual submission in their marriages instead of the top-down model of the creation order of authority (I Corinthians 11:3). And for several, as will be revealed, the creation order was not top-down or vertical, but horizontal. Repeatedly my participants shared that they were under submission to God over all others. If a husband or pastor asked a woman to do something she believed was not in alignment with what God would have her do, she reserved her right not to submit to the man but to God. Still, many women maintained that, while husbands welcomed their input on decisions they made together, they gave their husbands the final say. Even in this however, the women took the stance that it was the husband’s responsibility to ensure he was keeping with the plan of God for their home and family. If his final decision led them down a path that took their marriage or family away from God, he had to answer to God for that, not the wife.

The narratives reveal that there are multiple frameworks to submission that depend on the woman’s individual approach, interpretation of scripture, and how she understands submission and applies it. Thus a woman’s road to submission brings self-awareness and identity. In the following sections I discuss further emergent research themes concerning how
the women defined submission for themselves, how their theology frames its practice, their process to submission and when a woman reserved her right of refusal to submit.

**What Submission is and What it Means**

Participants shared a host of their own descriptions for submission and there are four one-word definitions shared by most: listening (26), respect (19), obedience (18) and honour (16). Some claimed only one of these, while others claimed more than one, but all indicated these terms were interchangeable for them with that given to God, husbands, pastors and leadership. On the meaning of “listening,” Clarabelle said, “That is what it means to me, listening and doing what I am supposed to do as a woman of God.” Jewel said that submission in her marriage is, “listen[ing] to him and submitting to him and yet, you’re doing it together.” Concerning respect, Violet said submission is “respecting the position and voices of those around you. To me, respect is an even bigger issue than submission because submission flows out of respect.” Viola concurred. “Some people would think of submission [in marriage] as a doormat: weak. Submission is all about respect…reverence; respecting your position and respecting your husband’s position.” Many saw obedience as synonymous with submission. Lacey said, “I think that spiritual authority is more attached to the submission of obedience.” Similarly, Vonda said, “I think the more we obey and draw close to the Lord, the more he can speak through us and use us, rather than doing what we want to do or how we want to do it.” The fourth characterisation is honour, of which Lallie said, “As far as submission you are only required to submit to your husband. But I think it is respect which comes from love. The root of respect is love and to honour him and that is…submission.” Judith said that she has witnessed a shift in Pentecostal lexicon to characterise submission as honour, which extricates submission from its gender-boundedness in “giving honour one to another.”

In other definitions, twelve interviewees said submission is about being in agreement. Constance gave her definition of submission in her native Southeast Asian language. “Wonkan,” she said, which means, “Agreeing to that person to be part of you.” She explained, “We’re in this together; I’m agreeing with you, I’m with you.” For Constance, submission was never about saying, “you have to submit to me.” She pointed out, “The moment that happens you resist, right? You don’t want to agree to that person anymore. Agreement has to be [given] freely by the person. So for me submission is agreement; wonkan.” This was in keeping with Verina who said of one’s husband, “If he is worthy of being submitted to, it will be because he’s not demanding it.”
At least 37 participants used metaphor to describe what submission is for them. For example, Verity said that she wants to be “the neck that holds the head.” She said, “In a marriage, the man is the head and the wife is the neck, and the head can’t move anywhere unless the neck turns. But if the neck is being stiff and not wanting to…it doesn’t work well.” She said, “I want to hold him high and help him do what he’s called to do.” In explaining why submission in leadership, Violet too used metaphor. “Somebody has to be in charge even if you have a collaborative system. At the end of the day, there has to be a go-to person. It can’t just be a jellyfish that has no structure or order to it,” she said. Her use of the gender-neutral words “somebody” and “go-to person” suggests that the one in authority and the one who submits are not gender-bound and are on a continuum of change. Still, her metaphor of the jellyfish calls forward negative connotations if no structure for submission is in place. Similarly, Vanessa also used a submission metaphor. “Submission means knowing your creation role,” she said. “God created me to blossom as a flower – that’s what I believe. But I have to have some kind of covering…I can’t be the covering. Like a flower - it needs the rain to blossom.”

The language of having a “covering” came up in 11 interviews. It is derived from I Corinthians 11:2-16 concerning the covering a woman should wear on her head while praying or prophesying in the assembly. The covering is a literal one (hair vs. veil), but is also seen in submission doctrine as a metaphorical reference to the covering the husband provides for the wife as her “head,” although some interviewees also used it in connection with prayer, as in “prayer covering.” Continuing Vanessa’s metaphor from above, “The rain’s going to cover that flower,” she said. “I can’t be the rain and the flower at the same time. I’ve got to pick one of my creation roles.” She finished, “Either God made me to be the flower, or he made me to be the rain – you [have] to know your role!” For Vanessa, this was an “either/or” arrangement rather than an “and/both” and her metaphor was stratified with meaning. If a person is socialised to be either “the flower” or “the rain” that “covers” and these creation roles are not interchangeable, then roles are predestined and determined by rigid gender boundaries. Can a person ever be socialised as “now the flower, now the rain” in interchangeable roles in submission? Some interviewees’ narratives reveal yes, others possibly. For instance, Lallie, who indicated she strictly believes in the marital hierarchy of submission, said, “I pray for my husband and I have to cover him with prayer...because he is a minister...[since] the devil will try and take him down more than someone else. I cover him with so much more prayer.” Her words therefore indicate that there are times she provides the covering in their marriage as well. These metaphors are rich, reflecting the “multi-layered” nature of submission, to use
Lashay’s definition of the term. Even when it seems to be one thing, the description or portrayal of submission may actually be or mean something else.

Interviewees redefined the word for themselves based on personal values and scripture. For example, Jael described submission as a series of steps to create a state of being. “The fruits of the spirit: being self-controlled, patient, kind, good”\(^\text{72}\) which, she said, were not submission in themselves. “But if you were doing those things, you wouldn’t need to be warned off not being submissive.” But, she said, a man must earn the woman’s honour, “by doing what the Bible says; ‘loving his wife as he loves himself.’”\(^\text{73}\) In turn, a husband also should frame being loving by “[the] fruits of the spirit, being kind…patient…long-suffering…That kind of man would earn honour from any woman, wouldn’t he? Not one who thinks he’s the boss and is tearing up a woman. That’s not kind. That’s not what Jesus would want.” The fruit of the Spirit, then, was Jael’s framework for submission.

In holding values about submission, 24 interviewees said that submission can at times be about doing what you do not want to but are called to do in following God’s will. Leah said, “I think my definition of submission is ‘obedience without understanding’ because…it’s sometimes begrudging, but [I will] do it.” She said to counteract her own reluctance, “I think about Samuel telling Saul, ‘obedience is better than sacrifice.’”\(^\text{74}\)…But when you have to do it – it’s hard.” Lacey, on the other hand, conflated sacrifice and obedience as one and the same. “There’s a giving up and there’s a sacrifice,” she said. “And I guess for me, if you’re talking about submission to God, there’s definitely a…giving up of my will to His will, whatever that looks like.” Verity said that after she moved away from her hometown to attend university, she had no inclination or desire to return. Yet as she made career plans, her hometown “kept popping up.” She tried to ignore it until she no longer could. “Finally I [said], “God, I will put that on the list, and I’m going to go wherever you want me to, but if you make me go back there…you [have to] tell me why.” And she said, “I felt that I was going to go back there to marry someone,” although marriage was not part of her plans. She returned and soon after, she was introduced to the man who eventually became her husband. Verity mixed submission with trusting God to provide not only direction for her life but the underlying reason for it. Her move back to her hometown, albeit reluctantly, signalled the submission and sacrifice that characterised her relationship with God.

Another example and definition for submission was about letting go of the barrier of pride and having humility, claimed by 13 interviewees. Vanessa and Laney both defined

\(^{72}\) Galatians 5:22-23.
\(^{73}\) Ephesians 5:28.
\(^{74}\) 1 Samuel 15:22.
submission as “humility,” while Lexie said, “Because if you are submitted you will lower your pride.” She went on, “God obviously knows more than [I] do. So I am going to lower my pride and know that I don’t always have the right answer, and ‘God, I will let you lead me.’” The youngest woman in this study, Lexie is very reflective about her definition of submission. “It makes sense why mine is pride because I sing, and… pride is targeted amongst musicians and singers...So I think it is a big thing.” Lexie indicated that pride can compromise her musical gifting and she was gifted. I regularly attended her church while conducting fieldwork in Missouri, and Lexie demonstrated great capability in leading worship. With confidence and authority well beyond her years, she led the church in vibrant, dynamic song. Swaying, jumping and raising her hands while singing in a powerful voice, she initiated the same in the congregation. Her definition of submission, “lowering your pride,” reflected a prayerful self-awareness.

In conclusion, Vanessa said, “It’s not about becoming something lesser than someone else – it’s about becoming everything that you are.” Her words suggest that submission brings about a whole new person. Women in the following sections reiterate this point, noting that submission empowers them to subvert the self, to shed old beliefs and ways of being in their relationships and to become new.

Next I look at submission doctrine and the scriptures which are foundational to it as seen through the women’s own theology.

**Creation Order & Submission Doctrine: Women’s Theology**

Nearly all of the women provided theological rationale to explain their belief systems around submission, either directly with scripture and verse or as scripture interwoven throughout their conversation.\(^{75}\) Across the interviews, participants’ scripture-based theology for submission mostly centred around three texts: the Fall in Genesis 3:16, the creation order in I Corinthians 11:3, and mutual submission in Ephesians 5:21-33. These texts frame relations between the women of this study and the men in their lives, especially in terms of who carries authority and who submits to whom.

One of eight interviewees who spoke of the Fall in Genesis 3:16, Jael explained, “The Curse came and ‘ruling over’ and ‘submitting under’ was part of that Curse. Well, Jesus came to redeem us from that. So now we stand side by side again.”\(^{76}\) For Jael and Vianna (discussed below), Jesus’ death on the Cross covered all sin and returned humankind to pre-
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\(^{75}\) The scriptures which comprise submission doctrine include, but are not limited to, Ephesians 5:21-33; Genesis 1:26-28, 2:18, 20-24 & 3:16; I Corinthians 7:1-5, 13-15 & 11:2-16; I Peter 3:1-7; Titus 2:3-5, Colossians 3:18-19.

\(^{76}\) I Corinthians 11:3.
Fall conditions, before sin entered the world. Jael explained, “Because when I went back to the Garden of Eden and [saw] the perfect way to be Man and Woman, working together side by side with God as their leader, that’s it. That’s what Jesus died for…It’s easy. It’s not complicated.” Constance, a pastor and theologian in the UPCI, expounded on Jael’s words and said, “I want to raise awareness that women are created in the image of God.” She explained that the Creation Story is the ideal in relations between women and men. Both male and female were created by God in God’s image to be fruitful and multiply and be caretakers over the animals and the earth. They lived and worked side by side together in true egalitarian fashion. Constance emphasises that both are created in God’s image, thus indicating oneness and mutuality rather than separation and hierarchy. In the Creation Story, God called Creation ‘good.’ Therefore, the mutuality in which Man and Woman walked was also good, but that mutuality was lost with the first sin. These participants see mutuality as being restored at Jesus’ death, and the resurrection brought about a New Creation and new ways that women and men can relate to one another in Christ.

In accordance with the Creation Story and submission, nine interviewees talked about the phrase “helpmeet” from Genesis 2:18, 20. Some also indicated they considered this the framework for their marital role. Vicki gave an exegesis on this word, explaining that it is from the King James Version, while later translations used “helper,” from the original Hebrew. She said, “It’s ‘help meet’ or ‘fitting.’ The word ‘meet’ was a help fitting for him – that Eve was a helper fitting for Adam – she wasn’t a ‘helpmeet’...But if you’re submitting to one another in love, you’re going to help each other.” Jewel elaborated, “We’ve heard the sermons where Eve came out of Adam’s side. You are side by side, but the man is protection head over you. It doesn’t necessarily have to mean...that you are under him…That’s a hard attitude of submission.” Jewel’s words mixed the scriptures concerning Creation Order with her discussion of the first Woman and Man and use of the word “head” as written about in I Corinthians 11:2-16.

According to the Apostle Paul’s writings in I Corinthians 11:3, the creation order is God, Christ, Man and Woman, and adds to the discussion on kephalē from the introductory chapter of this thesis. Twenty-six interviewees claimed this scripture or indicated it held presence in their marriages when they spoke of their husbands as being “head of the house.” Joyce said,
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I’m a pretty bolshy\textsuperscript{82} kind of person, and really, I don’t need someone telling me what I should be doing. But I do have to realise that God does have an order which doesn’t mean that the male is at the top and I’m down at the bottom; we’re actually side by side.

Joyce’s interpretation of husbands and wives being “side by side” was expounded on by Judith who gave practical application to these words. She told of being taught early on in her Pentecostal walk that the Creation Order is, “God first, then Jesus, and then husband, wife…kids…and then your ministry.” But one day she heard a sermon that changed everything. “Life is a balance,” she heard the minister say. Using her hands, she showed that rather than vertical [\textit{stacking her hands one over the other}], the order of authority is in fact, horizontal, one next to the other [\textit{using her hands to demonstrate}]. “It’s God, Jesus, Man, Woman…not the vertical, it’s the horizontal…each has value. You balance life!” Veronica, a theologian and missionary, concurred with this interpretation of I Corinthians 11:3. “If you start to exegete it from the Greek and realise that the meaning of the word ‘head’…in verse three especially,” she said, “it’s chronological, not hierarchical.”

Some used metaphor to describe the creation order. Vivien said, “We don’t buy into the whole umbrella, [\textit{using hands to demonstrate}] God’s up here, then it’s my husband, and then it is me. We don’t have that chain of command at all. He is the head of our home…but under God he is not higher, he is not responsible for my spirituality, nor mine for his.” Loretta also used the same metaphor, although oppositely. “I believe submission has a chain of command,” she said firmly. “The Lord set it up in the Bible. We are to be submitted to the authorities [who] are over us\textsuperscript{83}…If we have a husband, then we have to be in submission to him because he is our head.” Jane, who indicated she believed in a vertical creation order, placed her relationship with God squarely within it: “We were taught ‘God, Christ, man, woman’ and I am respectful of that way of things.” She went on. But, “I don’t feel that I have been negated in any way for being a woman at the bottom of the list…because I’ve been up there beside God at the top.” Like others, Jane equated her submission with spiritual authority. Vivien’s, Loretta’s and Jane’s resonant use of metaphor with “umbrella,” “chain of command,” “bottom of the list” and “at the top,” demonstrates again the multi-layered nature of submission in that it lends itself to a variety of definitions and imageries.

Vianna summarises this section by connecting the texts on Creation Order in I Corinthians 11:3 and the Fall in Genesis 3:16. A full-time lecturer, she said she is often

\textsuperscript{82} Urban Dictionary.com gives the definition for “bolshy” as the following: “1) a Bolshevik, or someone accused of having Bolshevik (communist) leanings. 2) (more commonly) an adjective meaning that someone is very assertive in the pursuit of something and/or hostile to authoritarian manoeuvres by others. A bolshy person gets cross if confronted and is likely to say “what’s it to you?”, “mind your own business” and stuff like that a lot...\textit{He was getting stroppy with me, so I started getting bolshy} (Andy, 2004, urbandictionary.com).”

\textsuperscript{83} Romans 13:1.
involved in online discussions where men will state, “I’m fully supportive of my Sisters in ministry but, in my house, I’m the leader.” She said that her usual reply in these conversations was to say,

Listen, I’m not a theologian. I don’t know what the Greek says, but here’s what I can tell you. I don’t believe that at the moment of Creation, there was this CEO model of leadership established. I just think that these fissures occurred at the Fall and if Jesus’ blood covers those things, it’s got to cover this too. And we need to stop living like people in sin and start living like redeemed people, which means we are all on the same plane.

Vianna said, with mild exasperation, “Can somebody please point to me in the scripture where the Bible says ‘you’re the boss’ and ‘you’re the follower’ and these are the rules?” Because it’s clearly laid out in scripture...[and] I don’t see that.” AG authors Gill and Cavaness (2004:87) write that I Corinthians 11:11-12 in fact, upend the creation order of verse 3 because while the first woman came from man, every man thereafter has been born of woman. Therefore, this scripture might be considered the real creation order, harkening back to the Genesis story and the interdependence of Woman and Man created in God’s image. These various perspectives demonstrate how both submission and its scriptural interpretations can be contested.

Along with the Genesis and I Corinthians 11:3 texts, 22 interviewees cited Ephesians 5:21-33 as their personal framework for submission. Verina told of the first time she heard an exegesis of this text in a theology class at bible college.

But [Ephesians] five twenty-one is submitting yourselves, one to another. And that most of us start with, ‘Wives, submit to your husbands’ [vs.22]. And [the lecturer] said, ‘If you go back, and look at it in the context, you start with [verse] twenty-one, you’re not going to get this part wrong. If you submit yourselves one to another [vs 21], and then wives submit to your husbands [vs.22]; husbands, love your wives” [vs 25].

From then on, Verina saw submission in a framework of mutuality through Ephesians 5. Veronica said that she teaches in her courses on Ephesians 5 that, while many look at verse 22, “‘Wives submit to your own husbands,’ in the original Greek, ‘wives also to your husbands’ with no verb means that...if both the husband and wife are in the body of Christ then sometimes the husband submits to the wife,” as laid out in verse 21. She said the definition of this type of submission is, “‘Comes under in order to lift her up’ and sometimes the wife submits to the husband: ‘Comes under in order to lift him up.’” Vicki concurred and gave her own explanation. “I know he says ‘wives submit to your husbands’ [but] he also tells
the husband to submit to his wife in love." While Ephesians 5 does not expressly tell husbands to ‘submit,’ it does say in verse 21, ‘submit to one another’ and in verse 25, as well as verses 28 and 33, ‘Husbands, love your wives.’ Therefore, Vicki and Veronica rendered a fresh definition of the husband’s role within submission, equating it with the love husbands are commanded to give to wives.

Again, some used metaphor to describe what a husband who loves his wife in the sacrificial way that Ephesians 5 calls him to may actually look like. Jerrie cupped her hands one over the other to provide imagery for submission. “The idea is that God wants us to submit to one another, that a man shall lay down his life – that is submission - for his wife, as Christ did for the Church. That is very protective,” she said. “There is preparedness like a Shepherd that lies in the sheepfold: ‘You have to go by me before you can get to my flock.’ That is what Jesus did when he laid down his life. That is what a husband would do.” Jerrie’s imagery was of Christ the shepherd over his “flock” the Church, a parallel metaphor of the husband’s love for the wife. Verity called this a “totally different picture” of submission. “If somebody’s loving you and doing everything they can to serve you, submitting to that is a beautiful thing because the more you help them lead and do their thing, the more you are…helped and uplifted.”

In summary, interviewees spoke of the Genesis, Ephesians 5 and I Corinthians 11 passages as being foundational to their understanding and the application of submission doctrine to their lives. In the exegesis of scripture, the women applied it in ways accessible and applicable to themselves. It was the metaphor of a three-stranded cord spoken of by Catrina, however, which pulled these themes together. “Because I know with that whole process of [male] doing his part and female doing her part,” she said, “it is with the Lord in the middle. It is a three-stranded cord that cannot easily be broken and that is the safety.” There’s safety in the word of God.” This structure of scriptural “safety” provides a variety of ways to understand and apply theological interpretations in respondents’ marriages and lives.

Next I discuss who first spoke submission into their lives and what the women’s development to their own understanding of submission was.

Who First Spoke Submission into Their Lives

Participants’ stories of who first spoke submission into their lives are varied. Twenty-four indicated they learned it from a young age in the home, while 35 said they came to it as
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84 Husbands are commanded to love their wives in four verses of the Ephesians 5 passage, including verses 25, 28, 31, 33.
85 Ephesians 5:25.
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adults. All remembered where and from whom they learned of the concept. For those who learned submission in the home, it was a theme running fluidly through their childhood memories in words or in the way they saw the women in their families (mothers, grandmothers, aunts) live. Vada equated submission with learning obedience to her parents and her elders as a child. She also witnessed it in her parents’ marriage. “My mom was actually a stronger leader by nature, but when the final decisions came it was Daddy’s decision,” she said. “So we always knew there was a straight line of authority.” Still, there was mutuality in their marriage when it came to parenting. “We also knew [about] paying attention to Mom, or we would hear from Dad [chuckling]. He was very supportive of what she would tell us to do.” She indicated that her father deferred to her mother’s authority in raising their children. Vada said she had “co-ordinated teaching” growing up about obedience, taught by family and Sunday school teachers. She remembered the personal testimonies of women in the church as being influential in teaching her about submission, along with messages her pastor’s wife gave the children. “And so it was a lot of reinforcement,” she said, “a rich background.” Now in her own home, “even the children know that I am submissive to [my husband], [although] I have a pretty strong will of my own,” she said. This was the co-ordinated teaching of her upbringing finding fruition. Conversely, Vera, who was widowed, said, “Frankly, I never remember that we ever talked about submission in our marriage. It was never discussed. That wasn’t who [my husband] was.” Vera’s daughter Verina reinforced this with her own memories of her parents’ marriage. “Very healthy, very strong, very mutual...each one had their role and neither role undermined the other...they [were] mutually uplifting to each other,” she said. This was the type of submission Verina learned in the home.

Another framework for submission taught in the home was through scripture. “Within the context of submission,” Julia said, “I love [the] scripture, ‘As for me and my house we will serve the Lord.’” Julia indicated that her childhood home followed this, and she wanted to emulate this in her own soon-coming marriage. Lavonne indicated that her household too practised this scripture, sharing that the family begins each day with prayer together. Her daughter Lexie said that for her, submission was given to her parents, while her older sister Lalahl gave her definition of submission as “sovereignty,” which matched her mother’s definition. Lavonne, who was also present, chuckled and said, “It’s funny, because I can hear myself in both of you.” Her observation demonstrates the submission she was modelling and teaching her daughters in the home. For all of the women, submission to God in their homes.

87 Joshua 24:15.
is indeed a household response, and there is no question that their households “serve the Lord.”

In terms of coming to an understanding of submission later as a young woman, Viviana, a university student was also raised in a Pentecostal home. She said that her parents taught her that when she married, she should be under submission to her husband but as she grew older, she was troubled by the submission she witnessed in their marriage. She said that sometimes when her parents were shopping together she would see her father put his hand at the small of her mother’s back or on her neck to “steer” her to where he wanted her to go. Watching her father do this troubled Viviana, and she said, “I don’t want to get pushed around. I don’t want to feel weak.” She said that when her parents married, her mother asked for the obedience vow to be removed but was counselled by their pastor to keep it in. He explained that it meant for both the husband and the wife to submit. “But the way it sounded, it was just going to be my Mom saying that,” Viviana said. While she wanted a marriage different from that of her parents, Viviana also saw the same thing happening amongst her peers. She told of an incident recent to our conversation about a man who was dating her friend. The three were at the supermarket together, and her friend was looking for flour but came to stand in front of the sugar. The young man bodily picked her up and placed her by the flour, and she exclaimed, “I needed sugar too!” Viviana watched with eyes wide and the incident troubled her: “that’s just something that I don’t like.” She already had before her the model of her own parents, so to see such steering physically take place amongst her peers gave Viviana pause. It was a powerful statement of the implied inferiority that women need direction from men and that this could be generationally entrenched.

This generational entrenchment is real. Vera shared the grim surprise she felt while teaching a class at bible college, “where the boys were adamant about wives submitting to their husbands,” even to the point of physical abuse, she said. Vera warned her students, “If you become a pastor and tell a wife to be submissive to [her] husband to the point of physical abuse, you are liable for that woman’s wellbeing. You are putting yourself in liability. So be very careful when you say that.” Viviana too spoke of young men she knew whom she heard say, “Oh no, I’m the head of the house.” To which her response was, “That’s fine – there’s probably some woman out there who want[s] to be like that too. It’s probably a lot less stressful.” Instead, she said she envisions a model for her marriage-to-come of having equality and being “egalitarian [and] in it together.”

The stress Viviana spoke of concerns the level of thought and enactment that goes into mutual submission. Maintaining such submission in the home can take more work than it does to give everything over to one’s husband. This is because mutuality is more self-work. Mutual
submission requires those who practice it – both women and men - to be self-aware, reflective, prayerful, and vigilant. Hierarchical submission by contrast may require less investment in the self since by its very nature it requires one to subvert their own goals, desires, indeed, personhood for another’s desires and goals. There is therefore the risk of a woman losing herself in the process. Several women told stories of mothers, mothers-in-law, grandmothers and aunts who practised hierarchical submission with their husbands, and witnessing those experiences had caused many participants to choose mutuality in their own lives instead.

One who said she struggled with “un-learning” the hierarchical submission she witnessed in her parents’ marriage was Vivien. “By far the biggest baggage I’ve carried into my marriage; by far,” she said. “My only example I ever knew was a mother who submit[ted] everything to [her] husband.’ She did not have a voice; my father was the head of our home.” As a daughter and then a wife, this model carried long-lasting ramifications for Vivien. “Subconsciously, my whole frame of reference was that the woman always gives in, always submits; it is whatever the man wants.” She said that this had been her “default mode” but that her husband would actively draw her out by asking, “Vivien, what do you want?” By asking her to state her preferences, her husband enrolled her into mutual submission, gently but firmly insisting they make decisions together while sharing responsibilities. “You don’t change that family background, those upbringings,” she said. “Even though you know theologically that it is not correct…it is not what our culture is, but I still regularly try to defer to [my husband] first.” Vivien said that she has been “careful and conscious to overcome that [because] later you come back to resent it.”

Vivien’s words, “it is not what our culture is” are laced with meaning and beg the questions, whose culture and who does the “our” of her statement refer to? In retrospect, these would have been good questions for me to have asked in the interview. Vivien is an administrator and academic who, along with her husband, is in high echelons of leadership. Is Pentecostal leadership the “our” of her statement? A common theme from AG Pentecostal leaders in this study is mutuality in marital submission; they even seemed to take it for granted that mutuality is what they practise. Nor is Vivien alone; stories abound in this study of women who daily navigate and struggle with competing discourses and practices of submission in their marriages and faith communities. Is Vivien’s reference to “not our culture” AG culture in general? Yet, she was raised AG just like many of the women in this study, all of whom practise submission in their own ways. Her statement then is about the type of submission, rather than about submission itself; this is not in question, since her words were situated in a discussion about the mutual submission her husband often called her
Submission is an important component of the culture of Pentecostalism, but there is a smorgasbord of submissions to choose from (discussed later). Perhaps Vivien envisioned that the culture of submission which was already in place was a redefinition of husband/wife roles, characterised by mutual decision-making, communication and respect. This utopian ideal has been captured by some as evidenced in this research, but the Pentecostal lifeworld as a whole (evidenced, for example, in the history chapter of this thesis) has yet to achieve that.

The 35 participants who said that they first learned of submission in their faith community said that it came from pastors and older women in their churches. Chantelle said that her first pastor was “hard as, but a really awesome pastor,” who spoke submission to her. She said that she struggled with submission when she first converted and that her pastor “could see I was unsermissive and disobedient to my husband. Quite the opposite of the person [I am] now.” He taught her that her unsermissiveness was emasculating to her husband. Chantelle said that her “standards had fallen short” and she was “quite aggressive.” Soon she was taken in by older women in the church, a “strong group of intercessory prayer warriors, leader ladies” from whom she learned how to apply submission. She said that these women loved and honoured her husband and that she in turn “honoured them as being elders. They taught me a lot of… the Scriptures. When I’d struggle and when I’d rise up against my husband, ‘you need to be submissive, you need to always give that to the Lord,’” they would say to her. Chantelle said the women prayed for her that she would learn how to “surrender.” I shall return to Chantelle’s story later in this chapter.

Another way to learn about submission was through the Pentecostal lifeworld itself in scriptures, sermons and watching how other husbands and wives navigated submission. Cheyenne said that she first heard it in “scriptures shared about how women should be submissive unto their husbands and their husbands submissive unto the Lord, and in all things as well.” This indicated Cheyenne’s first experience of Ephesians 5:21-25 was to hear that men are commanded to be submissive alongside women. “I did not understand it,” she said. “I just thought, ‘do whatever they say.’” But she quickly found that submission was particularly difficult because her husband had not yet converted. She asked older women in the church, “How do you submit to someone who doesn’t submit to the Lord and their life is really worldly? How do you be obedient and submissive?” She said that the women taught her, “Submission doesn’t mean you just do what you are told in a relationship. Submission [with] your husband is to be ‘as one in agreeance.’ That can be negotiating and finding a common ground.” Cheyenne said that this approach worked for her and that defining submission as being in agreeance with her husband had changed their communication for the better.
In another example of locating submission in the lifeworld, Coral said she came to it by watching her pastors with their wives. “They were treated like queens. They treated their husbands like kings and if they ever disagreed with something their husbands [said], they would wait until it was just the two of them [to] bring the subject up.” This is the model Coral and her husband would later follow in her own home when she too became a pastor, which I will discuss later in this chapter. Coral said, “I used to always think [being] submissive was, ‘Listen to what I say and don’t speak back,’” but she soon decided, “This is what God is talking about when it comes to submitting is how I see these ladies treat their husbands.” Eventually, she said she learned that true submission allowed her to have her own point of view.

Chantelle’s, Cheyenne’s and Coral’s stories demonstrated that while submission is expected to go both ways between husbands and wives, older women in the church coming alongside younger women teach submission. It is women’s fellowship which shapes, sculpts and hones the technique of women’s submission specifically as a tool to maintain peace and harmony in the home and in the faith community.

The next section examines the women’s stories about their process in coming to a deeper understanding of submission and its application in their lives.

The Process of Coming to Submission

Regardless of who spoke submission into participants’ lives, their stories reveal that there is a process by which a woman comes to her own understanding of it; it is a journey that one lives. Whether the process to submission was straightforward in their lives or a struggle, the women harnessed its importance to them in deeply powerful ways. Chantelle said that though she originally perceived it as weakness, “I love submission. I find it’s a strength. I feel very powerful in submission.” Chantelle found its power in “showing me silence sometimes and resisting this urge to open my mouth and contend. It’s just giving me foresight into thinking ahead of the problem, or whatever the situation is that’s happening.”

Accordingly, 18 interviewees gave descriptions of themselves before submission and some expressed wonder that they had ever come to it at all. While Joyce referred to herself in the section on submission doctrine as “bolshy,” Verity described herself as “abrasive.” “I had this reputation in college of being a man-hater and [into] women’s lib,” she said. “So people were shocked years down the line when they found out that I got married.” Her perspective of submission softened when her husband earned her trust before they were married. She said, “As time goes on and the more I am in the Bible, the easier it is to look at the big picture and
say, ‘I love you, and I trust your judgement.’” She said that now, “I love it that he values my insight, and he doesn’t make these snap decisions and say, ‘This is how it is.’”

Comparably, Clarabelle came to submission in her marriage after three decades of already being a Pentecostal woman. She said, “I used to just do what I wanted to do; I didn’t really care how he felt about it,” and said she did not want to ask “permission.” She would say to herself, “I am just going to do it because I am allowed to,” and frequently she expressed these sentiments to her husband. Eventually, he left to tend a property in another region of New Zealand, and she began to see him only twice a year. She said that she began to realise he was unhappy, and said she did not want to live a “separated life.” Finally, after three years, one day she prayed, “Lord, I know that [my husband] is not going to come back here of his own free will, but I will for myself make a change.” A few weeks later, she received a phone call that her husband was indeed moving back home. After he arrived, she said to him, “I know this is of the Lord that we are not supposed to be separated. And I told the Lord that I will do a one hundred and eighty degree turn.” Her next statement makes use of Ephesians 5 as her foundation. “Because I am going to do what I am supposed to do, what the word of God says: ‘Husbands love your wives, wives submit to your husbands.’” In the eight years since, she said, “I have never changed what I promised, and I have found it easier now.” Her communication had changed into agreeance and as a result, she said, her marriage was transformed.

Similar to others, Catrina described herself pre-submission when she heard the obedience vow spoken at her sister’s wedding. She said that at the time, she was “a very strong, independent, single mother [thinking], ‘No man is going to be doing that to me!’” But, she said, “I had a misunderstanding of submission. I didn’t realise the beauty of it and the purpose of what God says submission is.” She said it was “a process…and some unlearning about my perception[s] of submission...as I learnt and observed the lifestyles of women whom I have come to respect for the way that they honour their husbands.” Yet her next words demonstrated that submission for her goes beyond the marital when she said, “That is part of the process of surrendering my life to [Christ] and allowing him to be in charge of my life.” The women demonstrated that submission brings understanding of the self and a containment of spirit while at the same time, allowing a woman to express herself in ways by which she can be heard. In so doing, they submit to God before all others.

Similarly, 20 participants told of genuinely wanting to submit but being unsure of the definition of submission, or of which was the right kind of submission for their marriage. Jewel said she struggled at first as a married, newly Pentecostal woman with the concept of “honour” from Ephesians 5 and prayed, “Lord, honour - how can I honour [him]?” She
explained, “You honour the King and you honour the Queen...but you honour your husband?” Judith expounded on the conundrum Jewel presented and explained what it means to honour. “It’s actually more than honour; it’s about giving honour...I think if you have an attitude of giving it, you’ll never have a problem with submitting. It won’t be an issue.” Judith continued, “I think one mistake that we’ve made is to think that there’s a hierarchy.” She said that for many years she tried to have a hierarchical marriage, but said, “I think we were very unhappy...It was very hard to submit to his authority, because he wasn’t that kind of person. So what do you do with that? It wasn’t his nature but I felt a little bit at times [like] I had no choice.” It is likely Judith felt this way because of the theology concerning submission, which she received from the Pentecostal lifeworld from varying interpretations of scripture.

Fifteen interviewees spoke of having to build their trust in both God and men before submission could flow freely, due to negative life events or past abuse they had encountered. Chantelle came from an abusive childhood home and said that her journey to submission included coming to trust her husband. “I was the head. I was a control freak, and I pretty much said ‘what’ and wore the pants. And we came to the Lord, and it showed in my early walk with my husband. I just didn’t trust him; I wouldn’t submit to him.” Chantelle said that early in her marriage, her husband would tell her something, “and I’d go and do the extreme.” One day in exasperation he gave Chantelle the car keys and told her to “go for a ride.” That evening, she called him from Australia. “He had to pay for my ticket to come home [to New Zealand]. That’s how disobedient I was and un-submissive. So I’ve come a long way!” Chantelle shared a dream she had recent to our interview that she and her husband were in a bobsled. With a “crazy, eager look on his face” her husband was preparing to drive. Fearfully, she cried, “What are you doing to me, Lord? He doesn’t know how to drive!” She said God spoke to her and said, “‘Trust me, trust him.’ So I lay back and [said], ‘okay, Lord.’” Chantelle attributed the dream to changes that were taking place in their marriage and ministry and that she was continuing that journey to trust. Similarly, other women spoke of having emerged from spiritual, sexual and other abuse and they agreed that learning to trust required negotiation and patience and it was at the heart of their journey. Still, they believed that only with trust could submission grow.

In conclusion, Vanessa summed up these themes when she said, “So I had to learn to surrender those feelings of wanting to be completely independent – not depending on anyone, or trusting anyone. It’s been a struggle and a journey for me that I will probably be on for the rest of my life.” Though submission is a relegation of independence, in the process of submitting, the women indicate they found a new sense of self and identity. The women’s stories demonstrate cerebral aspects of submission, its negotiation and structuralism, when a
woman decides what it is, so she can then see what it is not. Following is my next section in which I discuss who the women submit to.

**Who Receives Submission**

While interviewees indicated that they gave submission to the men in their lives including, fathers, husbands and pastors, across the board, the women said they submitted to God over all others and 34 participants gave descriptions of times when they had done this. Lashay described what submission that is ultimately given to God looks like:

> There is the submission we have to the Lord that we allow ourselves to be submitted unto him, to his ways, to his thoughts. His thoughts are higher than our thoughts so we have to give ourselves over to him. Allowing him to have control of our lives, of our minds, our hearts, our intellect, our knowledge...I think one dynamic [of] submission with the Lord is a daily-ness of life where he wants to provide.

Lashay’s words captured the essence of most participants’ ethos surrounding submission. Every behaviour, belief, thought and deed is filtered through theology of what it is to be “godly;” that is, to submit one’s self to God over all others. This was not unproblematic, however, or straightforward, especially for Lashay who had neither father, husband nor pastor. “My father has passed away and usually it’s from your father it goes to your husband. Well, I am not married. Then after that it goes to a pastor,” but as a missionary she did not have a pastor. “Where does that leadership come from? What I have gone back to is that I am called; therefore, I have my leadership under the Lord.”

Yet giving submission to God was not without its struggle. For instance, Jacquelyn used Matthew 11:28-30 as a framework for her marriage and ministry, one of four interviewees who did so. Jacquelyn said that this text helped her at a time when she was struggling with the questions of life and her call into ministry as a pastor’s wife. In her sense-making around it she decided,

> We wear a yoke whether we are aware of it or not. Nobody is yokeless. And so the yoke of the ministry; if he has called [my husband] to the ministry and he has called [us] to get married, then he has called me to the ministry too. And if he has called me to the ministry, then he is going to make a yoke that will fit well.

This analysis helped Jacquelyn to place her marriage and calling into a submission perspective.

---

88 It is often taught that submission should be given to one’s father as “head of the house,” but except for the discussion on learning obedience in the home, only a few named their fathers in accordance with submission, and those few also named mothers. Space does not allow for a separate discussion on submission to parents outside of what has already been mentioned.
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Across the board, the women’s narratives indicated that they submitted to God over all others, a point I make throughout this thesis. From this foundation, the women built their submission to husbands, pastors, and others in their lives; however, there was some variation in how women achieved the latter. For example, 38 women in this research claimed marital mutuality as their practice, compared to only 13 who indicated they practised submission hierarchy. Those who practiced mutuality agreed that it required negotiation, consistent communication, and equal respect. Violet said, “I can say for sure in our home with my husband, we have mutual submission. We collaborate, and it is a give and take. It always has been and that will never change.” Her phrase “give and take” was shared with at least three others, including Jacquelyn who spoke of mutual submission with her husband as a “balancing of roles.” “Because we have always both felt like we have got our own way. It is through giving and taking…It is mutual submission, and it works. It clearly does.” She said, “We probably have had to work at it to a degree,” but now, “to us it is just normal.” Without consistent communication, she said, mutual submission could not work.

A sense of negotiation and mutual respect is a common thread, however, throughout all the narratives on marital submission. Vicki, like Jacquelyn, found Matthew 11:28-30 an excellent framework for her ministry and marriage, connecting being yoked with Christ to the mutual respect she and her husband enjoy. “Not that it’s always been easy to submit to each other but I think submission to God, being ‘yoked up’ and the closeness to God helps us,” she said. “Because if we’re both staying as close as we can to the Lord, we’re hopefully going to hear these things together.” She expounded, “We see ourselves on this journey together, but there’s an equal respect of each other. I do believe that God uses us both as believers, to give wisdom to one another in this process; ‘co-submission’ - submit to one another in love,” she explained. Her use of the word “co-submission” was the only time it was used, though it seems to share the definition of mutual submission with agreeance and a sense of negotiation. In order to both submit (“co” or mutual), each must negotiate how they’re submitting. Vicki’s imagery of husband and wife being yoked up with Christ disrupts the idea of hierarchy and describes instead the horizontal creation order of man, woman and God as previously mentioned.

Along with negotiation and respect, women who practiced it agreed that mutual submission also means identifying their and their husbands’ strengths in marriage and ministry. For instance, Constance said that while she is better at talking to their children because of her pastoral gifting, she and her husband support one another in their preaching or other areas of ministry, work and home life. “It was always mutual support,” she said. “He has such respect for me, and I have such respect for him…There are some areas that he’s
good at, and we’re dependent on him,” she said. “But [I have] never said, ‘Oh, you’re the man, you lead.’ There’s never once…an argument about who submits. That conversation never comes up.” She said thoughtfully, “For me, love has to be first right. When there is love you don’t worry about who submit[s] to who[m].”

In focusing on their interdependent gifts, Coral is not only wife to her husband but also his pastor, so for her, navigating marital submission requires strategy and good communication. She said that during church business meetings sometimes her husband would publicly agree with her, yet at home would privately tell her he disagreed on the matter. This created a conundrum. “I am at home so I am not actually his pastor, I am his wife,” she said. So Coral utilises strategy. She asks her husband to bring it up at the next business meeting, or she waits and brings it up later when he is in a good frame of mind. “So,” she said, “I have had to come up with how to deal with that and still be a submissive wife...We have always had to do things as a team, so we respect each other.”

Along with the women’s stories of partnership, mutual respect, and listening to God together, however, came one narrative unlike any other. Laney said that now and again, when “I feel that critical spirit rising up in me, I will do something that shows him I am submitted to him...When the Lord tells me to...I wash my husband’s feet.” Laney explained that while foot-washing may not be for everyone, she finds this spiritual practice to be “powerful” in its ability to cleanse her spirit. “That is something that God gave me for him, for myself.” She said, “The first time I did that, [it] broke my husband...I sat him on the edge of the bed and I washed his feet. And it made him cry...and it made me cry, and it really brought us together.” Laney explained that after the times she had done so, “I feel a change in the atmosphere of our home. I feel a change in me.” Laney gave her definition for submission as “willingness” and indicated this practice was one of humility and servanthood, given in submission to God (“when the Lord tells me to”) and expressed to her husband. Having him sit “on the bed,” a place central to the marital union, was symbolic of her renewed commitment to their marriage, and it deepened her submission. “There is a keeping power,” she said, “that is part of submitting to God.”

And yet women also maintain power while relinquishing control, and they are strategic in their approach even as they remain true to their interpretations of scripture. For instance, 16 interviewees said that in matters of decision-making, their husbands had final say. However, they indicated that their husbands were accountable for the outcomes, and especially to God, for decisions made. Cicely said that if as head of the home the husband makes a wrong decision for the marriage or family, it is he who has to answer to God, not the wife. Lavonne concurred and said, “Because if I know that God is in control then it helps me
to...have patience with my husband when I think he is out of control [laughs], or when I think he is not doing something right.” She continued. “It helps you to see, ‘OK, well, God has got this.’ So...I am good. I am going to wait until you come around, and you can see that that is probably not the right thing to do.” If she indeed knows, in Lavonne’s words, that “God is in control,” a woman is better able to relinquish her own control and rely on God to bring about desired outcomes, even when the husband does not seem to be in alignment.

The narratives therefore reveal that marital submission - hierarchical or mutual - requires patience, humour, centredness in one’s beliefs, and trust that God is present. Within this section, I next look at alternative frameworks of marital submission outside of mutuality.

**Alternative Frameworks of Submission in Marriage**

There were other frameworks of submission that built on mutuality and hierarchy and seemed to take one of three categories: indulgent parent/child framework, appropriation and pride, and extraordinary support in an adult/adult framework. The first framework consists of being childlike to their husband’s adult persona. For example, Vada practiced hierarchy and she said in her marriage, “It may take a while, but I am submissive...I’ll still mind” [chuckling]. Her words, “it may take a while,” suggest the mental calisthenics that any kind of submission requires and the accompanying tension. With the word “still,” however, there is a conclusion already drawn that she will submit; it is only a matter of time. Her words, “I’ll still mind,” convey a childlike framework of submission. Laney indicated that her marriage was a hierarchy, but she “struggles” to keep it that way, she said. “My natural self likes to be in charge.” But, she said, “I will ask [God] to make and remember me as a little child and help me to be that way.”

She confessed, “I have made a lot of mistakes as a wife, but I have done a lot of things right because [of the] little child that is in me...But I think most of the time it is a hierarchy with God, [my husband] and me.” Laney’s terminology of becoming as a “little child” in submission suggests that perhaps she sees that having her husband over her is at some level denying her full personhood as an adult woman. It implies that she must be a little child in order to justify her husband being “over her.”

This was also the case with Lalah who, although unmarried, said, “Submitting to my husband would mean...allowing him to guide me and know more than I do...and being OK with him knowing more than I do.” Lalah also envisions a spiritual hierarchy. “Being under his spiritual guidance and trusting that he hears from God. Just like I do or even more than I do.” Lalah’s vision of submission seems to convey a sense of holding herself back, always a student, never graduating or becoming the teacher. Her final words, however, indicate that she
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does not doubt her own ability to hear from God. She expects that the two will listen together, so in that capacity there will be some equality.

In another scenario within this framework, Vonda said that her husband is “the kind of man that allows us to sit down and talk about a decision, and I am allowed to express my opinion. And then I will say, ‘But the decision is yours.’” Vonda’s use of the word “allowed” suggests that she gives submission to her husband, and he in turn “indulges” her by listening. She continued, “One time he made a decision, and I said, ‘Sweetheart, I think that is not a good decision but I will respect you.’” Vonda said “amazingly,” the results were that “the next morning he said, ‘OK, hon, we won’t do it that way.’ I expressed myself to him but I left it at that, I didn’t argue with him.” Vonda’s story demonstrates that her husband listens to her when she expresses a dissenting viewpoint and indulges her by taking on board her contribution. Of the 16 interviewees who said though they discuss decisions first, their husbands have the final say in making them, this number included some who claimed mutuality, of which Vonda was one. In this framework, however, the wife becomes simply a sounding board for the husband rather than an actual decision-maker. These stories are situated within a framework of indulgence or parent/child relations within marriage.

In a framework of appropriation, Vanessa was engaged to be married and spoke of being a “helpmeet” to her fiancé in their soon-coming marriage. “I will let him be the man, and I will support him from the sidelines…But I think my greatest calling [is] to be his wife, meaning I need to be praying for him and supporting and encouraging him,” she said. “And just whatever it is I need to do as a helpmeet. That’s…my primary focus.” Her words, “I will let him be the man,” suggest a choice is being made to relinquish her power and control. Her words “from the sidelines…supporting and encouraging” invoked a certain amount of holding one’s self back while cheerleading. They suggest that her husband will appropriate that space in her life where she would normally pursue her own callings. Yet Vanessa shared that in actual practice, her ministry in music and the creative arts make space for her musician fiancé to come alongside her. Because Lalah (mentioned above) and Vanessa were both unmarried and inexperienced at marital relationships, their perspectives were as yet undeveloped in comparison to married respondents. Therefore, it was unclear if their approach to submission was theory only and if it would change once they became married.

In another example of appropriation, Lesley, a faith healer and evangelist, shared that her late husband had said to her, “I want you to succeed; your success is my success...I have always backed you, I packed your suitcases.” He sometimes travelled with her when she preached. With his words, “your success is my success,” her husband appropriated her success, making it his own. Yet Lesley was one of 11 interviewees who at first purposely
chose not to heed her own calling, or subverted her calling to be lesser in care of her husband and their marriage. When married women subvert their own callings, husbands may appropriate wives’ time and effort for their own ministries, rather than husband and wife focusing each on building their own. Perhaps it could be said that husbands who indulge or appropriate their wives’ ideas and opinions, prayers, time and ambitions are doing so from a sense of pride in who their wives are. However, this can also cause the woman herself to be lost in translation, her personhood put on hold. While Lesley eventually moved fully into her calling, some who subverted their own did not. Vianna told of women in her family who had done this to the detriment of their own callings, and she questioned whether or not God was pleased with that.

In an example of a woman being lost in translation which resulted in a feeling of “non-personhood,” was Loretta’s story. She said that when she was young she learned “not to have opinions and to live with it,” due to conflicting parental beliefs about how she should spend her time. She concluded that what she wanted was not listened to or valid and ceased to express her opinions. She said, “So I went into marriage that way, which was a mistake.” She found that even stating her opinion when asked, “Where would you like to eat tonight?” She said she would reply, “‘Anywhere you would like to go!’ knowing full well where I wanted to go.” She said, “I didn’t start having opinions until I was in my early 40’s. Then it blew him away.” Loretta said her life changed when their children left for college “and I felt like I had absolutely nothing here, I am just a [long thinking pause] chameleon. Anything goes, whatever anybody wants, I’m just wishy-washy. Like mush.” She decided, “I am going to voice my opinions. I am going to be a person...I described myself literally as being a non-person.” She said it was “still sometimes difficult” to express her opinions. Loretta’s story demonstrates the alternative framework of non-personhood that a warped sense of submission can result in but she managed to make healthy changes. While Loretta believes in being submissive to her husband (as expressed in the section on submission theology), her experience of the Pentecostal lifeworld reveals that she is allowed to have opinions and express them and still have submission. Yet it was largely due to her upbringing rather than her marriage that contributed to the submission she at first practiced. This juxtaposition demonstrates yet again submission’s competing discourses and customs.

Finally, however, there were those whose stories were situated within a placement of extraordinary support in an adult/adult framework. Vicki, an administrator said of her husband, “He told me once, ‘Sometimes I wonder if one of my main roles in life is just to be here for you.’ And he has; he has, in so many ways.” She agreed, however, that this seemed to be a reverse of the norm and spoke of her husband as a “helper,” flipping the usual woman-
focused definition of “helpmeet,” discussed above. In another example, Vianna said, “If I am only doing things that bring me fulfilment, then that is selfish.” Submission for her, she explained, is respecting her husband’s process and not putting over on him her own way of doing things. He in turn, she said, submits to her by “not being expect[ant] of relationship gender roles, by not asking me to give things up for him.” Vianna, a lecturer, feels fulfilled in her career and she is glad that her counsellor husband supports her. “The truth of the matter is,” she said, “I don’t want to live in a state of constant conflict. I see too much of that, and I saw too much of that. And so this is how we negotiate.”

And finally, in an example of an adult/adult relationship in submission that happened only when the wife claimed her calling as her own, Coral said that she held herself back for ten years. Told by members of their church, “You have to stop exactly where you are because your husband is back there, so you can’t go ahead of him. You have to always wait for your husband,” she finally decided, “Why do I have to wait? I am sick of waiting!” Soon after she was recommended by her pastor for ministerial licensing and eventually became a pastor herself. Her husband came alongside her as a strong source of support. These relationships and their subsequent negotiations are done on an adult/adult level, with the husbands coming alongside their wives in focused, supportive, respectful ways that are neither indulgent nor appropriated.

In summary, these alternative frameworks of submission in marriage leave behind mutuality when women become contortionists to fit submission ‘boxes,’ making themselves childlike or giving away their autonomy and sense of choice. Some admit to struggling within these constructed frames. When juxtaposed with stories of women who flatten the hierarchy in order to achieve their callings, it is demonstrated again how submission can be contested. From submission that is given in an adult/child framework, appropriated by husbands or situated within a loving, mutually supportive structure, the women’s narratives reveal a smorgasbord of submission types, any of which can be contested.

Submission is not only given to husbands, but pastors as well and 32 women stated the importance of this and why.91 Vonda said that she learned respect for the pastor while growing up. “My parents never, ever talked about a pastor in front of us kids. The pastor was our friend; we loved our pastor,” she said. “When we would get a new one, we would all take turns whether he was tall or short, heavy, slim, dark hair or light hair; we would play this little game and then we would come home and say, ‘Yeah, I was closest!’” She chuckled at the

91 I Thessalonians 5:12-13. While this text reads “respect those who labor among you” and assumes in this framework that these labourers are pastors, the next words, “and have charge of you in the Lord and admonish you;” provide a framework of pastoral care and leadership. Therefore, this scripture has common usage in framing submission to one’s pastor.
memory, and I noted with interest that there never seemed to be a question in this game as to whether the pastor might be a woman. The Pentecostal lifeworld (as with any lifeworld in which culture is created and inculcated) can often be seen in the ways children communicate and are socialised to behave and believe, what they pick up from the adults. The game suggests that the possibility their pastor might be a woman was not presented to the children, which indicates a way that the lifeworld begets thought and behaviour.

In being under submission to one’s pastor, Cami spoke of the guidance she receives from hers and explained, “We’re taught that our pastors are responsible for our souls...They’ve got to answer…when they appear before God [for] each one of the people that were under their care.” Cami said that she would often go to her pastor with her plans for ministry or travel. She said that those were times when, “I’ve gone with his blessing.” She said that she had seen the difference between going with his blessing and going without his blessing and said, “It makes a big difference, because you know you’re in the will of God.” She shared of a time when she had not talked to her pastor first and said she had to “repent” of the result, learning then that it is important to do things in “right order.” Therefore, Cami said, we “honour the man of God who ministers the Word of God to us. We don’t put him up on a pedestal…but like Paul said to the Romans, ‘Give honour where honour is due.’”

Pastors may be more or less conservative in the way they lead and in their expectations on members to live according to God’s Word if they wish to be used in ministry, such as singing in the choir, or in other aspects of leadership in the church and in their lives. Lorraine said she believes that it is necessary in submission to one’s pastor to go along with any requirements or requests the pastor may have in order for members to be involved in church ministry. For her, these usually include members following the UPCI standards on dress, body adornment or women not cutting their hair (as discussed in the next chapter). Lorraine said, “I just think if you want to be part of it then submit to it.” She believes it is a question of having the right attitude and the right spirit and said that one does it, “not because it’s a rule but because you want to do the right thing...and want to be involved.” I will talk more about the perspective of being obedient in order to be used in ministry in the chapter on the power of uncut hair.

Lacey said that she submits to her pastor because, as an unmarried woman, her pastor is her “covering,” the word Vanessa used in her metaphor in the first section of this chapter. An ordained minister, Lacey said, “I’ve been under some situations where men expect women in the church to be submissive to every man, just because she’s a female and he’s a male.”
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She told of taking part in a ministers’ online group discussion about submission where she commented that, as a single woman, “If I’m supposed to be submitted to every man in the church, I would be really confused. If each man said something different, then who am I supposed to submit to?” She is adamant that, “The scriptures are about submission to a husband. I’m not married. I don’t have a husband, so I don’t have to submit to you.” Still, she said, “I do feel like it’s important for me to submit to authority, whoever that authority is...and making sure I have somebody that I’m accountable to.” For Lacey, this was her pastor. Interestingly, parallel to Lacey, Chantelle said, “I submit to the men in our church, and I honour them as men of God,” but then clarified, “when they’re in their right place.” As the pastor’s wife she is over the men in her church, but she conflates giving them honour with also giving them submission. Her qualification “when they’re in their right place,” however, suggests that she honours their position as “men of God” more than she actively submits.

Those with a call to preach or who worked in positions of Pentecostal administration and leadership told of working directly with male pastors as part of their work and ministry. An evangelist and faith healer, Lesley told of sitting in the pastor’s office of the largest UPCI church in her home state. Invited to preach for a Sunday night service, the pastor met with her beforehand in his office. “He asked, ‘What do you want to happen in the service tonight?’” Lesley said that she had learned “diplomacy” from ministers who were her mentors, and she used it. “I looked at him and said, ‘While I am in this church, I am under your leadership and your authority as the pastor. You are supposed to tell me what you want.’” He accepted that and then asked her another question. “Where do you want to sit tonight; on the platform or in the congregation?” Lesley said,

Well, it is like this, Brother. I am welcome on most platforms across the United States. However, I know in [this state] there is an issue with women in ministry. I do not know what your church will accept or not accept. You are the only one [who] knows that. I am comfortable wherever you want me.

The pastor said, “Well, I will have you sit on the front pew.” Lesley indicated that was fine. But as they walked into the service together, he said, “No, ma’am, you are ministry. I want you on my platform.” Lesley was amazed. “I will never forget it,” she said.

Lesley’s influence through submission and diplomacy made way for her, and her story is a historic one for its gender dynamics, as this pastor is a former UPCI district superintendent of the state. Therefore, his invitation to Lesley to preach for him sent a loud message to other churches. When he asked her where she wanted to sit, they both knew he would not have asked a male minister that question. He may have been testing her level of submission and humility. He knew that Lesley had been invited into places where only men
had been allowed; indeed, when she first walked into his office, he was in a meeting with his ministers, all of whom were men. Perhaps he therefore wanted to find if her ministry had made her “unsubmissive.” Lesley had a sense of authority of her identity and giftings through the Spirit; yet, by using diplomacy that contextually resembled submission, she was brought to high places. Submission was a strategic tool for her empowerment.

Concerning submitting to other women, 17 interviewees indicated that they submit to their female pastors, pastors’ wives, and other women in the faith community. Chantelle said that along with the older women in the church whose authority she continues to “come under” as mentioned previously, there are older women who submit to her who are spiritually “not in that place.” She said, “Usually, I’ll have that authority over those ones, and I’ll honour them because they’re an elder, but just be a good guide for them and support, mostly.” In this manner, Chantelle and the women who mentor her are following Paul’s directives in Titus 2:3-5 in guiding other women. Others, like Cheyenne and Lallie said that they submit to their pastors’ wives. Some, including Jewel, Cami and Jael, said that they would also submit to women pastors. “If the Lord has put them into that position and you are a member of their flock, then yes,” Cami said firmly. “If they’ve been ordained as a pastor, they need to have the honour given to them, just as the honour is given to a man who has that position.”

To summarise, Vonda explained why submitting to authority is important. “It starts first with God,” she said. “Because I have seen in my years of ministry and in missions, unfortunately, there are people [who] challenge leadership in every aspect; every decision [and]…requirement is challenged. You cannot do that with God; you’d better not do that with God.” Like Vonda, throughout this study, women’s submission to men is filtered through submission to God first before all others. Vonda concluded, “So I would say submission in marriage has been quite easy for me just because of the wonderful gift of the husband that God gave me…the upbringing that my parents gave me, and because of my walk with the Lord.” Submitting to the pastor and other church leaders as a way of being used in ministry and especially, pleasing God is an underlying theme connecting respondents’ personal belief systems concerning submission and how each member interprets God’s word. Yet women in this study revealed times when they reserved for themselves the right to refuse to submit.

Following is the final section of this chapter in which those narratives are explored.

**When a Woman Refuses to Submit**

Submission is many things, none of which is guaranteed. Lydia said that submission is what she gives “when it is the right thing to do,” and 11 participants clarified when submitting would *not* be the right thing to do. Along with their clear life-definitions, theology, heritage
and active frameworks surrounding submission, the women have firm parameters around when they will or will not submit in the home or the church. Concerning the latter, Valerie had been through a difficult situation with her former pastor. “Submission to the pastor and the elders was the issue at our main church,” she said, where she and her husband attended for more than two decades. Valerie told of being given a new vision of submission from another pastor-mentor who used the text, “If the blind lead the blind, then they are both going to fall into a pit.” She sees this text as a framework and an admonition not to follow “blindly,” that she must be cerebral about the submission she gives. If “things are being done un-biblically,” she said, it is okay not to submit. Both perspectives, determining what is un-biblical as well as when she will not submit requires a strong understanding of scripture, which Valerie has. She and her husband eventually left that church and began to attend another.

In a further example of organisational abuse in submission, Jacquelyn told of when she and her husband were members under the pastor from whom they eventually took over. He was, she said, “an appalling minister who had his own issues, and one of his favourite sayings was ‘submit or split.’” Jacquelyn said this was in fact a movement in New Zealand in the 1970s in which some ministers set themselves up in “dictatorial” ways in abuse of their congregations. She and her husband saw this as a “terrible over-balance of submission,” she said, and “just not what Jesus is like.” They witnessed the damage it did and “we had the difficulty of trying to be godly in a very difficult situation where you knew that what was happening was not godly.” These stories demonstrate that submission can be a factor in spiritual abuse or in personal relationships and that each can impact the other.

In the home, these women reserve for themselves the right not to submit, specifically, when the husband is not following the wife’s or the faith community’s interpretation of scripture and seeking the best for her, himself or their family. This decision is dependent of course upon the woman having a strong understanding for herself of scripture, rather than relying on members of the patriarchy to interpret scripture for her. If she does not know that what her husband is asking her to do is unscriptural or sinful, but believes that he is “God’s representative” to her, she may not challenge him or know that she can. Lallie said that she and her husband were preparing to co-teach a church class on submission and marriage and discussed a scenario in which a husband forbade his wife to go to church. They agreed that such an action is out of line with God’s word and with submission doctrine, according to Ephesians 5, where one very important tenet is that husbands are commanded to love their
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95 Jacquelyn indicated this movement came out of the USA. While it was beyond the scope of this research to follow up and look further at this movement, a comparative look between USA and New Zealand on the historical movement of “submit or split” would make for intriguing future study.
wives. “You need to respect your husband because of the role he has. He is your husband. But if there are things that you know biblically do not line up, then you need to have that submission towards God first,” Lallie said firmly. Vanni experienced this very scenario of her first husband attempting to forbid her and their children from attending church but said, “I overrode that. It cost me a lot of grief and hurt because I did, but I felt that my submission to the Lord came first.” If a wife feels that she must ‘submit to survive’ a husband’s actions then he is not showing her love, so he is out of alignment with submission theology as it is laid out in Ephesians 5.

Some of the women in this study had been in abusive relationships in which submission was used as a manipulatory tool. One interviewee said that if she had a disagreement with her husband, she would apologise and say that it was her fault, even when she knew that he was at fault. She did this in order to subvert a larger argument. This wife’s means of managing in her home was submission as survival. The husband was not in keeping with the Ephesians 5 depictions of the sacrificial way a husband should love his wife. In submitting to God before all others, she might offer a suggestion that they pray together or agree to a time for reflection between them and return to the discussion later, but she is not required to submit.

Jacquelyn named the traits of a non-egalitarian husband who may have an “ingrained attitude of inequality, superiority, or gender imbalance” and “genuinely believes that the husband is the leader to a fault.” If a woman is married to such a man, she said, “I don’t think you can do much about it.” These are the types of traits a husband may have that could cause a wife to submit to survive or refuse to submit at all. As a pastor’s wife who practises mutuality with her husband but who has seen other models of submission during their ministry, Jacquelyn knew that not all men take an egalitarian approach. Her statement, “I don’t think you can do much about it,” is weighty, loaded with meaning. There are various steps a wife can take, such as seeking the help of others in the faith community, as many did here or ultimately leave, as some also did. If a man has such an ingrained attitude of superiority, inequality or gender imbalance as Jacquelyn spoke of, not only is it unscriptural but it can translate into abuse. In I Peter 3:7 (NLT), the apostle Peter’s words clearly lay out the way husbands are expected to treat their wives. He admonishes, “She is your equal partner in God’s gift of new life. Treat her as you should so your prayers will not be hindered.” In the Pentecostal lifeworld, where there is a strong emphasis on relationship with God and moving under the authority of the spiritual gifts, to have one’s prayers hindered means one’s spiritual power is severely compromised. As a result, a man risks, among other things, his social capital. According to this text (as well as I Corinthians 7 and Ephesians 5), a man must
consider his wife as his equal. Jodene agreed. “To change that culture, they need...the men first to go to bible college and actually learn how to read...and interpret the Bible properly.” Jodene, reiterating Jacquelyn’s words, said it would have to be the men “because they’re the only ones who can change it.”

Viola unequivocally said, “You have to be careful of who you’re willing to submit [to] and settle with. You have to know the difference; are you submitting to the devil or are you submitting to the Lord? So some women are submitting to the devil.” They do this, she said, because “they haven’t seen or know any better.” Viola clarified that submission made it important for both husband and wife to be believers. Quoting I Corinthians 7:13-15, Viola interpreted, “if the husband is unbelieving, he is sanctified by the wife.” She continued, “So even though he’s unbelieving he still is considered a believer because his wife is a believer...So they are won by our conduct, by how we act.” This scripture, however, has sometimes been used in conservative Protestantism to influence wives to remain with abusive husbands. The fact that it came up in a discussion about submission’s potential for abuse was not a coincidence.

In summary, Joyce’s words bring together the themes of this section. “Sometimes the way it appears that God has ordered things is that the ‘buck stops with the guy,’” she said. “But it is like government; you obey the rules of government, unless they compete with what God is saying.” Interviewees agree that a woman need only submit when a husband or pastor is in accordance with her interpretation of scripture. However, when a woman is not permitted or is made to feel that what she does, thinks, or where she goes must be in alignment with her husband’s or pastor’s wishes, or if she must submit to survive, it is abuse. At the very least, it is an abuse and misuse of scripture, but it is often abuse of the woman herself. This dialogue about when the women refused to submit demonstrates yet again that submission can be contested, and its shadow side is revealed.

**Conclusion**

These narratives uncovered the empowerment that a woman locates in submission when she embraces and cerebrally engages with it. Respondents spoke of submission as a force that provides a space of harmony in their homes and faith communities and helps to centre the self. Learning submission from parents, pastors and especially other women keeps a woman connected to her faith community. Still, the women indicated they came to their own definitions and application of submission in their relationships based on what works for them.
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but is still aligned with scripture. Most expect their husbands to engage with them in mutuality of submission based on their interpretation of Ephesians 5 and other texts. If a woman determines that her husband or pastor is out of alignment with scripture, however, she reserves for herself the right not to submit. Overall, the women used their own words to define submission in all of its layers and forms, revealing it as a strategic tool to frame their relationships, beliefs, behaviours and decisions.
Chapter 7 – “When women pray, we touch the throne of God”: The Power of Uncut Hair

In my exploration of women’s spiritual power in both of these faith communities and countries, the data revealed that there were not many significant differences between them in terms of the women’s approach to enacting their callings, spiritual gifts and submission. In this chapter, however, I discuss one point of significant divergence that emerged in terms of how the women of these two denominations understood and enacted submission. The UPCI holds a doctrine that is less common in the Pentecostal lifeworld significant to its women, that their uncut hair is simultaneously expressive of submission and spiritual power. This belief provides another layer to submission doctrine and is integral to my research question concerning how Pentecostal women enact spiritual authority while navigating submission. This doctrine is not one shared by the AG, although some AG participants remembered a time when women in the denomination also did not cut their hair. Grounded in I Corinthians 11:2-16, this doctrine holds that a woman’s uncut hair maintains her ‘place’ in the creation line of authority as interpreted in I Corinthians 11:3. When men keep their hair short according to verse 14 and women keep their ‘glory’ uncut according to verse 15, a clear gender demarcation holds between male and female and God’s plan in the creation order of authority is established. Furthermore, according to a popular interpretation of verse 10, if a woman keeps her hair uncut, she also has access to great spiritual power.

While these prohibitions may be the denominational stance, however, my research reveals that there are a plethora of members’ beliefs surrounding them. Thirty-one UPCI women were interviewed in this study and 22 talked about their beliefs concerning hair. The women were divided on whether they practise this doctrine out of total obedience, or due to a “revelation” or “conviction” they had experienced, or whether they still cut their hair but did so prayerfully. Regardless, all made their beliefs about hair a very personal part of their own walk with God. As members of the world’s largest Holiness denomination, UPCI women had plenty to say about how the doctrine of uncut hair defines their lives and beliefs about submission and how it underwrites their spiritual power.

I begin with a brief look at AG and UPCI beliefs and practices pertaining to women’s bodies and adornment by utilising women’s narratives to demonstrate the timeline in the AG concerning Holiness standards and prohibitions, while grounding the UPCI’s continued
observance of them as they pertain to women’s bodies. This is followed by a discussion of the women’s theology and how they make the doctrine their own. Finally, I explore the dis/empowering aspects this doctrine brings, as evidenced by the data. These themes are also set in conversation with UPCI and AG literature and teachings.

**Hair and Holiness Standards in Pentecostalism**

In the early twentieth century, an era when Pentecostals eschewed divorce, drinking, smoking, contemporary fashions, mixed bathing, and makeup or ‘bobbed’ hair, they did not stand out much from their non-Pentecostal peers who did not always engage in these activities either. Only later, when Pentecostals adhered to these values and the changing world around them no longer did came a massive othering of Pentecostals and their message. While most Pentecostal denominations, including the AG, relaxed Holiness standards during the twentieth century, the UPCI has maintained them from its inception and took a stand not only against women cutting their hair but also against wearing makeup, jewellery, and trousers. When Loretta said, “I was Pentecostal to the core when we married. My hair has not been touched in over 50 years,” these words were not two unrelated statements. The latter was, in fact, an outcome of the former and provided an embodied testimony of how the UPCI and its members, especially women, have held true to Holiness standards. As Caroline said, “Because we believe there is power in uncut hair,” that is “the reason why a lot of women, including myself, don’t cut our hair.” While participants of this study across AG and UPCI lines share similar beliefs concerning spiritual power and submission, the power of uncut hair is a clear line of demarcation between them.

The AG observed Holiness standards on hair, dress, adornment and activities like movie-going and bowling until after World War II. Some interviewees like Vivien and Verina, in their late 40s and early 50s respectively, remember that growing up they were not allowed to attend the cinema, and there was even question when Christian movies such as David Wilkerson’s *The Cross and the Switchblade* or *Joni* about Joni Eareckson Tada, were showing. They recalled that some youth leaders obtained permission from AG district officials to take their youth groups to see these and films like them. Soon, however, most AG districts and churches moved away from Holiness standards in a bid to be more inclusive and accessible for non-Pentecostals. It was a way to be “all things to all people.”

AG interviewees reminisced about their mothers, grandmothers and aunts who did not cut their hair or wear trousers, jewellery or makeup until the late 1950s and 1960s, and some like Vera

---

971 Corinthians 9:19-23.
and Vesta, the oldest members of this study, remembered this for themselves. Vera in her early 80s, and Verina, in her early 50s, mother and daughter, were interviewed together. They talked about the AG women who brought them their family’s Pentecostal heritage.

_Vera_: I don’t know that Grandma Rubina ever cut her hair.
_Verina_: I was wondering about that. I don’t think she did.

_Vera_: It never grew very long, but she had very curly hair. [To interviewer] Now this would be my husband’s mother, her grandmother. And she joined the Pentecostals. She was raised a Quaker...She had this very, very curly hair, and she said she would cry and pull it back and try to make it so straight until one day it occurred to her, ‘God gave me this curly hair.’ But she always wore it confined, contained...She rolled it in that old fashioned roll around the back. But that wasn’t so much a religious choice as it was the style of the time and that is how she learned to do her hair. And she did it that way until she couldn’t do it anymore, and then she wore a wig over it but she never cut the hair underneath...So she made a personal decision too. I think that generation was still in the...it was born out of commitment. It was born out of...

_Verina_: [A] deep desire to do the right thing.

_Vera_: …You don’t want to do anything that would ‘separate you from God’ and I think that is how they were.

_Interviewer_: So for them, hair was that?

_Verina_: I don’t think it had a power, but it had more to do with simplicity and Holiness...‘You are not going to wear make-up. All those things are distracting.’ It was simplicity of lifestyle and..., plus, they were poor. It wasn’t like they had a lot of money to go and have it done.

_Vera_: It wasn’t widely practised back then, like my mother and grandmother.

_Verina_: I was going to say Grandma Helena,

_Vera to Interviewer_: My mother

_Verina_: Her mom. I remember when I was little she did the French roll.

_Vera_: But that was kind of the style.

_Verina_: Kind of the style and then she cut it and she had short hair...as an older woman.

_Vera_: [She] had perms, I don’t know if she wore any makeup, maybe a little powder...

_Verina_: [speaking of her elderly aunt, Grandma Rubina's daughter] Because Aunt Lyn doesn’t approve of my lipstick, or my earrings or my pants, for that matter.

_Vera_: Or your short hair

_Verina_: Or the colour, or the fact that I straighten it instead of leaving it curly [laughter]...

The dialogue between Vera and Verina provides a useful timeline through which to see Holiness standards as AG women lived them before and during World War II until the present day. It also demonstrates the generational heritage of Pentecostal women in one family. Verina’s story about the makeup, trousers and contemporary hairstyles she often sports now provides a useful counterpoint to her aunt’s historically-rooted ideology about Holiness standards. Her aunt, who was in her 80s, shares the traditional perspectives of Verina’s grandmothers now passed, one of whom had been the aunt’s mother. Vera, on the other hand, came of age during the war-years and said that she wore lipstick in high school, jeans on their farm, and took for granted that she could cut her hair.
Similarly, Vesta reminisced, “I had really long hair in bible school and had it in the glory roll,” the same hairstyle that Vera described her mother-in-law Rubina as wearing above. Vesta explained that after she began having children in the mid-1950s, she decided to cut her hair, and a woman in their church approached her husband who was pastor and said, “I always felt that the power of God is with women with long hair.” Vesta said her husband “chuckled, and he told the woman, ‘I would hate to think that my power with God is at the end of my hair.’” With his statement he included men in the power and doctrine of hair while standing with his wife, but he demonstrated a decidedly pastoral position on the matter. This was significant, because both Vesta and her husband had attended Bible college in the immediate post-war years before women denomination-wide cut their hair. His pastoral stance on the “hair question” signifies that there had been a definite shift in thought within the AG.

Veronica said that she had once worked in an AG district office where she had seen original AG applications for ordination which included these questions:

Are you a woman?

If so, do you have bobbed hair?

If so, are you willing to let it grow?

The questions reveal that for women being considered for ordination in the early AG years, having uncut hair was preferred. Veronica, in her early 60s said ironically, “Even with that, for whatever reason, I came from third generation AG [but] in our family, it was not an issue.” Vivien, in her late 40s, said, “I knew of a lot of things I could not do, but [not] getting my hair cut was not on my radar.” Like Vera and Verina, who agreed that hair and makeup in the early AG years were more about simplicity and limiting “distractions,” Veronica and Vivien said that these things were less about spiritual power and “more of seeing it as worldliness,” but not an issue in the homes they grew up in.

While many AG interviewees dismissed UPCI beliefs about uncut hair as being superstitious, legalistic and works-based faith, one AG interviewee, Viola, emerged as having made a conscious decision based on her relationship with God that she would not cut her hair. Viola said, “It is very spiritually powerful. When I was with my husband, I would cut my hair because I felt that I was the man,” she said. Wondering to herself why her preference was always for short hair, she said God eventually revealed to her that it was “because you feel like the dominant one.” Viola said that when she was growing up, her father was not in the home. “So, I had the need to cut my hair because my mom kind of leaned on my power for strength. I just know that now I feel more feminine.” Now that she is no longer in the marriage and is single, she said thoughtfully, “It’s just God...So it’s just the power of the Lord on me. It’s not a man. It’s the power of the Lord; he’s saying that I’m the daughter of a king.
He makes me feminine.” She indicated having no prior knowledge of the UPCI beliefs concerning the spiritual power of uncut hair before our conversation but nonetheless, believed it to be true from her own personal experience. “Because your hair is your glory,” she said. “So he’s glorifying me.” Viola’s decision gave her a sense of power. Her story was not unlike Catrina’s, told later in this chapter, in that having uncut hair provides her a deeper, more intimate connection with God.

In comparison, the AG by-laws which originally upheld Holiness standards included ones like the following:

We unitedly declare ourselves against all forms of worldliness, such as wearing of slacks and shorts, lipstick, paint, earrings, and excessive jewelry. We further declare ourselves against mixed bathing, use of tobacco and alcoholic beverages’’ (Rocky Mountain District, 1961, qtd. in Bernard, 1998: p.22).

And,

We oppose all appearance of evil…such as immodesty in dress, bobbing or undue dressing of the hair;…attendance at picture shows, dances, roller rinks, places where mixed bathing is permitted, use of tobacco, and the use of cosmetics which change the natural appearance” (Ohio District, 1963, qtd. in Bernard, 1998:p.22).

While these restrictions have been done away with in the AG, the current UPCI stance on Holiness standards is located in the Articles of Faith and the Position Papers of the UPCI Manual (2014:p.35) and reads:

We wholeheartedly disapprove of our people indulging in any activities which are not conducive to good Christianity and godly living, such as theaters, dances, mixed bathing or swimming, women cutting their hair, make-up, any apparel that immodestly exposes the body, all worldly sports and amusements, and unwholesome radio programs and music. Furthermore, because of the display of all these evils on television, we disapprove of any of our people having television sets in their homes. We admonish all of our people to refrain from any of these practices in the interest of spiritual progress and the soon coming of the Lord for His church.

The similarities in the language of these by-laws published by the AG and UPCI demonstrates there is (or was) a common Pentecostal language about what constitutes “the world” and compromises Holiness. The ruling seen above has been the UPCI position on Holiness standards from the organisation’s inception in 1945, and it was established to encourage separatism and to limit ‘distractions.’ Unlike other Pentecostal denominations, in the UPCI there has never been a question or a vote ending prohibitions on women’s dress, adornment

---

including hair colouring (which I talk about at the chapter’s end) and the practice of keeping women’s hair uncut. ‘Holiness’ can be defined as resistance to modernity which creates an inner world where members, especially women, take on board its prescriptions for beliefs, dress and behaviours. UPCI women’s theologies concerning dress, adornment and hair are subversive in the sense that the women are more concerned to live holy and upright lives than to dress like the world. The focus is that they should be in the world but not of it.99 These women use dress and uncut hair to differentiate themselves and to demonstrate their own definition of what it means to live a life apart, consecrated to God. Such life-ordering beliefs regulate adornment and dress on a woman’s body and demonstrate to other believers that the Holy Spirit is at work in her life, achieving – and reflecting - Holiness. A truly beautiful woman allows the beauty of the Holy Spirit within to shine through her unadorned face and body.100 In so doing, she challenges modernity.

Yet these beliefs are not without their entanglements. During fieldwork, I heard one UPCI pastor during his annual address on Holiness standards to the choir and all church leaders warn the women “not to be a stumbling block for men!” by wearing adornment or “immodest” clothing. Another leading UPCI pastor told women and girls during a sermon to the entire church, “Don’t make yourself a ‘slut’ by dressing like the world!” Clothing and adornment act as markers in the UPCI; those who abide by the standards are seen to have spiritual power, while those who do not are distinctly outsiders. Standards are specifically for and about women who emulate, articulate, and embrace Holiness imagery on their bodies but are also to minimise distractions for men and cleanse oneself and the faith community of sexual desire. Holiness standards concerning dress and adornment are as significant as the doctrine of hair, given their placement in the UPCI Articles of Faith (2014:pp.30-113) and the Position Papers (2014:pp.167-193). They were discussed by many UPCI interviewees whose bodies demonstrated the doctrine of modest dress and uncut hair.

I now focus on the women’s narratives concerning hair, submission and spiritual power, demonstrating that women members in both New Zealand and the USA take various approaches to the official UPCI stance on uncut hair, from strict adherence to not at all.

**Doctrine on Hair & Submission: Women’s Theology**

Just as shown in the chapter on submission, all respondents demonstrate that while they search the I Corinthians 11:2-16 text and make the UPCI teachings about the power of uncut hair their own in various cerebral ways, the doctrine is also about a binary gender
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demarcation. Caroline said, “A man is a man with short hair,\(^{101}\) and a woman is a woman with long hair\(^{102}\)…so it’s the woman’s crown of glory. It’s her glory.” Caroline said that, for her, “I know it’s in submission to the husband as Christ is to the church.\(^{103}\) The church has to be in submission to Christ. So, after that understanding, I let my hair grow.” How short her husband’s hair is kept and how long hers is indicates that they are in accordance with the creation order of authority as explained in I Corinthians 11:3, and by extension their union is a representation of Christ and the Church. These physical markers, along with the prohibition against women wearing trousers,\(^{104}\) drive the demarcation that is important to the bifurcated gender structure of the UPCI. General Superintendent David Bernard writes, ‘A woman’s long hair symbolizes that she submits to God’s plan and to the family leadership of her husband. It is her glory,’ Bernard explains. Accordingly, ‘A man’s short hair symbolizes that he submits to God’s plan and accepts the family leadership position…When men and women follow the biblical teaching on hair, they follow God’s plan as established in creation’ (2009:p.6). UPCI pastor’s wife and author Ruth Harvey (2006:p.25) agrees and writes that for a woman to cut her hair is to usurp the position of the man, and she steps out of her place in God’s created order. Yet UPCI minister and theologian, Daniel Segraves (1989:p.27), writes that Paul does not in fact, address husbands and wives in I Corinthians 11:3, but women and men. Therefore, women’s uncut hair as a symbol of the husband’s authority over her is at best speculation (Segraves, 2009a:p.56).

On this topic, I briefly turn to the story of Samson, who was dedicated to God as a Nazirite from birth\(^{105}\) and had great physical and spiritual power through his hair. The Nazirite vow, mentioned in Numbers 6:1-21, could be taken by either a woman or a man and, for the time of the vow, the person observed certain dietary regulations and could not cut their hair,\(^{106}\) a prohibition which Samson famously followed. The Nazirite also could not go near a corpse, even if the deceased was a parent or sibling or other close family member.\(^{107}\) They also could not ingest anything having to do with the grapevine.\(^{108}\) The vow was meant to be for a certain period of time, having a clear beginning and end,\(^{109}\) and when it was done the person would shave their head and burn their hair as a sacrifice to God.\(^{110}\) This is not what

\(^{101}\) I Corinthians 11:14.

\(^{102}\) I Corinthians 11:15.

\(^{103}\) Ephesians 5:22-23.

\(^{104}\) This prohibition and Holiness standard is derived from Deuteronomy 22:5.

\(^{105}\) Judges 13:4-5, 7.

\(^{106}\) Numbers 6:5.

\(^{107}\) Numbers 6:6-8.

\(^{108}\) Numbers 6:4.

\(^{109}\) Numbers 6:8.

\(^{110}\) Numbers 6:18.
UPCI women have done since they attend funerals – often cooking the funeral dinners - and there are no dietary restrictions in the I Corinthians 11 passage. Segraves concludes that the Nazirite vow does not apply to the UPCI context since it mixes the ‘Old and New Covenants.’ He writes that furthermore, ‘while this provision of the Law of Moses is no longer in effect, it is evident that the Lord would not require any woman to do something that would expose her to spiritual danger’ (2009a:pp.56-57) by shaving her head.

Even more than the creation order as laid out in I Corinthians 11:3, all 22 respondents discussed I Corinthians 11:10 as to whether it was the true indication of a woman’s spiritual power through her uncut hair. The KJV and NKJV translate verse 10 differently – using the words ‘power’ and ‘symbol of authority,’ respectively - but the UPCI interpretation conflates the intent as being the same:

I Corinthians 11:10 (KJV): 10 For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels.

I Corinthians 11:10 (NKJV): 10 For this reason the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.

The word ‘power’ in the KJV version of this passage is the Greek word *exousia*, meaning ‘authority, jurisdiction, or capacity.’ Bernard (2009:p.3) writes that in this context *exousia* …indicates a mark or sign of authority. The angels look to see if women have the sign of consecration, submission, and power with God, or if they are rebellious like Satan. Women’s hair shows the angels whether or not the church is submissive to Christ, the head of the church.

Segraves writes that context determines the meaning of *exousia* and its possible range of meanings, which includes a variety of types of authority (Segraves, 2009a:p.56). This then allows for both translations of verse 10. Bernard’s interpretation that women’s long hair is a ‘sign’ to the angels of their own and by extension the church’s, consecration, and that a woman’s short hair is a sign that she is ‘rebellious,’ is far more speculative than Segraves’. The latter writes that it is an assumption to make *exousia* imply long hair, because not only is the word ‘hair’ absent from the KJV passage, but so are the words ‘symbol’ and ‘sign.’ Segraves writes that the passage is not clear enough to indicate whether or not what a woman wears on her head should be seen as a symbol of authority or even of whose authority (2009a:pp.56-57).

Harvey (2006:p.68) agrees, however, with Bernard’s interpretation that the angels view a woman’s long hair as a demonstration of her consecration. This UPCI author connects I Corinthians 11:10 with Ezekiel 10:18-19, interpreting that the glory of the Lord lifted and departed, as did the cherubim. Harvey writes, ‘They were committed to the glory! We are the
temple of the Holy Ghost, and the glory is in residence as long as our submission and place in the creation order are maintained through obedience and uncut hair.’ Harvey writes that cutting a woman’s hair in fact, severs God’s glory from her life. ‘The angels will lift and depart, for they are committed to the glory.’ Harvey associates a woman’s glory with her ‘rearguard,’ from Isaiah 58:8, because as Harvey points out in Ephesians 6:10-18, the armor of the Lord does not include protection for one’s back, which, she says, is what the woman’s hair is. The rearguard can, when acted upon by her faith and prayers, bring spiritual and physical protection for herself, her children, husband and family (Harvey, 2006:p.72).

That a woman’s hair is her glory and is connected to the angels is a belief reinforced when Bernard writes of I Corinthians 11:10, ‘It is a sign to the angels of her commitment to God and her power with God’ (2009:p.6). This was the interpretation held by nine interviewees, to the extent that six of the nine asserted that a woman has the ability to dispatch angels if she keeps her hair uncut. For example, “As women, when we don’t cut our hair we have that authority to charge…angels to go here and go there,” Lavonne said. “The angels are used to answering to someone...So I feel like your hair is your actual covering where the angels respond and you can discharge them, dispatch them.” In this manner, Lavonne believes that her hair is a “covering” for her home and ministry, and she prays daily for God to send angels as a protective “hedge” around her family, using her prayers as a covering, one of nine interviewees who used this word, discussed below. Lavonne said they had felt angels in their home and she believed angelic protection had once kept them from having a serious car accident: “God stopped that car,” she said. Her eldest daughter once saw an angel in the backseat of the car she was driving and members of their church saw “huge angels just standing there with a sword on both sides of the platform.” Lavonne said, “So I believe that is just one thing that the angels respond to: our covering that we have that authority to say, ‘go here, do this.’” Still, she said, she felt “conflict” because “I don’t pray to angels. I don’t ask angels to do anything, I ask the Lord to put them somewhere because I don’t think we’re supposed to be praying to anybody else.” Lavonne’s daughter Lalah, who was also in our interview, said that she often prays the same way, while Luca said she too has been known to claim the angelic power of her uncut hair. When praying for someone she said she will dispatch angels to fight demonic spirits. “And so I would tell God, ‘I’m sending angels to encamp around about me and her.’ Because sometimes I feel like there are demons fighting against me and my flesh, because I’m trying to fight for my friend.” On the strength of her authority, Luca said, “Sometimes I’ll speak to them and say, ‘You will leave her alone and you will leave me alone, because I’m fighting on her behalf.’”
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Celeste said she too had this assurance from the power of her uncut hair and the ability to call on angels through her prayers of protection and healing according to the scriptures. “We know that God has got it all under control [and] those angels are doing the work the Lord has asked them to do through our prayers...We receive the blessings from the angels of the Lord.” Celeste said that there are “two types of angels” and Segraves (1989: p. 41) expands on this, writing that in I Corinthians 11:10, the angels spoken of could be either fallen or faithful, since both groups follow the activities of people. The difference, he writes, is that while fallen angels look for ‘opportunities to destroy,’ faithful angels look for opportunities ‘to protect, guide, strengthen, and minister to the children of God.’ This explanation underscores the women’s beliefs concerning angelic power.

Not only do interviewees pray to dispatch angels, eight participants pray the power of their uncut hair and some were among another eight who believe that uncut hair carried spiritual power that seemed unattached to angels since they did not mention them. Loretta, in the first group, said, “I have definitely mentioned it in prayer: ‘Okay, God, you know I am supposed to have power on my head because of the angels and my hair has not been cut.’” Laney, from the second group, said that she may pray, “Lord, this is a promise that I would have power in anointing, and I am asking for that right now.” These are examples of ways in which women pray the power of uncut hair but all agreed it was a prayer to be used only when all other prayer avenues and solution-seeking had been exhausted. For them, it was the ultimate sacred prayer. I return to this in the next section.

Eleven had dissenting voices, however, about praying the power of uncut hair and also doubt that angels are present. Lacey said she had not prayed that prayer and is sceptical of it.

*Interviewee*: I would have to know how they’re praying. Are they praying, ‘God, I don’t cut my hair, so I need you to save me, or help me in this situation’?

*Researcher*: They say they remind God, ‘I have not cut my hair; this is the situation and I need You to move.’

Lacey said that it sounded a “little manipulative” and named her reservations. “It makes you create levels of actions in God: ‘Okay, God, I’m obedient in this area, so I need you to do what I need you to do.’” Thoughtfully, she said, “Well, what if God’s answer isn’t to take us out of that situation, but to take us through [it]?” Lacey said that while she believes that she has spiritual authority through keeping her hair uncut, she does not believe that it makes God answer her prayers differently. “He will answer, but it may not be what I want to hear,” she said, and the answer could be “no,” “maybe” or “wait.”

Bernard (2009: p. 10) writes and Segraves (2009a: p. 57) agrees that women who live by faith and follow God’s will in keeping their hair long and uncut, can pray with confidence.
Bernard says that one such prayer might be, ‘Lord, I am cooperating with Your plan for my life to the best of my understanding and ability, so I trust You to help me in matters beyond my control.’ Still, he admonishes believers that prayer has no ‘magic formula’ to immediately obtain what is sought. Bernard (2009:10) speaks of reports about women who let down their long, uncut hair when making an urgent prayer petition. ‘If the idea was to obligate God to answer prayer or to create a new method of praying, then this action was misguided,’ he says. However, he writes, the situation must be seen in context and if instead it was done spontaneously to reaffirm their consecration, ‘then it could have been a legitimate means of expressing and focusing faith.’ In his response to Bernard, Segraves (2009b:p.6) partially agrees but writes gravely that ‘the teaching...currently circulating among us’ seemed to be less about consecration and more as a technique to guarantee the miraculous. He says that the claims of positive results when women let down their hair and lay it over the altar or over a sick person are not biblically based. He admonishes, ‘When we are not absolutely certain of the meaning of a verse, it is best not to be dogmatic about its meaning’ (2009a:pp.56-57).

Another dissenting voice is Coral’s, who said, “I have had people say to me, ‘Oh, you will have the power of the angels if you don’t cut your hair.’ And that is not what the scripture says.” She affirmed, “Or, ‘you lay your long uncut hair over the body of a sick person that they will be healed,’ because I have heard that too.” Coral said that she remembered reading a book once that said “I will go to hell because I have cut my hair. And I am thinking, ‘Well, my relationship with God is not teaching me that.’” Coral called this “manmade interpretations of scripture” and insisted that it is up to the individual to discern the texts and how she will apply them to her life. Coral’s words demonstrated yet again how these beliefs can be contested. The confidence she holds in her relationship with God gives her authority to cut her hair and still have spiritual power, while there are others whose relationship with God has taught them the opposite. Coral’s faith and authority were no less sure than Lavonne’s and Lalal’s, though her expression of it in terms of her hair was different. This demonstrates that women can have varying approaches to both their relationship with God and to the doctrine of uncut hair; each is no less meaningful than the other, and their faith makes it so.

But many theologians and biblical scholars hold that the I Corinthians 11 passage is culturally restricted and has no bearing on the Church today. AG authors Gill & Cavaness (2004:p.110) say that because the passage is specifically about head coverings in the Corinthian congregation, it cannot be considered normative for any other congregation, context or time period. The authors write that I Corinthians 11:4-5 is about women and men publicly praying and prophesying. Bernard (2009:p.8) agrees and writes that the apostle Paul was advocating for women to pray and prophesy in public worship without becoming
honorary men,' an assertion that was quite ground-breaking for the first century Church. Still, Gill and Cavaness argue that I Corinthians 11:2-16 is specific and restricted to that time and place, unable to be translated in the present-day context since head coverings are no longer used in Western culture. Constance, a participant of this study, is a biblical scholar who studies the Pauline writings and injunctions pertaining to women and is one of the five interviewees who said she does not believe angels are present with uncut hair. She explained that the word ‘angels’ in I Corinthians 11:10 has, in fact, been translated as ‘messengers’ or even spies. Given that the first century Church was under watch and persecuted by the Roman Empire, the first Christians who were the recipients of the Pauline epistles could reasonably expect to have among them those who would carry ‘messages’ of what they had seen and report back to the Roman government. According to Constance, verse 10 is a built-in protection that Paul placed there for the early Church’s women. Because respectable women in the dominant culture usually wore headdresses and for them not to be worn was a sign of loose morals or prostitution, the Christian women amongst Paul’s audience should have a covering while speaking in the assembly to protect them from censure (Segraves 1989:p.34). Vera and Clemency both pointed out that scripture confirms scripture but there is no confirmation or mention elsewhere in the Bible about women’s head coverings which compares to the I Corinthians 11 passage. While this certainly does not mean the passage should be wholly disregarded, in lacking clear equivalent elsewhere in scripture, it is ambiguous in meaning. Therefore, it is likely culturally restricted. In interpreting scripture, Jodene said that a useful tool to use in exegesis is ‘them, us, me.’ This is the approach that Gill and Cavaness (2004:p.25) also recommend, and they admonish the reader to ask two questions while interpreting Bible passages: ‘What was God saying through the human writer of Scripture to the first hearers of readers of the passage? [and] ‘What does this passage say to readers today, in this place?’’ Jodene said that inquiries must be made into first-century Corinth and what women and men did in wearing or not wearing head coverings, respectively, while praying. Once the historio-cultural context is ascertained, the question can then be asked, Jodene said, “Does this apply to us today?” In this manner, the reader must explore the context of each verse and the content together, because they are interrelated and un-extricatable from each other.

Coral approached her reading with a similar style of critiquing concerning whether or not she would “go to hell” for cutting her hair, and she weighed it against what she believed

\[112\] The approach “them, us, me” is to look at the scripture in its context to see how it applies to the corporate body of the denomination (macro level), one’s church (meso level), and finally how it applies to one’s self (micro level). This is all done after looking at the full cultural context of the text.
God was telling her within the parameters of her relationship with God. Conversely, when Luca, Lavonne and others studied the text for themselves and took away that they were not meant to cut their hair, they too weighed it against their personal relationship with God and acted on their interpretation of it. Celeste says, “Actually I am allowed to cut my hair. This is something that I choose. I really want to be blessed by those scriptures...[and] I want to receive what those blessings hold.” Yet even outcomes like blessings can be contested. UPCI women in both countries indicated that they take different individual approaches to I Corinthians 11:2-16, especially verse 10, and all believe they are blessed, regardless of their interpretation. I contend then that it is the power of belief that makes the outcomes from prayer what they are. Lashay said, “Holiness is ‘being holy, for I am holy.’” Because I am of God, I want to present myself as that living sacrifice for him.” Along with Lashay, the women in this study indicated that each believes that they are “of God.” Regardless of their stance on hair, whether UPCI or AG, presenting themselves as a “living sacrifice” is what they strive to do in their interpretation of what it means to love and submit to God as faithful women. In their belief, they are powerful.

Next I look at the stories of women who received the doctrine of uncut hair as a revelation to live by and the way they believe that spiritual power is manifested in their lives as a result.

**Revelation & Spiritual Power**

Thirteen women indicated they had had a revelation or conviction about why they should not cut their hair, five of whom said they searched the I Corinthians 11 passage before coming to their decision and the others indicated their decision was made through church and family teachings. The revelation took the form of being a moment, a decision made, a knowing that this was right for them, and it was a very personal conviction. They indicated it was about spiritual power, freedom, and intimacy with God. “I have told God so many times that I don’t want to lose one speck of my power,” Loretta said. “Yes, it is about power. It is about being able to work for him and to do his will. And be in total submission to him. I don’t want to lose any power.” She said that after she married and her husband became a pastor, she still occasionally trimmed her hair an inch or two until one day an intrepid hairstylist took off nearly twelve inches. As she left the salon in tears, Loretta said she made a vow: “As long as I am the wife of a preacher, I will never again cut my hair.” More than fifty years have passed and, though now a widow, she has kept that vow. She said that, until that incident, “I did not...”
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have the true conviction, but I knew that preacher’s wives were not supposed to do that.”

Maintaining spiritual power now, she said, is her “real reason.” More than “being submissive to my pastor,” Loretta said, it is about “being submissive to God.” This is yet another example of the cerebral re-packaging participants do around the topic of submission. Rather than out of duty or obedience to pastors or the denominational stance, it is a personal choice. I talk more about Loretta’s revelation later in this chapter.

While for Loretta the revelation was about spiritual power, for Catrina, it was about power, intimacy and freedom. She said, “I one hundred and fifty percent believe and adhere to it. [This] was not told to me. The Lord revealed it to me through his Word.” Gesturing to an old picture of herself on a shelf, she said that before her conversion she was the lead singer in a heavy metal band. “I used to spend thousands of dollars on my hair, to cut it off and put in different colours.” After her conversion, while reading her Bible one day, “I cried out to the Lord. And I said, ‘Lord, I want to be as close to you as I can get. Show me, reveal to me.’” Catrina said she read the scriptures to understand what gave women in biblical days a connection to God. “I started to see when Mary washed his feet...and that intimacy she must have had drying his feet with her hair. And I had short, very blonde hair at the time,” different from her normal brown colour. She remembers thinking, “I want to dry your feet with my hair. I don’t know whether it is going to grow long or not,” but she said God took her to the “scripture that talked about the power of angels being upon our head.” For Catrina, hair, makeup and jewellery were all part of the revelation. “And he started showing me all of these things through his word about the adornment and that I was using it personally. I didn’t know what other people were doing but I saw that the ladies had long hair and I thought, ‘Maybe they have got this revelation too.’” Catrina asked other women in her church if they cut their hair and received mixed responses but she also learned one of her friends had received the same revelation.

And I said, ‘I have just been reading in the Word, and I really want to do this. I want that power upon my head…I want whatever God has for me. I want that intimacy with him.’

And [the friend said], ‘That is something between you and the Lord. If you think this is the right thing to do, and you know God has revealed it...I feel the same way, I had the same situation.’

‘Wow, that is profound.’

This conversation clarified for Catrina the “biblical aspect” of what she was learning concerning the doctrine of uncut hair, and it also demonstrates that such precepts are taught and passed on through women’s conversations with each other. “I made a decision from that

day that I would not cut my hair anymore. And I haven’t since.” She said, “I made the
decision to do this…It wasn’t preached over the pulpit, never was, and it wasn’t spoken about
in any way that was convincing me…It just happened.” Catrina said her hope was that others
would see “me reflecting the Lord” through her belief about the power of uncut hair. Her
words “it just happened” suggest the ‘learning by osmosis’ that happens in the Pentecostal
lifeworld when teachings and beliefs become such a part of the social fabric that they are
seamlessly woven into a person’s life.

As Catrina and others indicated, in New Zealand the doctrine concerning hair is most
often not preached across pulpits, and women take on for themselves that revelation through
conversations with other women or in bible study. In the USA, however, the doctrine is
disseminated from the pulpit and often women’s access to positions in ministry and the
church are predicated upon not having cut their hair. Catrina said, “There are not that many in
New Zealand that have had this revelation…probably not compared to the States…Because I
see that there [are] a lot in the States and it [seems] almost mandatory.” She feels that to make
it mandatory causes the belief to lose its beauty. In fact, nine interviewees indicated that they
believe the decision to keep one’s hair cut or uncut should be a personal one between the
woman and God and all of these were from New Zealand. No UPCI-USA interviewee
indicated this as their belief, thus reflecting how the doctrine is framed by leadership. Catrina
finished, “So this is just my walk with God, and I hope and pray that more women will get
this revelation. I do because it has been an incredible blessing for me. I have never felt so free
in my life.”

The revelation of the doctrine of uncut hair can, however, work in reverse. Clemency,
raised in the UPCI from the age of four, had never cut her hair, and when she was a young
mother in her 30s her long, chestnut coloured hair was thick, heavy and fell to her ankles. A
petite woman, she said that the weight of her hair caused her frequent migraine headaches.
She wore it up to church but at home braided it in two braids she would pin to the waistband
of her skirt to hold the weight. She also took ibuprofen every day. Finally, her pastor husband
said to her, “Clemency, I think you should cut your hair.” The prospect, she said, worried her
that members in their faith community would think she was “backslidden,” and she thought of
the ideals concerning obedience to God that she had taught their children as well as what she
had been taught. Her husband said, “Well, you do what you want but I think you should cut
it…I don’t think God’s pleased with you having headaches all the time.”

That was the beginning, and Clemency began “searching things with God.” She had
lived the doctrine of uncut hair but was now at a crossroads. She said she came to understand
the individuality of her walk with God when she felt God say to her, “I accept anyone’s
sacrifice in the Spirit of their offering unto me. It is accepted but it’s not required.” So, Clemency said, “The Lord walked me through a different journey. And…too, it was like he was saying, ‘Obey your husband,’ and ‘It’s not my will for you to be having headaches.’” She said she sat her children down to talk with them, both under the age of twelve at the time. “They knew about my hair being heavy,” she said, “I told them that Dad said maybe I should get my hair cut…but you know how I’ve brought you up.” Like many UPCI mothers, Clemency had never cut her daughter’s hair. Even so, her daughter agreed but her son demurred and Clemency waited for the whole family to be in agreement. Meanwhile, her husband suggested, “If you do it, then fix it so it doesn’t draw attention to itself. So it doesn’t look as if you cut it.”

Clemency continued to search out her decision with God and to pray. Finally one day her son came to her and said, “Mum, I think you should get your hair cut.” With the family now in agreement, Clemency said that eventually she called a hairdresser near their home and explained her situation. Surprisingly, the hairdresser’s sister-in-law had had a similar conundrum, and the stylist had helped her. Heartened by this, Clemency said, “I went around and we braided it [and] cut it off;” the braid was at least three or four feet long, bringing her hair up below her waist. She said in simplistic irony, “And I never let my hair get that long again.”

Clemency said that she taught bible school, and when “it came to the hair issue, I shared with them that it says a woman’s hair is her glory. So let it be your glory but do not let it be a stumbling block.” Clemency was one of seven respondents who said she does not believe uncut hair is a “heaven or hell issue.” “It doesn’t bother me if people have that conviction, because that’s between them and God. It’s just that the Lord has brought me [on] a different journey, and I know how strong that can be.” She said thoughtfully, “When I walked home from [the] salon that day I felt so happy, and I knew that [I wasn’t] going to look back.” Clemency said that she had “learned to listen, and I knew that was not something God had put on me. I was able to rejoice in that and…be well.” And then, speaking quietly as though lost in memory, she said, “It was a good day. It was a good day.”

Clemency’s story reveals that the revelation of the doctrine of uncut hair could work in the opposite direction for those who have been marginalised by it rather than freed. Her cerebral decision was made in a framework of submission to her husband who was also her pastor and to God, since neither of them believed that it was God’s will for her to literally carry such a heavy burden. The decision was made communally, with all members of her
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immediate family having a voice. She honoured her beliefs and her right to live a life free from pain and, in doing so, finally she was free.

Along with the revelation of uncut hair came certain prayers and as aforementioned, eight interviewees said that they actively pray the power of uncut hair, even using their hair in the belief of spiritual power. Chantelle told the story of a close family friend who was undergoing medical tests, and she said that she remembered hearing UPCI Rev. Lee Stoneking preach about the power in women’s hair and its ability to bring about healing. This inspired her.117 “And I heard about Brother John being diagnosed with possible cancer, and I just went up in the room and I cried. And I said, ‘Lord!’ I pulled out all my hair…I had masses of hair. It was thick and rich.” Chantelle said that she laid her hair across the bed. “I’m committing my hair, Lord, because you know what I’ve done with my hair and that attitude behind all the times that I cut it. But I grew it in obedience to you,” she said. “Because I knew it was in obedience to my husband. It was in obedience to you, Lord, because you’re over my husband and he’s over me.’ And I knew that there was power.” Chantelle said she prayed, “‘Dispatch those mighty angels to Brother John right at this moment and heal him, Lord.’ We got a call that the tests had come back negative, and I believed from then on.” Chantelle said that she is certain of “the faith I have and the power of the angels in my hair.” Chantelle claimed the power of submission under the creation order of authority from I Corinthians 11:3, with her prayer that she had grown her hair in obedience to her husband and to God. Indeed, rather than the hair itself, it was Chantelle’s faith on which she stood; her hair is a symbol of that faith that caused her to pray in this manner. She is not alone. An interviewee in the UPCI-USA told of unloosing her hair while she and her husband stood with hands clasped during a Sunday altar service, praying together during a particularly difficult time in their marriage. Prompted by the Holy Spirit, she said, she began to take down her long, waist-length hair and made it cascade over their clasped hands, claiming the power that was hers through prayer and submission because her hair was uncut. She said that not long after, their situation began to turn around.

While these outcomes may have been brought about by other means, they serve only to reinforce the women’s faith that by applying this scripture in their lives, they have access to great spiritual power. While Pentecostalism has a highly patriarchal structure, women bring their own effectiveness in belief and prayer. As Lalah said, “It just shows when women pray,

117 Five NZ-UPCI interviewees cited the message by UPCI minister Rev. Lee Stoneking in a sermon in which he told the story about a UPCI woman whose son was in a car accident. The young man was rushed to the hospital but there was not much hope that he would survive. While he lay in a coma, his mother laid her hair over him and prayed, reminding God that she had not cut her hair out of obedience and submission and that she was now claiming the power that was hers and praying for God to heal him. Her son came out of the coma and made a miraculous recovery. (For link, see Reference List, under @Naycrumors YouTube video.)
we touch the throne of God so much faster than men do. There’s something about women that we just get there. And I believe that [in the UPC] a lot of it has to do with our hair.” Lalah is naming a space of distinct, gendered power. Not even men are given this assurance when they follow verse 14 in keeping their hair short. Therefore, an alternative reading of the doctrine of uncut hair creates a bold woman-only space.

All 22 women indicated that they apply a careful mix of prayer and scripture in their approach to and belief about the doctrine. Cassia said that she has prayed prayers of protection and healing over her children and firmly believed, “the situations would have been worse had I not intervened through prayer.” It had been three years, however, since Cassia had prayed the power of her uncut hair. “The last time I actually prayed the prayer and I claimed the scripture of my hair,” she said, “I was on the phone to my dying mum but she passed as I was talking to her. She passed as I was talking.” Cassia’s siblings had phoned her while surrounding their mother’s deathbed and pressed the phone to their dying mother’s ear as Cassia prayed over her.

She was gasping for air…, but when I was praying for her [they said] her face just started to change, her countenance became lighter. They said that she was really at peace…, she was just breathing lightly and they said it was just, all of a sudden, her face just shone. And then she went.

Cassia said that her aunt came on the phone and said, “She’s gone.” Cassia was greatly distressed. “I questioned God about that: ‘Well, I claimed the scripture; why didn’t you save my mother?’ So I phoned Pastor straight away, and I was speaking with him.” But her pastor had a different take. “He said to me, ‘Even though you were praying for your mum for the Lord to save her, what you’ve actually done is the most beautiful thing; you have allowed her to go straight into the arms of the Lord.’” He told Cassia, “Because when you pray, you have to believe in your heart your mum received that.” Cassia said that she was deeply comforted by and felt peace from her pastor’s words. “When he shared that, it was such a blessing!” Cassia said, “I just thank the Lord that I had that experience to be able to pray for my mum.”

Cassia’s last comment demonstrates a shift from praying with the hoped-for end result in mind (the miracle of her mother’s recovery) to the privilege of being able to pray for her mother and letting those be the last words she heard in this life, thus praying her “into the arms of the Lord.” Cassia’s pastor showed sensitive discernment in the moment of Cassia’s distress. Indeed, Segraves (2009a:p.57) writes, ‘There is a good possibility that women who attempt to follow this teaching will question themselves and even God when things do not work out. This can lead to despair.’ Such was the case for Cassia, but her pastor was able to help her navigate and dispel the despair. His words, “because when you pray, you have to
believe in your heart” actually summarises the reason why women with uncut hair pray the scriptures in this manner. Regardless of the actions women may take while praying this prayer, whether unbinding their hair and claiming the power given them through submission and obedience, or simply claiming their answer through faith, it is the authority of belief which underwrites their prayerful application of scripture. Lallie spoke to this when she said, “And I believe that we walk in authority with our uncut hair. We have power…to claim miracles.”

Seven participants used the word “authority” in the context of their hair and gave descriptions of what that authority for them looked like. Some were among another nine who, in the language of I Corinthians 11:15, said that their uncut hair provides a spiritual “covering” for themselves and their families. For instance, Catrina believes that her authority and power to claim miracles through her uncut hair strengthens her spiritual gift of discernment and provides a covering for herself, her family and faith community from her prayers. She and her husband were once protected when on the strength of her discernment alone she yelled for her husband to “step on it.” They were sitting still before a semi-truck sped around a curve in the road, bearing down on them from behind; they had just enough time to get out of harm’s way. Another time she discerned that her cousin should not be taken off life support even though the doctors and family had all but given up hope. She insisted he be kept on it, and her cousin eventually recovered. From these and other instances, including her own miraculous deliverance from terminal illness, Catrina said, “I really believe what the Word says that it is a covering for my family…[These] are brilliant, amazing examples of the promises of God on my life. I took this seriously and the Lord honoured my obedience to him.”

Still, the beliefs concerning uncut hair can be and often are contested. Luca told of shopping in a mall with her mother one day, when an unknown woman approached her and commented on her hair which she wore loose down to her waist. “And she grabbed my hair and she said, ‘There’s power in this…If you only knew how much power you had in this, you would never cut it.’” Luca learned the woman was Wiccan. Cicely also told the story of being in a mall once while wearing her silvery, waist-length hair down and also wearing black. A woman approached her and said, “Hello, Sister.” Given that in the UPCJ, all women refer to one another as “Sister,” Cicely looked up with a friendly smile. “Hello! Do I know you?” She said that she learned that the woman was Wiccan and had mistaken Cicely’s spiritual affiliation for her own, based on her long hair and dress. UPCJ author Jasinski (1995:p.4) said that after a similar encounter she too had with a ‘New Ager’ woman acquaintance, she began thinking about the doctrine of hair in new ways. ‘We Oneness Pentecostals are not the only
ones out there that believe that there is power on a woman’s head ‘because of the angels,’ she writes. This incident led her to research and write the book, *My Hair My Glory*. These incidents underscore the similarities of belief about hair as it pertains to spiritual power between UPCI women and practitioners of Wicca. Both believe that women’s hair should not be cut and that it holds innate power to bring healing and answers to prayer. Segraves (2009a:p.55; 2009b:pp.5-7), however, strongly cautions against the belief that UPCI women should use their hair in a manner similar to the practice of members of witchcraft and the occult.

In summary, of the I Corinthians 11 passage, especially verse 10, Segraves (2009a:55) writes, ‘This verse is the subject of an amazing variety of interpretational efforts...[and] the best attempt to understand this verse may lie in the future.’ One Corinthians 11:10 carries a sense of mystery and, while it does not mention hair, believing women bypass its ambivalence and make the belief their own. If scripture is inerrant - and in the UPCI it is considered that - then a woman’s belief makes this true for her. In the words of Cheyenne, “It depends with people how much inside they really feel about something before it will actually become a part of what they choose to be.” Therein lies the power of belief.

In the next section I discuss the doctrine of uncut hair as it is situated within a framework of submission.

**Submission**

All 22 UPCI interviewees who talked about hair indicated that, regardless of whether they keep their hair uncut or prayerfully trim, this is a deeply personal decision they make themselves, informed by the denominational stance and especially, their relationship with God. For 12 interviewees, submission supersedes or undergirds the promise of spiritual power when given to God, husbands, pastors or other leadership. For example, Lacey said, “I do think that the spiritual power comes in the submission and obedience to the Word of God.” Rather than having spiritual power due to her uncut hair, however, “I think it is a part of submission. And the fact that it is in the Bible so if I know that it’s there, and I don’t follow it, then that’s a submission issue for me.” Similarly, Laney said that when she prays the power of her uncut hair, she says, “I am claiming the promise, Lord, as I am trying to be submissive to you.” She said that her hair falls to her waist, while her sisters have hair past their knees but does not compare herself to them since everyone’s hair grows differently. Laney believes it is a matter of trusting God and she likens it to marital submission. “It does help me to understand about prayer and being submitted to my husband [because] I am willing to keep [my hair] that way.” Laney’s discussion of hers and her sister’s hair is a commentary on the
UPCI debate, “How long is long?” Most ministers and members agree, at least in principle, that “long” equates to “uncut.” Even if a woman’s hair grows only to her neck or shoulders, if it is uncut, it is still long. This does not, however, keep women from comparing themselves to one another. I talk more about this in the next section.

Lallie said that she too sees it as an act of submission and that when she prays the power of her uncut hair she says, “I am submitting to you. I have authority to walk in this that you have provided. This is my glory. And, God, you have given me this as a covering, a covering over the home.” Lallie said she knows that God will honour her submission. On this, Cheyenne also agreed and said, “I do see it as an act of submission. I do because obviously it is for the woman, and so that is a sure sign it is the woman [who] is submitting even unto the Word of God.” Cheyenne was naming the woman-centric space of the doctrine of uncut hair. She said that she was submitting to her husband whether or not she cut her hair. She said, “That is something that is in here [gestures towards her heart] with or without the hair.” Her hair therefore is only an outward symbol of her submission, an indication to other believers that she is submitted. Similarly, Clarabelle said that, though she knows the scripture, power comes less from her uncut hair and more from her relationship with God. “I’ve always just felt that it’s my spirit and my walk with the Lord that has done a lot for me; communication with the Lord, reading his Word, just being in tune with what the Lord has in my life.”

As an extension of submission, four participants indicate that they do not cut their hair out of obedience to leadership in order to be used in ministry. Leah explained that the UPCI rules observed by her church concerning adornment and women cutting their hair, she personally does not believe are heaven or hell issues. Instead, “The way I reconciled it, I made a vow to God to be obedient to my leadership [and] to honour the vow that I made to God…I will line up with apostolic doctrine in this ministry, to be in leadership.” Therefore, she abides to protect her ministry and the leadership she enjoys in the church, out of respect for her pastor. Lesley said that in the books she has written she teaches, “We have to shed things to get close to God. And if that means ‘I can’t do this,’” then so be it. For both, it was a matter of putting one’s ministry before one’s private beliefs that did not necessarily align with the official denominational stance but they could live with it. Veronica came alongside them when she said, “To earn the right to be heard I have the responsibility to find out what their expectations are and then to conform. And I choose to do that because I want to be heard.”

As another outflow of submission, eight interviewees believe that it is the consecration which their uncut hair symbolises that is the power in itself. Lesley said, “It is when we consecrate ourselves fully to God, we have more power with God. And if you want power
with God it will cost you something. ‘What are you willing to pay to have power with God,’ is the question.” Fifteen respondents shared that living the doctrine of hair in the way that they believe sometimes brings questions and even push-back from others who do not understand. In other words, regardless of their stance on the doctrine of uncut hair, whether they never cut their hair or prayerfully trim, their belief does indeed cost them something. I will explore some of these stories, including Lesley’s, in the next section.

The submission narratives concerning the doctrine of uncut hair demonstrate the women’s foundation on which they enact the spiritual power they claim for themselves. Rooted in submission, they stand on the power they hold through their relationship with God. This concludes the narratives about spiritual empowerment through the doctrine of hair. Next I look at the social hierarchy that the cultural beliefs surrounding the doctrine create.

**The Cultural Realities about Hair, Power & Truth**

I move now from the narratives of the empowerment that the doctrine of uncut hair brings many who practise it to its disempowering aspects. These cultural beliefs create the politics of what I am calling ‘Pentecostal femininity,’ a framework that sets up a standard of beauty and power within the sacred that many cannot hope to achieve. For instance, every UPCI interviewee who spoke to me on the subject said that she had cut her hair at least once. Some did it before they converted and had not done so since, while others had done so, usually due to body image and how they viewed themselves and their hair. As a result, they cut off split ends or opted for a new hairstyle altogether. Still others, as mentioned before, said that they had not received the revelation about the power of uncut hair and did not believe it to be a sin so continued to prayerfully trim.

But those who expressed regret for cutting or trimming their hair showed remorse that bordered on shame, a silent acknowledgement and enactment of I Corinthians 11:6. Lallie, raised in the UPCI, said that once as a young girl she had cut off her dead ends, saying she felt “pressured” about them though she did not say from whom. She said, “The thing is, as soon as I did it, I went in my bedroom and cried and prayed, because I was so distraught that I did it.” She said she never told her mother but wore her hair in braids for a long time to hide her trimmed ends. Though the incident had happened many years before and Lallie’s hair was now “almost to her hips” and though she believed God had forgiven her, it was clear the incident still caused her distress. “All the things I have done in my past that I shouldn’t have done, it is my greatest disappointment in myself. I wish I had never, ever cut my hair so I can say, ‘scissors have never touched my hair.’” Because Lallie firmly believes in the blessings that come from keeping one’s hair uncut, her regret at not being able to say, “scissors have
never touched my hair” holds great meaning for her and therein lies her shame. This is a common mantra in the greater UPCI faith community, and it carries a sense of pride for those who can rightfully claim it. Yet it is marginalising to those who have cut their hair in the past but sincerely claim the doctrine for themselves now. There is a clear demarcation between purity and impurity, and whether or not one has ever cut their hair determines the category they may claim or be placed within forevermore by others. Social capital awaits those in the former category of “purity,” and shame for those in the latter.

Like Lallie, Lashay, also raised in the UPCI, had a ‘qualifying event;’ as a young woman her hair was cut for her sister’s wedding. As the youngest member of the bridal party, she did not feel she had the power to say no, especially since she felt she was “talked into it.” She called the experience “powerful” and said, “Ever since then I made a vow that [it] would never happen again.” While Lashay was not alone in expressing regret or shame around having her hair cut or in calling her choice a “vow,” her wording seems to imply that there is a particular vow that UPCI women choose to enact when deciding never again to cut their hair. While not a formal written vow in a book somewhere with ceremony or rituals, it is a vow grown out of a choice. It goes beyond scripture in its life-defining framework, although scripture underwrites it. But like Loretta who made her vow after departing a hair salon for the last time, as told in the section on revelation and spiritual power, Lashay did as well. A feeling of coercion characterises both women’s stories since both said they were “talked into” having their hair “trimmed.” Neither woman felt that her voice and power to choose was taken seriously, and each out of regret made a vow in equal measures to stand true to what they believed God was calling them to do, thus retaining their sacred power.

Like Lallie and Lashay, Luca was also raised in the UPCI but with a different experience. She said that about five years before, women in her church had “started cutting their hair – it was in rebellion and…disrespect. And it only came from the women that were cutting their hair. And so to me, that was just attacking my spirit.” At 18 years old, this brought Luca a great deal of confusion and caused her to question everything of God, others and herself. Luca decided, “I’m an adult now, and I’m going to have to make this decision. It can’t be something that I’m following because my church said, ‘You have to do this,’ [or]…my mom said I have to do.” Instead, she said, “I had to do personal research for myself, and that’s when I had the revelation of it…And at that point I decided, ‘No, I’m never going to cut it again.’”

Although her hair had been cut while growing up but not from the time she made her decision, Luca sometimes feels the marginalising categorisation from others. Now when she prays, she claims the power of her uncut hair but indicated that she still receives push-back
from others in her faith community who have said to her, “Well, you have cut your hair, so you can’t pray like that.” Luca said, “They don’t understand. I guess that’s some people’s personal belief, but what I choose to believe is that God’s forgiven me; that’s something that was in my past – I haven’t cut my hair in years.” Luca said on the occasions when her hair was cut, it was without having “complete understanding and revelation.” She wisely believes, however, “that’s not something that is going to ruin all my spiritual gifts and anything I feel called to do for the rest of my life.” Luca said that she had identified her spiritual power and in fact demonstrates great results from her prayers (as written about in the chapter on spiritual gifts). As a result of her decision not to cut her hair again, she said, “I do believe that I can call my hair ‘uncut hair,’ even though it has been cut in the past. I don’t try to hide that from anybody.” She continued. “God forgives. And if he forgives people [who] have done drugs or had affairs, or did anything else in this world, then he can forgive me for cutting my hair.” By placing cutting her hair on par with doing drugs and committing adultery, Luca is naming the weight she has seen placed on women, and felt herself, for cutting their hair - that doing so rates with ‘higher order sins’ because as numerous UPCI authors contend, women cutting their hair is rooted in disobedience (Bernard, 2009; Harvey, 2006; Hataway, 2003; Jasinski, 1995; Segraves, 1989). Jasinski (1995:p.114) writes that a woman’s decision to do so ‘is more than just a cosmetic decision, it’s a spiritual disruption.’ Luca herself called it “rebellion.” Yet others telling Luca that she cannot pray the power of her uncut hair because years before it had been cut, demonstrates a hierarchy of ‘prayer privilege.’ Luca is barred by public opinion from entering the highest echelons of belief and prayer – even though she does so regularly - because at one time, her hair was cut. And even though she continues to come and go with her own prayer privilege, she has experienced the shame (and shaming) inherent in the culture.

This is an example of the political discourses placed on women’s bodies by others in the group, whether or not the women claim these discourses for themselves. Of the shame spoken of in I Corinthians 11:6, Segraves (1989:pp.29-38) writes, ‘If a woman is presently uncovered because she has cut her hair, she should be permitted (‘let,’ KJV) even to be in that condition (of being shorn) while enjoying the fellowship of the church.’ A woman who converts after having cut her hair would be an example of this. He continues, ‘But since it is a shame for her to be in that condition (of being shorn or shaven), she should allow her hair to grow again’ (p.33). Segraves’ interpretation is that as a woman’s hair grows and is no longer cut, her shame may be discarded and is no more. Therefore, the political discourses placed on women who have cut their hair before but do so no longer are misplaced. Yet the politics continue through mantras like Lallie’s or the push-back Luca has received from others in her faith community. The phrase “since it is a shame for her to be in that condition,” while not a
perpetual condition, is made perpetual by other members and by the mantras of the women’s faith communities.

In the next section I speak on the politics of Pentecostal femininity as it pertains to race and ethnicity.

**Some African American, Melanesian & Polynesian Experiences**

Another disempowering aspect of the cultural beliefs which set up a framework of Pentecostal femininity is how long a woman’s hair can physiologically grow due to her race or ethnicity. Lavonne and Leah, who are African-American, both spoke to this. Lavonne, a pastor’s wife, said that she had spoken at numerous churches and ladies’ retreats around the USA and had heard many concerns from white pastors’ wives about black women members of their congregations. The white pastors’ wives worried that black women, whose hair is often considerably shorter than theirs, are cutting their hair. Lavonne said that her own shoulder-length hair was as long as her hair would grow and there was a time, she said, “you would never catch me in a picture with my hair down.” She said that she did not feel that her hair was long enough to meet the standards and was concerned that others would think she had cut it. So she wore her hair up at all times. “I would go speak…, and I was appalled but pastors’ wives used to [say], ‘I really think I need you to come back because I like the way you wear your hair.’” Lavonne said that, while wearing one’s hair up while speaking on the platform is common practice, she would do it also as a means of “fitting in.” She would wear her hair “like white Pentecostal women would with the curls,” she said, up in a French twist or in some other graceful hairstyle. She was often complimented on her hair by other women, Lavonne said. “But if I would have worn my hair down, they would have assumed that I had cut it.” Lavonne eventually grew tired of the double standard, and finally one day, her change came. Speaking of the black women in her congregation,

> A pastor’s wife told me, ‘You know, I just have a hard time using them.’¹¹⁸ I don’t know if they’re cutting it, I don’t know what they are doing.’
> And I [said], ‘Well, first of all our hair doesn’t grow like yours. It will never go to the floor. Please don’t assume that every black woman that has short hair is cutting their hair.’
> That is when I started wearing my hair down. I didn’t care anymore…what anybody thinks, because I have uncut hair.

The white pastors’ wives sat in judgement on their black women members. The woman’s statement, “I just have a hard time using them” was discriminatory and demonstrates yet again

¹¹⁸ For definition of this phrase, see Glossary.
the demarcation between purity and impurity. This is a racial parallel that puts white women in the category of ‘pure’ and black women in the category of ‘impure,’ in terms of submitting to the doctrine of uncut hair, how long their hair can grow and still be involved in ministry. The woman’s hesitation to “use” the black women in her congregation in ministry means that she was quite possibly blocking them from enacting their callings and seeing their spiritual gifts actioned, all based on an assumption. Regardless of how much or how hard the black women in her church prayed or showed up and otherwise proved themselves worthy, they were always already not going to be used in ministry to their highest capacity because their hair was not the “respectable” length, which is a subjective measurement, at best. Conversely, while Lavonne’s ministerial calling was actioned because her hairstyle resembled that of white pastors’ wives, she was tokenised.

By comparison, the possibilities of hair length were also brought up in New Zealand in connection with Melanesian women’s hair. Caroline, who pastored with her husband in a Melanesian South Pacific island country, said that when she first converted in that country and began to grow her hair, “It wasn’t until I actually heard the preaching of the Word, because when I came to the Lord my hair was quite short. It took a little while to come to an understanding of it,” she said, “because in the islands, being Melanesian, they have short hair anyway.” It was not that the women cut their hair, she explained, it just did not grow long. Caroline, who self-identifies as part Māori, part Samoan and is therefore Polynesian, can and does grow her hair long to her waist, while the women around her who also observed the precepts concerning uncut hair, could not grow their hair long. Caroline’s experience then parallels African-American women’s experiences amongst white congregations, albeit in reverse. Caroline reiterated, however, that “the women are just so humble and obedient to the Word of God.” The comparative responses are striking since Caroline became a pastor’s wife who recognised the consecrated stance of Melanesian women in her congregation. Yet many African-American women are not afforded this same regard by many white pastors’ wives.

Similarly, Lashay said that in the Polynesian South Pacific Island country (not New Zealand) to which she was called as a missionary, she taught the biblical doctrine concerning uncut hair but faced challenges. “There were a lot of people who truly got it. They began to see that it was important to have spiritual power or covering,” she said. Some of the young people in her bible school classes “chose not to do things that the culture demanded.” She explained, “If a father or an uncle or someone in the family passed away that was of a certain status…the auntie would go around and literally cut the hair of the people as a sign or symbol of that person’s passing or death.” This created a cultural divide. Lashay explained that she was “standing up against culture saying, ‘No, it’s a biblical thing. This is why we don’t do it...}
as a biblical principle,’” and soon there was backlash. “Once I began to teach it, not to participate in that part of the culture based on the biblical principle, it upset some families,” she said. “Some people said I was trying to preach against their culture.”

This divide was multi-layered because what Lashay called a biblical principle is cultural as well, since the doctrine of uncut hair is a meaningful practice carried out by a particular group of people as a rite to achieve a purpose, in this case spiritual power. Though it may be interpreted as a biblical principle, only a small percentage of Christians (or Pentecostals) actually observe it that way, as this research attests. Therefore, the practice is cultural, not universal. For the members of Lashay’s host country who practise the funerary ritual she describes, this would set up a situation in which members who bridge both cultures have to make a choice. Now Lashay’s students felt pressure from family members to conform by cutting their hair as a practice of mourning when their newfound faith “trumped” their cultural practice with its own of keeping women’s hair uncut. Considering this, Lashay said that some of her students “took a stand” and some did not. Some were seen as a “renegade and a rebellion within the family” while others, she said, were respected for taking a stand for what they now believed. Lashay said that the experience had taught her a “lot about those that were so steeped in tradition versus those…[who] respected the whole new modern way.”

Ironically, this statement is exactly what many AG women of this research said about the UPCI observance of keeping women’s hair uncut. They feel it is an unnecessary, legalistic hold-on to the past. The sense of bridging “two cultures” extends to African-American women as well. Lexie and Lalah, Lavonne’s daughters, self-identified as “mixed,” African-American and Mexican, and spoke of trying to manage their hair with friends at school. When Lexie was 16, she said that her white friends told her that her hair was “too curly.” In order to fit in, Lexie continually straightened it until her hair suffered such breakage from the heat and products she used, that she lost a great deal of it. This placed her on the outside of her faith community, where a woman’s hair is highly prized as her glory, and women taking care of their hair equates to godliness. No longer able to fit in with either of her communities, Lexie went through a time of searching for what she truly believed about herself and her body image as a young Pentecostal woman of mixed-race heritage. She said as difficult as that time was for her, however, she had learned a lot about herself and “that it really is a testimony and I love my hair.” She no longer feels the insecurities, and her hair has grown back. “The awesome part about it, I didn’t know who I was when my hair got thick and healthy. I started to know who I was in the midst of my hair still being practically gone.” She said it was a “process” and that now her hair, often un-straightened, “speaks to who I am because it speaks to the
confidence I have and how great God is.” Lalah, who at times has also straightened her hair, albeit with different results, said that hers had grown back full and healthy and attributes that to praying over it.

Lavonne explained that African-American women put perm in their hair to make it manageable. Sometimes the perming causes the hair to weaken, she said, and since the new growth is heavier than the permed hair, it begins to break off. “So you have to get retouches. And because it is breaking off, if you want it to look nice, you have to trim it.” She said, “So when I got in church that is when I first heard about not cutting your hair. And then I read the scripture, and I broke it down.” When she did, she prayed, “Okay, Lord, you obviously didn’t put this in the Bible just for white women. This has got to go across every culture, every person, every hair type in order for that to be in the Bible.” This brought her to a personal decision. “So I am not going to cut my hair, and I am going to watch you do whatever you do.” Lavonne said that her choice may sometimes put her at odds with other black women who do not observe the doctrine of uncut hair. They may urge her to cut it for healthy maintenance but she stands firm on what she believes, focusing instead on using quality products and praying over her hair. She believes that as a result, God has blessed her.

Lavonne’s story reveals, however, that black women may receive censure in opposite directions. As already mentioned, censure may come from white women in their congregations, and Leah, who came to our interview with her hair styled in a magnificent afro, also spoke to this. “There is sometimes some concern [in churches] almost to be, ‘Why is your hair not down your back?’ Like, ‘Are you cutting your hair?’” Yet, the same censure albeit in the opposite direction came from other black women, sometimes in their own families, “Why are you not cutting your hair?” These women’s stories demonstrated that when African-American women who follow the doctrine of uncut hair stand on scripture and the power of their own belief, they rest in the knowledge, as Lavonne said, that God calls “every culture, person, [and] hair type” as seen in the I Corinthians 11 passage. Lavonne and Leah both find great meaning in this realisation, make their personal choice and leave the rest up to God.

The politics of Pentecostal femininity is felt by all UPCI women, especially in the one place where the belief about uncut hair consolidates: in UPCI church services. An observer may walk into any UPCI church, rally, conference or convention where women are present and see women’s hair in a variety of styles. Some wear it in complicated coils on top of their heads or in other artistic ways. Some wear it down, and indeed in any UPCI service it is common to see throughout the congregation women’s hair hanging over the backs of pews and chairs so the wearers do not sit on it. Some of my interviewees critiqued their Apostolic
sisters for having obvious pride and using their hair as “adornment” in lieu of jewellery and makeup as evidenced by the complicated, time-consuming hairstyles some women wear. Others, they said, wear their hair in too-simple, modest hairstyles (e.g., a bun on the back of the head), and these women were critiqued for almost never wearing their hair down. It is believed that their long tresses grown over years are a testimony that should be shared. Still others worry that non-UPCI women church visitors may feel that they can never relate to women who wear their hair in elaborate hairstyles or wear it down, especially if these visitors’ hair is short. In comparison, some women who are long-standing members have hair that does not grow long due to a host of reasons which include (but are not limited to), genetics, the change of life, side effects from medications or other more serious conditions like alopecia and terminal illness treated by chemotherapy. These women may feel a sense of marginalisation, of being somehow “deficient,” if their hair is not as long as other women’s. There is a dichotomy at work here, since the longer one’s uncut hair the more one fits the feminine ideal. Given its significance, some women are made to feel marginalised in a social hierarchy of Pentecostal femininity, a by-product created by the cultural beliefs surrounding this doctrine. Indeed, Leah named this when she said, “I have an issue when it’s used as a condemnation – ‘Oh, because your hair is not this length, or that length, then you’re less saved, or less protected…’ I don’t agree with that.” As several interviewees of this research reiterated, women are created in God’s image to be in relationship with God, and that is where they should receive their validation and spiritual power.

Accordingly, there were six respondents who drew their own conclusions and reconciled their beliefs that they could have spiritual power and prayerfully trim. Although she had stopped trimming as an expression of her consecration in ministry, Lesley said, “I believe you have power with uncut hair. I have struggled with it my whole life. I won’t lie to you, I have coloured it, I have trimmed it. In my position, I had to look a certain way.” As mentioned earlier, Lesley was a career woman and vice president of a bank who had become a full-time evangelist and faith healer. “There are a lot of things that I don’t see like we teach,” she said, “it is about my walk with God and the power I have with God.” She said that the last time she had cut her hair was a year and a half previous and coloured it too which is also taught against. At a church service soon after while conversing with her pastor, he said,

‘Lesley, you realise, there are some things you do you are going to have to quit doing.’

I looked at him and said, ‘You know, there’s some things that you don’t preach against you should probably preach against. If you are going to preach against my hair colour, you need to preach against Viagra. That’s as synthetic as my hair colour and as wrong.
Oh, he turned red from his neck up... He is young, in his mid-30’s. He could not believe I said that.

With her canny observation, Lesley called this pastor (and by proxy all UPCI male pastors) to account for focusing only on women’s bodies in their zeal to preach against ‘unnatural,’ synthetic enhancement. If a woman colouring her hair is sinful and ‘of Jezebel’ because hair colouring is a synthetic and not ‘God-given’ (Manual 2014:35,174-177), then Pentecostal men should be called to account as well. “Viagra is synthetic,” she said. “I am sorry, you don’t have to have sex. [speaks crisply] The last I looked, that was not a requirement for living.” Lesley called her pastor to account for the double standard and the male gaze that polices women. Underwriting her words was the understanding that women are held to Holiness standards less for their own relationship with God and more so that they do not become a stumbling block for men by wearing adornment.

Finally, we return to Coral, who holds that her spiritual power has nothing to do with whether or not she cuts her hair. She said that even before she converted, “God was doing miracles in my life.” She therefore reconciled her own beliefs with scripture and her relationship with God. Yet Coral, like Lallie and Lashay, had what I call a qualifying event, a moment which brought these beliefs into stark clarity. She said that as an adult convert under her first pastor and his wife, she learned the doctrine of uncut hair. But one day,

   The wife said to me, ‘Oh, I cut my hair anyway.’
   And I said, ‘What?’
   ‘I pray about it first.’
   ‘So you have been teaching me all this time that I must not cut my hair and yet you have cut yours.’
   ‘Oh, but I pray about it first.’
   ‘Yeah, but you have been teaching me I mustn’t do it.’

The awareness that Coral’s beliefs about hair was based on what she was taught by teachers who did not practise the teaching themselves highlights again how these discourses can be contested. It was ground-breaking for Coral to learn that there is a parallel belief system which says that, as long as cutting one’s hair is prayerfully done, a woman can cut her hair and not compromise her spiritual power or her walk with God. It created a crossroads. By the time of our interview years later, Coral had reconciled her own stance on the doctrine of uncut hair, believing that her spiritual power is fully intact whether or not she cut it. Hers and other women’s stories told in this chapter demonstrate how each woman reconciles them through her own experiences, faith and interpretation of scripture.
Conclusion

In the UPCI, the doctrine of uncut hair is the embodied locus for women’s spiritual authority. This is not a space that men can inhabit. While Apostolic men are expected to keep their hair short in accordance with I Corinthians 11:14, they do not have the same promise attached to their hair for doing so; they have it attached to faith. Every Christian who claims the doctrine of the ‘mustard seed’\textsuperscript{119} has access to spiritual power based on faith. But Apostolic women can claim a distinct promise under the doctrine of uncut hair as interpreted in I Corinthians 11:2-16 that if they submit themselves to its teachings and do not cut their hair, they will have access to great spiritual power, even to the point of dispatching angels. There are varying approaches to this doctrine, from women who believe and claim its revelatory power to women who prudently rely on faith instead. Their individual beliefs contest the organisation’s doctrinal stance, but all demonstrate through their prayers and relationship with God that their spiritual authority is intact, regardless. Still, the doctrine and its various cultural interpretations do create a set of disempowering social nuances concerning categories of purity and impurity and who can “claim” uncut hair, creating a social hierarchy of Pentecostal femininity. Yet their belief and approach to the doctrine of uncut hair gives these women strength of authority. Within the patriarchal structure of Pentecostalism, to consider Pentecostal women as having spiritual agency in a space only they can inhabit is powerful in itself.

\textsuperscript{119} Matthew 17:20.
Chapter 8 - Discussion: Pulling & Tying the Strands Together

This thesis has explored themes of Pentecostal women’s identity and the life transformation they experience at conversion, as well as their sense-making around calling, submission, and their own spiritual authority. This is seen through the actioning of their ministries, the embodiment of their spiritual giftings and, especially, through the strategic ways in which they navigate the patriarchy. Pentecostal theology focuses on a personal encounter and relationship with Christ, a life moulded by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, and an overall commitment to evangelism and social renewal; it is something one lives. This discussion chapter synthesizes the strands of this material, looking at three pertinent themes which are interwoven through the mosaic of these narratives and bringing to fruition the components of my research question concerning Pentecostal women’s spiritual power and their submission. These themes are presented here as the transformation brought by conversion, the women’s spiritual power comprised by the amalgamated siblings of submission and biblical feminism and, finally, by the spiritual authority under which the women operate, an authority that I call woman space.

Pentecost may have led other Christian denominations in allowing the ordination of women, but the reality of women’s access to positions of ministry is in fact complicated, despite the large (two-thirds) proportion of women making up the movement. Pentecostal women must navigate the patriarchy in ways that are strategic and feminist. My research sought to locate how Pentecostal women brought to bear their spiritual authority while exercising the doctrine of submission to men. Respondents’ narratives revealed that their experiences and beliefs were first grounded in a sense of what it meant to be a Pentecostal woman. The majority of these women took, I will argue, a culturally feminist approach to equality and to gender relations in Pentecostalism by co-opting submission, weaving it into their lived relationships with God and men and reframing it as an honourable foundation to their identity and selfhood. In being led of God, the women came to their own unique perspective of submission through their exegesis of scripture.

In their faith communities, submission brings these women social capital and spiritual authority. These together were the foundation from which the women enacted submission, releasing them to embody and action their spiritual gifts and to enact their callings. In this thesis, I have argued that, while Pentecostal women may indeed submit, there are a plethora of definitions and understandings which they hold about submission, about what it means and
about how it is applied in their lives. While submission is not the whole of their existential experience in the lifeworld, Pentecostal women utilize it as a component of spiritual power, and respondents’ narratives revealed that it was given to God first over all others. When a woman encountered patriarchal blocks, which most women in this study inevitably did, they circumvented these with prayer, ingenuity and reliance on God, trusting that they indeed had heard God’s voice and could move forward in new directions. They continued steadfast in their ministry or created new opportunities by which to exercise agency. Pentecostal women choose the reviverist experience for the spiritual authority that is a trademark of their lives, of which submission is just one aspect.

This research uncovered the complicated layers that comprised submission. Whether hierarchical or mutual, given to husbands or shared with them, or given to pastors and to other women, submission was a dynamic force in each woman’s life. Thirty-eight women said that they practiced mutual submission with their husbands in alignment with Ephesians 5, and if a woman found her husband was out of alignment with scripture she reserved for herself the right not to submit. As Franks (2001:p.101) found, submission and leadership were unable to be disentwined, because ‘submitters’ hold true power. Those in leadership cannot lead without being submitted to. Every woman had her own definition of submission, and the ways she applied it in her life demonstrated it was given to God first over all others.

As the research unfolded, it became clear from the data that the women’s conversions had brought a transformation in their lives along with a sense of clarity and life purpose. Their ministerial callings intertwined with conversion. My data revealed that submission was only one aspect of these women’s Pentecostal identities, and while other studies such as Nadar and Potgieter (2010), Joyce (2009), Aune (2006), or Brusco (1995), focused on marriage and the home as being central to evangelical identity, my study asked what was central to the women’s identity. This research uncovered that it was the transformation through conversion by which Pentecostal women obtained their spiritual gifts and a sense of purpose that led to calling that comprised powerful aspects of their personhood. Along with conversion came the spiritual gifts of discernment, faith healing, word of knowledge and other giftings that shored up a woman’s authority, and she operated under their power. Each respondent identified the giftings she personally was given by God and moved under the aegis of their authority, developing and honing them as tools in her Pentecostal toolkit. Operating under what I call the ‘dilemma of responsibility and consequence,’ women stepped out under the authority of their giftings for the benefit of members in their faith community, regardless of personal convenience or comfort. Sometimes a woman’s giftings presented dilemmas, such as when she felt asked by God to bring a particularly “hard” word to another church member or to her
pastor, and there was a risk of consequences, like being misunderstood or even ‘shut down’ by the patriarchy. Yet submitting to God first over all others was their overarching concern; pleasing God above all else their goal.

While these Pentecostal women’s perspectives concerning submission may seem anti-feminist to those on the outside, these women navigate the gender line in ways that are both strategic and empowered. Though revivalist women may eschew the label of feminist, their gender strategies in furthering women’s empowerment reveal that they are feminist to the core (Weiss, 2008:p.187). Locating ways to subvert systems of domination is their task, and they do this by exercising and displaying their spiritual power in submission to God first over all others. In doing so, they make room for themselves and each other through the aegis of their calling.

Throughout the women’s narratives, three themes emerged which formed the foundation of this discussion chapter: identity transformation, submission as spiritual power, and biblical feminism. I demonstrate how these culminated in women’s authority and agency within a conceptual framework I call woman space. I argue that woman space is an embodied spiritual creation through which a woman’s authority is enacted. I begin by discussing the similarities with findings from other published research studies and then move into these research themes.

**Corroborating Previous Research**

The place of beginning in each of my interviews was at respondents’ point of conversion from which their Pentecostal life stories unfolded, clearly demarcating the women they once were from the women they now were. Like other studies, I too found that women’s conversion stories brought a sense of life and self-transformation (Franks, 2001:p.163; Brasher, 1998:pp.30-57; Griffith, 1997:pp.140, 173-174; Eiesland, 1997; Brusco, 1995). Like Brasher (1998:pp.42-45), I also found that many interviewees came to their conversion experiences as a result of life trauma, or came in search of something, answers to life’s questions or new ways of being. As other studies uncovered that Pentecostal and evangelical women build strong networks of support, I too discovered that no woman of this study found fruition alone but was enveloped by the vibrant fellowship of other women, coming under their discipleship and guidance (Brasher, 1998; Griffith, 1997; Eiesland, 1997). This is the women’s enclaves of Brasher’s (1998) study or the members of Women’s Aglow International who participated in conventions and group meetings designed for women’s spiritual and emotional support (Griffith, 1997). Another example is women who came to Pentecost at mid-life from male-dominated careers and found the gender-segregated groups
and activities in their Pentecostal church comforting and a woman-centric source of power, as in Eiesland’s (1997) study. The women of my study developed into their Pentecostal experience lovingly and prayerfully aided and supported, their ministries and authority developing and culminating with the help of other women.

Like Lawless (1993a:p.45), I too found that Pentecostal women decry the feminist label but work within it. And along with Weiss (2008), I found that their endeavours to empower themselves and other women were feminist to the core. Like the rabbinical court pleaders, biblical feminists or Muslim women of other studies, all of whom located women’s rights in Jewish, Christian or Muslim canonical texts, religious teachings and culture, so it was with my research participants (Weiss, 2008; Prickett, 2015; Aune, 2006; Gallagher, 2004; Franks, 2001). They questioned meanings and the implications of dominant cultural norms of being women, locating their values in sacred texts in local ways.

Though Pentecostalism has long had a history of ordaining women, this has been mostly a paper mandate, since the reality tells a far more complicated story. More often than not pastor, minister and administrator positions for Pentecostal women have been relatively few, and when a position is created and a woman steps into it with her giftings and callings, she may find it absent of necessary support. Not only did my study find this; others wrote of it as well (Ambrose & Payne, 2015:pp.57-59; Ingersoll, 2003; 2002; Lawless, 2003; 1993a; 1988a). This lack of support translates into patriarchal blocks of women’s ministerial giftings. The word ‘blocks’ was one I found worked well for its ambivalence in being both a deterrent and something to build on, and Lawless (2003) too found this word useful in her work with ordained women who were unduly confronted by the patriarchy. Just as Lawless (1993a; 1988a) found, women Pentecostal preachers often claimed their power from God as a strategy to counteract the patriarchy and operate under their callings and spiritual gifts. Lydia, an interviewee of this study and a high-ranking minister in the UPCI, told of standing in church pulpits across the denomination and feeling the resistance of men standing below her in the congregation. Just like the women of Lawless’s study, she used a carefully constructed narrative to show that her legitimacy to be there came from God.

Like Ingersoll’s (2003:pp.81-83), my research uncovered the prevailing mindset that women attend bible college to ‘find a husband’ and are steered away from careers toward marriage and family as their occupation. My study also found, like Brasher’s (1998:pp.153-54), that unmarried women (though not all) seemed to favour male-dominated marriages more than married women did. Both Lalah and Vanessa in this study held these types of beliefs in language that most married interviewees did not use, as discussed in the chapter on submission. My theoretical framework informed my questions and stemmed from what I
expected to find, that gender roles between women and men in Pentecostalism were
delineated by the patriarchy and would therefore fall into strict binaries. What I did not expect
to find was that, across the board, most women who were married reported having mutual
submission in their marriages instead of the top-down model often interpreted in I Corinthians
11:3 for the creation order of authority preached from pulpits. This was a paradox also spoken
of in other studies (Aune, 2006; Franks, 2001; Brasher, 1998). My data revealed that women
coopopted submission as a strength. Like Griffith (1997) who spoke of the empowerment
Aglow women found in submission, or the women of Franks’s (2001) study who reserved for
themselves the right not to submit, especially if a husband’s request was not in keeping with
scripture, so it was with many of the members of my study. During fieldwork, I encountered
the belief that if the wife submitted to the husband’s decision and things went awry, it was he
who had to answer to God, not her, an outcome other studies also found (Joyce, 2009; Mate,
2002; Franks, 2001; Brasher, 1998:pp.130-131). In Quiverfull, a movement built on women’s
complete submission to men (Joyce, 2009), there were some strands of similarity. In
Quiverfull, an unsubmitive wife was a signal that the husband was not fit for church
leadership because her lack of submission proved he was not in control of his own house
(Joyce, 2009:57). When Chantelle in this study was made by her UPCI pastor to feel that her
unsubmitiveness towards her husband was emasculating, he took a a similar stance to that of
Quiverfull. Similarly, in the UPCI-USA, a woman who cuts her hair signals that she is
“unsubmitive” and that her husband does not have control in their home, thus making both
of them questionable for church leadership. I talk more, however, about the dissimilarities of
submission between Quiverfull and my study below.

Overall, just as Franks concluded that contemporary, postmodern women join
revivalist movements for ‘reasons of direct or indirect empowerment’ (2001:p.34), my study
sought to uncover these very components of Pentecostal women’s spiritual power. I now turn
to relaying these findings.

Identity Transformation & Circumventing the ‘Blocks’

In his Introduction to Conversion to Christianity, which looks at conversion from an
anthropological perspective, Editor Robert W. Hefner (1993:p.17) writes that the ‘most
necessary’ component of religious conversion is a new point of self-definition, the locus for a
convert’s new identity. As previously mentioned, while my study discovered (along with
others) the identity transformation conversion brings, there was a vital point of divergence.
Other studies positioned women’s conversion as a means of managing and coping with
suffering and locating a network of support with other women through their churches and
religious organisations. However, my study argues that conversion and the subsequent sense of life purpose was, in fact, not only the locus of a woman’s new identity but also where her spiritual authority unbounded. And, whereas other studies started from the question of why women would actively choose revivalism in a contemporary postmodern world, my study recognized that they already did so. It bypassed this question to ask instead how the women embodied and enacted their spiritual giftings and ministerial callings while exercising submission doctrine. I was interested in learning what components comprised Pentecostal women’s sense of identity.

When a woman was born (again) into the Pentecostal lifeworld, she found awaiting her possibilities, training, mentorship and especially a relationship with God, all of which brought a sense of life purpose that shored up her new identity in the shape of calling. Women of this study told of being ushered in and encouraged to find God’s plan for their lives, usually by other women, by seeking out clear directives in God’s word. Many spoke of reading the Bible for the first time and having their understanding opened. Therein women located life-framing scriptures to live into as they actioned and executed their callings.

Some have written about conversion as a means of freighting ideological imperialism, capitalism, development and modernisation to those converted (Mate, 2002; Brusco, 1995:pp.136-146). However, my study explored what converts themselves sought to acquire and attain from conversion. Far from having materialistic ends, interviewees of this study reported that they sought conversion for the transformation it would bring to their lives. Those who abused drugs and alcohol ceased using; those who sought clarity and a sense of life purpose found them. Interviewees used conversion for their own purposes. Converts to Pentecostalism are encouraged to “seek” the indwelling of the Spirit, often with the supernatural evidence of speaking in tongues. The Holy Spirit (AG lexicon) or Holy Ghost (UPCI lexicon) is pure spiritual energy to fight “evil forces” that would keep one from living an overcoming and triumphant life. They stepped out into this radiance under the authority that their identity as Pentecostal women provided for them. The women’s lives were transformed at conversion, and a sense of purpose and calling was established through their belief.

In the process, identity segued from the old to the new under the transformative power of the Holy Spirit/Holy Ghost (Tangenberg, 2007:p.230). Indeed, Franks (2001:pp.185-86) writes that the transformation of conversion and the ability to be born anew is an attraction of revivalism. Conversion, which includes full-immersion baptism symbolizing a convert’s desire and decision to be born again (Tangenberg, 2007:p.231), is a dual experience that in this study, painted a definitive ‘before and after’ picture of their lives. Conversion brought
them into a community of believers with whom they now shared common ‘beliefs, commitments and cultural identities’ (Tangenberg, 2007:p.231). It is also the harbinger of the spiritual gifts given by God, according to I Corinthians chapters 12 and 14, for the woman to use for the benefit of her faith community (Tangenberg, 2007:p.230). Whether a woman’s life calling happened at conversion, before or later, it was always undergirded by the sense of life purpose conversion brought. Franks notes that women who join revivalist groups do so in order to become ‘what they are not’ (2001:p.163), a process that I argue is foundational to their empowerment. Upon their becoming, the women of this study found that their conversions and callings compelled them to submit to God. Once a woman ascertained her life’s calling and vocation, a realization that was sometimes episodic, sometimes circuitous, she firmly believed she was called. Whether it was to preach, pastor, evangelise, missionise, teach, become a labourer or ministerial leader, a woman’s belief made this true for her, and she moved forward under God’s authority. Often, outcomes and results from the embodiment of the spiritual giftings and ministerial callings not only reinforced a woman’s belief but validated her authority to the faith community, thus accruing social capital.

The Pentecostal lifeworld may provide opportunities for women with a call on their lives, but these opportunities are sometimes janus-faced. Ingersoll’s (2003:pp.62-96) study of professional evangelical women revealed the limited support women received in leadership positions. Ingersoll’s respondents told of graduating seminary and finding few to no pastoral positions available to them or of ascending the pulpit only to have men in the congregation stand and turn their backs in demonstration because the Bible did not permit them to ‘submit to a woman’ (2003:p.66). Those who took teaching or administrative positions at Christian universities and bible colleges spoke of being given little to no support, being undermined by male staff, faculty and even male students, having teaching contracts go un-renewed without reason and of being judged by standards of marriage and family that male colleagues were not held to. One study revealed that at (Methodist) Seattle Pacific University, 76 percent of male staff and faculty were promoted the first time they applied for it, while 76 percent of women were denied promotion the first time, often for unsubstantiated reasons like ‘lack of collegiality’ or not being ‘ready’ (2003:pp.76-77). While sexism exists in the secular context and may (or may not) be appropriately dealt with, in the religious context it is seen as validated by God. Respondents’ beliefs about proper roles of women and men evolved over time, usually after a woman was exposed to evangelical feminism and began to reshape her life according to ‘Christian liberty,’ which brought discord with the patriarchy (2003:p.91). Ingersoll found high rates of depression amongst respondents yet many remained in their faith communities rather than seeking acceptance and opportunity elsewhere. Exploring their
reasons why, Ingersoll found that they developed strong support networks amongst their congregations and especially with other women. Those whose husbands were supportive were also able to manage the sexism they faced in their pastoral, faculty or administrative positions.

Conservative Protestantism is a subculture that removes the partition between the sacred and the profane and calls for members to bring ‘every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.’\(^{120}\) The facets of conservative Protestant women’s lives, therefore, are absorbed in their Christian faith. Leaving usually means departing their families of origin, networks of support, even their marriages. They bring every area of their lives into alignment with their calling from God. Those who do leave usually opt for denominations more open to women’s leadership or switch to nature-based spiritualities, agnosticism or atheism. Some leave religion altogether (2003:pp.136-137). Yet many women remain, choosing to navigate the patriarchy by reinterpreting submission theology and locating meaning in the order and purpose conservative Christianity provided, remaining steadfast in the strength of their own calling (2003:p.140). Ingersoll argues that religious traditions do not and cannot exist apart from the dominant culture and that they are ever changing. Therefore, the real question becomes how members decide what the transformed tradition will look like (2003:p.29).

This space where women stayed and engaged was the social niche which my study addressed. My interviewees spoke repeatedly of being blocked by the patriarchy but found submission a means of bringing harmony and right order to relationships. This required a firm grounding of their identity and who they were as Pentecostal women. Biblical scholar and theologian Grey (2015:pp.82-83) writes optimistically that believing women can disentangle themselves from the destructive messages perpetuated by patriarchal religious culture, and confront the injustice of their disenfranchisement with truth and grace. In doing so, she writes, they will be mobilised to think, act and move with their bodies and minds in the freedom of the gospel and kingdom which they serve as effective members of the community. When women are made to feel lesser than, this is in direct opposition to the values of the creation story in which women were created alongside men in the image of God.\(^{121}\) Created in God’s image to be in fellowship with God, with one another and with creation, Pentecostal women’s identity is shaped by these values. When women return to the creation mandate of reflecting God’s image they locate their true purpose, thus affirming their full participation in every area of the faith community.

Yet identity is multi-layered for Pentecostal womanhood, because it may often be fixed within the gender binary and the patriarchal laws about acceptable expressions of

\(^{120}\) II Corinthians 10:5.

\(^{121}\) Genesis 1:26-28.
femininity. This can be seen especially in the Holiness standards of the UPCI that mandates for women not to wear body adornment, trousers, makeup or to cut their hair. It is a feminine identity designed by men for men so as not to cause men to “stumble.” AG women of this study also dressed modestly – though not as conservatively as UPCI women did - and often spoke of the importance of doing so, just as did UPCI women. The Pentecostal woman’s body is always already a political battleground dictated by accepted modes of dress, adornment (if any), and hair styles, and this patriarchal fear of women’s bodies comes in various forms.

Grey (2015:p.80) writes that princess theology (discussed in the Introduction of this thesis) is a modern-day reaction to it and Maddox points out (2013:p.25) that princess theology is infantilising to women. Women’s Holiness is often equated with great self-denial, and the control of their sexuality is a means of acquiring sanctity. Thus, Holiness standards created by the patriarchy for women to embody are put in place for men. In a male-centric way of subverting their own gaze and sexual urges unprovoked by women’s plain dress and unadorned bodies, men can safely serve God without distraction. For these reasons, women bear by far the greater burden of Holiness standards, and yet it is women who continue to move the practice forward through their narratives and their stories, and by teaching their daughters the same. Still, writes Deans (2001:pp.168-170), sexuality and spirituality are unable to be extricated from each other and emanate from one’s being; they are what makes us whole people. When a woman speaks from her integrity as a whole person, others respond from their own sexuality or spirituality, categorizing her communication and her ways of being. Integrity holds self-knowledge, and both sexuality and spirituality are in tandem with one’s relationship to God, to oneself and to others. Therefore, when women suppress their sexuality in the Church, an institution that favours men’s sexuality over women’s, they suppress an essential aspect of their being to the point of denying their own humanity.

The modest dress of respondents in both denominations and countries of this study also became a way of containing their sexuality so as not to be a “distraction” for themselves in their own walk with God; or perhaps it was a way of subverting “vanity.” Their pursuit of Holiness involved outward markers of respectability in the areas of proper dress, creating a godly home, education, and respect for religious gender norms (Butler, 2007:p.66). Yet my study revealed that modest dress was also a strategy by which to navigate the patriarchy. By co-opting patriarchal laws that women’s bodies must be covered, they did not attract undue attention and were therefore able to follow God’s direction in distinctly woman-centric spaces unimpeded by men. Thus, the tools of their subordination became those of their resistance.

In summary, I argue that Pentecostal women’s identity, beginning with transformation at conversion, which bestowed a sense of life purpose as well as the spiritual gifts, is the
foundation from which they strategically navigate the patriarchy. I discuss the threads of their spiritual power in the next section.

**Submission, Biblical Feminism & Spiritual Power**

After identity, the data revealed that submission was a strong component of Pentecostal women’s spirituality, for it released divine power and was a tool of strategy by which to navigate the patriarchal realm. Submission doctrine is rooted in a Pentecostal cosmos of spiritual power which flows through being. Submission narratives in this study carried the situated knowledges (Haraway, 1988:p.88) of women in Pentecostalism and demonstrated one very important way in which gender gets ‘done’ (Lorber, 2006) in these faith communities. Like gender, submission is something one does, enacts, and embodies. It is easier not to submit than it is to submit, because submitting is a subversion of one’s own will (Scanzoni & Hardesty, 1992:p.143). Submission, spiritual gifts, and authority provide the foundation of a woman’s identity as a spiritually powerful person in the Pentecostal community. Submission is conflated with having spiritual power which gives a Pentecostal woman authority to enact her spiritual giftings and ministerial callings in her faith community. In that space of submission, she is powerful.

Varying frameworks of submission that this research uncovered included mutuality, hierarchical, adult/child, appropriation of the woman’s time and callings, and adult/adult. There were also types of submission that were situational, such as husbands deferring to wives in parenting but otherwise making all the decisions for the family, or some wives stating that they and their husbands practiced mutual submission but that the husband had the final say. My questions concerning women’s submission were met with cerebral, informed responses by each woman as to how she applied submission in her life. This indicated the ‘learning by osmosis’ that takes place in the Pentecostal lifeworld, when teachings and beliefs become such a part of the social fabric that they are seamlessly woven into a person’s life. It demonstrated a social constructionist element in that women gain social capital and spiritual power when they enact submission.

However, my findings concerning marital submission differed from studies like Joyce’s (2009:pp.50-54), where authors from the Quiverfull Movement rejected the idea that wifely submission came about as part of the curse and punishment given by God for Adam and Eve’s disobedience, as described in Genesis 3:16. Instead, they pointed to Eve’s creation as Adam’s helpmeet as proof that submission was part of God’s plan before the Fall. Quiverfull holds that a husband is ‘protection head’ and is considered to be God’s representative to his wife. Unless he is asking the wife to sin, what he says should be
considered ‘God’s will’ (2009:p.54). Quiverfull holds that a woman is under submission to her husband at all times, to the point of being a non-person. Though Jewel in my study used the phrase “protection head” in accordance with her husband, she also said that she could never embody a type of submission where she was expected to do everything her husband said. This, she said, was a “hard attitude” of submission. Accordingly, when equated with non-personhood, submission was considered abuse by interviewees of this study. One UPCI interviewee, Loretta, described the way she had originally applied submission as making her a “non-person” (discussed in the chapter on submission), because she had not felt free to give her own opinions during the first two decades of her marriage, due to her own interpretation of submission. Finally, she took on freedom for herself and found that, though she actively believed in hierarchical submission, being her own person was not only allowed but desirable. Descriptions of becoming a non-person resonated through interviewees’ stories of women in their families as well as 11 members of this study who subverted givings or ministerial callings in favour of building up their husbands’ ministries instead or in navigating blocks husbands put in their way. They subverted their own callings so as not to be “in competition” with husbands, rather than the two deciding to build their ministries concomitantly. Thus their full personhood was denied.

No wife in my study claimed the tenets of Quiverfull. They embraced wifely submission from Genesis 3:16 - with the qualification that a wife should not be treated like a “doormat” - and mutual submission from Ephesians 5:21-33, insisting that a husband must love his wife for her to submit and that they should submit together in mutuality. No wife indicated that she thought of her husband as God’s “representative.” Mollenkott (1992:p.12) calls it ‘heteropatriarchy,’ when women are taught that their destiny is to serve men and meet their needs, and men are taught they are only as masculine as the control they exercise over women. Franks discusses Van Leeuwen’s (1990:p.46) comments, who warns about the possibility of abuse based on a literalist interpretation of Genesis 3:16. She writes that the man sins when attempting to exercise dominion with no regard for God’s original design for male/female relationships. But likewise the woman sins when she uses the preservation of these relationships as an excuse for not exercising her own accountable dominion (Franks 2001:pp.86-87). Franks’s study reveals that some Christian women may hide behind a literalist translation of Genesis 3:16 as a means of avoiding decision-making and leadership (p.87).

Mate (2002) wrote of her work with Zimbabwean Pentecostal women who were encouraged, like Quiverfull wives, to show their submission to God and husbands by bearing many children. Submission was described as being a ‘helpmate.’ A wife was meant to submit
provided her husband was not a tyrant, which was considered ungodly. Submission therefore carried qualifications, since wives were taught it should not lead to sinful “idolisation” of the husband (Mate, 2002:p.557). Like Verity’s metaphor that submission was “the neck that turns the head” (in the chapter on submission), Mate (2002:556) wrote that amongst Zimbabwean Pentecostals, this metaphor was used for ideal conjugal relations. The man as the head required the support of the neck, the woman. Together, they were part of one body. This metaphor brought to my mind the novel Atlas Shrugged (1957) by Ayn Rand. According to the myth, Atlas, a Titan, carries the whole world on his shoulders. The stability of the world is therefore dependent on Atlas not shrugging, and when Atlas does so, in the book, the world for Rand’s characters becomes an unsustainable dystopia. For those who hold to this submission metaphor, the stability of the home and by extension the church, is dependent on the neck, the woman, faithfully supporting the head, the man. Otherwise, the world, by implication, is without order.

Some scholars (Butler, 2007; Blumhofer, 1993:pp.121-22) have noted that the Pentecostal women of their research seemed content with the language of submission. However, I found that such ‘contentment’ in fact hid a gender strategy, in that Pentecostal women used submission to navigate the patriarchy, to embody their giftings, to enact their callings and, in short, to get the work done. I contend that Pentecostal women from the outset have known that as long as they were not seen as usurping ‘the authority of a man’ and that often, what they did was not called ‘preaching’ but rather teaching, speaking or testifying, they could operate under their own God-given authority and not be hindered in their work by Pentecostal men (Butler, 2007; Wacker, 2003:p.104; Lawless, 1988b). Many women who practise submission cite the freedom that doing so brings them and that Christianity emphasizes freedom and discipline as being co-existent (Griffith, 1997:pp.180, 202).

Participants reimagined these concepts by redefining submission as respect, humility, regard, loving, accepting, having creation roles, mutuality, willingness, honour or seeking the best for one’s spouse and vice versa. By redefining the word in accessible terms, they demonstrated a personal, cerebral approach to submission. They also ‘remade in the vernacular’ their ideologies concerning submission, which were ‘interpreted, reframed, and translated’ in a process by them as local actors (Werbner, 2008:p.8). When Jewel struggled with what it meant to embody submission to her husband and tested the elasticity of the word “honour,” she was very articulate about her journey to and into submission and ultimately by her understanding of it (as shared in the chapter on submission). Her deep introspection and sense-making about this word, as evidenced by its placement in conversation with her situatedness in the New Zealand context and what it meant to “honour” the Queen while
comparing that to the honour she gave her husband. This demonstrated the multiple layers Pentecostal women work through in navigating submission. With language, they free themselves from tradition and form a philosophy by which to live that encompasses and creates a new tradition of mutual submission and spiritual power. Their effectiveness depends on their ability to fashion themselves as ‘active agents of the discourse’ (Ram, 2008: p. 148).

By this means, submission also releases divine power. Griffith (1997: p. 196) writes that spiritual warfare prayer is distinct from the language of submission to men and emphasizes female power and authority, taking women’s realm of spiritual activism beyond the home. In this study, submission to God was behind a woman’s actioning of her giftings, and each one used prayer as a medium to action the gifts, even if it carried dilemmas or challenges. For instance, even before Cassia claimed the power of her uncut hair in praying for her dying mother’s recovery and had instead the privilege of “praying her mother into the arms of God” (as told in the chapter on the power of uncut hair), members of her family, none of whom were Pentecostal, already saw her as having great spiritual power. Anytime she travelled to visit them, each would have her around to pray and speak a blessing over them in their homes. This demonstrates the high status and spiritual power conferred on women when they embody and enact submission to God.

Sometimes the women believed that they were asked by God to give a word to another member of the faith community or to their pastor that was quite confronting. As a result, they worried how they would be received. But they recognised that it was God who had given them the word and that not to bring would be to risk displeasing God. When they were asked by God to do the miraculous, such as laying hands on and praying for someone’s healing in faith, the women believed that it was God’s presence working through them which brought the power of the gifts, and all praise is given to God for the outcomes. Underneath it all was the transformative power of belief which underwrote the women’s enactment of their spiritual giftings. They believed that laying hands on the sick would bring healing. When they gave another member of the faith community a word of prophecy or brought the word of knowledge, they believed that it was given them by God and that it would come to pass. When they were driven from their beds in the middle of the night to intercede for someone, they believed that God had laid that person’s name on their heart whether or not they knew the one whose name they were given, and that through their intercession God would intervene in that person’s life. The women of this study gave a constant refrain that “it was God, not me” when they used their spiritual gifts and callings for the benefit of other members of the faith community. In this manner, they submitted to God first, over all others.
These women also used submission as a strategic tool to create harmony in their relationships with men, including husbands and pastors, in order for their God-given purpose to find fruition. Submission to men was therefore an extension or outcome of their submission to God. Some might say this is a natural segue given that God is patriarchal in the Christian / Pentecostal belief system, and the construct of men’s headship is a manifestation which upholds the patriarchy. Some might also question the validity of women’s power, since they are channeling the voice and spiritual authority of a patriarchal God, albeit a God having feminine attributes of wisdom and love. These arguments hold weight, but to summarily dismiss these women’s experiences is to deny them their true belief and voice. These women have a relationship with God that they honour above all else, and they believe that they are called to right order in their relationships with others, which is considered a significant fruit of the true believer’s life (Brasher, 1998:p.129). To borrow a concept from matriarchal studies, the women used submission as ‘peace-oriented politics’ to create homes and to order lives that were ‘just and peaceful’ (Goettner-Abendroth, 2012:p.xxxvi). Similarly, in her study, Franks (2001:p.31) found that biblical and Islamic feminists hold in common cooperation with men as a means of building a better society, similar to feminist ideals in the majority culture. The concepts of submission and surrender offer a woman ‘power in vulnerability,’ which disarms masculinism and does not complement it (Franks, 2001:p.185). For most of my interviewees, marital submission was mutual. They said that submission was something they shared with their husbands, based on their own exegesis of scripture, especially Ephesians 5 and Genesis 1:26-28. They demonstrated that personal power was encoded in the doctrine of submission and their capacity to action personal healing and to cultivate domestic harmony (Griffith 1997:p.175).

They were not far from feminist goals of freedom, peace and harmony and therefore suggested common ground with feminist support of women’s agency (Aune, 2006:p.647). I contend that when feminist scholars focus only on marriage and family as being the central aspect to revivalist women’s lives without asking what other components make up their identity, they disenfranchise them into what I call the ‘one-dimensional other.’ They write revivalist women off as ‘anti-feminist’ and ‘disempowered’ when in fact, family and marriage to men are a life direction many women actively choose, revivalist or not. Therefore, asking why women choose evangelical and Pentecostal lifestyles and therefore submission, should be only a starting point and not the whole study. Submission is just one aspect of a revivalist woman’s identity, and it is in fact a political tool which she uses to navigate the patriarchy, including husbands, in order to achieve larger goals of embodying her spiritual gifts and
enacting her ministerial callings and life’s purpose in God. After their relationship with and submission to God, all else including marriage, family, and submission to others is secondary.

Feminisms are as varied as those who practise them, and Pentecostal women with their unique, local and cultural brand of gender-conscious feminism fit within a feminist discourse. Biblical feminists believe in the equality of the sexes, but they may also hold to varying interpretations of submission doctrine. For them, there are values which are not only universal but also local (Appiah, 2006:p.xxi). While the way they hold egalitarian principles of gender yet embody submission may seem counter-intuitive, their embodiment and practice of submission doctrine also brings about religious pluralism, the harmonious coexistence between women and men as religious adherents. Women who practise submission do so as an active ‘demand’ of their interpretations of submission doctrine; they act on what is most true to them (Rapport, 2012:p.130).

Many revivalist women see feminism’s overall goals of encouraging women to seek independence from men and shake off male dominance as being antithetical to Christian cultural beliefs of the equality which was given to the first Woman and Man created by God. Therefore, Pentecostal women do not see the dominant feminist means of achieving common goals as biblical or all-inclusive of God’s created human beings, and they reject postmodern feminism as having little to no relevance to them. For this reason, as a general part of their world-view, revivalist women often do not call themselves feminist. How then do we interpret feminism in their narratives? In terms of subjects’ lifeworld, it is through bodily expressions and narrative introspection, the stock of knowledge with which members approach the familiar world (Schutz, 1964, qtd. in Holstein & Gubrium, 1998:137-140). In order to access these women’s lived experiences of feminist empowerment, I have presented my subjects’ own ‘version of evidence’ (Rapport, 2012:pp.126-128). Pentecostal women reimagine their rights (Stivens, 2008:p.99), in that they co-opt equality of the sexes as being less a feminist perspective and more a biblical one. The women of my study exhibited a feminism grounded in a foundational understanding of scripture and what God would have them do as faithful women, thus choosing for themselves the ‘right to dissent’ (Werbner, 2008:p.6). In this regard, revivalist women’s negation of postmodern feminism, regardless of their own race or ethnicity, mirrors that which non-white women in the developed and developing world have also declared against feminism’s universalism. They argue that the feminist ideal of global sisterhood is not rooted in a local, regional, or cultural framework (Bulbeck, 2000; Mohanty, 2003). It does not encompass all women’s experiences, nor do these women believe they are part of a global sisterhood united through their oppression. But, in this study, whether or not they identified as feminist, biblical or otherwise, threads of feminism were clearly interwoven
Regardless of who are more effective agents of change, conscious or de facto feminists, the
systemic philosophy of evangelical or biblical feminism holds relevance to these women’s
ideologies, regardless of how it is applied and brought to the fore through their life narratives
(Weiss, 2008:p.187; Rapport, 2012:p.128). Questions of truth have no eternal answers
(Rapport, 2012:p.143), and that is what I term the ‘push me/pull you’ of feminism. As
mentioned in the Introduction chapter in the discussion about de facto feminism, there is no
one way of doing feminism, and the ways in which it is performed are a manifestation of the
doer’s truth. The view that Pentecostal women are anti-feminist and un-progressiv e is far too
simplistic and based on one-dimensional observations. These discourses keep Pentecostal and
other women who practise biblical feminism or egalitarian gender roles, and even feminists in
the dominant culture, within delimited boundaries. Just as disagreement concerning values
need not put us off, so agreement is not required. But understanding can and should be

Yet there are parameters placed around submission, a component of biblical feminism.
In all of my interviews, each woman, regardless of age, ethnicity, geographical location or
status, indicated that she submitted to God first over all others when moving forward to
embody her spiritual gifts and to enact her calling to ministry. Submission was given to the
husband only if he was in compliance with the woman’s interpretation of God’s word and
what she believed that God would have her - or them - do. These women did not submit
indiscriminately and, according to Scanzoni and Hardesty (1992), to do so would be
unbiblical. They write,

To argue that a woman is responsible to submit to her husband under all circumstances
- even if it violates a command of God or the wife’s own conscience (and sermons
have been preached to that effect) – goes totally against the spirit of the New
Testament. ‘We must obey God rather than men’ (Acts 5:29). Each Christian, male or
female, married or unmarried, is responsible to God (pp.143-44).

Accordingly, interviewees demonstrated that mutual submission requires a couple’s reflexive
communication and tactful strategy if decisions are to be made successfully and harmony
maintained.

Biblical feminism and submission doctrine creates a ‘critically engaged space’
focusing on ideals and projects of the ‘intimate sphere’ (Stivens, 2008:p.92). Submission
itself is an intimate space, and Pentecostal women are very protective of it, of their beliefs and
ideologies that surround it, and especially of the spiritual power that flows from it.
Submission is a highly emotive force and, when embodied, carries the doer who rises up and
steps forward under her authority vested by God upon her conversion when she received her
spiritual giftings. These – the force of submission, authority, spiritual gifts – are all intangibles, but when a woman moves forward in them, she reaps tangible results such as the faith healing which she actuates by laying her hands on the sick who in turn, demonstrate that they have been healed. For instance, when Vanni laid hands on other women and prayed for their wombs to be opened, she embodied this authority from the force of her submission to God by offering her giftings to the faith community, and from the sheer power of her belief that it would happen.

The intimacy and daily rhythms of Pentecostal women’s lives happen within a gendered, spirit-filled, experiential framework at the centre of family and church life. With Pentecostalism’s strict gender binaries and hierarchy, and traditional “creation roles,” there is an emphasis on what a “man does” and what a “woman does.” A couple practising egalitarian, mutual submission must stay vigilant in such an atmosphere so as not to slip into roles grounded in gender complementarity. Appiah (2006:pp.83-84) writes that relations between women and men are part of the intimate details of daily life. Our feelings about these relationships are strong, and each of us inherits and receives ideas about the habits of gender. For instance, nine married women of this research held full-time careers to support the family and four of them were pastors’ wives. These women blurred gender boundaries in that the husbands retained the gendered roles of men serving as pastors but relinquished the gendered, bread-winning role to their wives. Yet these women retained the identities of being nurturers and mothering sources of family support.

In this research, however, submission was janus-faced, because when a woman submitted to God first over all others in exercising her callings and giftings, she could still be blocked by the patriarchy. No less than 40 women reported at one time or another, experiencing patriarchal blocks, including from pastors, other male ministers and sometimes husbands, because they dared act under their own God-given authority rather than waiting on a man. In spite of these blocks, submission, given to God first over all others, undergirded the women’s ability to bring into fruition their callings and giftings and they navigated the patriarchy accordingly. A dissenting few in the UPCI who refused to abide by the doctrine of uncut hair found themselves outside the majority because not submitting placed a woman in direct opposition with most others. They demonstrated that truth can be contested and is never absolute. Through the doctrine of uncut hair, UPCI women navigated another layer of submission that AG women did not have, and this was considered the core of their spiritual authority. If they followed the organisational interpretations of I Corinthians 11:2-16, especially verse 10, it was believed they had access to great spiritual power, even to the point of dispatching angels. Many saw this doctrine as revelatory and chose their faith belief in its
power, whether from submission and from the uncut hair itself or from their relationship with God. Either way, most kept their hair uncut out of submission and believed that spiritual power was theirs for doing so.

Yet, across the board, my research discovered there was no difference in women’s spiritual power between either of these denominations. Regardless of one’s baptism (Oneness, in “Jesus Name,” or Trinitarian, in “the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit”), whether or not a woman adhered to the doctrine of uncut hair, spiritual power was inherent in every woman’s story, placed there by the power of her belief. The Pentecostal women whose lives and spiritual experiences I researched, claimed that they practised mutual submission with their husbands yet ultimately submitted to God first over all others. This truth was situated at the core of their experiential belief system. It was what felt most true to them, regardless of rationality. Everything that guided their lives, including their primary relationships, was situated in a framework of belief and ‘commitment to passion’ (Rapport, 2012:p.130). The personal truths that subjects hold are what affect their choice of relationships and how those relationships are ordered. Order is a harmonising process of stability for members of the lifeworld. These personal truths guide how they live their lives, how they view events - indeed, what is even considered an event. When a woman lays hands in faith healing on a sick person, prophesies over another, or prays in tongues (and also interprets them), these events are simply part of being in the lifeworld. In their commitment to sense-making, participants create meaningful physical worlds and shared elements of behavioural norms (Rapport, 2012:p.140).

During my fieldwork in New Zealand, I often heard the phrase, “being Jesus with skin on,” to describe acts of service by meeting the needs of others. And because Jesus embodied the spiritual gifts and enacted his ministerial callings, Pentecostal women feel they must do no less; thus, they are “being Jesus with skin on.” Rapport writes that subjects embody their personal truths, carrying and performing them in their lifestyles and projects (2012:p.150). Dawson and Scanzoni (1992:p.130) write that members must free one another from socialisations of gender roles and take on the attributes and example of Christ as their paradigm instead, called to mature personhood in Christ’s image. Reuther (2010) calls for feminist ‘Christologies’ that are woman-friendly ways of understanding the person and message of Christ. I contend that when a woman makes her life-framing mantra, “Jesus with skin on,” she follows the model Reuther proposes. Such a model and mantra calls women into full personhood because being Jesus with skin on is a statement of identity.

In summary, submission to God first over all others is a component of biblical feminism due to the spiritual power it unlocks and it creates feminist space for the evangelical
and revivalist Other. This turns on its head the postmodern feminist perspective that revivalist women are required to have unconditional loyalty and submission to the patriarchy. It also dissents from conservative, scriptural justifications of women’s subordination, since scriptures are sometimes misinterpreted and misused by the patriarchy. This misinterpretation is most often seen when revivalist women who exercise their call into the ministry find there are far fewer pulpits open to them than there are to men. When women are blocked by men from speaking or preaching in the assembly and cannot exercise their spiritual gifts of prophecy or tongues interpretation is a misuse of scripture. It is also seen when only men are chosen for positions of leadership in the church and women must content themselves with being in assistant, lay or staff positions. These and many more were stories my interviewees shared, thus demonstrating that Pentecostal women are not unselfconscious. They know that they can at times, be blocked by the patriarchy from ‘personal mobility’ (Werbner, 2008: p.17), but it mobilises them to strategy and harmony in securing gender justice. Pentecostal women take on a view that is not held in the mainstream - that of submission as power.

Next I look at the culmination of these threads in the conceptual framework of authority and woman space.

**Authority: ‘Women-space’ to woman space**

I contend that the women of this study held great authority based on a variety of factors. Their sense of identity and purpose mixed with their co-optation of submission as that given to God first over all others when exercising their spiritual giftings and callings in their faith communities, underwrote their spiritual power. Their biblical feminist stance when securing for themselves access by navigating the patriarchy (whether or not they ever claimed the feminist label) ordered their relationships with men and other women. Through the narratives of this study emerged a common, recurring theme of women’s fellowship similar to the first century Church. Stories abound in the New Testament of personal conversions mediated by others, relationships both in the home and the faith community, and of believers seeking direction for their lives. So it was with the interviewees in this study. All these factors combined to create the women’s sense of agency or spiritual authority to culminate in what I am calling woman space.

Graham’s (1995) article argues for ‘women-space’ in religion and the sciences as a way of transforming women’s experiences and correcting their exclusion from male-dominated spaces. What Graham calls women-space and I call woman space is critical to women’s spiritual growth in their faith communities, but they are not the same thing. Woman
Space can take place in women-space (and often does), but the reverse is not so. The latter is organised specifically to meet women’s social and spiritual needs away from male oversight (Butler, 2007:p.149; Brasher, 1998; Eiesland, 1997). The former is women’s spiritual aura and is enacted in the public, corporate worship of the church or in a woman’s own private worship.

That place of authority in which women are visible and heard within their faith communities, I argue, is spiritual woman space. It is what gives women their voice upon conversion or engagement in the faith community. Spiritually created, it is a space awakened within, and a woman taps into it with her prayers. After seeking to remove “sin” from their lives, members move in the power of the Holy Spirit/Holy Ghost where a woman worships God, feels God’s presence, and acts on God’s guidance. From the beginning, she is often ushered into this space by other women. I argue that the sanctification of which Butler (2007) wrote and women’s adaptation of it creates woman space the spiritual authority that is its natural outcome. Women who demonstrate in their lives personal consecration to service and to God through prayer, self-sacrifice, fasting, and cleansing brought by self-denial and who operate under their spiritual giftings and spiritual authority are in woman space.

This is comparative to female sacrality in contemporary Goddess spiritualities (Raphael, 1996:pp.21, 263) except that woman space is located within patriarchal religion. Raphael’s definition of female sacrality that it conceptualises the female body as a ‘locus and medium of the sacred,’ informing the ‘thealogy and practice of spiritual feminism,’ as well as that of ancient matrifocal societies (1996:p.22), taps into the same divine power as does woman space. Further, what Graham’s (1995) article defines as women-space becomes an umbrella term for what Blumhofer calls ‘appropriate women’s spheres’ of editing, administrating or evangelizing (2006:p.402; 1993:p.173); women-church (Reuther, 1985); women’s enclaves (Brasher, 1998); organised groups like Women’s Aglow International (Griffith,1997); Atlanta career women who converted at middle age and created their own prayer group (Eiesland, 1997); and other women’s groups in faith spaces are by-products of what I am calling woman space. These are places that women themselves create, come to and are, in order to receive or give emotional and spiritual support, thus reclaiming their existence within a ‘symbolic economy’ that renders them unseen and unable to speak (Graham, 1995:p.23). Accordingly, while enclaves, prayer groups and organised functions are in fact outcomes of women-space, they become ‘outward hallmarks’ (Butler, 2007:p.47) of woman space when they engage in leadership, teaching, imparting and enforcing cultural, doctrinal and organisational values in their faith communities. Butler (2007:p.50) writes that COGIC women used the church’s female-dominated, male-sanctioned, shared gender space to further
their admonitions and teachings about the sanctified life and from which they enacted control of the congregation as church mothers. Only women with authority can do such things, but before they can step out in authority, they must first have it. I argue that _woman space_ is where that authority is imparted.

_Woman space_ is embodied; women-space is outside the body. _Woman space_ makes women-space possible and necessary. It is where the spiritual meets the physical. _Woman space_ is where a woman’s spiritual giftings of faith healing, prophecy, word of knowledge and the rest come to life and her ministerial callings enacted in order to usher in and make way for God’s presence within her and the faith community. It is where a woman acts on the ‘God within’ from the space of the self in testimony, worship and bringing God’s word to the assembly. And while women-space can be dismantled by the patriarchy, as Jewel’s story demonstrated when her prayer meetings were shut down by her former pastor, _woman space_ exists wherever a woman worships. She carries _woman space_ with her. Women usher one another into both _woman space_ and women-space.

But what came first in Pentecostalism, patriarchy or _woman space_? This could well be a chicken or egg question, and Ambrose and Payne (2015:pp.54-55) write that in the early days of Pentecostalism, American Protestantism underwent masculinisation (Bederman, 1996:pp.107-20). The penchant in Pentecost to weep, sing and otherwise emotively submit to the Spirit even to the point of losing control of the physical body was out of step with tenets of ‘rational’ and ‘controlled’ manliness. When women embody _woman space_ it is an assertion of their shared humanity with men, because they are fearlessly worshipping and acting on their spiritual giftings even as men do. They recognise the gender-neutrality that is God’s Spirit operating within them. There is a degree of negotiation and collaboration in these systems. Brasher (1998:p.120) told of men who tried to gain access to women’s enclaves. They recognised that the women’s spiritual power was greater than their own and wanted to experience why. _Woman space_ and women-space are what Goettner-Abendroth (2012:p.141) calls a ‘form of resistance from below,’ the schism of two parallel cultures, the patriarchy ruling and the oppressed women’s culture. These co-exist in a fragile balance. When women operate either in women-space or in _woman space_, these spaces are safe and demarcated from the patriarchy. They are able to share the physical (male) space in satisfactory ways without backing down from their rightful place. Both exist alongside patriarchy, because any structural system requires the existence of its opposite in order to receive its identity. Both patriarchy and _woman space_ are concomitantly creators of and created by a gendered culture that establishes conventions and hierarchies by which women and men are differentiated and ultimately divided (Brasher, 1998:pp.11-13; Graham, 1995:p.14).
A woman may be in a patriarchal space by virtue of being in a Pentecostal (or any) faith stream and church, but her worship is not patriarchal in itself nor is her embodiment and acting on her spiritual giftings. Woman space is a feminised public differentiation from the patriarchy. A woman moves as the Spirit moves through her. She may lay hands on the sick, prophesy into people’s lives, or preach a word from the pulpit as led by God. Since she is not a member of the patriarchy, her space of authority comes from the self. Her decision to lift her hands in worship, to raise her voice in prayer and song or in tongues interpretation, to use her hands to lay on others to bring forth healing or tongues as the Spirit gives utterance, or to dance in the Spirit all comes from a space within, from the self. And she does all this with a knowledge that she hears and ascertains God’s voice and follows God’s leading. She is in woman space, where society, self and knowing converge. She embodies these actions congruent to her relationship with God and according to power that comes to her from the God within.

Woman space is agency as spiritual authority where women can act independently because of social capital. When Lydia, a member of this study, laid hands on a man in a gender-segregated altar service, she transgressed the gender line but her authority was recognised in the faith community by the outcomes. Both she and the man fell to the floor under the spiritual power, and he began speaking in tongues. This validated that Lydia was operating under God’s authority. As Lawless (1988a:p.76) wrote, Lydia’s success attested to God’s preference for her. Hildegard of Bingen, composer, scholar, songstress and abbess from the twelfth century, once wrote, ‘I fear the justice of God more than the justice of men.’ Boyce-Tillman (1993:p.155) writes that Hildegard’s music came to her by God from her visions, an authority ‘vested in the woman herself and not in an outside authority.’ Boyce-Tillman’s description of Hildegard’s musical and authoritative giftings, similar to the women of my study who submitted to God first over all others, and to those of Butler’s research who operated under God’s authority (2007:pp.66-71), is what I am calling woman space. It is a ‘woman-centered identity,’ uncontained and un-circumscribed by the patriarchy, an identity fixed in women’s distinctive experience of the body (Graham, 1995:p.21). Woman space is embodied knowledge. Like Hildegard, participants in this project repeatedly claimed that their authority, spiritual power and knowing came from God, that it was God working through them, or that it was God’s direction that they followed. In woman space, they embodied God’s pure energy as authority. I contend that it is the threads of identity, submission and spiritual power, along with their biblical feminist stance on relationships within the home and Church which comprises their spiritual authority or agency, conceptualised as woman space.
Tying the Strands and Conclusion

Evangelical and conservative women may seek gender equality, but the means fit their values. The pluralistic stance that practitioners of biblical feminism take (whether or not they claim its name) of working towards harmonious co-existence between the genders, co-opts submission doctrine and makes it work for them. The ‘social conditions’ of being a woman (Stivens, 2008:p.91) in Pentecost involves emotional negotiation within their relationships with men and each other in culturally appropriate ways. In this, they shun the dominant culture of feminism and its “secular” values, even though they may work towards common goals of gender equality and women’s empowerment. Theirs is instead a ‘process-oriented framework’ in which all work together for the common good (Reilly, 2011:p.369).

Empowerment, however, can be janus-faced when what Pentecostal women do in pursuit of and living their truth may actually look anti-feminist to observers on the outside. These categories are purely subjective, both to the ones who live submission doctrine and to those who observe them living it. These women’s performance of their truth concerning submission and the enactment of their spiritual gifts and ministerial callings gives rise to their own physical truth which they hold to be self-evident. These women take abstract knowledge - in this case, the belief that God, upon conversion, bestows upon a person spiritual giftings without repentance – and they apply it in a sense of knowingness about themselves that translates into an authority which comes from their sense of life purpose. Because they have dedicated their lives, behaviours, indeed, their very bodies to God, when they embody their giftings and enact their ministerial callings, they submit to God first over all others, and in their faith communities they are considered spiritually very powerful. They live their lives according to their own personal truth. While an intangible idea gives way to tangible, embodied results, the impetus of their submission is the begetting of selfhood or identity from which flows authority. These are Pentecostal women leading reflexive lives, engendering ‘direct feedback from knowledge to action’ (Rapport, 2012:136). They submit as an interpretation of scripture and become free agents in exercising their spiritual giftings and ministerial callings. It is submission which releases their spiritual power to flow freely.

Women’s ability to nurture and connect with other women is feared by patriarchy and a disruption of that interdependence between women is a patriarchal tool, especially when wielded by women against other women, and it will never dismantle patriarchy’s house (Joyce, 2009; Lorde, 1984). Pentecostal women eschew the idea of a global sisterhood, because while they may have benefitted from women’s rights activism throughout the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries, they do not wish for an ideology that is not God-

---

122 Romans 11:29.
based to name them or their oppression. What feminism may consider to be revivalist women’s oppression, revivalist women consider to be their empowerment.

The women of my study found strategic ways to work with the patriarchy in recognising women’s God-given authority. They did this by submitting to God first over all others when they enacted their giftings and callings, took up the spiritual authority conferred on them by God, and by co-opting submission doctrine they led under their own authority, regardless of patriarchal leanings concerning gender. In woman space, Pentecostal women are powerful.
Chapter 9 - Conclusion

This work has revealed the ‘interior world’ (Butler, 2007:4) of Pentecostal women’s lives, belief systems and spiritual power. My empirical findings made known that the transformation through conversion and continuous relationship with God is a strong component of these revivalist women’s identity. Across the board, in both denominations and countries, the women’s spiritual power was often operated and exercised according to their levels of faith and belief. The spiritual giftings and callings emerging from conversion, coupled with the believer’s personal relationship with God, allowed for identity and a sense of personal fulfilment in a woman’s life. Pentecostalism is a vibrant worldwide movement made up of a diverse array of beliefs that surround a core doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ, the importance of conversion with full-immersion water baptism and speaking in tongues as initial evidence of the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals have a shared history, a similar belief in the spiritual gifts and a commitment that every believer should seek a personal relationship with God, locating and living the calling God has placed on their lives.

I have employed the theoretical concept of feminist standpoint theory to provide a framework for the ways that Pentecostal women experience dis/empowerment. They co-opt submission as a tool of resistance, offering it to God first over all others, while navigating the patriarchy in ways that are strategic and feminist. Their identity and sense of being a Pentecostal woman, bestowed at conversion and buttressed by calling, underwrites the embodiment of their spiritual gifts and authority. I have also used the theoretical and philosophical construct of biblical feminism to demonstrate how the women are rendered active agents in seeking their own and other women’s empowerment by co-opting submission, given to God before and over all others, as a feminist tool of resistance.

In their faith communities, submission brings great social capital. It is an important strategy Pentecostal women use to navigate the patriarchy and find fruition for their giftings and callings. This study revealed a range of submission models from mutuality to hierarchical, adult/child, appropriation and adult/adult, a veritable smorgasbord of various types of submission. These models emerged from the women’s interpretation of scripture, personal experience, and individual approaches to submission. Various forms of submission can be contested and even compete with one another. In the Pentecostal lifeworld, there is no ‘post-submission’ because it is constantly being reframed and reinterpreted as churches respond to contemporary culture.
For instance, respondents who were AG administrator leaders took an egalitarian approach to submission, shared mutually with husbands according to their readings of Ephesians 5:21-33. They seemed to take for granted amongst them that this is what submission was. All the women’s narratives in this study, however, revealed submission’s complexities and complications, and they took a sophisticated approach to demarcating what it was from what it was not. While they offered submission to men, the women were definitive that submission was always given to God first and prioritised over all others. Therefore, it was conditional. I have shown how scriptural frameworks were used by the women in life-framing mantras and scripture as conversation to capture their submission to God. As delineated by their narratives, the women’s reinterpretation of submission was an empowerment strategy.

Pentecostalism is the largest world denomination after Roman Catholicism, and it often leads other Christian faith streams in women’s ordination, based on varying interpretations of scripture. The history of women’s ordination in the Pentecostal lifeworld, however, is fraught with contradictions, replete with gender nuances, ambivalence and strategy. Despite the strength of women’s spirituality and their efforts to move the core beliefs of Pentecostalism forward, the movement was quickly co-opted by the patriarchy with only certain channels open to women in its organisational structure, despite the preponderance of their numbers in membership. Accommodating the patriarchy is never easy, and Pentecostal women must traverse a host of written, or more often unwritten, rules to have access to ministry. While some of my interviewees were ordained, they were given the impression, spoken and unspoken, by male leadership that women could not be senior pastors. Indeed, in both the UPCI and AG, women comprise a very small percentage of senior pastors overall in either country, the USA or New Zealand. Yet the difficulties faced by men pastors are the same difficulties faced by women pastors; still, senior pastor positions are rarely granted to women. The research has shown that the women in this study have found ways to subvert those male arguments that use the Pauline injunctions about ‘not suffering a woman to speak,’ forbidding women to have authority, and attempting to trump their aspirations and callings. Instead, the women provided counter-arguments from scripture, including Joel 2:28-29, Matthew 28:19-20, and Paul’s greetings to women who were fellow labourers with him in the gospel. In this manner, women were subversive in challenging men, meeting text for text.

The Church’s ambivalence about allowing women to speak is expressed in hostility when the patriarchy is slow to provide support or withdraws it altogether. Participants told of experiencing discouragement and nuanced forms of promotion in ministries and careers due to the stained glass ceiling. Equality is polemical in the Pentecostal lifeworld, and an uneasy
accommodation exists between woman space and the patriarchal establishment of pastors, husbands, protocols and guiding documents. Claiming woman space comes down to faith and a personal relationship with God; yet, woman space is nonpartisan, depoliticised and offered first to God. Ultimately, though, some Pauline injunctions do trump women’s aspirations. While woman space may help them to retain their faith, there are uneasy articulations of patriarchy, played out in contemporary, twenty-first century expectations around gender and the adaptation of first-century Christianity.

Such discrimination is often disseminated via osmosis in the Pentecostal lifeworld. Whether blatant or insidious, whether a woman examines the circumstances or simply takes them for granted as ‘the way things are,’ or whether she applies such discrimination to other women, there is a perpetual woman question inherent. It arises to trouble women’s involvement in operating their ministerial callings and embodying their spiritual giftings. Therefore, when they experience a patriarchal block, women imaginatively create for themselves new opportunities to operate under their God-given authority, seeing those opportunities as open doors provided by God through their submission.

Women use the delineation of gender roles in the Pentecostal lifeworld as a means for their empowerment. By co-opting submission, by dressing modestly as an expression of Holiness, and by remaining in right relationship to God, men and each other, Pentecostal women are able to work alongside or even around the patriarchy to get the work done. As stated in the Introduction, while these women do not have an overt feminist agenda, when they co-opt submission, reserving for themselves when or if they will give submission to men and always giving it to God, they invent a strategy for creating gender harmony in a patriarchal world. As mentioned on the first page of this thesis, even though women are the driving force of Pentecostalism in terms of sheer numbers, rather than challenging the patriarchy head on, they seek to build an ordered society with men. They exercise calling and embody and enact their spiritual giftings while locating their empowerment in canonical texts like Genesis 1:26-28, Galatians 3:28-29 and for UPCI women, I Corinthians 11:2-16, especially verse 10. By doing so, these women exercise true biblical feminism which holds that women’s empowerment is already located in scripture, and they indeed find it so. Though some feminist scholars may write Pentecostal women off as being anti-feminist, these women’s ways and means of navigating the patriarchy demonstrate the type of feminism they use.

Just as there are various ways of doing gender or submission, so it is with feminism, as the various definitions of feminism indicate in the Introduction. How feminism gets defined is determined by the values a woman holds and her approach to gender roles or any life-defining
situation of dis/empowerment in her faith community or family. At the beginning of this research, although I hoped to locate feminism in Pentecost, it was not an established goal; locating the components of Pentecostal women’s spiritual authority was. But as I began to hear feminist themes in respondents’ stories, it became evident that feminism was a component of their spiritual authority. Time and again, with only a few exceptions, respondents eschewed the feminist question when asked, and most often their narratives never even alluded to the terms feminist or feminism. It was as though it did not occur to respondents that they or the ways they navigated the patriarchy could be considered feminist, although their narratives were rife with feminist themes. As mentioned in the Introduction, I found a thread inherent in the Pentecostal lifeworld of de facto feminism, yet it remained unnamed. The women wove their stories around feminism even as feminism was woven throughout their stories. They did not lay claim to solutions that were overtly feminist but rather privileged those elucidations which came through prayer and being submissive to God’s plan for their lives. Just as the Literature Review and Scripture Key of this thesis revealed, participants found the means for their empowerment already situated in scripture, and lived their lives according to their own exegesis of it, which is the truest expression of biblical feminism.

This research also raised opportunities for future study. One possible research avenue emerged from the narratives of the aforementioned AG administrator leaders who seemed to have reconciled submission, claimed mutuality and, in essence, moved on. Yet narratives of all respondents revealed that submission was still a dynamic force in the Pentecostal lifeworld that was constantly being reconstructed. This begged the question, was the leaders’ egalitarian approach to submission in fact one reason why they became leaders at this level? Did their confident reconciling of mutuality in their relationships with husbands and pastors make way for positions of leadership in their lives and careers in Christian service? Or perhaps it was their confidence itself which underwrote both? A study looking specifically at how Pentecostal women leaders view and use submission, how they came to these understandings, and how it may have contributed to their career journeys, could produce revealing results. Another research possibility would be to give focused study to the dis/similarities of Pentecostalism in both countries, the USA and New Zealand. Though this was an outcome of my research by virtue of its comparative aspects, a focused, systematic study of this topic could provide answers to how Pentecostalism as a world movement is absorbed and gets done within countries. The factors of varying populations, political and class systems and how Pentecostalism gets manifested in multicultural ways would provide useful insight into what has made the Pentecostal experience a global movement. Another intriguing aspect for study,
and one I hope to pursue in future publications, is collecting Pentecostal men’s perspectives on submission and how they themselves view Pentecostal women’s spiritual authority and power. Do they see it as something to be contained or celebrated, threatening, or God-driven? Do they view submission as a strategic tool women use or as an expected outcome in who women recognise as their patriarchal leadership? And how do men’s responses compare generationally? Answers to these and other questions could provide more insight into the Pentecostal lifeworld in terms of masculinities and gender roles. Finally, due to the sheer numbers of women in Pentecostalism, some secular authors (Hallum, 2003; Brusco, 1995) have called for it to be termed a women’s movement. What do Pentecostal men - and women - think about that?

In summary, revivalist women are on a quest for power – spiritual power. And in their quest, they believe there should be structure around the ways they enact their identities as wives, mothers, daughters of God and labourers in the gospel. These structures carry constraints that they willingly take on, such as the navigation of the patriarchy or their discovery that few pulpits are available and there is less opportunity to exercise their spiritual callings and giftings. Yet they work within this structure because of the meaning and order it brings to their lives and to their relationships with God, men and each other. They find great value in the women-space groups, the networks of friendship and the discipleship they enact with other women. Most of all, through the structure of Pentecostalism, a world movement that releases members regardless of gender to believe in, embrace and move within the spiritual realm, they embody woman space, the power of authority they carry as believing women, submissive to God. In that space, they are powerful.
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Appendices
## Appendix 1: Interviewee Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity (as self-identified)</th>
<th>Age Range (at time of interview)</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Vocation Pro/Non-Pro/Ret incl. Pastor, Co-Pastor or (PW)</th>
<th>Ordained or Licensed (Y)</th>
<th>Childhood, Youth, or Adult Convert to Pentecost (Former Denomination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Mid-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PG Diploma</td>
<td>Clinical Assessor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewel</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Early-70s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Hospitality &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>AC (Catholic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Late-20s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Bible College</td>
<td>Teacher’s Aide / Administrator / Asst. Pastor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Early-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Office Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>CC (Baptist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jael</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Early-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td>AC (Anglican)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Office Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Early-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YC (Catholic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquelyn</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Late-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MeD</td>
<td>Chaplain (PW)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YC (Anglican)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodene</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Early-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Co-Pastor, Theologian (PW)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YC (Anglican)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodie</td>
<td>Pākehā – English / Jewish</td>
<td>Mid-60s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>PG Diploma</td>
<td>Artist / Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cami</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Mid-60s</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AC (Anglican)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Late-40s</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Customer Svc, Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Certificate (in progress)</td>
<td>Community Health &amp; Food</td>
<td>AC (Methodist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Māori / Samoan</td>
<td>Early-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bible College</td>
<td>Childcare Teacher / Evangelist (PW)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmella</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Early-60s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td></td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charis</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Late-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Teacher (PW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Late-60s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Māori / Samoan</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>PG Diploma (in progress)</td>
<td>Social Worker / Postgrad</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemency</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Missionary / Counselor (PW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CC (Methodist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral</td>
<td>Māori / Pākehā</td>
<td>Early-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bible College</td>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catrina</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Mid-40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicely</td>
<td>Native Am.</td>
<td>Early-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Retired (PW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>YC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantelle</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Late-40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Mental Health Worker (PW)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AC (Baptist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarabelle</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Late-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>YC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Early-30s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Business Diploma (in progress)</td>
<td>Imaging &amp; Archiving</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance</td>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD (in progress)</td>
<td>PhD Candidate (Secular) / Asst. Pastor</td>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verity</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-30s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Professional (PW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>African-Am.</td>
<td>Mid-30s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgie</td>
<td>Scottish &amp; Irish-Am.</td>
<td>Late-30s</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bible College</td>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC (Presbyterian)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A / G NZ Interviewees (10)**

**UPC / I-NZ Interviewees (16)**

**AG-USA (19)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity (as selfidentified)</th>
<th>Age Range (at time of interview)</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Vocation Pro/Non-Pro/Ret incl. Pastor, Co-Pastor or (PW)</th>
<th>Ordained or Licensed (Y)</th>
<th>Childhood, Youth, or Adult Convert to Pentecost (Former Denomination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td>African-Am.</td>
<td>Mid-30s</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Management, Customer Svc</td>
<td>AC (Baptist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD (Secular)</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vada</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Business Certificate</td>
<td>Secretary, Pentecostal Administration</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbena</td>
<td>Native Am. / European</td>
<td>Mid-60s</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonnie</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bible College + Nursing (LPN)</td>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vonda</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Bible College</td>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Assoc. Professor / Pentecostal Administration</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Pentecostal Administration (Pastor)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivien</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Late-40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Pentecostal Administration</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Late-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Missionary / Theologian / Educator</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verina</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD (Secular)</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>Early-80s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Pentecostal Administration (Retired)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>Caucasian / British</td>
<td>Late-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Professor / Pentecostal Administration</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viviana</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-20s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>BA (in progress)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vianna</td>
<td>Scandinavian Heritage</td>
<td>Late-30s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Asst. Professor</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesta</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-80s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Bible College</td>
<td>Retired Co-Pastor (PW)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YC (Nazarene)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanni</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-50s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator, Pentecostal Administration</td>
<td>AC (Baptist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lashay</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>PhD (in progress)</td>
<td>Missionary / Educator / PhD Candidate</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-70s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Retired (PW)</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Late-60s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Late-40s</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Banking/Finance / Evangelist</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lani</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>Educator (Pastor)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>African-Am.</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>PhD (Secular)</td>
<td>Asst. Professor / Evangelist</td>
<td>AC (AME)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Late-30s</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>YC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavonne</td>
<td>African-Am.</td>
<td>Early-40s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Executive Secretary (PW)</td>
<td>AC (Catholic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexie</td>
<td>African-Am. / Mexican (&quot;Mixed&quot;)</td>
<td>Late-teens</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>BA (in progress)</td>
<td>College Student</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalalah</td>
<td>African-Am. / Mexican (&quot;Mixed&quot;)</td>
<td>Early-20s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>Non-Disclosed</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca</td>
<td>Puerto Rican / Caucasian</td>
<td>Mid-20s</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Bible College + BA (in progress)</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Late-70s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>Pentecostal Administration (PW)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>AC (Baptist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Age Range (at time of interview)</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Vocation Pro/Non-Pro/Ret incl. Pastor, Co-Pastor or (PW)</td>
<td>Ordained or Licensed (Y)</td>
<td>Childhood, Youth, or Adult Convert to Pentecost (Former Denomination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney</td>
<td>French-Am.</td>
<td>Mid-40s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lallie</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-30s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Office Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leandra</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Early-60s</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>Caterer</td>
<td></td>
<td>AC (Catholic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A/G NZ interviewees’ pseudonyms began with the letter ‘J’ and UPC/I-NZ interviewees with the letter ‘C’. AG-USA interviewees’ pseudonyms begin with the letter ‘V’ and UPCI-USA interviewees with the letter ‘L’.

- Pākehā are New Zealand-born persons of European descent.
- (M)arried, NM-Never Married, (D)ivorced, (S)eparated, (W)idowed
- Professional Development also equates to vocational training
- (P)astor, PW-Pastor’s Wife, Co-Pastor
- Converts: CC-Childhood Convert, YC-Youth Convert, AC-Adult Convert

UPC/I-NZ represents both the UPCI-NZ and UPC-NZ (see History of Pentecostalism chapter)

- Denomination or faith stream converted from in parentheses. If interviewee was a CC, they were most often raised in Pentecost as were most YCs. Otherwise, if former faith is not included, it may have been unspecified by interviewee.
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INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request. If you have any questions about the project which you would like answered before you decide whether or not to participate, please contact Sherrema Bower or Dr. Fitzgerald.

What is the Aim of the Project?
This project is being undertaken as part of the requirement for a PhD Degree in Anthropology. The major aim of the project is to understand more about how Pentecostal women in the following denominations – the Assemblies of God (AOG) and the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI) in New Zealand and the United States and the United Pentecostal Church (UPC) in New Zealand - organize their lives in a gendered framework of social and spiritual experiences. These denominations utilise the same biblical scriptures but seem to have very different interpretations of certain passages (i.e., I Corinthians 11, Deuteronomy 22:5, 1 Peter 3:1-4, etc.) when it comes to women's spiritual power. Therefore, how do women in these Pentecostal denominations define and claim their own spiritual power? The aim of this study is to explain and explore the narratives of these self-selected Pentecostal women concerning submission to men in their communities and in doing so, will reveal how these women’s embodied, gendered experiences of spirituality as well as spiritual gifts, are expressed.

What Type of Participants Are Being Sought?
Consenting female participants are being sought who are from the ages of 18+ from either of these Pentecostal denominations – the UPCI, UPC/NZ, or AOG - in New Zealand and mostly in the state of Missouri, USA, although some participants may be sought in the USA who are not from the state of Missouri.

What will Participants Be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to participate in a conversational interview at a time and place that suits you. The interview is expected to take approximately one hour. This interview, with your permission, will be recorded and later transcribed. Video may also be used to record the interview, again only with your permission. Participants have absolute freedom of choice in deciding which questions they do or do not want to answer during the interview, and may stop the interview at any time. The interviewee can elect to view the researcher’s analysis and interpretation from the interview and will be provided with that (those) section(s) of the thesis.
Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?
You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?
The information collected will be anything offered by the participant in response to interview questions. It will be transcribed and analyzed whereupon relevant pieces of the interview will be used in the written discussion of the thesis.

This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

Although specific questions will be developed during the interview, the following broad topics provide a guide to the types of questions that are of interest:

- What is your conversion story? Were you born into Pentecostalism or brought to it?
- What does the word “submission” mean to you – just looking for a definition of the word. Was “submission” taught to you and if so, by whom?
- Based on this definition of submission, in what ways do you submit and to whom? • What are your spiritual beliefs concerning hair? Do you cut it or leave it uncut? Do you believe that spiritual or angelic power resides in your hair as outlined I Corinthians 11:116 (especially vs. 10)?
- If married, who submits to whom in your home and what does that submission look like? Who does what domestic labour around your home? How do these duties get distributed?
- Do you feel that you are called to a ministry outside of your home sphere? If so, what is that ministry? In what ways do you actively exhibit your call?
- What does having spiritual gifts mean to you? Do you know what your own spiritual gifts are? If so, in what ways do you actively exhibit or use them?
- Do you believe that one can ever be blocked from following one’s call or utilizing one’s gifts? If so, how so?
- Have you ever found it difficult reconciling your Pentecostal beliefs with the national culture you live in or with your ethnicity?
- Who are your mentors (in terms of demographics like age, gender, etc.) and how do they mentor you?
- Do you mentor others and if so, who do you mentor (in terms of demographics like age, gender, etc.) and how do you mentor them?
- Would you consider yourself a biblical (or other) feminist or having feminist ideals? (e.g., biblical feminists are those who hold, among other beliefs, that there should be a mutuality of submission between women and men; that scripture does not bar access to ministry or gifts based on gender, etc.)
- Are your mentors or any other women (or men) in your life biblical (or other) feminists or have feminist ideals?

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

The purpose of this study is to provide collection of Pentecostal women's gendered social and spiritual experiences within the spheres of home and religious community. Similarities and differences between all participants' answers will be considered. The data will also contribute to a discussion of the long-term experience of Pentecostalism and how it affects identity, concepts of home and spiritual calling.

Interviews will be conducted by Sherrema Bower. Only Ms Bower and Dr. Ruth Fitzgerald will have access to the information you provide. The results of the project may be published but every attempt will be made to preserve anonymity. While information such as age, gender, ethnicity and country of origin may be included in publications with permission, no real names will be used. You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the project should you wish.

The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only Ms Bower and Dr. Fitzgerald will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University's research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

**What if Participants have any Questions?**

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

Sherrema Bower or Dr. Ruth Fitzgerald

Department of Anthropology

Telephone Number: 022-697-4655

Email: sherrema.bower@otago.ac.nz

Dr. Ruth Fitzgerald

Department of Anthropology

Telephone Number: 03-479 8169

Email: ruth.fitzgerald@otago.ac.nz

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;
3. Personal identifying information will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which they will be destroyed;
4. This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops and that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.
5. There are no discomforts or risks associated with this project other than emotions possibly raised by subject matter.
6. I am volunteering my time to participate in this study, and understand that no remuneration of compensation is being offered.
7. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity.

I agree to take part in this project.

☐ I would like to receive the researcher’s analysis and interpretation from our interview as written about in the PhD thesis.

(Signature of participant) (Date)

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix 3:  

Demographics Sheet

REF #12/291

Sherrema Bower, Researcher

“A Woman’s Glory: A Comparative Study Exploring Experiences of Spiritual Power and the Gendered Lives of Women in Two Pentecostal Communities in the USA and New Zealand”

Name:

Address:

Email:

Age:

Marital Status:

(If any) Number of children: Ages:

Sex of each:

Highest Level of Education:

Vocation (work doing now):

Ethnicity:

(If married) Spouse’s Vocation:

Spouse’s Ethnicity: