

2021

Towards a Pentecostal Conscientizing Praxis of Mass Culture Engagement: Contrasting Pneumatologies of Amos Yong and Simon Chan

Monte Lee Rice
monterice@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/spiritus>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christian Denominations and Sects Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), [Comparative Methodologies and Theories Commons](#), [Ethics in Religion Commons](#), [History of Christianity Commons](#), [History of Religions of Western Origin Commons](#), [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#), [Missions and World Christianity Commons](#), [New Religious Movements Commons](#), [Practical Theology Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rice, Monte Lee (2021) "Towards a Pentecostal Conscientizing Praxis of Mass Culture Engagement: Contrasting Pneumatologies of Amos Yong and Simon Chan," *Spiritus: ORU Journal of Theology*. Vol. 6 : No. 1 , Article 8.
Available at: <https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/spiritus/vol6/iss1/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Theology & Ministry at Digital Showcase. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Spiritus: ORU Journal of Theology* by an authorized editor of Digital Showcase. For more information, please contact digitalshowcase@oru.edu.

TOWARDS A PENTECOSTAL CONSCIENTIZING PRAXIS OF MASS CULTURE ENGAGEMENT

CONTRASTING PNEUMATOLOGIES OF AMOS YONG
AND SIMON CHAN

MONTE LEE RICE

Spiritus 6.1 (2021) 81-102
<http://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/spiritus/>
© The Author(s) 2021

Keywords *Amos Yong, Cheryl Bridges Johns, James K. A. Smith, Simon Chan, Tracey Rowland, conscientizing praxis, theologies of cultural engagement, Frankfurt/Birmingham culture critique, mass culture, Pentecostal cosmology, Vatican II Gaudium Et Spes*

Abstract

This essay notes promises and problems with Pentecostal cultural engagement through its dualistic “spiritual warfare” cosmology. I propose a promising foray by forging Amos Yong’s and Simon Chan’s theologies of cultural engagement. For both employ their Asian particularities towards addressing cultural phenomena in manners that distinguish their contrasting yet I shall argue, complementary pneumatologically themed theologies of culture. Yet neither have engaged methodological disciplines of cultural analysis and critique. In response this essay suggests a Pentecostal *conscientizing* praxis of mass culture engagement, in conversation with Amos Yong and Simon Chan. This essay concludes by suggesting need for discerning possible prophetic elements operative within contemporary global populism, notwithstanding its identified ignoble themes.

Introduction

Pentecostal spirituality makes Pentecostals highly adept at appropriating “glocal”¹ cultural artifacts to ministry aims.² Allan Anderson has long defined this appraisal as Pentecostalism’s “contextual pneumatology,”³ which he links to the tradition’s stress on experiencing the Spirit through oral- and narrative-driven “spontaneous

liturgy.”⁴ In his more recent research, Anderson thus stresses how Pentecostals characteristically approach their local and global networks as a missiologically tuned, global “metaculture.”⁵

Birgit Meyer’s and André Droogers’ respective anthropological research clarifies this interface. Meyer explores links between world Pentecostalism, globalization, and neoliberal capitalism while Droogers assesses Pentecostalism in relation to global cultural and social processes of modernization, globalization, and transnationalization.⁶ Interestingly, both describe Pentecostal cultural engagement through two facets. First, Pentecostal cultural engagement operates within a cosmology that construes the world with its glocalization dynamics, as an arena of spiritual warfare between God and demonic powers.⁷ Second, Pentecostals negotiate this cosmology through two contrasting, cultural engagement modes. Droogers call these “rupture” and “continuity,”⁸ which parallels Meyer’s “world-breaking” and “world-making” or “world-embracing” categories.⁹ I suggest locating these along a continuum comprising three ways of Pentecostal cultural engagement: 1. world-rupture; 2. world-embracing; and 3. world-making.

At this point, several observations on Pentecostal cultural engagement emerge. First, significantly fuelling the world-rupture/embracing/making continuum is the Pentecostal embodying drive towards sensory experience with spiritual realities. Meyer calls this “sensational form”: a process whereby Pentecostals use cultural artifacts, mainly in the form of media technologies, for rendering God’s presence “sense-able,” while also striving to show themselves as culturally relevant.¹⁰ Second, Meyer notes that notwithstanding Pentecostal other-worldly rhetoric, the “world embracing” and “world-making” modes imply that Pentecostals generally embrace a consumerist oriented lifestyle, fostered through global market economies and neoliberal capitalism,¹¹ which contributes to the contemporary appeal of Pentecostalism.¹²

Third, I suggest these analyses demonstrate an interface between the Pentecostal contextual adeptness that grants a liturgical freedom attuned to cultural items availed through the glocalizing dynamics of world Pentecostalism, and its missiologically tuned posture towards local, popular, and mass cultures operative through the global economic complex. Roughly drawing from Jacques Ellul’s notion of modern “technology as a system,” I am using this phrase to signify the systemic elements of local/transnational profit-driven, mass-consumer aimed, and technologically evolving production of information knowledge and culture.¹³ I particularly refer to mass produced culture. Fourth, substantiating the Pentecostal cosmological framing of the global economic complex is Graham Ward’s thesis that

this complex comprises a cosmologically framed “religious ideology”¹⁴ rooted in metaphysical forces that purport teleological aims for humanity.¹⁵ Ward however does not suggest that we should deem this metaphysics as entirely antithetical to a Christian vision of human and creational flourishing. He rather argues that Christian discipleship involves acting (praxis)¹⁶ in manners that orientate these forces and their issued cultural products towards the moral curve of Christian eschatology.¹⁷ Finally, I thus suggest that Pentecostal cosmological dualism comprises salient resources towards a relevant Pentecostal theology and praxis of cultural engagement.

However, much research suggests that the continuum I earlier suggested (comprising the world-rupture, embracing, and making Pentecostal practices of cultural engagement) generally operate rather superficially. Harvey Cox noted that while Pentecostal cultural adeptness may be the tradition’s greatest “strength,” it sometimes functions as “its most dangerous quality,” recalling South African Pentecostalism’s earlier failure “to exorcise” the “evil demon” of “racism.”¹⁸ Meanwhile, Amos Yong notes that too often Pentecostals approach cultural engagement “instrumentally, as a means toward an end,” usually in terms of world evangelization.¹⁹ Mirroring Cox’s assessment, he notes “subtle ways” that varied ideologies, political agendas, and consumerist-oriented market forces highjack this instrumental approach.²⁰

I propose a foray through these challenges by forging together Yong’s and Simon Chan’s respective theologies of cultural engagement. What makes this alluring is that both employ their Asian backgrounds for addressing cultural phenomena, in manners that distinguish their contrasting, yet I shall argue complementary, pneumatologically themed theologies of culture. I suggest for instance that foremost informing Chan’s ecclesial-centered pneumatology²¹ is his lifelong reflection on negotiating the religiously pluralistic, polytheistic, and animistically rooted conceptions of “spirit” that characterize his Southeast Asian Chinese context.²² Aimed for the Asian setting and secondarily for the “global church,” Chan has thus constructed a theology of cultural engagement that stresses the contextual effectiveness of Pentecostalism within Asian “folk” culture.²³ He credits this to three features of Pentecostal spirituality; its “spirit world/warfare cosmology,”²⁴ its stress on paradigm shifting “conversion” experiences that effects social-economic empowerment through life style changes,²⁵ and its tapping into “the *vestigia dei*” (footprints of God) that Pentecostals intuitively discern within “folk” religious practices and cultural resources.²⁶

Conversely, I surmise that foremost funding Yong's creation-charged pneumatology²⁷ is his lifelong reflection on his "hybridized identity,"²⁸ forged through his diasporic life experiences. For though he started life as a Malaysian born Southeast Asian Chinese, he later became an Asian-American, resulting from his family's migration to the United States when he was still a young child.²⁹ His theology of culture comprises one part of a broader political theology developed from the Pentecostal fivefold Christological motifs (Christ as Savior, Sanctifier, Spirit-baptizer, Healer, and Coming King).³⁰ Similar to Chan, he too retrieves the traditional Pentecostal spirit-world/warfare cosmology for constructing his political theology. He begins this through the "savior" motif, from which he constructs a "cosmopolitical liturgics of resistance."³¹ Then through the "sanctifier" motif, he posits a theology of culture issuing in a "redemptive cultural praxis"; hence, a sanctified politics of cultural redemption."³² Biblically drawing from the Acts narrative and Pentecost imagery³³ Yong funds this praxis through a constructed "pneumatological (and ecclesiological) theology of culture"³⁴ that stresses the Spirit's redeeming aim towards the "many tongues, many cultures" of humanity.³⁵ He then delineates how for this purpose the Spirit empowers us to a praxis of "cultural discernment," comprising a growing "sanctified imagination."³⁶

Two problems, however, challenge this hypothesis. First, while Chan and Yong have both constructed sophisticated theologies of cultural engagement, neither have actually specifically engaged the methodical disciplines of cultural analysis and critique. Second, both operate from very contrasting premises and methodologies: Yong's creation-charged versus Chan's ecclesial-centered pneumatologies. Yet I believe that Yong's work comprises a far more promising response to the twenty-first-century "post-" context,³⁷ broad enough to assimilate helpful features from Chan's ecclesially-informed pneumatology.³⁸

What I shall therefore attempt is this. Working from Meyer's and Droogers' shared construal of Pentecostal cosmology while also responding to Pentecostal contextual adeptness of mass cultures operative through the global economic complex, I shall build on Yong's "redemptive cultural praxis"³⁹ to construct more specifically a Pentecostal conscientizing praxis of mass culture engagement and culture-making. But to do so we should define three different kinds of contemporary culture: folk (or grassroots), popular, and mass culture. For brevity sake, I will do so as they emerge through this discussion. Vis-à-vis Yong's and Chan's contrasting pneumatologically-themed theologies of culture, I have also developed the praxis by employing Australian Roman Catholic theologian Tracey Rowland's critique on the *Gaudium Et Spes* Constitution that fostered Vatican II's

aggiornamento agenda. Engaging Rowland's work thereby directed me to another vital resource that proved critical towards the constructed praxis: namely, methodical insights derived from the Frankfurt/Birmingham schools of cultural critique.

Emerging from these main resources, I shall outline four integrated features of the praxis. The first frames the Yong/Chan synthesis against Rowland's critique of the Vatican II *Gaudium Et Spes* and *aggiornamento* agenda. The second appropriates to the praxis Rowland's argument that culture engagement within modernity requires a strong moral forming ecclesial culture. This feature proceeds by complementing features of Yong's theology of culture with Chan's Eastern Orthodox-informed, "hypostatizing"-purposed ecclesiology. The third informs Yong's and Chan's guidelines towards Pentecostal grassroots cultural engagement with insights derived from the Frankfurt/Birmingham culture critique methodologies. The fourth frames the praxis within apocalyptic-themed Pentecostal dualistic cosmology, by appropriating Cheryl Bridges Johns' "conscientization" notion of Pentecostal formation, integrated to James K. A. Smith's practice of apocalyptic culture reading. The appendix visualises the praxis-model.

Rowland's Critique of the Vatican II *Gaudium Et Spes*

This first feature frames the Yong/Chan synthesis within Rowland's critique of the Vatican II *Gaudium Et Spes*, and broader *aggiornamento* agenda, which she deems woefully inadequate for guiding Roman Catholic cultural engagement. Rowland outlines her critique and prescriptive trajectories in her 2003 book, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition: After Vatican II*. Identifying herself within the Radical Orthodoxy movement, Rowland describes her work as a "postmodern Augustinian Thomism" critique, substantially drawing on the "Communio" movement and MacIntyreian themes.⁴⁰ She explains that the purpose of the *Gaudium Et Spes* was to ground theologically the aims of Vatican II, conceptualized through the Conciliar slogan *aggiornamento*, meaning, "an updating . . . of theological resources."⁴¹ Crucial to this aim was a renewed openness towards contemporary culture.⁴² She does not mention this, but it seems that the crucial aim of the *Gaudium Et Spes* and its corresponding *aggiornamento* theme was to serve Vatican II's greater concern for evangelization in the modern world.⁴³

Rowland argues, however, that the *Gaudium Et Spes* articulated a woefully weak theological posture towards contemporary culture, particularly referring to "mass culture." A crucial element she uses is the German term "*Bildung*," which

means “culture” as an ethos where “self-formation” occurs.⁴⁴ Hence, she argues that the document’s main progenitors presumed the “culture of modernity” as a “neutral” ethos for the “flourishing of Christian practices,” thus believing that ecclesial culture as “*Bildung*” for moral formation can be adequately transposed into the idioms and ethos of modern culture,⁴⁵ specifically mass culture.⁴⁶ Rowland rebuts this understanding. She does so by following John Paul II’s description of mass culture as a “culture of death,” which he juxtaposed with his envisioned “culture of love.”⁴⁷ She especially faults the *Gaudium Et Spes*’s pronouncement that “everything must be done to make everyone conscious of the right to culture and the duty one has of developing oneself culturally.”⁴⁸ She thus faults the “Conciliar fathers” for not defining “the substance of this ‘right to culture,’” or “what it means to ‘develop oneself culturally.’”⁴⁹

Rather than tuned towards drawing supposed relevant resources from modern culture, Rowland thus argues that the “right to culture” needs to be specifically geared for enabling people towards an ecclesial culture as “*Bildung*,”⁵⁰ strong enough to counter rival *Bildung* conceptions operative within modernity; specifically, Enlightenment-Liberalism’s stress on human autonomy apart from “tradition,”⁵¹ and Postmodern Romanticism with its Nietzschean disregard for past tradition and stress on human “authenticity.”⁵² She thus argues for an “Augustinian Thomist conception of culture” that structures people’s formation along the theological virtues (faith, hope, love) Trintarianly coalesced to the Transcendental Predicates and three soul faculties (Intellect: Faith/Truth; Will: Love/Goodness; Memory: Hope/Beauty).⁵³ This scheme thus follows the “‘proto-typical’ classical Christian model” that envisions Christ as proto-typical for formation towards “perfected humanity.”⁵⁴

Moral Forming Ecclesial Culture

The second feature appropriates to the suggested praxis Rowland’s argument that culture engagement with modernity requires a strong moral forming ecclesial culture. Hence, an ecclesial culture in the *Bildung* sense of culture for the sake of moral formation. This feature proceeds by complementing features of Yong’s theology of culture with Chan’s Eastern Orthodox-informed “hypostatizing”-purposed ecclesiology. Yong has exemplified this direction while working from his “foundational pneumatology”⁵⁵ that posits the Spirit imbuing “the cultural dimension of human life.”⁵⁶ Specifically, he argues for a “cosmopolitical liturgics of resistance” issuing in a “liturgical imagination.”⁵⁷ Building on this trajectory, he

moreover posits a redemptive cultural praxis in conversation with “post-Constantinian” political theologies of cultural engagement, appreciating how each prioritizes ecclesial formation for a viable “post-Constantinian/Christendom” engagement with public culture.⁵⁸ He then argues for the purpose of “cultural discernment” this praxis requires liturgical formation of an eschatologically oriented “sanctified imagination.”⁵⁹

Two relevant features characterize Chan’s ecclesiology. First is his ecclesial-centered pneumatology. In his 2011 *Pentecostal Ecclesiology* book, Chan warrants his second feature by asking, how can Pentecostalism continue into the future “without surrendering to the culture of this world?”⁶⁰ He then proffers a foray through the Eastern Orthodox church-creation interface that theologically integrates ecclesiology, anthropology, creation, and eschatology. For within this interface, Eastern Orthodoxy encourages fresh experiences of the Spirit albeit recognized as “ecclesial experience” shaped through the liturgical experiences of church life.⁶¹ From this matrix he thereby reiterates his long stressed argument that “the church is . . . the special place where the Spirit is present on earth,” and in “a way that he is not present in the world.”⁶² For as Eastern Orthodoxy stresses, “what God intends for creation can only be understood in terms of what He intends for the church and what the Spirit is doing in the church.”⁶³

Drawing from Eastern Orthodox theologian John Zizioulas, Chan describes his second feature as the *hypostatizing* aim of ecclesial experience. The patristic theological notion of *hypostasis* has played a crucial role in contemporary Eastern Orthodox theology. Zizioulas argues that comprising the dynamic of “*ekstasis*” (“out of” stasis [“being”]), *hypostatization* means “movement towards communion,” or growth into rightly-formed existence.⁶⁴ While the term primarily refers to a person’s “way of being,” he appropriates it to God’s aim for creation.⁶⁵ He argues that this occurs through a “‘chain’ of hypostatic existence,” where all creation becomes rightly connected to God; hence, hypostatized.⁶⁶ As “images of God” within this chain, the vocational purpose of humanity is the hypostatizing of creation.⁶⁷ Priming this vocation is “ecclesial existence.”⁶⁸ Chan clarifies Zizioulas’ doctrine like this: “The indwelling Spirit ‘hypostatizes’ believers, and through the church creation too is ‘hypostatized.’”⁶⁹

While I find Chan’s ecclesial-centered pneumatology far unnecessarily ecclesial bound, I believe there is profound insight to this basic dictum characterizing his ecclesiology: in the church, the Spirit is present in ways not present in the world. For this prioritizes the soteriological role of ecclesial culture towards priming us for non-ecclesial culture engagement. In his roughly analogous

comparison between the epistemologies of Yong's identified "correlationist" and James K. A. Smith's identified "postliberal" approaches, Simo Frestadius similarly suggests we may helpfully enrich Yong's epistemology with Smith's "notion of habits being formed through" ecclesial "liturgy,"⁷⁰ also benchmarked by a stronger "Christological framework."⁷¹ Frestadius' analysis closely parallels mine, which I am addressing through engaging Rowland's work in tandem with Chan's hypostatizing purposed ecclesiology, and later, with Smith's "apocalyptic reading" of culture. I also believe that Chan's stress ultimately strengthens Yong's "sanctified imagination" notion. It does so by inferring that through liturgies of ecclesial experience, the Spirit primes our imagination with morally-shaped epistemic resources for the renewing and making of human culture.

Frankfurt/Birmingham Culture Critique Methodologies

The third feature informs Yong's and Chan's respective guidelines with insights derived from the Frankfurt/Birmingham culture critique methodologies.⁷² Substantiating this direction is Rowland's biographical analysis on Joseph Ratzinger (Benedict XVI), whose work she finds antidotal to her argued weaknesses of the *Gaudium Et Spes* and the Conciliar *aggiornamento* agenda. She stresses that Ratzinger's work complemented John Paul II's (Karol Wojtyla) envisioned "civilization of love" for countering the contemporary "culture of death."⁷³ She also argues that Ratzinger strove to rectify Vatican II's accommodative approaches to global mass culture.⁷⁴ For these reasons, he engaged the 1920–30's neo-Marxist-influenced Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, Germany (the Frankfurt School of critical cultural analysis),⁷⁵ finding their resources helpful towards engaging modernity and mass culture.⁷⁶

From analyzing 1930–40's European-American industrialized culture, Frankfurt founders Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer argued that profit-aimed dominant classes co-opt consumer masses to systemic compliance for the aims of capitalist industrialized productivity. They achieve these aims through their apparatus of culture industries and mass culture,⁷⁷ which satiate consumers with a "false-consciousness,"⁷⁸ thereby masking their impoverished human growth as they subordinate themselves to the system's productivity requirements.⁷⁹

Adorno and Horkheimer also posited that culture industries produce cultural artifacts for mass consumption, thus generated not from grassroots/folk culture,⁸⁰ but "from above" as mass-produced culture; hence, mass culture.⁸¹ Lacking the creativity of grassroots cultural production, what results is, as earlier mentioned, an

impoverished human development.⁸² Among the ways that Frankfurt theorists identified how the culture industries/mass culture complex stifles authentic folk culture, one I particularly find relevant is culture industry manufactured “kitsch.” This refers to mass-produced cultural art and entertainment that while readily accessible to the subordinate consumer populace, narcotically impedes their capacity to critique aesthetic, intellectual, or moral qualities of culturally produced artifacts.⁸³

Particularly helpful to my argued praxis is the work of John Fiske, representing what we might call the Frankfurt/Birmingham school of culture critique methodologies. Diverting from Frankfurt cultural critique theory, Fiske argued that we recognize more proactive roles that the mass consumer populace practices in response to the culture industries’ production of mass culture.⁸⁴ Fiske stressed a strong contrast he draws between “popular” and “mass” culture,” though arguing their interwoven roles within profit-driven mechanisms of industrialized society.⁸⁵ He thereby argued that the consuming populace implicitly wields a formidable countering-power, though contingent to how skilfully they creatively utilize mass culture towards transfiguring their original meanings into new ones that foster social transformation.⁸⁶

Fiske shares Birmingham founder Stuart Hall’s thesis that popular culture involves “power relations” between subordinates functioning as consumers, and a dominant system maintaining its hegemony over them via culture industries.⁸⁷ He similarly posits that culture industries satiate the consuming populace by producing a “mass culture”⁸⁸ of standardized “cultural commodities.”⁸⁹ Yet again reflecting Hall’s work, he argues that the populace often exercises counter-resistance by creating a “hegemonic zone” comprising “popular culture.”⁹⁰

Fiske illustrates this power struggle through production and consumption of jeans: “Tearing or bleaching one’s jeans is a tactic of resistance,” followed by as “a strategy of containment,” an industry’s incorporation of the new consumer produced artefact back “into the culture industry’s production system.”⁹¹ He thus defines *popular culture* not simply as consumption, but “the *active process of generating and circulating meanings and pleasures* [italics mine] within a social system.”⁹² Hence, these meanings and pleasures are not those originally handed down by the dominant system but rather generated from below.

We can now consider how Frankfurt/Birmingham culture critique methodologies help forge Yong’s and Chan’s respective theologies towards the proposed model of mass culture engagement. Pertinent here is Chan’s 2015 book, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, where he argues that contextual theologies should begin with the “ecclesial experience” of “folk”/“grassroots Christianity” as a foundational

theological resource,⁹³ for engaging “primal”/“folk” religiosity.⁹⁴ This he contrasts with alleged “elitist” top-down approaches that prescribe theological agendas while sidestepping attention to grassroots experience and concerns.⁹⁵ Though I would fault Chan’s broad dismissal of Tillichean correlationist methodologies and similar inter-disciplinary approaches to theologizing,⁹⁶ I find that his preceding trajectory confirms Fiske’s thesis that the subordinate consuming populace is the true driver towards social transformation, thereby functioning as an apt theory for conceptualizing a Pentecostal praxis of mass culture engagement.

Fiske’s notion of “counter-practices” aids the suggested praxis by locating it within the hegemonic zone of popular culture.⁹⁷ There, a populace *practices* the “art of making do” with what a culture industry avails,⁹⁸ yet thereby undermine its attempted “power” to dominate.⁹⁹ He broadly conceptualizes three “practices”¹⁰⁰ the subordinate consuming populace uses to counter the dominant system operative through culture industries and their produced mass culture. Namely, 1. “resistance” (or “evasion”);¹⁰¹ 2. “discriminate” use;¹⁰² and 3. “producing meaning” (meaning making).¹⁰³ Fiske calls these “popular tactics,”¹⁰⁴ whereby the subordinate consuming populace “resists”¹⁰⁵ the dominant system by discriminately changing, disordering, and transforming original functions and/or meanings of mass produced cultural commodities,¹⁰⁶ thereby leading to progressive social action and transformation.¹⁰⁷

Meanwhile, Yong develops his theology of culture by merging two evangelistic-“empowerment” trajectories he observes in early North American “Pentecostal-holiness spirituality and piety.” Namely, a “from”-the-world “sectarian” and “toward”-the-world mode of cultural engagement.¹⁰⁸ He thus extrapolates these into a “redemptive cultural praxis” comprising on one hand, “from” acts of rejection/cleansing/countering culture, and on the other, “towards” acts of redeeming/affirming/making culture.¹⁰⁹ Working from the Pentecostal dualistic cosmology that frames the mass-popular culture interface as more precisely a warfare zone, my suggested praxis thus integrates Fiske’s and Yong’s respective practices into two broad categories, namely, apocalyptic and sapiential practices of cultural engagement. The following chart visualizes these, which I further clarify in the praxis’ fourth feature.

Resistance World-rupture	Discriminate use World-embracing	Meaning making World-making
From-culture praxis	Toward-culture praxis	
Apocalyptic	Sapiential	

Conscientizing Praxis of Apocalyptic Culture Reading

The fourth feature tightly frames the praxis within Pentecostal dualistic/apocalyptic-themed cosmology, by appropriating Cheryl Bridges Johns' 1993 "conscientization" notion of Pentecostal formation, integrated to James K. A. Smith's practice of apocalyptic culture reading. Drawing from South American liberationist educator Paulo Freire's original conscientization model, Johns defined conscientization as "the process whereby persons become aware of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives," yet also "their ability to transform that reality."¹¹⁰

She argued that Pentecostalism functions as a "movement of conscientization"¹¹¹ through its participatory "oral/narrative modes of liturgy," socially inclusive ethos, and grassroots empowerment through experiences of Spirit baptism.¹¹² These dynamics thereby effect an "unveiling" of unjust social realities.¹¹³ Johns' conscientization notion thus reaches towards Smith's "theology of culture"¹¹⁴ comprising a practiced "cultural exegesis,"¹¹⁵ otherwise called an "apocalyptic reading" of culture.¹¹⁶ He builds his model from biblical apocalyptic literature, stressing how we ought to appreciate the genre's aim as not about "prediction" but rather "*unmasking*—unveiling the realities around us for what they really are."¹¹⁷ Apocalyptic literature thus trains us towards becoming awake, that we may see the "idolatrous character of the contemporary institutions that constitute our own milieu."¹¹⁸

Smith challenges us towards apocalyptic readings of "cultural liturgies," where liturgy means "formative practices" that shape us¹¹⁹ through "pedagogies of desire."¹²⁰ Hence, that we may discern the "cultural liturgies" that pedagogically form us in manners counter to the desires and *telos* that authentically Christian liturgy forms within us.¹²¹ Examples include the "cultural institutions of the shopping mall and sports/entertainment venues and mediums."¹²² I suggest that Smith's apocalyptic culture reading steers the true prophetic hope of Pentecostal spirituality from both aberrations of apocalyptic nihilism and triumphalistic-fueled narcissism, by retrieving both the tradition's eschatological themes and apocalyptic imagery, along with the eschata-passioned psyche that has historically imbued Pentecostals with a firm sense of historical destiny. These features I stress should function as core epistemic resources for engaging mass culture.

Resistance World-rupture	Discriminate use World-embracing	Meaning making World-making
From-culture praxis	Toward-culture praxis	
Apocalyptic	Sapiential	

A final step within this feature classifies the toward-culture praxis as sapiential culture readings. Doing so roots it appropriately to the Old Testament sapiential tradition, cosmologically anchored upon a theology of creation.¹²³ For Old Testament scholarship has demonstrated how this theology evokes a “creation spirituality”¹²⁴ operative within Old Testament covenantal life that encouraged integration of cultural items from cultural contexts and knowledge domains far beyond the immediate liturgical context of faith formation.¹²⁵

Conclusion

Working from Pentecostalism’s dualistic/apocalyptic-themed cosmology and Yong’s and Chan’s contrasting pneumatologies, I have delineated a theological model for methodically guiding Pentecostal cultural engagement. The model suggests ways of doing so that are responsive to the metaphysical realities operative within and through the global economic complex that characterizes our twenty-first-century “post-” context. To recap, this model of Pentecostal conscientizing praxis of mass culture engagement and culture-making comprises four features. The first frames the Yong/Chan synthesis within Rowland’s critique of the Vatican II *Gaudium Et Spes* and *aggiornamento* agenda. The second feature appropriates her argument that culture engagement with modernity requires a strong moral forming ecclesial culture. This feature thus complements Yong’s creation-charged pneumatology with Chan’s Eastern Orthodox-informed, “hypostatizing”-purposed ecclesiology. The third feature retrieves insights from the Frankfurt/Birmingham culture critique approach. The fourth feature tightly frames the praxis within Pentecostal dualistic cosmology by appropriating Johns’ “conscientization” notion of Pentecostal formation, integrated to Smith’s practice of apocalyptic culture reading.

This model warrants reflection on contemporary populism. As a “political force” often emerging from popular culture,¹²⁶ grassroots populism comprises an uncanny mobilizing power towards countering perceived hegemonic forces.¹²⁷ Contemporary populism worldwide has often demonstrated “three core features: *anti-establishment*, *authoritarianism*, and *nativism*.”¹²⁸ One theory accounting for the xenophobic/monocultural nationalism that has commonly characterized it is the “cultural backlash thesis,” which roots these drives to nostalgic longings for “retro norms.”¹²⁹ So I often wonder how even amongst Pentecostals worldwide, contemporary populism has comprised what Miroslav Volf describes as the “deadly logic” of “politics of purity.” By this he refers

to longings for “pristine purity of our linguistic, religious, or cultural past,”¹³⁰ thereby aiming for the removal of human “otherness.”¹³¹

So how might the model provide us direction? Here I find help from Wolfgang Vondey’s insistence that the “core theological symbol of Pentecostal theology” is, “Pentecost.”¹³² For as postcolonial theological readings have well-articulated, the “Babel-Pentecost promise-fulfilment” relation signified God’s judgement against homogenization and mandated blessing towards differentiation—seminally displayed through the “many tongues” of Pentecostal outpouring.¹³³ Similarly, Frank Macchia stresses how the “tongues of Pentecost” functions as “*prodigium*” of our present “fragmentation,” yet “promise of reconciliation,” through which the Holy Spirit is calling us to encounter and embrace one another’s cultural “diversity.”¹³⁴ So as Daniella Augustine stresses, the “Spirit of Pentecost” wills nothing less than God’s judgment against “the spirits of racism, sexism, tribalism/ethnocentrism, and nationalism” as “social pathologies.” For through the “many tongues” of Pentecost, “The Spirit reveals the sacrament of the other, even the enemy . . . and the essentiality of loving them as the means to loving God.”¹³⁵

I would concede that a theologically robust model for popular culture analysis involves listening to prophetic elements operative through its varied expressions,¹³⁶ including contemporary populism. Yet this argued praxis of mass culture engagement urges a thick ecclesial and moral-forming culture that fosters reconciliatory acts of heterogeneous embrace with differentiated otherness. Herein lies the conscientizing outcome of Pentecostal spirituality.

So to conclude, how might we discern and hear what God’s Spirit might somewhere within the chaos of grassroots populism speak resonating cries for new creation? Let me suggest some helpful themes emerging from forging together a Roman Catholic “eucharistic theory of culture”¹³⁷ and Pentecostal philosophical reflections on tongues speech as the language of resistance and subversion that is reaching beyond present age hegemonic regimes of social order.¹³⁸ This means seeking out even within present day populism some hard labored resistance against the dominant global economic complex, reflect on how we might remake it, and then epicleitically offer it back to God within the prophetic cacophony of tongues that generates the subversive culture of his coming kingdom. Where speaking in tongues means the liturgical “language of resistance”¹³⁹ that prophesies a shared tilled land where not one but “multiple languages” flourish.¹⁴⁰ Where speaking in tongues prophesies a shared love-labored land; a land where we who through the Spirit of Jesus sojourn as healing hosts to “the other.” Where on a welcoming land

engage one another; Wolfgang Vondey, *Pentecostalism: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2013), 25–26.

² Grant Wacker described this as the Pentecostal “pragmatic impulse,” whereby Pentecostals have shown themselves highly adept towards “working within the social and cultural expectations” or resources available within a setting; *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 10–13.

³ Allan H. Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 198.

⁴ Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 283; idem, “The Dynamics of Global Pentecostalism: Origins, Motivations and Future,” in *Spirit of God: Christian Renewal in the Community of Faith*, eds. Jeffrey W. Barbeau and Beth Felker Jones (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015), 119–20.

⁵ Anderson, “The Dynamics of Global Pentecostalism,” 115–16, 119–21; idem, “The Transformation of World Christianity: Secularization, Globalization and the Growth of Pentecostalism,” plenary paper presented at the Society for Pentecostal Studies 44th Annual Meeting, Southeastern University, Lakeland, Florida, 6 March 2015.

⁶ Birgit Meyer, “Pentecostalism and Globalization,” in *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, eds. Allan H. Anderson, Michael Bergunder, André Droogers, and Cornelis van der Laan (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2010), 114; André Droogers, “The Cultural Dimension of Pentecostalism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Pentecostalism*, eds. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., and Amos Yong (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 196.

⁷ Meyer, “Pentecostalism and Globalization,” 117–18; Droogers, “The Cultural Dimension of Pentecostalism,” 196, 201.

⁸ Droogers, “The Cultural Dimension of Pentecostalism,” 203–8.

⁹ Meyer, “Pentecostalism and Globalization,” 120–21.

¹⁰ Meyer, “Pentecostalism and Globalization,” 123–24.

¹¹ This thus also accounts for why the prosperity gospel exists as an indelible aspect of world Pentecostalism; Meyer, “Pentecostalism and Globalization,” 114, 118, 126.

¹² Meyer, “Pentecostalism and Globalization,” 119.

¹³ Jacques Ellul, *The Technological System*, trans. Joachim Neugroschel (New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation, 1977, 1980), 76–121, esp. 92–93.

¹⁴ Graham Ward, *The Politics of Discipleship: Becoming Postmaterial Citizens* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 83, 97.

¹⁵ Ward, *The Politics of Discipleship*, 79, 115–16, 232–33.

¹⁶ Ward, *The Politics of Discipleship*, 181–84, 200–1.

¹⁷ Ward, *The Politics of Discipleship*, 181–84, 279.

¹⁸ Harvey Cox, *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century* (Reading: Addison Wesley, 1995; Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2001), 259–60.

¹⁹ Amos Yong, *In the Days of Caesar: Pentecostalism and Political Theology* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2010), 180.

²⁰ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 181.

²¹ Simon Chan, “Mother Church: Toward a Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” *Pneuma* 22:2 (Fall 2000), 202–3; idem, *Pentecostal Theology and the Christian Spiritual Tradition*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 21 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 109–14; idem, “The Church and the Development of Doctrine,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 13:1 (2004), 74–75; idem, “Jesus as Spirit-baptizer: Its Significance for Pentecostal Ecclesiology,” in *Toward a Pentecostal Ecclesiology: The Church and the Fivefold Gospel*, ed. John Christopher Thomas (Cleveland: CPT Press, 2010), 147–48; idem, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology: An Essay on the Development of Doctrine*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 38 (Dorset: Deo Publishing, 2011), 22–29; idem, *Grassroots Asian Theology: Thinking the Faith from the Ground Up* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014), 133–56.

²² Chan, “Mother Church,” 202–3; idem, *Pentecostal Theology*, 111–12; idem, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 30–33.

²³ Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 30–31, 119.

²⁴ This cosmology resonates with “folk religion” worldwide and its primal assumption about a “spirit world” comprising actively opposing spiritual powers; Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 31–32, 61, 149–50, 156.

²⁵ Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 104, 119–20.

²⁶ Hence, reflecting the “world-embracing” mode towards culture; Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 30–33, 41–42, 61–62, 95–96.

²⁷ Yong often conceptualizes his creation-charged pneumatology as a “foundational pneumatology”; *Spirit-Word-Community: Theological Hermeneutics in Trinitarian Perspective* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2002), 109–12; idem, *Beyond the Impasse: Toward a Pneumatological Theology of Religions* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 44–45, 130–32; idem, *The Spirit Poured Out*, 267–302; idem, “Poured Out on All Flesh: The Spirit, World Pentecostalism, and the Renewal of Theology and Praxis in the 21st Century,” *PentecoStudies*, 6:1 (2007), 28–30; idem, “Creatio Spiritus and the Spirit of Christ: Toward a Trinitarian Theology of Creation,” in *Spirit of God: Christian Renewal in the Community of Faith*, 168–82.

²⁸ Amos Yong, “From Every Tribe, Language, People, and Nation: Diaspora, Hybridity, and the Coming Reign of God,” in *Global Diasporas and Mission*, eds., Chandler H. Im and Amos Yong, Regnum Edinburgh Centenary Series, vol. 23 (Oxford: Regnum Books International, 2014), 253–61; idem, *The Future of Evangelical Theology: Soundings from the Asian American Diaspora* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014), 17–31, 235–49.

²⁹ Amos Yong, “‘As the Spirit Gives Utterance . . .’ Pentecost, Intra-Christian Ecumenism and the Wider Oikoumene,” in *The Dialogical Spirit: Christian Reason and Theological Method in the Third Millennium* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014), 45–46 (originally published in *International Review of Mission* 92:366 [July 2003], 299–314).

³⁰ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 109–17.

³¹ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 121–65, esp. 151–52.

³² Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 114. In this praxis, “politics” reflects the term *polis*, referring to the “public sphere” where Christian life is practiced; 1.

³³ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 195–99.

- ³⁴ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 201.
- ³⁵ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 201; he reiterates these themes in *The Future of Evangelical Theology*, 135–40, and “Pluralism, Secularism and Pentecost: Newbegin-ings for *Mission Trinitatis* in a New Century,” in *The Gospel and Pluralism Today: Reassessing Lesslie Newbigin in the 21st Century*, eds. Scott W. Sunquist and Amos Yong (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015), 158.
- ³⁶ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 114, 205, 208.
- ³⁷ See my book review: Amos Yong, *The Dialogical Spirit: Christian Reason and Theological Method in the Third Millennium* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014); idem, *The Missiological Spirit: Christian Mission Theology in the Third Millennium Global Context* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2014), in *The Pentecostal Educator* 3:1 (Spring 2016), 42.
- ³⁸ Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out*, 116, 124–25; idem, *The Future of Evangelical Theology*, 54–56, 128–29. Chan meanwhile has long waged disapproval against “Creator Spiritus” pneumatologies; “Mother Church,” 196–97; idem, *Pentecostal Theology*, 110–14; idem, “The Church and the Development of Doctrine,” 74–75; idem, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 14–21; idem, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 131–36.
- ³⁹ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 199; see also idem, “Pluralism, Secularism,” 159–70.
- ⁴⁰ Communion movement stressing the theological *ressourcement* (“return to the sources”) methodology includes Balthasar, de Lubac, John Paul II, Benedict XVI; Tracey Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition: After Vatican II* (New York: Routledge, 2003), ix, 6–7.
- ⁴¹ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 19.
- ⁴² Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 19.
- ⁴³ R. Jared Staudt, “Vatican II and the New Evangelization: The Importance of Culture and Dialogue,” *National Catholic Register*, 15 May 2016, 1, <http://www.ncregister.com/site/article/vatican-ii-and-the-new-evangelization> (21 May 2016).
- ⁴⁴ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 20–21, 72–73.
- ⁴⁵ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 2, 11, 35, 159–61, 163, 168.
- ⁴⁶ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 26, 72, 83–84, 168.
- ⁴⁷ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 2, 39–42.
- ⁴⁸ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 72; citing *Gaudium Et Spes* (“Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World”), 7 December 1965, no. 60, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html# (16 June 2016).
- ⁴⁹ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 72, referring to her fourth chapter theme (“‘Mass Culture’ and the ‘Right to Culture’”).
- ⁵⁰ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 3, 5, 20–21, 32–34, 78, 80–84, 90.
- ⁵¹ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 74.
- ⁵² Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 77.
- ⁵³ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 21, 80–81, 160–61.
- ⁵⁴ Rowland, *Culture and the Thomist Tradition*, 77–78.
- ⁵⁵ Yong, *Spirit-Word-Community*, 59–72, 300–5.

⁵⁶ Amos Yong, “Primed for the Spirit: Creation, Redemption, and the Missio Spiritus,” in *The Missiological Spirit*, 193.

⁵⁷ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 151–65.

⁵⁸ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 186–94; see also idem, “The Church and Mission Theology in a Post-Constantinian Era: Soundings from the Anglo-American Frontier,” in *The Missiological Spirit*, 178–79.

⁵⁹ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 210. Namely, John Howard Yoder’s Anabaptist “political ecclesiology,” Stanley Hauerwas’ “church as colony” model, and the New Monasticism movement; 186–94. See also Amos Yong, “The Church and Mission Theology in a Post-Constantinian Era: Soundings from the Anglo-American Frontier,” in *The Missiological Spirit*, 178–79.

⁶⁰ Chan, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 2.

⁶¹ Chan, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 8.

⁶² Chan, *Pentecostal Theology*, 110; idem, “Mother Church,” 197–98; idem, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 136–37, 144.

⁶³ Chan, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 25.

⁶⁴ John D. Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness: Further Studies in Personhood and the Church*, eds. John D. Zizioulas and P. McPartlan (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 214.

⁶⁵ Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness*, 23.

⁶⁶ Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness*, 67; Chan, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 28.

⁶⁷ Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness*, 67.

⁶⁸ Zizioulas, *Communion and Otherness*, 75–76.

⁶⁹ Chan, *Pentecostal Ecclesiology*, 29. Creation thus receives its redemption (Rom 8:21) through the active priesthood of hypostatized humanity (28–29). As Chan further stresses in his *Asian Grassroots Theology* text, it is thus through the Church that as people become hypostatized into true personhood, the Spirit pursues the “hypostatization” of “nonhuman creation”; *Asian Grassroots Theology*, 45, 143–44, 156.

⁷⁰ Simo Frestadius, “In Search of a ‘Pentecostal’ Epistemology: Comparing the Contributions of Amos Yong and James K. A. Smith,” *Pneuma* 38 (2016), 103. Frestadius describes Yong’s epistemology as a “pneumatological correlationism”; 99.

⁷¹ Frestadius, “In Search of a ‘Pentecostal’ Epistemology,” 113. Frestadius (103) notes however that Yong has been recently moving more in this direction, evidenced in Amos Yong with Jonathan A. Anderson, *Renewing Christian Theology: Systematics for a Global Christianity* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), ch. 12; see also Yong, *The Dialogical Spirit*, 285.

⁷² Pamela Holmes (“Paul Tillich, Pentecostalism, and the Early Frankfurt School: A Critical Constellation,” in *Paul Tillich and Pentecostal Theology: Spiritual Presence & Spiritual Power*, eds. Nimi Wariboko and Amos Yong [Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2015], 194–97) similarly argues the Frankfurt School’s relevancy towards evoking the prophetic orientation of Pentecostal spirituality that can counter its too often uncritical accommodation to the contemporary “capitalist culture” status quo.

⁷³ Tracey Rowland, *Ratzinger’s Faith: The Theology of Pope Benedict XVI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 9, 160; cf. idem, “Gospel and Culture after Vatican II: John Paul II

and Benedict XVI,” *ABC Religion and Ethics*, 13 October 2012, n.p., <http://www.abc.net.au/religion/articles/2012/10/13/3610041.htm> (6 December 2016).

⁷⁴ Rowland, *Ratzinger’s Faith*, 26–27. This resolve accounted for his selected papal name, Benedict, signifying “his belief that Western culture needs a new Benedictine moment, where the ‘banality of mass culture’ would ‘be transcended by islands of spiritual excellence’”; 39.

⁷⁵ Rowland, *Ratzinger’s Faith*, 75. Ratzinger drew specifically from its notable figures such as Ernst Bloch (1885–1977), Max Horkheimer (1895–1973), and Theodor Adorno (1903–1969); 72.

⁷⁶ Rowland, *Ratzinger’s Faith*, 75. This is shown in his *Spe Salvi* (“Saved by Hope”) encyclical, *Saved by Hope* (see nos. 22 and 42, and 43) where he dialogues with Frankfurt founders Max Horkheimer’s and Theodor Adorno’s work as he articulates his vision of Christian hope in contrast to mass culture versions of hope; *Spe Salvi*, 30 November 2007, n.p., http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20071130_spe-salvi.html (6 December 2016). See Gerald O’Collins, “Saved by Hope: Insights from Pope Benedict’s New Encyclical,” *American Magazine*, 21 January 2008, n.p., <http://www.americamagazine.org/issue/642/article/saved-hope> (6 December 2016).

⁷⁷ Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, “The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception,” in *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. by Edmund Jephcott (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002; originally published 1947), 94–136; Theodor Adorno, “Culture Industry Reconsidered,” in *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. J. M. Bernstein (London: Routledge, 1991), 96–97, 106.

⁷⁸ Max Horkheimer, *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, trans. by Matthew J. O’Connell et al. (New York: The Continuum Publishing Co., 2002), 198.

⁷⁹ Horkheimer and Adorno, “The Culture Industry,” 94–136.

⁸⁰ “Folk culture, derived from the German word *volk* for ‘people,’ ‘common people,’ or ‘the masses,’ signals a form of culture thought to originate from the elusive category ‘the people.’ It is often regarded as the culture *made by or of* ‘the people’ and, for this reason, has been thought to serve the needs and interest of its producers”; Omayra Cruz and Raiford Guines, “Entangling the Popular: An Introduction to Popular Culture: A Reader,” in *Popular Culture: A Reader*, eds. Raiford Guins and Omayra Zaragoza Cruz (London: Sage Publications, 2005), 5. See also Kelton Cobb, *The Blackwell Guide to Theology and Popular Culture* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 46–47.

⁸¹ Adorno, “Culture Industry Reconsidered,” 98–99.

⁸² Horkheimer and Adorno, “The Culture Industry,” 94–136; Adorno, “Culture Industry Reconsidered,” 106.

⁸³ Dwight Macdonald, “A Theory of Mass Culture,” in *Popular Culture: A Reader*, 40–42, 44–46. Macdonald notes (40) that Clement Greenburg first coined the term *kitsch* in his essay, “Avant-Garde and Kitsch,” *Partisan Review* 6:5 (1939), 34–49, while also citing (46) Adorno’s famous analysis (“On Popular Music,” *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science* 1 [1941], 42–49) on *kitsch* elements in mass culture music.

⁸⁴ John Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture* (London: Routledge, 1989), 20–21; Cobb, *The Blackwell Guide to Theology and Popular Culture*, 54.

⁸⁵ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 23.

- ⁸⁶ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 21, 160–64, 177, 190–94.
- ⁸⁷ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 19.
- ⁸⁸ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 20; cf. 176–77.
- ⁸⁹ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 176–77.
- ⁹⁰ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 20–21. Stuart Hall theorized three methodological concepts integral to the Birmingham approach: the notions of “hegemony,” “dialect of cultural struggle,” and “containment/resistance”; “Notes on Deconstructing ‘the Popular,’” in *Popular Culture*, 65. Hence, the Birmingham School theorized that whereas dominant societal groups persuade the mass consumer market through culture industries and its production of mass culture, the mass consumer populace exercises dissenting counter-resistance. This dialectic of negotiating processes creates the “hegemonic zone” that we can understand as “popular culture” (68–69). See also Cobb, *The Blackwell Guide to Theology and Popular Culture*, 54–56, 69; Gordon Lynch, *Understanding Theology and Popular Culture* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 11.
- ⁹¹ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 29.
- ⁹² Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 23.
- ⁹³ Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 7–8, 28–35, 45–46.
- ⁹⁴ Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 15–18, 31–35, 47–48, 59–62, 95–96.
- ⁹⁵ Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 7, 18, 26–28, 30–35.
- ⁹⁶ Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 7, 24–26, 30, 35.
- ⁹⁷ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 47.
- ⁹⁸ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 15, 27–28.
- ⁹⁹ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 47.
- ¹⁰⁰ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 45.
- ¹⁰¹ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 26–47.
- ¹⁰² Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 129–30.
- ¹⁰³ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 26–47.
- ¹⁰⁴ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 20–21. Fiske often uses similar terminology, which he derives from Michel de Certeau (*The Practice of Everyday Life* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984], see 34–40), who describes the practices of popular culture through military metaphors, likening the actions of subordinate consumers to that of “guerrilla tactics,” referring to those fighting from below a dominant force.
- ¹⁰⁵ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 19, 27, 33–33.
- ¹⁰⁶ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 26–27.
- ¹⁰⁷ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 163, 192–93.
- ¹⁰⁸ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 167–72, 177.
- ¹⁰⁹ Yong, *In the Days of Caesar*, 195, 201, 206–10.
- ¹¹⁰ Cheryl Bridges Johns, *Pentecostal Formation: A Pedagogy among the Oppressed* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 13.
- ¹¹¹ Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, 62, 108–10.

- ¹¹² Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, 65–96, 138–39.
- ¹¹³ Johns, *Pentecostal Formation* 13.
- ¹¹⁴ James K. A. Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom: Worship, Worldview, and Cultural Formation*, vol. 1, Cultural Liturgies (Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2009), 91.
- ¹¹⁵ Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 89.
- ¹¹⁶ Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 23, 89–93; idem, *You Are What You Love: The Spiritual Power of Habit* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2016), 27–46.
- ¹¹⁷ Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 92; idem, *You Are What You Love*, 39–40.
- ¹¹⁸ Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 92.
- ¹¹⁹ Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 24; idem, *You Are What You Love*, xii.
- ¹²⁰ Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 24; idem, *You Are What You Love*, 21.
- ¹²¹ Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 24–25; idem, *You Are What You Love*, 22, 39.
- ¹²² Smith, *Desiring the Kingdom*, 93–110; idem, *You Are What You Love*, 41–45.
- ¹²³ Walter Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), 2:111; Roland E. Murphy, *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids; Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002), 114, 118; Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 680–81, 685.
- ¹²⁴ Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1962), 1:428; Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2:111; Murphy, *Tree of Life*, 114, 118; Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 680–81, 685.
- ¹²⁵ Roland E. Murphy, “Wisdom in the OT,” *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, 1992), 6:922, 925.
- ¹²⁶ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 159.
- ¹²⁷ Fiske, *Understanding Popular Culture*, 165, 177, 190–94.
- ¹²⁸ Ronald F. Inglehart and Pippa Norris, “Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash,” *Faculty Research Working Paper Series*, Harvard Kennedy School, August 2016, 6–7, <https://research.hks.harvard.edu/publications/workingpapers/citation.aspx?PubId=11325> (28 December 2016). These features can be further described as belief in the virtue of “ordinary people” in contrast to a perceived corrupt/elitist establishment; authoritarian leanings towards charismatic leadership that provides resonance to their aspirations; “xenophobic nationalism” or “mono-culturalism over multiculturalism,” “national self-interest over international cooperation,” “closed borders over the free flow of peoples, ideas, labor, and capital,” and “traditionalism over progressive and liberal social values.”
- ¹²⁹ Inglehart and Norris, “Trump, Brexit,” 14–15.
- ¹³⁰ Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 74.
- ¹³¹ Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace*, 130.
- ¹³² Wolfgang Vondey, *Pentecostal Theology: Living the Full Gospel* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), 1, 11.

¹³³ J. Severino Croatto, “A Reading of the Story of the Tower of Babel from the Perspective of Non-identity: Genesis 11:1–9 in the Context of Its Production,” in *Teaching the Bible: The Discourse and Politics of Biblical Pedagogy*, eds. Fernando F. Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1998); Hinne Wagenaar, “Babel, Jerusalem, and Kumba: Missiological Reflections on Genesis 11:1–19 and Acts 2:1–13,” *International Review of Mission* 92:366 (2003), 406–21, esp. 411–13.

¹³⁴ Frank D. Macchia, “The Tongues of Pentecost: A Pentecostal Perspective on the Promise and Challenge of Pentecostal/Roman Catholic Dialogue,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 35:1 (Winter 1998), 1, 7, 14.

¹³⁵ Daniela C. Augustine, *The Spirit and the Common God: Shared Flourishing in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2019), 9–10.

¹³⁶ Lynch, *Understanding Theology and Popular Culture*, 102–3.

¹³⁷ Peter J. Leithart, “A Eucharistic Theory of Culture,” *First Things*, 13 April 2016, n.p., <https://www.firstthings.com/blogs/leithart/2016/04/a-eucharistic-theory-of-culture> (15 May 2016).

¹³⁸ Here I am bringing together Smith’s philosophy of language stressing tongues speech as “resistance” (“A Pentecostal Contribution to the Philosophy of Language,” in *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy* [Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2010], 123–50, esp. 146–50) and Ekaputra Tupamahu’s similar proposed portrayal of tongues speech as “subversion”: “Tongues as a Site of Subversion: An Analysis from the Perspective of Postcolonial Politics of Language,” *Pneuma* 38 (2016), 293–311.

¹³⁹ Smith, *Thinking in Tongues*, 146–50.

¹⁴⁰ Tupamahu, “Tongues as a Site of Subversion,” 310–11.