The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology

Volume 16 · Number 4 Winter 2012

Editorial Office & Subscription Services:
SBTS Box 832
2825 Lexington Rd.
Louisville, KY 40280
(800) 626-5525, x 4413

Editorial E-Mail:
journaloffice@sbts.edu

God the Holy Spirit

Yearly subscription costs for four issues: $30, individual inside the U. S.; $55, individual outside the U. S.; $45, institutional inside the U. S.; $70, institutional outside the U. S. Opinions expressed in *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* are solely the responsibility of the authors and are not necessarily those of the editors, members of the Advisory Board, or the *SBJT* Forum.

This periodical is indexed in the *ATLA Religion Database®* a product of the American Theological Library Association, 300 S. Wacker Dr., Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606, atla@atla.com, www.atla.com.

The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology is published quarterly by The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2825 Lexington Road, Louisville, KY 40280. Winter 2012. Vol. 16, No. 4. ISSN 1520-7307. Second Class postage paid at Louisville, KY. Postmaster: Send address changes to: SBTS, Box 832, 2825 Lexington Road, Louisville, KY 40280.

Editorial: The Glorious Work of God the Holy Spirit

Stephen J. Wellum

Over the last year, *SBJT* has been devoted to thinking through and wrestling with various significant aspects of theology proper, i.e., the doctrine of God. We have done so by reflecting respectively on the work of God the Father, God the Son, and now, in this issue, we turn our attention to diverse and crucial aspects of the person and work of God the Holy Spirit.

Regarding the subject of the third person of the Godhead, we must, sadly, admit that even today he is still the neglected person in Trinitarian discussion. Even though great strides have taken place in recent years to think through Scriptural teaching and to theologize about the Spirit's person and work, for many in the evangelical church a robust understanding and living out of the Spirit's work in our lives is still lacking. For the most part, Christians are more familiar with the work of God the Father and Son than God the Holy Spirit. It is for this reason that we are giving special attention to the Spirit's work and it is our prayer that this issue of *SBJT* will help in some small measure.

In order to set the stage for the following articles and Forum section, I want to begin our discussion on the glorious work of the Spirit by thinking briefly about three important points of the Spirit's work which Pentecost highlights and underscores. Why Pentecost? For the simple reason that Pentecost is uniquely the redemptive-historical event where we see most clearly the Spirit's work with respect to God's plan of salvation centered in our Lord Jesus Christ. What, then, does Pentecost teach us regarding the glorious work of God the Holy Spirit?

First and at the most basic level, Pentecost reminds us that the Spirit's work in redemption is a Triune work. A crucial truth of Trinitarian theology is that in all of God's actions whether in creation, providence, or redemption, all three persons are inseparably at work yet in their own

Stephen J. Wellum is Professor of Christian Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

In addition to his role on the faculty, Dr. Wellum serves as editor of *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*. He received the Ph.D. from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and he is the author of numerous essays and articles, as well as the co-author of *Kingdom through Covenant: A Biblical-Theological Understanding of the Covenants* (Crossway, 2012).

distinctive ways. Thus, for example, in creation the one God creates but he does so as the Triune God—the Father through the Son and by the Spirit (Gen 1:1-2; Col 1:15-16; Heb 1:1-3). The same is true of redemption. In redemption, the one God acts to save but all three persons inseparably act—the Father elects us and sends the Son; the Son obeys and becomes incarnate in order to act on our behalf as our covenant head; and the Spirit applies the work of the Son to us (see Eph 1:3-14). Pentecost, as a unique and unrepeatable event in redemptive-history is a beautiful illustration of this point. The entire event is placed within God's eternal redemptive plan, initiated by the Father, secured by the Son, and applied to us by the Spirit. In every way, the Spirit's work at Pentecost is a Triune work.

Second, Pentecost also reminds us of the unique new covenant work of the Spirit. This is *not* to say that the Holy Spirit was not operative in a variety of ways in the OT era, including the work of regeneration. Yet, it is to say that we cannot do justice to the reality of history in God's unfolding plan of redemption unless we affirm that it is not until Christ's cross work is accomplished that that the Spirit of God is poured out in a *greater* way upon the people of God than before (see John 7:37-39). Generally speaking, under the old covenant, God dealt with his people in a representative fashion. Various leaders—prophets, priests, and kings—represented the people and on them the Spirit was poured out in a special, empowering sense, which could come and go (see e.g., Num 11:24-30). We do not read about the Spirit's work in this empowering way for *each* individual believer in Israel, as he was operative in the various representative figures. Yet, as the OT prophets anticipate, there is coming a day when all of this will change. In such places as Jeremiah 31:29-24 and Ezekiel 36:25-27, there is the anticipation of the coming of the Messiah and the dawning of the new covenant age. When this occurs, we are told that *all* of God's people will be empowered by the Spirit, not just the representative leaders (Joel 2:28-32). In addition, the *entire* community will also be transformed by the Spirit that *all* will know the Lord, from the least to the greatest. In truth, the pouring out of the Spirit in this *greater* way is one of the crucial evidences that the new covenant era has indeed dawned.

As we move to the New Testament, what the prophets anticipated, the New Testament announces is inaugurated in the coming of our Lord and his triumphant cross work for us. Rather than serving as an isolated event, Pentecost is central to our Lord's victorious work which uniquely signals the dawning of the new covenant era. In this crucial way, Pentecost demonstrates both that Jesus is Lord and Messiah *and* that the new covenant age has finally dawned (Acts 2:36). This is why the Spirit is described in relation to Christ's work as the seal of God's ownership upon us in Christ, as well as the firstfruits and deposit of our full inheritance yet to come (Rom 8:23; Eph 1:13-14). Pentecost rightly viewed is more about the finished work of Christ and the dawning of the era of fulfillment than any mere debate over charismatic gifts.

Third, Pentecost also reminds us that in light of Christ's work, that which *characterizes* this entire new covenant era is the Spirit's work in transforming grace and power. That is why the New Testament constantly exhorts us to walk and pray in the Spirit, to be filled by the Spirit, and to not grieve the precious Spirit of God (Gal 5:22-25; Eph 4:30; 5:18) since it is the Spirit who makes us alive, brings us to Christ, and transforms us.

If all of this is true (which it is) then Pentecost reminds us that it is our joy, delight, and duty to think carefully about the person and work of the Holy Spirit. To get him wrong not only gets our Triune God wrong (which is awful enough), it also leads to our spiritual impoverishment. With this in mind, let us spend some time reflecting upon the glorious work of God the Holy Spirit.

Baptism with and Filling of the Holy Spirit

Gregg R. Allison

As the other contributions to this journal underscore, the ministry of the Holy Spirit during this intra-advent period is multifold; indeed, the expansive work of the Holy Spirit is characteristic of the new covenant.[1] Among unbelievers the Spirit works powerfully to convict of sin (especially unbelief), (self) righteousness, and (false) judgment (John 16:8-11), and to bring them from spiritual death to spiritual life through his regenerating action (John 3:1-8; Titus 3:5). The Holy Spirit seals these new believers, being the guarantee of God's continuing work in their lives (Eph 1:13-14) and providing assurance that they belong to Christ forever (Rom 8:16). As Christians struggle in prayer, the Spirit helps them through his intercessory ministry (Rom 8:26-27) and, as they read Scripture, the Spirit illumines them to grasp properly its meaning and significance (1 Cor 2:10-3:4). His sanctifying work is an ongoing process of transformation into greater conformity to the image of Jesus Christ (2 Cor 3:18), which is noticeable in Christ-like characteristics, the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22-23). The Spirit empowers church members for evangelism (Acts 1:8), endows them with spiritual gifts for growth (1 Cor 12-14), equips them to desire and carry out the will of God while resisting the enticements of their sinful nature (Gal 5:16-17), and much, much more (e.g., Acts 13:1-3; 20:28).

While rehearsing with great appreciation these mighty acts of the Holy Spirit, I will focus my attention on two often overlooked works that involve him: baptism with the Spirit and the filling of the Spirit. I will describe both of these works involving the Spirit, explain the biblical affirmations about them, present the controversies surrounding them, and conclude with an appeal for Christian respect for divergences on these two matters while urging the church toward greater dependence on the Holy Spirit.

Gregg R. Allison is Professor of Christian Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Dr. Allison served many years as a staff member of Campus Crusade, where he worked in campus ministry and as a missionary to Italy and Switzerland. He also serves as the Secretary of the Evangelical Theological Society and the book review editor for theological, historical, and philosophical studies for the *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*. Dr. Allison is the author of several books, including most recently *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine* (Zondervan, 2011) and *Sojourners and Strangers: The Doctrine of the Church* (Crossway, 2012).

Personally, this topic is of vital importance to me. When I became a Christian my senior year of high school, the powerful work of the Holy Spirit rescued me out of a life of self-righteous striving to become acceptable to God and focused my attention on Jesus Christ and the salvation he offers as my only hope for a relationship with God. The very first thought that flooded my mind after I cried out to God to save me was "now you have eternal life," striking evidence of the Spirit's internal witness (Rom 8:16) that I would belong to Christ from that day onward. Together with the sixty or so high school friends that professed faith along with me, I boldly shared my newfound faith with schoolmates, family, even my teachers. We gathered regularly to read the Bible and pray, urged on by the Spirit in the absence of mentors who would disciple us new Christians. As the emotional impact of our conversion began to dissipate, however, our Christian faith seemed to evaporate—and we stagnated.

It was not until over a year later, at the prompting of a friend, that I found relief from this desperate situation. Attending a meeting of Campus Crusade for Christ at my university, now known as Cru, I found myself in a breakout session on the topic "have you made the wonderful discovery of the Spirit-filled life?"[2] What I took away from that presentation was this truth: I cannot live the Christian life in my own strength and by my own resources, but God provides all that I need to please him through the Spirit that indwells me. Grasping my utter dependence on the Holy Spirit, I began a journey that propelled me into campus ministry, international missionary service, pastoring, Ph.D. studies, and a nearly two decade career in theological education.

But I get ahead of myself. I begin with baptism with the Holy Spirit, and then I will treat the filling of the Holy Spirit.

BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT: BIBLICAL AFFIRMATIONS AND THEOLOGICAL FORMULATION

According to John the Baptist, Jesus is "he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit" (John 1:33). The Greek construction—*ho baptizōn en pneumati hagiō*—indicates that an ongoing ministry of Jesus is to baptize new believers with the Holy Spirit. Because this idea may be somewhat hard to grasp, I will use an example—water baptism—to illumine this Spirit baptism. Water baptism consists of four elements: the agent who baptizes (the pastor), the one who is baptized (the new believer), the medium of baptism (water), and the purpose of baptism (e.g., association with the triune God [Matt 28:19]; identification with the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus [Rom 6:1-10]). Baptism with the Spirit similarly consists of four elements: the agent who baptizes (Jesus Christ), the one who is baptized (the new believer), the medium of baptism (the Holy Spirit), and the purpose of baptism (incorporation into the body of Christ [1 Cor 12:13]). Following this discussion, I define baptism with the Spirit as the work of Jesus Christ in which he pours out the Holy Spirit on new believers thereby incorporating them into his (Christ's) body, the church.[3]

The three Synoptic Gospel passages that address baptism with the Spirit confirm this understanding. To cite one of these parallel passages, Luke narrates John the Baptist's announcement of the future work of Messiah:

> As the people were in expectation, and all were questioning in their hearts concerning John, whether he might be the Christ, John answered them all, saying, "I baptize you with water, but he who is mightier than I is coming, the strap of whose sandals I am not worthy to untie. He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing fork is in his hand, to clear his threshing floor and to gather the wheat into his barn, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire" (Luke 3:15-17; par. Matt 3:11-12; Mark 1: 7-8).

In ways similar to John's ministry of pouring out water upon those who heard his message and repented, Messiah would engage in a ministry of pouring out the Holy Spirit upon his (Messiah's) followers.

That the purpose of Jesus Christ's baptism with the Holy Spirit is to incorporate new believers into his body, the church, is established by Paul in his instructions to the Corinthians: "For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and all were made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor 12:12-13). In the midst of his discussion of spiritual gifts and before he talks about the diversity of spiritually-gifted Christians, Paul underscores a point of commonality for them: all are baptized in the same Spirit into one body. Though the earlier cited passages and this current passage differ as to their construction, their meaning is the same. Specifically, the Gospel passages, grammatically speaking, are expressed in the active voice:[4] Jesus Christ baptizes [Christians] with the Holy Spirit. The Pauline passage, grammatically speaking, is expressed in the passive voice:[5] all [Christians] were baptized with the Holy Spirit. The meaning of both the actively expressed Gospel passages and the passively expressed Pauline passage is the same: the baptizer, Jesus Christ, baptizes all of his followers with the Holy Spirit. Importantly, the Pauline passage adds the purpose of this Spirit baptism: to incorporate all Christians into the body of Jesus Christ.

Seven passages in the book of Acts further address this work of Christ involving the Holy Spirit. The first is the resurrected Savior's own prophecy, addressed to his disciples sometime during the forty days between his resurrection and ascension, that the promise regarding this Spirit baptism would be fulfilled imminently: "And while staying with them [his disciples] he [Jesus Christ] ordered them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, he said, 'you heard from me; for John baptized with water, but *you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit*[6] not many days from now'" (Acts 1:4-5).[7] The fresh, new, unprecedented outpouring of the Holy Spirit, as promised by John (in keeping with such Old Testament prophecies as Ezek 36:25-27 and Joel 2:28-32), was just days from being actualized.

The second passage in Acts presents the fulfillment of Jesus' above-cited promise:

> When the day of Pentecost arrived, they [the 120 disciples] were all together in one place. And suddenly there came from heaven a sound like a mighty rushing wind, and it filled the entire house where they were sitting. And divided tongues as of fire appeared to them and rested on each one of them. And *they were all filled with the Holy Spirit*[8] and began to speak in other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance (Acts 2:1-4).

Though Luke does not narrate this descent of the Holy Spirit in terms of Jesus baptizing the disciples with the Spirit (active voice) but in terms of them being filled with the Spirit (passive voice; "being filled with" rather than "being baptized with"), the terms are clearly synonymous, for two reasons: the promise/fulfillment structure of Luke's work (Acts 1:5 anticipating 2:4), and the confirmation given shortly afterwards in the concluding section of Peter's sermon about Jesus: "Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, *he* [Jesus] *has poured out*[9] this that you yourselves are seeing and hearing" (Acts 2:33). In terms of what happened on the day of Pentecost, Luke describes Jesus as the one who "baptized with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 1:4), or who "poured out" the Holy Spirit on the disciples (Acts 2:33), who were thereby "filled with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:4).

The third related Acts passage is Peter's promise to the audience listening to his preaching of the gospel on Pentecost. As those who responded to this message were convicted of sin, Peter indicated the appropriate response:

> Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and *you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*[10] For the promise is for you and for your children

> and for all who are far off, everyone whom the Lord our God calls to himself (Acts 2:38-39).

According to Peter, salvation in Jesus Christ is appropriated by repentance from sins and baptism in his name, with the result that those who so respond are forgiven of their sins and receive the Holy Spirit.[11] This affirmation, being all of a piece with this narrative that earlier recounts the filling/baptism with the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:4/Acts 1:5) which Jesus pours out (Acts 2:33), clearly indicates that this divine work is baptism with the Spirit. Amazingly, three thousand people experience this mighty work of Jesus Christ and are incorporated into the new church of Jerusalem (Acts 2:41-17). Peter further promises to his audience that the gift of the Holy Spirit was not reserved for them but was intended for all who would find salvation through the divine call. Clearly, this promise anticipated future events such as the inclusion of the Samaritans and the Gentiles in the salvific plan of God.[12]

The fourth and fifth passages address this conversion of the first Gentiles, with Luke providing two very similar accounts of this stunning incident. Acts 10 is the first and lengthier story of Peter's preaching of the gospel to a centurion and his family and friends; it concludes:

> While Peter was still saying these things, *the Holy Spirit fell on*[13] all who heard the word. And the believers from among the circumcised who had come with Peter were amazed, because *the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out*[14] even on the Gentiles. For *they were hearing them speaking in tongues and extolling God*.[15] Then Peter declared, "Can anyone withhold water for baptizing these people, who *have received the Holy Spirit*[16] just as we have?" (Acts 10:44-47)

While the falling of the Holy Spirit upon these Gentiles was certainly unexpected and unprecedented, the fact that this event was Jesus baptizing them with the Holy Spirit was unmistakable. Peter and those with him heard the proof: now, even the Gentiles were rehearsing the mighty acts of God in unusual utterances, as the Jewish disciples had done on the day of Pentecost when they were baptized with the Spirit.[17] Expressed in a slightly different way, Peter insisted on (water) baptism for "these people [Gentiles], who have received the Spirit just as we [the Jewish disciples] have." Luke's further description of this phenomenon as the pouring out of "the gift of the Holy Spirit" recalls another earlier narrative promising "the gift of the Holy Spirit" to all who respond to the gospel (Acts 2:38) and confirms that baptism with the Spirit occurred as the Gentiles experienced salvation.

The second account of the conversion of the Gentiles (Acts 11:1-18) is shorter and presents Peter's personal reminiscence provoked by this incident:

> As I began to speak, *the Holy Spirit fell on*[18] them just as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, "John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit." If then God gave *the* same *gift*[19] to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could stand in God's way? (Acts 11:15-17)

The startling experience of his Gentile audience reminded Peter of the startling experience of the 120 disciples—among which he himself was included—on the day of Pentecost.[20] The parallelism is striking:

- the Holy Spirit had fallen on the Jewish disciples; the Holy Spirit fell on the Gentiles;
- the Jewish disciples had been baptized with the Spirit; the Gentiles were baptized with the Holy Spirit;
- God gave the gift of the Holy Spirit to the Jewish disciples[21] when they believed in Christ, who had promised them such a baptism (Luke 3:15-17; Acts 1:4-5); God gave "the same gift [of the Holy Spirit]" to the Gentiles when they believed.[22]

The parallelism between the experience of the Jewish disciples on the day of Pentecost and the experience of the Gentiles confirms that baptism with the Spirit occurred as the Gentiles believed in Jesus Christ for salvation. Of particular note is Peter's identification of the day of Pentecost with the coming of the Spirit as the occasion "when we [the disciples and himself] believed in the Lord Jesus Christ." Even for the disciples of the Lord, baptism with the Spirit and faith in Christ were contemporaneous.

The conclusion to be drawn from these passages is that one of the aspects of God's work of saving sinful human beings is Jesus Christ's baptism of new converts with the Holy Spirit, by which they are incorporated into his (Christ's) body, the church. Such a baptism is (1) initiatory, occurring at the beginning of salvation (along with effective call, regeneration, justification, union with Christ, adoption, and initial sanctification); (2) universal, being a divine work in the life of every Christian; (3) purposeful, incorporating new believers into the church of Jesus Christ; and (4) indelible, being a permanent membership in the body of Christ, from which defection is not possible.[23]

BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT: A PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATIC INTERPRETATION OF KEY PASSAGES AND THEOLOGICAL FORMULATION

This position does not go without challenge. Pentecostal and charismatic theology generally maintains that baptism with the Holy Spirit is a second blessing, an experience of God's grace subsequent to conversion.[24] To be more specific, a distinction is commonly made between (1) *the doctrine of separability*, which maintains that baptism with the Spirit is different from regeneration (Spirit baptism can be *separated from* regeneration), and (2) *the doctrine of subsequence*, which holds that baptism with the Spirit follows regeneration, either temporally (Spirit baptism occurs *some time after* salvation) or logically (Spirit baptism and salvation occur *at the same time* but the former is *logically* dependent on the latter).[25] In the following discussion, I will particularly interact with J. Rodman Williams, a leading Pentecostal theologian.[26]

According to Williams, we must distinguish between two experiences involving the Holy Spirit. The first occurs at salvation and it involves Jesus Christ as the one who baptizes believers in the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:8; 1 Cor 12:13).[27] Essentially, this first experience corresponds to what I have set forth above.[28] The second experience is the coming of the Holy Spirit, who is said to be "poured out" (Acts 2:33; 10:45; Titus 3:5-6), to "fall upon" (Acts 8:16; 10:44; 11:15) and to "come upon" believers (Acts 1:8; 19:6). Accordingly, these Christians are said to be "baptized with" (Acts 1:5; 11:16) or "filled with" (Acts 2:2-4; 4:31; 9:17; 13:9, 52; Eph 5:18) the Holy Spirit.[29] This position by no means denies the powerful work of the Holy Spirit at the beginning of salvation, a work that includes conviction of sin (John 16:8) and regeneration (Titus 3:5; John 3:3, 5).[30] Indeed, Williams specifies, "There could be no repentance and faith without the work of the Holy Spirit making such possible.... But salvation itself was not the gift of the Spirit."[31] Assessing that "none of the New Testament accounts of the coming of the Holy Spirit are concerned with salvation," Williams insists, "The gift of the Holy Spirit ... goes *beyond* salvation; it is promised to those who repent *and* come to faith in Jesus Christ."[32] Thus, the purpose of this Spirit baptism is not soteriological—that is, to save nonbelievers—but missional—that is, to empower Christians for effective evangelism and ministry. This second experience of the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, which is available to all believers, takes place sometime—minutes, days, months, years, perhaps even decades—after salvation occurs.[33] Williams describes this divine work as "a profoundly internal experience of the Spirit of God moving throughout like wind or fire until all barriers are breached and the Holy Spirit pervades everything."[34] Accordingly, the gift of the Spirit, which is the pouring out of the Spirit such that believers are "baptized with" or "filled with"

him, is a second blessing following salvation.

This position is commonly supported by appealing to six key New Testament accounts in which the reception of the Holy Spirit is subsequent to salvation. These events, and the passages that narrative them, are:

- The command of Jesus to his disciples to wait for the Holy Spirit to come (Luke 24:48-49; Acts 1:4-5). The disciples had already "come to a vital faith in Christ" and had been "redeemed from their old life"; after all, they were disciples of Jesus, who had called them, led them, taught them, and even imparted the Holy Spirit to them (John 20:22). Accordingly, as believers saved by Christ, the disciples experienced the gift of the Holy Spirit subsequent to their conversion.[35]

- The salvation of the three thousand people listening to Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost. As his audience acknowledges their sin, Peter exhorts them, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). According to Williams, "By such repentance and faith there would be salvation; and to such persons the Holy Spirit was promised."[36] This passage upholds the doctrine that the reception of the Spirit is dependent on and subsequent to salvation.

- The carrying of the message of salvation to the city of Samaria. The narrative (Acts 8:4-25) recounts that Philip went to the Samaritans (8:4-5) and, "when they believed Philip as he preached good news about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (8:12-13). Upon hearing of this mighty work of God among the Samaritans, the church in Jerusalem "sent to them Peter and John, who came down and prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit" (8:14-15). Luke provides an explanation for this event: "for he [the Spirit] had not yet fallen on any of them, but they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (8:16). The two apostles "laid hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit: (8:17). This supporting passage again emphasizes that the gift of the Holy Spirit is subsequent to salvation.[37]

- The conversion of Saul of Tarsus. While this dramatic event took place on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:3-6; 22:6-10; 26:13-18), a few days later Ananias, while laying his hands on Saul, said, "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus who appeared to you on the road by which you came has sent me so that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 9:17). Again, the reception of the Spirit is subsequent to salvation.[38]

- The expansion of salvation to the Gentiles. The narrative of the conversion of Cornelius and his family and friends cites Peter's promissory words, "To him [Jesus Christ] all the prophets bear witness that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name" (Acts 10:43). To this insistence on faith to appropriate salvation is added the need to repent of sin, for it is also said of Peter's audience, "to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance that leads to faith" (Acts 11:18). Accordingly, the first Gentiles repented and believed in Christ, resulting in the forgiveness of sins. With this stage set, the narrative suddenly breaks: "While Peter was still saying these things, the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word" (Acts 10:44); the apostle later describes these believers as "people who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have" (10:47). Williams underscores that "the relevant point here is that it was the Gentiles' 'repentance unto life,' i.e., their salvation, that was the background for the reception of the Holy Spirit."[39]
- Paul's encounter with twelve disciples of John

the Baptist. The narrative (Acts 19:1-7) can be understood in one of two ways: one, these men were Christians—hence, the descriptor "disciples" is used of them—who much later received the Holy Spirit; or two, they became Christians through the preaching of Paul, yet still subsequently received the Spirit. On the latter view, Paul stumbled upon a dozen men who had been baptized by John the Baptist. He sensed something unusual about them—"and he said to them, 'Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?' 'No, we have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit'" (Acts 19:2)—and promptly explained the good news about Jesus, to whom John the Baptist had pointed (19:4). "On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (19:5); subsequently, "when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they began speaking in tongues and prophesying" (19:6). As before "the occurrence of salvation was background for their receiving the Holy Spirit."[40]

BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATIC INTERPRETATION OF KEY PASSAGES AND THEOLOGICAL FORMULATION

With all due respect to this position, I think that it may be unnecessarily confused by the complexity of the richness of the vocabulary used in the New Testament to describe the works and ministries of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the point that the reception of the Holy Spirit is an event subsequent to salvation seems to make an issue of something that the narratives hardly underscore and, when attention actually is drawn to a delay in receiving the Spirit, the narratives themselves highlight how unusual the delay is.

As to the first point, the complexity of the richness of the vocabulary used in the New Testament to describe the works and ministries of the Holy Spirit can be handled fairly easily by carefully noting three categories:[41]

- Vocabulary used for *the initial experience of the Holy Spirit*: as we have seen, this category includes "baptism with the Spirit" (Jesus baptizes with the Spirit; people were baptized with the Spirit), "the outpouring of the Spirit" (Jesus poured out the Spirit; the gift of the Spirit was poured out); "the coming of the Spirit" (the Spirit fell upon people); "the gift of the Spirit" (God gave the gift of the Spirit; people receive the gift of the Spirit); and "being filled with the Spirit." Whether this vocabulary is used in reference to the descent of the Spirit in his new covenant mission on the day of Pentecost, or in reference to the experience of the Holy Spirit by Peter's hearers later that day, the Samaritan Christians, Saul of Tarsus, Cornelius and the first Gentile believers, or the Ephesian disciples, it is used to describe the initial experience or work of the Holy Spirit in peoples' lives.

- Vocabulary employed for *subsequent experiences of the Holy Spirit*: as we will see in the next section, the expression "the filling of the Spirit" is commonly used in reference to experiences of the Spirit that follow peoples' initial experience of him. For example, Peter, "filled with the Holy Spirit," addressed the Jewish leaders and proclaimed the gospel (Acts 4:8); the early believers, praying for boldness to preach the gospel, "were all filled with the Holy Spirit" and were emboldened to proclaim the word of God (Acts 4:31); Stephen, "full of the Holy Spirit," saw God's glory before his death (Acts 7:55); Saul/Paul, "filled with the Holy Spirit," addressed a sorcerer, leading to his blindness (Acts 13:9); Paul, Barnabas, and other disciples, rebuffing their Jewish persecutors in Psidian Antioch and moving on to Iconium, "were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 13:52).[42] These fillings with the Spirit were all subsequent to the initial experience of the Spirit by Peter, the early believers, Stephen, Saul/Paul, and Paul and

other disciples, and they seem to be particularly related to empowerment for specific ministry.

- Vocabulary utilized for *characterization of people in relation to the Holy Spirit*: sometimes the expression "full of the Spirit" is used in acknowledgements of a praiseworthy Christian lifestyle. For example, a qualification for the servers of tables was that they are "full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom" (Acts 6:3), a qualification that Stephen, "a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit," met (Acts 6:5); Barnabas is characterized as "full of the Holy Spirit and of faith" (Acts 11:24). In these cases, the descriptor "full of the Spirit" underscores the general tenor of the life of the person so characterized.[43]

For the purposes of our discussion of baptism with the Holy Spirit, the first category—vocabulary associated with the initial experience of the Spirit—is key. Whether describing this experience as baptism with the Spirit, the outpouring of the Spirit, the coming/falling of the Spirit, the giving/gift of the Spirit, receiving of the Spirit, or the filling of the Spirit, the New Testament vividly portrays the initial work involving the Spirit with several interchangeable expressions. A point of application comes from this fact: though believers who for years experienced an apathetic, listless, impotent Christian life may claim a decisive renewal through a crisis experience with the Holy Spirit and refer to that subsequent work of the Spirit as baptism with and/or the outpouring/falling/coming/gift of the Spirit, such an experience does not change the reality that they were already the recipients of the baptism with and/or the outpouring/falling/ coming/gift of the Holy Spirit at the moment they experienced salvation.

The next issue involves the nature of this initial work of the Holy Spirit. Does the New Testament support the twin doctrines of separability and subsequence? It certainly affirms separability: baptism with the Spirit is a divine work distinct from regeneration. Careful consideration of these two divine acts supports this doctrine. Regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit (Titus 3:5) through the Word of God (1 Pet 1:23-25) by which people are born again (John 3:3, 5), brought from spiritual deadness to spiritual life and rendered new creations (2 Cor 5:17). Baptism with the Spirit is the work of Jesus Christ in which he pours out the Spirit on new believers, thereby incorporating them into his (Christ's) body, the church. Importantly, the agents and the actions are different in these two divine works: In the case of regeneration, the Holy Spirit is the agent and his action is changing the nature of spiritually dead people so that they become spiritually alive. In the case of Spirit baptism, Jesus Christ is the agent and his action is pouring out the Spirit. Assuming we have correctly understood these two divine works, we rightly affirm the doctrine of separability.

What of the doctrine of subsequence? Does the New Testament support it? To read the narratives of Acts as portraying baptism with the Spirit as subsequent to conversion/regeneration seems to misinterpret these stories, focusing on something that they do not emphasize and indeed seem to deny. I return to the six key events, already outlined above, to which appeal is made to warrant subsequence and show that these narratives do not support this doctrine.

First, it is quite common to assume that the men who had followed Jesus from the outset of his ministry were "Christians." Certainly, Jesus had called and commissioned them as his disciples, and he spent three years preparing them to be the eventual leaders of his upcoming mission. Certainly, these men had left everything to follow Jesus, and at times they demonstrated profound knowledge about and commitment to him (e.g., they left everything to follow him, Luke 5:1-11; John 6:66-69; to them Jesus made known the secrets of his kingdom, Matt 13:10-17; by divine revelation Peter confessed Jesus' identity, Matt. 16:13-20). At the same time and by contrast, Jesus often rebuked his disciples as "you of little faith" (Matt 6:30; 8:26; 14:31; 16:8) and constantly had

to intervene to rescue them from misunderstanding and misbehavior (e.g., their argument over who is the greatest in the kingdom, Matt 18:1-4; Peter's rebuke of Jesus' prophecy of death, Matt 16:21-23; Peter's wrongheaded and futile attempt to rescue Jesus, Matt 26:51-54). Moreover, as we have seen, Jesus foretold an unprecedented outpouring of the Holy Spirit (e.g., John 7:37-39; John 14:17) upon which his disciples would be absolutely dependent as the founders and promoters of the new covenant church. If we are correct in defining a Christian as a member of the new covenant people of God (in contrast with, for example, being a member of the old covenant people of God), and if we are correct in affirming that a characteristic of the new covenant is the Holy Spirit and his dynamic ministry foretold by Jesus, then even the disciples were not—could not be—Christians until the death, resurrection, ascension, and exaltation of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Spirit for his new covenant mission on the day of Pentecost.[44] And is this not precisely what Peter affirmed in his personal reflection on the first Gentiles coming to faith in Jesus and receiving/being baptized with the Spirit? "If then God gave the same gift [of the Holy Spirit] to them as he gave to us *when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ"* (Acts 11:17; emphasis added). In other words, Peter locates the disciples' coming to faith in Christ on the day of Pentecost! And it was on that same day that they were baptized with the Spirit—at the same time ("when") they believed. If this is the case, then the disciples do not constitute an example of Christians experiencing the baptism with the Spirit subsequent to their coming to Christ.

Second, the narrative of the salvation of three thousand of Peter's listeners on the day of Pentecost actually emphasizes that repentance and (water) baptism are prerequisites for *both* salvation *and* reception of the Holy Spirit; this being the case, Acts 2:38 does not support the view that salvation constitutes the background for the (subsequent) gift of the Spirit. In this narrative, Peter instructs his audience how to appropriate the gospel: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." The purpose for which repentance and baptism are enjoined is salvation—"for the forgiveness of your sins"[45]—*and* receiving "the gift of the Holy Spirit."[46] In other words, it is the case that salvation is promised to those who repent and are baptized, and it is the case that the gift of the Spirit is promised to those who repent and are baptized. We would be wrong to conclude from these two statements that salvation and the gift of the Spirit are the same mighty act of God. But we would be equally wrong to conclude that "[t]he gift of the Spirit … goes *beyond* salvation" in the sense that "the prior activity of the Holy Spirit in repentance and faith"—salvation, or conversion, or regeneration—constitutes a prerequisite for receiving the Spirit.[47] Rather, on the basis of repentance and baptism, both salvation and the gift of the Spirit are granted, and the latter is not dependent on the former. Accordingly, this passage does not support the position that Christians are baptized with the Spirit after their salvation.

Third, the narrative of the conversion of the Samaritans and the subsequent apostolic-sanctioned visit by Peter and John to pray for their delayed reception of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:5-24) is highlighted by Luke as an unusual experience of the Spirit.[48] Verse 8:16—"for he [the Holy Spirit] had not yet fallen on any of them [the newly converted Samaritans]"—is an explanatory clause (*gar*; "for") indicating the reason why the Samaritans still needed to receive the Holy Spirit. This explanatory comment points to an unusual experience; delay is not normative. Indeed, if it were the case that this delay portrays the normal reality of experiencing the Holy Spirit, there would be no need for an explanation. But Luke—writing for those whose experience is that of receiving the Holy Spirit at conversion—needed to explain why prayer for the Samaritans to receive the Spirit was necessary. Accordingly, the Samaritans' delayed reception of the Spirit does not constitute an example of baptism with

the Spirit subsequent to salvation.

Fourth, the same is true of the conversion of Saul of Tarsas. Putting together the three testimonies of this event (Acts 9:1-19; 22:3-16; 26:12-18), the common threads in general but not specific order are: (1) as a persecutor of the church, Saul was travelling to Damascus to capture Christians and bring them in chains to Jerusalem; (2) about midday a lightning flash surrounded Saul who, falling to the ground, was confronted by the Lord; (3) identifying himself, Jesus questioned Saul and directed him to go to Damascus for further instructions; (4) blinded for several days by this encounter, Saul is guided to Damascus to find Ananias, who had been divinely commissioned to meet him; (5) laying his hands on Saul, Ananias said, "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus who appeared to you on the road by which you came has sent me so that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 9:17); (6) Ananias further explained Jesus' appearance to Saul, announced that Saul would become a witness of this revelation, and instructed him, "And now why do you wait? Rise and be baptized and wash away your sins, calling on his name" (Acts 22:14-16); (7) no longer blind, Saul "rose and was baptized" (Acts 9:18). If we are correct in piecing together Saul's testimony in this manner, then we would be incorrect to think that he was converted in his initial encounter with Jesus on the Damascus Road and later baptized with the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, it was the encounter with Ananias that was the occasion for his regaining of sight, filling with the Spirit, water baptism, cleansing from sin, and calling on the name of Jesus.[49] Furthermore, elapsed time is not the narrative point; indeed, the three testimonies demonstrate a high degree of fluidity in regard to the precise order of events.[50] Accordingly, to draw support for the doctrine of subsequence from Saul's conversion is unwarranted.

Fifth, the conversion of Cornelius and his family and friends is closely linked with their baptism with the Holy Spirit. Indeed, the issue of repentance from sin and faith in Jesus about whom they were hearing through Peter's preaching—that is, conversion as the response to the gospel—finds little emphasis in the two narratives of this important event. Rather, the sudden falling of the Holy Spirit on Peter's attentively listening audience is underscored in both accounts (Acts 10:44; 11:15). It is the divine initiative in bringing salvation to the Gentiles that comes to the forefront, as confirmed by the narrative's conclusion, "And they [the "circumcision party" in Jerusalem, to whom Peter recounted his mission to Cornelius, Acts 11:2-3] glorified God, saying, 'Then to the Gentiles also *God has granted* repentance that leads to life'" (Acts 11:18; italics added). If anything in terms of order is to be noted, the sequence narrated is preaching/listening to the gospel, the falling of/baptism with the Holy Spirit as evidenced by speaking in tongues, astonishment that the same gift of the Spirit was given to the Gentiles as had been given to the Jewish disciples on Pentecost, and water baptism. Certainly, the faith of the Gentiles to appropriate the gospel is assumed, but it is implied in Peter's reflection on God's gift of the Spirit to the Gentiles being the same gift God had earlier given to the Jews when *they believed in Jesus* (Acts 11:17). If we are correct in our understanding of the order of events, the conversion of the Gentiles cannot be used in support of the doctrine of subsequence.

Sixth, Paul's encounter with the disciples in Ephesus (19:1-7) must be seen as quite unusual. His question—"Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" (9:2)—underscores the normal experience of Christians; they receive the Holy Spirit upon embracing the gospel. Thus, the lack of receiving the Spirit pointed to an abnormal experience on the part of these disciples of John the Baptist. Indeed, these twelve men were not even believers in Jesus Christ, as the rest of the narrative demonstrates. They knew only the ministry of John the Baptist, who himself had pointed toward Jesus Christ. On hearing Paul's explanation of Jesus, they were baptized as disciples of Christ. Their reception of the Holy Spirit through the laying on of Paul's hands, accompanied by speaking in tongues and prophecy, corresponded to their becoming Chris-

tian disciples. Accordingly, the salvation of the Ephesian disciples does not provide support for the doctrine of subsequence.

In conclusion, these six key events to which appeal is made in support of subsequence do not uphold this doctrine. This is certainly true with respect to the form of the doctrine that emphasizes temporal subsequence; no support is found for a time lapse between conversion/salvation and baptism with the Spirit. This seems also to be true with respect to the logical form of this doctrine; no evidence is forthcoming for the view that Spirit baptism and salvation occur at the same time but the former is logically dependent on the latter.[51]

In conclusion, we should affirm the doctrine of separability; baptism with the Spirit is a divine work that is distinguishable from regeneration. But we should not affirm the doctrine of subsequence; rather, baptism with the Spirit is one of the divine works that occurs at the beginning of salvation along with effective calling, regeneration, justification, union with Christ, adoption, and initial sanctification.

More can and needs to be said, however.

FILLING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: BIBLICAL AFFIRMATIONS AND THEOLOGICAL FORMULATION

Our discussion of baptism with the Holy Spirit as an initial experience of salvation, together with our denial of the doctrine of subsequence, cannot end here. As we have seen, vocabulary used to describe the initial experience of the Spirit is also commonly used in reference to experiences of the Spirit that follow peoples' initial experience of him. Peter in his confrontation with the Jewish leaders (Acts 4:8); the early believers in their prayer for boldness for gospel proclamation (Acts 4:31); Stephen in his vision of God's glory (Acts 7:55); Saul/Paul in his rebuke of a sorcerer (Acts 13:9); Paul, Barnabas, and other disciples in rebuffing their Jewish persecutors (Acts 13:52)—all of these Christ followers were "filled with the Spirit" subsequent to their initial experience of the Spirit and were thereby empowered for specific, even extraordinary, ministry.[52] Furthermore, the same vocabulary is sometimes used to describe an honorable Christian lifestyle. The table servers (Acts 6:3), as exemplified by Stephen (Acts 6:5), and Barnabas (Acts 11:24) were characterized as being "full of the Holy Spirit." This descriptor generally characterizes the lifestyle of these persons.

To be noted is the consistency of the New Testament vocabulary for this work of the Holy Spirit: people are "filled with" or "full of" the Spirit. Contrast this regularity with the diversity and richness of the vocabulary used in conjunction with the initial experience of the Spirit. What seems to be the case is that Christians, who first have been baptized with the Spirit when they experienced salvation, may/can/should experience ensuing "fillings of the Spirit" even to the point of being characterized as being "full of the Holy Spirit." As Sam Storms explains, baptism with the Spirit at salvation "does not preclude multiple, subsequent experiences of the Spirit's activity.... The New Testament endorses and encourages multiple subsequent experiences of the Spirit's power and presence."[53] Because these fillings are connected to the initial baptism of the Spirit, or the outpouring of the Spirit, the nature of such fillings may be understood in reference to two passages in Isaiah that promise that the land of Israel and its people will experience the outpouring of the Spirit:

- until the Spirit is poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness becomes a fruitful field, and the fruitful field is deemed a forest (Isa 32:15);

- For I will pour water on the thirsty land, and streams on the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit upon your offspring, and my blessing on your descendants. They shall spring up among the grass like willows by flowing streams (Isa 44:3-4).

If the outpouring of the Spirit is being inundate or engulfed with the Spirit—well emphasized by the expression *baptism* with the Spirit—leading

to saturation in place of desiccation and fertility in place of sterility, the sense of the filling or fullness of the Spirit is being thoroughly and regularly pervaded by or permeated with the Spirit resulting in fruitfulness, seen in productive ministry and proven godly character.

Importantly, the New Testament not only includes narratives of this experience of the Spirit; in Ephesians 5:18, it instructs Christians, "do not get drunk with wine, for that is debauchery, but be filled with the Spirit."[54] Key interpretive elements in this instruction are:

- Its mood is imperative; it is a command to be obeyed: "be filled with the Spirit;"[55]
- Its tense is present; it is an ongoing command: (to paraphrase) "keep on being filled with the Spirit;"
- Its voice is passive; it is not an active voice imperative (e.g., "transform this equation"), so does not call for some action on the part of Christians, but it is a passive voice imperative (e.g., "be transformed"), so it calls for receptivity;
- The expected or intended response to this command is for Christians to yield to the Holy Spirit, to be controlled—pervaded or permeated—by the Spirit in all their ways, to consciously place themselves under the guidance of the Spirit moment by moment.

Such yieldness to the Holy Spirit will be evidenced as together Christians experience genuine community, engage in powerful worship, express gratitude in every circumstance, and love one another through mutual submission (5:19-21):

> speaking to one another with psalms, hymns, and songs from the Spirit; singing and making music from your heart to the Lord, always giving thanks to God the Father for everything, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and submitting to one another out of reverence for Christ.

The four gerunds (participles in Greek)—speaking, singing, giving thanks, submitting—not only indicate the results that flow from Christians obeying the Pauline command and thus being filled with the Spirit; they also absorb some of the imperatival force of the main verb ("be filled") and are thereby constituted concrete activities in which Christians filled with the Spirit are to be engaged. Accordingly, Spirit filled Christians develop authentic community by rebuking, admonishing, correcting, encouraging, and edifying one another; worship the Lord together with great delight; live intentionally with gratitude; and show preference for and serve one another for Christ's sake.

In addition to Ephesians 5:18, which uses the language of "filling," Paul employs what seems to be similar expressions to exhort Christians toward this ongoing yieldedness to the Spirit. When Christians "walk by the Spirit" (Gal 5:16), they are prompted to do the will of God rather than fulfill the desires of their sinful nature. Following a negative list of the outcome of yielding to the flesh (5:19-21), a positive list rehearses the "fruit of the Spirit: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control" (5:22-23). Accordingly, if death comes by yielding to the sinful nature—thus, Christians must crucify "the flesh with its passions and desires" (5:24)—and if life comes as "we live by the Spirit," Paul's concluding exhortation is "let us also walk by the Spirit" (5:25). He uses the same language in Romans, encouraging those

> who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit. For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. For to set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace (Rom 8:4-6).

Indeed, Christians "are not in the flesh but in the Spirit" (8:9), being "debtors, not to the flesh,

to live according to the flesh" (5:12), but "by the Spirit [putting] to death the deeds of the body" so as to live (5:13).

Though disputes over the meaning of baptism with the Holy Spirit may separate Pentecostal/charismatic Christians and non-Pentecostal/non-charismatic Christians, all must agree with the clear instruction of Ephesians 5:18-21 (and similar passages) about the necessity for Christians to be filled with the Spirit. Tragically, the former group of Christians may give the impression that they have experienced baptism with the Spirit while the latter group has not, leading to a lamentable division between "haves" and "have nots."[56] Tragically, the latter group may be overly fearful of what they consider to be excessive attention given to the Spirit by the former group and thus end up neglecting the essential work of the Spirit in their lives and churches. Tragically, the former group may be characterized as being focused on the Spirit of God while the latter group may be characterized as being centered on the Word of God. Surely, this situation is not the way it's supposed to be! Conversations between Pentecostal/charismatic Christians and non-Pentecostal/non-charismatic Christians may go a long way to overcoming misconceptions, fears, jealousies, dismissive attitudes, and the like.[57] Cooperative prayer, mercy ministries, and evangelistic efforts may result in greater appreciation for and unity between these different churches.[58] Developing a consensus vocabulary to describe the various experiences with the Holy Spirit—an initial baptism with the Spirit, subsequent and ongoing fillings with the Spirit, a fullness of the Spirit lifestyle—may help to overcome some barriers.[59]

I began this article with a bit of my personal journey of faith and the importance of the Holy Spirit for it. Though I have failed often and reprehensibly to appreciate Jesus Christ's baptism of me with the Spirit when I embraced the gospel and to be continuously and obediently filled with the Spirit so as to be characterized as one who is full of the Spirit, I am consciously aware that any progress that has been mine as a Christian, any empowerment for ministry that has been fruitful, any resisting of temptation, any development of Christ-like attributes, any boldness for communicating the gospel, any unity with other brothers and sisters, any genuine worship of God together with them—any and all of it has been the result of the gracious and abundant work of the Holy Spirit.

May God grant to all of us greater reliance upon and obedience to his Spirit!

ENDNOTES

[1] For systematic theological treatments of the work of the Holy Spirit, see: Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 634-53; Michael Horton, *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims on the Way* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 551-86; Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 880-98; J. Rodman Williams, *Renewal Theology* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 2:155-409; Graham A. Cole, *He Who Gives Life: The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2007); Sinclair B. Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1997).

[2] Those familiar with Campus Crusade for Christ (now Cru) will recognize this question as the title of the booklet, written by Bill Bright, founder of CCC, which treats briefly the empowering ministry of the Holy Spirit.

[3] It is important to articulate this Spirit baptism correctly: the agent who baptizes is Jesus Christ, while the medium of baptism is the Holy Spirit. It is incorrect biblically speaking to affirm that the Holy Spirit baptizes. For further discussion, see Williams, *Renewal Theology*, 199; Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 606; John R. W. Stott, *Baptism and Fulness of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1964), 27.

[4] In sentences written in the active voice, the subject does the action; e.g., I (the subject) throw (the action) the ball.

[5] In sentences written in the passive voice, the action is targeted to the subject; e.g., the ball was thrown (the action) to me (the subject).

[6] Italics added. In Greek: *humeis de en pneumati baptisthēsesthe*.

[7] This passage reflects a similar passage at the end of Luke's first volume, and the link is intended to remind readers that the book of Acts is the sequel to the Gospel. In that work, Luke presents these instructions of Jesus to his disciples: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. And behold, I am sending the promise of my Father upon you. But stay in the city until you are clothed with power from on high" (Luke 24:46-49). Though he does not mention the Holy Spirit by name, Jesus' circumlocution "the promise of my Father" clearly refers to the Spirit because (1) the same expression is used of the Spirit in Acts 1:4-5 and 2:33, and (2) the promised result of the fulfillment of this promise—"you will be clothed with power from on high"—is the same result promised "when the Holy Spirit has come upon" the disciples (Acts 1:8).

[8] Italics added. In Greek: *eplēsthēsan pantes pneumatos hagiou*.

[9] Italics added. In Greek: execheen.

[10] Italics added: In Greek: *lēmpsesthetēn dōrean tou hagiou pneumatos*.

[11] Because Luke later refers to those who responded to the gospel as "believers" (Acts 2:44), we are right to include faith in Christ as another element in the appropriation of the good news.

[12] I will defer consideration of the narrative of the Samaritans' salvation and baptism with the Spirit until a later discussion while next treating the two accounts of the first Gentiles' conversion.

[13] Italics added. In Greek: *epepsen to pneuma to hagion.*

[14] Italics added. In Greek: *hē dōrea tou pneumatos tou hagiou ekkechutai*.

[15] Italics added. This expression provides another warrant for making the connection between what the Gentile converts experienced and the baptism with the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. According to Luke's account of the phenomenon of speaking in tongues on Pentecost, the audience responded to the disciples' unusual utterances with "we [the audience] hear them [the disciples] telling in our own tongues the mighty works of God" (Acts 2:11; *akouomen lalountōn autōn tais hēmeterais gōlssais ta megaleia tou theou*). Similarly, Luke describes Peter's and the others' response to the Gentiles' unusual utterances with "they [Peter and those with him] were hearing them [the Gentiles] speaking in tongues and extolling God" (Acts 10:46; *ēkouon autōn lalountōn glōssais kai megalunontōn ton theon*). Because an effect of the baptism with the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was verbally magnifying the ways of God with unusual utterances, and because the indication that "the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out even on the Gentiles" was them verbally magnifying the ways of God with unusual utterances, we must conclude that both events were the same reality: baptism with the Spirit.

[16] Italics added. In Greek: *to pneuma to hagion elabon.*

[17] "In 10:44 there is no explicit comparison with the Pentecostal experience such as we find [in Acts 11:15] … but the language of 2:4, 11b is recalled in 10:46." F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (3rd rev.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans: Apollos, 1990), 268. Whether these utterances were in known human languages, as was certainly the case on the day of Pentecost when the disciples spoke in tongues (Acts 2:5-13), is debatable. In favor of the view that they were known languages is the fact that Peter and those with him recognized that the phenomenon experienced by the Gentiles was similar to the phenomenon experienced by the disciples on Pentecost; thus, if in the latter case the utterances were in known human languages, so also in the former case. Furthermore, Peter and the others clearly understood that what was being uttered was praise offered to God. Against this view is the fact that utterances in known human languages would not have served any purpose, for there were not diverse linguistic groups that needed to hear praise offered to God in languages that they spoke. Though appeal to the tongue speaking in Corinth would take us

far afield, a case could be made that the Corinthian phenomena were not known languages (again, what purpose would such languages serve?) yet the church could still acknowledge that "one who speaks in a tongue speaks not to men but to God; for no one understands him, but he utters mystery in the Spirit: (1 Cor 14:2).

[18]Italics added. In Greek: *epepsen to pneuma to hagion*.

[19]Italics added. In Greek: *hē dōrea*.

[20]"At the beginning" (*en archē*) refers to the day of Pentecost. Bruce, *Acts of the Apostles*, 269.

[21]"As … to us" (*hōs kai hēmin*) refers to the day of Pentecost, as confirmed by the similar expression (*hōs kai hēmeis*) in Acts 10:47.

[22]Peter makes the very same point at the Council of Jerusalem, when he relates what the Gentiles had experienced when he preached to them: "And God, who knows the heart, bore witness to them, by giving them the Holy Spirit just as he did to us" (Acts 15:8).

[23]Providing warrant for this fourth characteristic of baptism with the Spirit would take us far afield from our topic, but a substantial and convincing case for it could be made.

[24]Although the issue of whether or not speaking in tongues is a necessary sign accompanying baptism with the Spirit is of great interest, space and time constraints preclude me from treating it here.

[25]The Assemblies of God churches embrace both doctrines concerning baptism with the Holy Spirit: "This experience is distinct from and subsequent to the experience of the new birth." *Assemblies of God Statement of Fundamental Truths*, 7.

[26]One of the key reasons for choosing to interact with Williams is the thoroughgoing biblical nature of his treatment of this topic. While some of my readers may be quite dismissive of the Pentecostal/charismatic theology of baptism with the Spirit because of its articulation and defense by proponents who rarely if ever appeal to Scripture, they cannot so easily dispense with Williams's work. A second reason for interacting with Williams is the ready accessibility of his treatment; readers who wish to do more study on this subject are encouraged to work through his *Renewal Theology*. Further profitable study will also consult Douglas A. Oss, "A Pentecostal/Charismatic View," in Wayne A. Grudem, gen. ed., *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 237-83; Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984); Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament, vol. 54; Sheffield: JSNTSup, 1991).

[27]Williams, *Renewal Theology*, 199.

[28]Williams is not followed by many other Pentecostal/charismatic proponents, who make a distinction between baptism *in* the Holy Spirit (Acts 2) and baptism *by* the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 12:13). With regard to this latter verse, he explains: "It would seem preferable to translate it thus: '*In* one Spirit we were all baptized.' Accordingly, the Holy Spirit is again seen as element and not agent, and Christ (though not mentioned directly) is implied to be the agent." Ibid. Williams is certainly correct in his understanding.

[29]Ibid., 190-204.

[30]Ibid. 206. Cf. Oss, Pentecostal/Charismatic View," in Grudem, *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, 241-42.

[31]Williams, 206.

[32]Ibid., 205-206 (emphasis his). Williams offers a reason why these passages in Acts do not treat the work of the Spirit at salvation: "It should be added that Acts has little to say about the activity of the Holy Spirit in the occurrence of salvation because the focus of the book is on the role of the Spirit in the outreach of the gospel. This is a marked difference, for example, from the letters of Paul in which much attention is given to the Holy Spirit in the Christian life. The Book of Acts, on the other hand, deals almost wholly with the Holy Spirit in witness and mission." Ibid., 206.

[33]Though Williams does not speak of this second blessing in terms of the length of time elapsed between salvation and the experience of the Spirit, he does affirm that "the occurrence of salvation" is an "essential background for the gift of the Holy Spirit," which gift assumes "the prior activity of the Holy Spirit in repentance and faith, or to use another term, in regeneration." Ibid., 205-206. Accordingly, he holds to both the doctrine of separability and the doctrine

of subsequence, either in its temporal form or its logical form. As we will see in the next discussion, the examples to which he appeals seem to point more to a temporal distance between the experience of salvation and baptism with the Spirit than to a logical relationship between regeneration and Spirit baptism. Cf. Oss, Pentecostal/Charismatic View," in Grudem, *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, 242-43.

[34]Williams, 203.

[35]Ibid., 187.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid., 187-88.

[39]Ibid., 188.

[40]Ibid.

[41]Williams concurs with this three-fold categorization (ibid., 201-202).

[42]Because of the generic nature of this verse, it may be that this example belongs in the next category.

[43]So is the case with reference to Jesus, who was characterized as being "full of the Holy Spirit" (Luke 4:1).

[44]For further discussion and support of these points, see Gregg R. Allison, *Sojourners and Strangers: The Doctrine of the Church* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2012), chapter 2.

[45]In Greek: *eis aphesin tōn hamartiōn humōn*. For an excellent discussion on the various elements involved in salvation—faith, repentance, confession, regeneration, and baptism—see Robert H. Stein, "Baptism and Becoming a Christian in the New Testament," *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 2, no. 1 (1998):7-17; and idem., Thomas R. Schreiner and Shawn D. Wright, eds., *Believers' Baptism: Sign of the New Covenant in Christ* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2006), 35-66.

[46]The fact that this latter promise is expressed in the future tense does not mean that (1) it is disconnected from the means of appropriating the gospel (repentance and baptism), or (2) it occurs at a future point, that is, after the forgiveness of sins. For further discussion, see F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (New Iinternational Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 75-78.

[47]Williams, *Renewal Theology*, 205-206

[48]Theologians like Grudem and Stott offer what seems to be a strong theological, or salvation-historical, rationale for Peter and John being sent by the other apostles to confirm the reality of God's redemptive work among the Samaritans, a situation that necessitated a withholding of the gift of the Spirit until this divine work could be verified. Without in any way minimizing or denying this theological explanation, I offer also a textual reason for why such a delay should be seen as unusual and not normative for Christians today. Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 773-74; Stott, *Baptism and Fullness of the Holy Spirit*, 19-21.

[49]On the basis of the narrative of Acts 22, Williams appreciates the view that Saul was not converted until his encounter with Ananias, though in the end (and on the basis of Acts 9:17-18) he denies that this is the case. Williams, *Renewal Theology*, 188, n. 20.

[50]For example, in regard to Saul's commission as the apostle to the Gentiles, Acts 9:4-6 says nothing about it in Saul's conversation with Jesus, but 9:15-16 places it as part of Jesus' conversation with Ananias; 22:14-15 presents the commission as part of Ananias's instructions to Saul; and Acts 26:16-18 seems to condense the event (for example, it does not narrate the episode involving Ananias) by including the commission as part of Jesus' conversation with Saul on the road. Accordingly, the point of these three narratives is not the time of Saul's commission in relationship to the other events of his encounters with Jesus and Ananias. Another consideration is the timing of Saul's regaining of his sight. In Acts 9:18, it is placed "immediately" after Ananias's instructions to Saul and before he "rose and was baptized." In Acts 22:13 a comment about it is placed in the midst of Ananias's instructions—"And at the very hour I [Saul] received my sight and saw him [Ananias]"—but the comment gives only a general time frame. Accordingly, the narrative point is not the elapsed time of the various elements of Saul's conversion.

[51]Could it be the case that by bringing together all the biblical passages about regeneration with all the biblical passages about baptism with the Spirit, we could establish a theological support for the logical form of subsequence? I don't think this exercise would enable us to conclude that the logical form of the doctrine is

supported theologically. Additionally, Paul's discussion of the Holy Spirit in Galatians 3 closely associates several realities—receiving the Spirit (3:2), beginning by the Spirit (3:3), the divine supplying of the Spirit (3:4), justification (counting faith to Abraham as righteousness, 3:6; justifying the Gentiles, 3:7) and receiving "the promised Spirit" (3:14)—with faith. As emphasized above, if justification/salvation and reception of the Spirit alike are dependent on faith, and if no indication is given that the gift of the Spirit is dependent on a prior act of justification, then even a case for the logical form of the doctrine of subsequence seems very difficult to establish.

[52]I intentionally don't treat three other cases—John the Baptist (Luke 1:15), Elizabeth (Luke 1:41), and Zechariah (Luke 1:67)—who, previous to the coming of Jesus and the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost, were said to be "filled with the Holy Spirit." Certainly, the New Testament's association of these three people with the filling of the Holy Spirit underscores that we should not make a hard and fast discontinuity between the Spirit's work before and after the initiation of the new covenant. But as I am dealing with the experience of Christ followers in relationship to the Holy Spirit, I will not treat these three cases.

[53]C. Sam Storms, "Third Wave View," in Grudem, *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, 176, 179.

[54]To be acknowledged is a key element in this discussion, namely, the Pentecostal conviction that Luke develops a unique pneumatology that is quite different from, though complementary to, Paul's pneumatology. Briefly, this distinction is that Lukan pneumatology is missionally oriented—e.g., the purpose of baptism with the Spirit is empowerment for ministry—while Pauline pneumatology is soteriologically oriented—baptism with the Spirit is one aspect of the divine work in salvation. For scholarly discussion of this element, see particularly Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* and Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*. For a good summary of the point, see Oss, "Pentecostal/Charismatic View," in Grudem, *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?*, 250-57. Without assessing this claim (the case for which is not built on individual passages like those that are discussed next), it does not seem to hold true in the case of 1 Cor 12:13 (which, as we have seen, has strong overlap with Luke 3:16 and Acts 1:4-5 and 2:4) and Eph 5:18 (which, as we have seen, has strong overlap with Acts 6:3, 5; 11:24). At the minimum, 1 Cor 12:13 and its overlapping Luke–Acts passages, and Eph 5:18 and its overlapping Acts passages, are two sets of Scripture where little is to be made of the diversity between Luke and Paul.

[55]Unlike the initial baptism with the Spirit, the experience of which people are never commanded to seek, the filling with the Spirit is a command to be obeyed.

[56]Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 775-77.

[57]When I was a missionary in Italy and the Italian-speaking part of Switzerland, I readily accepted invitations by Pentecostal churches and charismatic movements to preach and teach. One of the highlights was teaching on baptism with the Spirit according to the position advocated in this article to a large group of Catholic charismatics, who offered great appreciation for my clear biblical treatment of a matter on which we disagreed.

[58]Some of my readers will categorically reject this suggestion, and I understand their reasons for such a stance. In either case, we must all decide the proper course of action to take in a world in which the expansion of the gospel and the growth of the church is largely taking place through the efforts of Pentecostal/charismatic believers and churches. The relationship between our churches will become an increasingly important issue, as together we face an American society that is increasingly anti-Christian and as together we seek to make inroads with the gospel in predominantly non-Christian—e.g., Islamic, Hindu, Buddhist—societies. There is no way that we can ignore one another in the real world.

[59]On this latter suggestion, see Grudem, *Systematic Theology*, 779-83.

Sins against the Holy Spirit

Graham A. Cole

INTRODUCTION

As I write there is ongoing war in Afghanistan, a bloody civil war in Syria, bombings in Iraq and mass shootings in the United States in a theater and a Sikh temple. Christians are saddened but unsurprised. Paradise has been lost. Sin is at work in the good world that God made. Indeed sin is the great spoiler as Genesis 3 shows. Sin spoils our relation to our creator. Fellowship gives way to flight and our relation to one another (blame shifting), to our very selves (shame) and to our environment (to the dust we return). And sin is the great disrupter. It fractures relationships: upward towards God, outward to the human other, inwards within ourselves, and downwards to the natural order.

We have become paradoxical beings capable of great compassion and great cruelty. Pascal of the seventeenth century summed up the paradox in these startling words: "What sort of freak then is man! How novel, how monstrous, how chaotic, how paradoxical, how prodigious! Judge of all things, feeble earthworm, repository of truth, sink of doubt and error, glory and refuse of the universe!"[1] Pascal further contended in another of his *pensées* that "Man's greatness and wretchedness are so evident that the true religion must necessarily teach us that there is in man some great principle of greatness and some great principle of wretchedness."[2] The doctrine of humanity as *imago dei* (theological anthropology) captures the glory. The doctrine of sin (hamartiology) captures the refuse side. Pascal also argued that a believable religion "must also account for such amazing contradictions."[3]

In this study we explore a subset of the doctrine of sin. Our focus is on sins against the Holy Spirit of God.[4] Two categories of such sins will be considered. We first deal with sins of the outsider (the unbeliever). These include blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and resisting the Holy Spirit.[5] Next we

Graham A. Cole serves as Anglican Professor of Divinity and Beeson Divinity School in Birmingham, Alabama.

Prior to this, Dr. Cole served on the faculty at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, served as an administrator in the New South Wales Department of Education, as a lecturer at Moore Theological College and at the University of Sydney, and from 1992 to 2001 he was the Principal of Ridley College, University of Melbourne. In addition, he is the author of *He Who Gives Life: The Doctrine Of The Holy Spirit* (Crossway, 2007); *Engaging With the Holy Spirit: Real Questions, Practical Answers* (Crossway, 2008); and *God the Peacemaker: How Atonement Brings Shalom* (InterVarsity, 2009).

treat sins of the insider (the believer). In the following section our focus will be on quenching the Holy Spirit and grieving the Holy Spirit.

SINS OF THE OUTSIDER

Blaspheming the Holy Spirit

It was only a few years ago now that a young man sat in my study carrying a great internal burden. He was a theological student who believed that he had committed the unpardonable sin. He had blasphemed the Holy Spirit. Had he? He was clearly a believer. Is this a sin that a believer can commit? Or is this a sin that only an outsider to the faith may commit? In the section title I have already tipped my hand as a believer in the perseverance of the saints. (The defense of this position lies beyond the scope of the present task.) I believe that blaspheming against the Holy Spirit is a sin of an outsider, but am I right? We need to turn to the biblical testimony like the Bereans of old to see if these things are so. That is the noble pathway (Acts 17:11).[6]

Mathew, Mark, and Luke refer to this sin, only John does not. In each of the Synoptic Gospels we read that blasphemy against the Son of Man is forgivable but not so with regard to slandering the Spirit (cf. Matt 12:31-32; Mark 3:28-29; and Luke 12:10). Blasphemy is slander directed against God that denigrates the divine character. Because this sin finds no forgiveness, it has been described as "the unpardonable sin." Significantly, in Matthew's and Mark's accounts, Jesus' warning about this sin is directed to those on the outside. The Pharisees and the scribes are in his purview. Luke's account is different in this respect. Jesus warns disciples about it, people he describes as "my friends" (Luke 12:4).

How have these accounts in the Synoptic Gospels been interpreted in the past and in the present? Generally speaking, the interpretation of these passages falls into two groups. On the one hand some, for example, Arnold G. Fructenbaum, argue that this sin was only possible while Jesus walked the earth. The Son of Man had to be physically present for this sin to be possible. From a classic dispensational perspective, he maintains, "The unpardonable sin, or the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit, is defined, therefore, as the national rejection by Israel of the messiahship of Jesus was while He was present and claiming He was demon-possessed.'[7] This view raises the question as to the rationale for the gospel writers to include such stories in their accounts of Jesus. Jesus was now ascended and at the right hand of the Father. The readers of the Gospels were not able therefore to commit this sin. On the other hand, there are others who argue that this sin remains a real possibility. Thomas Oden is one theologian who believes that this sin can be committed today. He argues, "The blasphemy referred to is that of directly ascribing to the power of evil, the coming of God into history through the Son and the Spirit (Mark 3:28, 29, and parallels). This sin *instantly* places the self beyond the range of forgiveness, because every step toward repentance and faith is enabled by the Holy Spirit (Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Holy Spirit*)."[8] In my view the latter position that the sin remains a possibility makes better sense of the inclusion of the warnings in the Gospels. But what exactly is this sin? Is Oden right? I believe not.

In Matthew's account, Jesus heals a demon-possessed man (Matt 12:22-23). He is no longer blind and mute. The crowds understandably are amazed and raise the question (12:23): "Can this be the Son of David?" The Pharisees take offence when they hear of it and pronounce (12:24): "It is only by Beelzebub, the prince of demons that this man casts out demons." Jesus responds with a *reductio ad absurdum* (reduction to absurdity) argument.[9] He argues (12:25-27), "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will stand. And if Satan casts out Satan, he is divided against himself. How then will his kingdom stand? And if I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore they will be your judges." Jesus gives the true interpretation of his actions and their importance (12:28): "But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." As R. T.

France comments, "There is a *kingdom of Satan* as well as a kingdom of God, and this passage reveals the two as locked in mortal conflict in the ministry of Jesus."[10] Jesus then compares what he is doing to that of a tying up a strong man in order to despoil him (12:29). Satan is clearly the strong man and Jesus the despoiler. He next issues a stark warning (12:31-32): "Therefore I tell you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven people, but the blasphemy [*blasphēmia*, 'slander'] against the Spirit will not be forgiven. And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come."[11]

What we say matters. What we say can betray the orientation of the heart. For Jesus goes on to declare to his objectors (Matt 12:33-35), "Either make the tree good and its fruit good, or make the tree bad and its fruit bad, for the tree is known by its fruit.[34] You brood of vipers! How can you speak good, when you are evil? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. The good person out of his good treasure brings forth good, and the evil person out of his evil treasure brings forth evil." Jesus then strikes an eschatological note (12:36-37): "I tell you, on the day of judgment people will give account for every careless word they speak, for by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned." Dale C. Allison, Jr., comments that these words of warning "[oppose] the possible supposition that blasphemy cannot really have eternal consequence because it is consists of nothing but words with the assertion that to speak evil is to be evil: words reflect the true self and so can be the criterion of divine judgment."[12]

Mark's account adds a nuance to the picture for in it Jesus did not declare that they had actually committed it (*enochos*, may be translated "liable"). After all, in both Matthew and Mark we find he reasoned with them in an *ad hominem* way by pointing out the *reductio ad absurdum* nature of their accusation. If Satan is fighting against Satan, then his kingdom is divided and doomed. This appeal to reason suggests that the Pharisees had not yet fallen into the abyss of an eternal sin (Mark 3:29). J. I. Packer rightly contends, "Jesus saw that the Pharisees were getting close to committing this sin, and he spoke in hope of holding them back from fully lapsing into it."[13] Given the Matthean and Markan accounts, to blaspheme the Spirit is to adopt a particular stance in relation to Christology, i.e., the person and work of Christ to which the Spirit bears witness.

The Gospel of Luke tells a similar story but with no explicit mention of the Holy Spirit or blaspheming the Spirit. In this account the Pharisees aren't identified *per se*. We are told only that some of the crowd objected (Luke 11:15). The same *reductio ad absurdum* argument reappears (11:17-18). What is new in the account is Jesus' using the image of the finger of God (11:20): "But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you." The next chapter in Luke's account does thematize both the Holy Spirit and the blasphemy against the Spirit. Jesus is teaching the disciples in the first instance but the crowds are listening in (cf. Luke 12:1 and 12:13). He warns in 11:8-9, "And I tell you, everyone who acknowledges me before men, the Son of Man also will acknowledge before the angels of God, but the one who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God." He elaborates (11:10): "And everyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but the one who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven." The contrast should not be missed. To speak against the Son of Man is forgivable, but against the Spirit, never. One can imagine how sobering 11:10 would have been to hear.

Importantly the very next verse is one of reassurance (11:11): "And when they bring you before the synagogues and the rulers and the authorities, do not be anxious about how you should defend yourself or what you should say, for the Holy Spirit will teach you in that very hour what you ought to say."

Importantly, speaking against Jesus on another occasion or at an earlier time in one's life does not

mean one has committed this sin. Paul described himself as a blasphemer, but God made him his apostle to the Gentile world (cf. Acts 7:58-8:3; 1 Tim 1:12-17). Saul, the blasphemer, received mercy. Blaspheming the Spirit is the settled rejection of the Spirit's testimony to Jesus. The Pharisees and Saul of Tarsus were in danger of just that. Nor is blasphemy against the Spirit committed by the disciple who denies his or her Lord on occasion. Peter denied Christ three times yet he was restored to Christ's service (cf. John 18:15-27 and 21: 15-19). Blaspheming the Spirit is not an episode but a way of life.[14] Put another way, this is the sin of persistent impenitent unbelief. John Paul II was right to describe this sin as "the radical refusal to be converted."[15] The lights are on in the Father's house but the prodigal persistently refuses to come home.

What, then, of those genuine Christians who worry that they have committed the sin against the Holy Spirit? J. I. Packer offers this helpful pastoral point: "Christians who fear that they have committed it [the unpardonable sin] show by that anxiety that they have not done so."[16] I counseled the young theological student whom I mentioned at the beginning of this section along those very lines.

Resisting the Holy Spirit

The one explicit reference to resisting the Holy Spirit is found in Stephen's speech in Acts 7. Stephen, we find, in the previous chapter has been appointed with others to relieve the apostles of table duty (Acts 6:1-6). Of those so appointed Stephen soon emerges as a significant person in his own right (Acts 6:8): "And Stephen, full of grace and power, was doing great wonders and signs among the people." Controversy quickly ensued. He was accused of blasphemy and brought before the Jewish authorities. It was alleged that he was speaking both against the temple and the law of Moses (Acts 6:12-14). Acts 7 is taken up with his address to the Jewish council with no lesser figure than the high priest present. Stephen rehearses the history of Israel's sorry disobedience climaxing in Acts 7:51: "You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist ['unceasingly,' *antiptete*, 'resist,' lit. 'fall against,'] the Holy Spirit. As your fathers did, so do you." The question raised by this text in Acts is the nature of this resistance to the Spirit.[17] According to Stephen such resistance had been a feature of Israel's history with God. The problem began even before the exodus from Egypt when, Stephen points out, the question was raised (Acts 7:27), "Who made you a ruler and a judge over us?" Moses was rejected and fled from Egypt. After the exodus and in the wilderness Moses received a "living oracle" from God to deliver to Israel. The result was infamous: our fathers refused to obey him, but thrust him aside, and in their hearts they turned to Egypt, saying to Aaron, "Make for us gods who will go before us" (7:40). Stephen's concluding question is a stabbing one (7:52a): "Which of the prophets did your fathers not persecute?" The underlying implication of this rhetorical question is that they persecuted every one of them. That persecution culminated in "And they killed those who announced beforehand the coming of the Righteous One, whom you have now betrayed and murdered, you who received the law as delivered by angels and did not keep it" (7:52b-53). Resisting the Spirit in context appears to mean rejecting the Word of God in promise, prophecy and law.[18]

The response to Stephen's stinging address was immediate and deadly (7:54): "Now when they heard these things they were enraged [*dieprionto*], and they ground [*ebryxon*] their teeth at him." Soon Stephen joined the persecuted and the slain but did so in a way so reminiscent of Jesus himself (7:59-60): "And as they were stoning Stephen, he called out, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.' And falling to his knees he cried out with a loud voice, 'Lord, do not hold this sin against them.'" This account stands in stark and illuminating contrast with the earlier one presenting Peter's Pentecost address. Both Peter and Stephen lay blame for Jesus' death at the door of their Jewish hearers. Peter preaches (Acts 2:36), "Let all the house of Israel therefore know for certain that God

has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you [*humeis*, pl. and emphatic] crucified." Stephen makes it clear by speaking of Jesus as "the Righteous One, whom you [*humeis*, pl.and emphatic] have now betrayed and murdered" (7:52). However the Pentecost crowd is cut to the heart by the word of God that they had heard in Acts 2:37): "Now when they heard this they were cut [*katenygēsan*] to the heart, and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, 'Brothers, what shall we do?'" Their response is an anxious question. In contrast at the council meeting we find (Acts 7:54), "Now when they heard these things they were enraged, and they ground their teeth at him." No question, only bloody action. The Pentecost crowd embraced the poured out Spirit's message, the council resisted it.

In Matthew 23:34-36 Jesus makes this intriguing statement that puzzled me for some time:

> Therefore I send you prophets and wise men and scribes, some of whom you will kill and crucify, and some you will flog in your synagogues and persecute from town to town, so that on you may come all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar. Truly, I say to you, all these things will come upon this generation.

Who are these prophets? Who are these scribes? Who are these wise? A case can be made that the apostles exhibit the characteristics of the three groups but only the apostles? Could it be that Stephen was one of these wise? Given the descriptors in Acts 6:3, "Therefore, brothers, pick out from among you seven men of good repute, full of the Spirit and of *wisdom,* whom we will appoint to this duty" he is a most likely candidate.[19]

Our response to the Word of God, which is the Spirit's Word, whether from the lips of an apostle or wise man like Stephen or God's Word written, is no trifling matter.

SINS OF THE INSIDER

We now turn to the church and the sins of the insider against the Holy Spirit and we begin with quenching the Holy Spirit before turning to the sin of grieving the Holy Spirit.[20] The references to both sins appear in the Pauline epistles addressed to churches whereas the two sins of the outsider, which we considered above, do not appear in any epistle but in narratives.

Quenching the Holy Spirit

The key text is 1 Thessalonians 5:19-21: "Do not quench the Spirit. Do not despise prophecies, but test everything; hold fast what is good." Translations have differences in their punctuation. The ESV, NIV, and NRSV break up 1 Thessalonians 5:19-22 into more than one sentence. The ESV presents three sentences and separates verse 19, which speaks of the Spirit and verses 20-21 which speak of prophecies. The NIV links the Spirit and prophecies by translating verses 19-20 as one sentence, but then breaks up verses 21-22 into three sentences. The NRSV provides two sentences and separates verse 19 from the rest. However, in both Greek texts that I used in preparation, verses 19-22 are one complex sentence that connects quenching the Spirit and despising prophecy. Paul's concern is not with quenching the Spirit's ministry in general, but specifically with prophesying.[21]

Why does Paul write this? As Gordon Fee points out, our text (1 Thess 5:19-22) surprises the reader since nothing else prior in the letter prepares the way for it.[22] So finding the apostolic rationale for the injunctions about the Spirit, prophecy, and discernment is not easy. Is Paul addressing a misuse of such a charismatic gift at Thessalonica, or is his aim preventative? Literally, Paul is commanding them—the imperative is second person plural—not to keep on quenching the Spirit. The verb "to quench" is in the present tense but does it have a continuous aspect? Scholars are divided.[23] We may not be able to definitively answer these questions. What is clear, however, is that prophecy was a *bona fide* practice in congregational life and

one that was sourced in the Holy Spirit, but even so discernment was necessary. Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians shows the necessity for such discernment as he instructs the Thessalonians not to be shaken by purported spirit or word or letter from Paul if such communication were characterized by an over-realized eschatology as though the day of Christ had already come (2 Thess 2:1-2).[24] The idea of quenching (*sbennumi*) the Spirit in the Thessalonians' context involves a metaphorical use of language.[25] The NIV brings this out in a virtual paraphrase of 1 Thessalonians 5:19: "Do not put out the Spirit's fire." In the Thessalonians' context, quenching the Spirit arguably involved a nullifying of the Spirit's work in the congregation.

The specific activity in view with regard to quenching the Spirit is prophecy. But just what was it? Were they Spirit inspired applications of the gospel that Paul had preached to the situations of the hearers? Or were they Spirit inspired applications of Paul's letter as it was being read out in the congregation?[26] Indeed Paul commands the Thessalonians to read his letter to the entire church (1 Thess 5:27). Or were they spontaneous revelations given by the Spirit through different congregational members concerning the state of the hearers as 1 Corinthians 14 might suggest? The prophecy of which Paul writes then does seem to stand on a lower level than either the gospel Paul preached or the word of the Lord that he shared with the Thessalonians. Grudem appears to be largely right to suggest that this sort of New Testament prophecy does not have the intrinsic authority of Old Testament prophecy.[27] This kind of Thessalonian prophecy needs testing. The word Paul uses for "testing" (*dokimadzein*) could be used of a variety of critical examinations ranging from scrutinizing people to testing metals.[28] The need was to sift the genuine from the false. Quality control was essential. The good needs to be separated from the bad, and that good embraced. Evil of every sort was to be avoided.[29]

My suggestion is that whatever else New Testament prophecy may have been, it was an oral communication sourced in the Spirit. In Acts it could be a very public phenomenon. At Pentecost, for example, its content was forth telling the mighty works of God in the gospel (Acts 2:11, *ta megaleia tou theou*, the ESV and NRSV are better than the NIV here, which has "wonders") and at Corinth, prophetic activity could disclose the secrets of the heart (1 Cor 14:25).[12] Interestingly, knowing or exposing the moral state of the human heart seemed to be a necessary condition for identifying a prophet for some in the first century—according to Luke 7:36-50 and John 4:1-38. In the former case, Simon the Pharisee thought to himself that if Jesus were a prophet he would know the moral state of the woman showing him such deference by washing his feet with her tears, wiping them with her hair, kissing them, and anointing them (Luke 7:39). And in the latter case the woman of Samaria, when confronted with Jesus' knowledge of her marital and extra-marital history, declared him to be a prophet (John 4:19). Peter's prophetic discourse on the day of Pentecost confronted the hearers with "this Jesus … you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men" (Acts 2:23).[30] The hearers "were cut [*katenug'san*] to the heart" (Acts 2:37). Returning to the Thessalonians, as we have already seen, Paul instructed the Thessalonian believers to not despise prophesying and yet called for discernment on their part (1 Thess 5:19-21). He instructed those at Corinth similarly (1 Cor 14:29).

The insider quenches the Holy Spirit whenever he or she embraces evil rather than good. However, to practice discernment when prophecy is claimed to be operating is not to sin against the Spirit. Rather it is to be wise rather than foolish. Gullibility is not next to godliness as far as the New Testament is concerned.

Grieving the Holy Spirit

The key text for grieving the Holy Spirit appears in Paul's epistle to the Ephesians 4:30: "And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by whom you were sealed for the day of redemption." Context is crucial here. Paul's command not to grieve the Spirit

falls into that part of Ephesians dealing with the lifestyle that fits with the unity God's call for (Eph 4:1-3). There is one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all (Eph 4:4-6). Indeed the ascended Christ bestows his gifts for ministry with the aim creating one new man whose head is Christ (Eph 4:7-16). This is a unified reality. To live in ways that are in keeping with this new reality means putting off the characteristics of the former life and putting on, like a new set of clothing, the defining characteristics of the new one (Eph 4:17-29). A wardrobe change is needed. This is the context in which we read that the Holy Spirit of God is not to be grieved (Eph 4:30). And furthermore we learn that the Spirit either is the authenticating stamp, as it were, that we belong to God and that God's future for us will come to pass for us, or, perhaps, it is the Spirit who stamps us to the same effect. Francis Foulkes usefully comments, "The Spirit's presence now is the seal and assurance of the life and inheritance that Christians will possess fully in the end, and the very contemplation of that should lead them to purify their lives…. There may be here the thought also of the work of the Spirit as keeping the Christian inviolate under his seal for the day of redemption."[31]

Paul does not explain what grieving the Spirit precisely involves, but the context makes it plain that our moral life is the key.[32] Negatively speaking, we grieve the Spirit by lying, giving place to the devil, stealing, speaking corruptly, in bitterness, wrath, anger, clamor, and malice (Eph 4:25-31). Positively speaking, we don't grieve the Spirit when we speak truth with our neighbor, are angry but don't sin with it, work, and use the product of our labor to do good to the needy, use speech to edify and impart grace to our hearers, are kind, tender-hearted, and forgiving (Eph 4:25-32).

The word translated "grieve" is *lupeō* and covers a range of meanings including "grieve," "suffer pain" and "suffer injury." Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians provides an example of the term in action when he counsels the Thessalonians not to grieve over the death of loved one, as though they had no Christian hope (1 Thess 4:13). Paul has sadness in mind. Likewise he has sadness in view when he writes to those troublesome Corinthians, informing them in his second letter that he had determined not to come to them in sorrow or to make them sorrowful. What Paul wants instead is joy (2 Cor 4:2-5 with its use of a mix of *lupeō* and *lupē*).[33]

This text has an important bearing on the question of divine suffering. The Spirit of God may be grieved. On this question of divine suffering B. B. Warfield had these relevant words to say: "Men tell us that God is, by very necessity of His nature, incapable of passion, incapable of being moved by inducements from without; that he dwells in holy calm [the apathy axiom] and unchangeable blessedness, untouched by human suffering or sorrows…. Let us bless our God that it is not true. God can feel; God does love."[34] He then adds to powerful effect, "But is not this gross anthropomorphism [more precisely anthropopathism]? We are careless of names; it is the truth of God. And we decline to yield up the God of the Bible and the God of our hearts to any philosophical abstraction.'[35] Although Warfield is preaching on Philippians 2 his words may apply, with the necessary changes, to Ephesians 4:30. J. I. Packer adds to the chorus: "Let us be clear: A totally impassive God would be a horror, and not the God of Calvary at all. He might belong in Islam; he has no place in Christianity. If, therefore, we can learn to think of the *chosenness* of God's grief and pain as the essence of his impassibility, so-called, we will do well."[36]

If on the one hand, we claim to be Christian, yet live as though Christ had never come, then we grieve the Spirit. If, on the other hand, we live as though he has indeed really come and that we truly belong to him then we do not grieve the Spirit. Instead we exhibit the true righteousness and holiness that should characterize the restored images of God that we are in process of becoming (Eph 4:23-24). Such images should indeed imitate God as Paul goes on to argue (Eph 5:1).

A further feature of the context is important. It is a communal one. Paul's desire is to maintain the unity of the Spirit. Gordon Fee observes: "Life in Christ means to live the life of God in the context of 'one another.'"[37] How we behave in relation to one another is the crucial part of the story of not grieving the Spirit. As Max Turner rightly suggests in the letter to the Ephesians the horizontal dimension of Christian community, as well as the vertical one of communion with God in Christ by the Spirit, are integral to this letter.[38]

CONCLUSIONS

Anselm of Canterbury made the classic statement: "Yet you have not duly estimated the gravity of sin."[39] I trust that in this piece we have indeed considered its gravity. For the outsider who blasphemes the Holy Spirit and the outsider who resists the Holy Spirit to the end the result is the same—no life with God in the world to come. To sin against the Spirit is to sin against God. For the insider quenching the Holy Spirit and grieving the Holy Spirit involves attitudes and behaviors that need to be eschewed. To so sin against the Spirit is to sin against the one who gave us an affection for Christ. This too is serious but not eternally fatal. Importantly, sinning against the Holy Spirit is yet further evidence that the Holy Spirit is no mere impersonal force at God's disposal but a divine person. You cannot grieve an influence. Here then we are encountering the awesome mystery of the triune God. The teaching in Scripture concerning sins against the Holy Spirit ought to be of significance to the teachers of the church in two respects. As Paul put it to Timothy in 1 Timothy 4:16: "Keep a close watch on yourself and on the teaching. Persist in this, for by so doing you will save both yourself and your hearers." The responsibility is twofold. Doctrine matters so keep faithfully to it. More specifically keep a close watch on your teaching about the Holy Spirit. Pay attention to yourself. Sinning against the Spirit is not only what others do.

ENDNOTES

[1] Blaise Pascal, *Pascal's Pensées* (trans. A. J. Krailsheimer; Harmondsworth, England: Penguin), 64.

[2] Ibid., 76.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Given a Trinitarian understanding of God, it would be an interesting question to pursue whether there are some sins which are specifically against the Father and some which are specifically against the Son.

[5] For more comprehensive discussions of these two sins see my *Engaging with the Holy Spirit: Real Questions, Practical Answers* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2008), 19-34 and 35-49, respectively.

[6] Biblical citations will be taken from the English Standard Version unless otherwise indicated.

[7] Arnold G. Fructenbaum, "Israelology, Doctrine Of," *Dictionary of Premillenial Theology: a Practical Guide to the People, Viewpoints, and History of Prophetic Studies* (ed. Mal Couch; Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1996), 197-203.

[8] Thomas C. Oden, *Classic Christianity: A Systematic Theology* (New York: HarperOne, 1992), 519. My emphasis in bold. Oden writes from a Wesleyan perspective. Oden also write from his Paleo-orthodoxy position with copious quotations from the Fathers. In places in his discussion on blaspheming the Spirit his use of the Fathers makes it somewhat unclear whether the sin against the Spirit is an instant one or a persistent one. Cf. 520 the reference to Gregory of Nyssa and 520 the reference to Leo 1.

[9] Interestingly, Scripture is full of familiar forms of argument. Another form of argument that Jesus seemed fond of was *a fortiori* (e.g. Matt 7:11). The great antithesis is Scripture is not between reason in the sense of argument and faith but faith and fear (Jesus e.g. Matt 8:23-27) and faith and sight (Paul, e.g. 2 Cor 5:6-7).

[10] R. T. France, *Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1985), 210, France also usefully points out: "The unusual use of *kingdom of God* (instead of Matthew's regular 'kingdom of heaven') serves not only to echo 'Spirit of God', but also to point out the contrast with the 'kingdom of Satan' (see on v. 26)." (Original italics.)

[11]Alan R. Cole suggests: "Nevertheless, Jesus dealt graciously with them, in spite of their stubborn blindness." R. Alan Cole, *Mark: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1989), 141. This is unpersuasive given Jesus' stinging rebuke in Matthew 12:34: "You brood of vipers."

[12]Dale C. Allison, Jr., "Matthew," *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (ed. John Batron and John Muddiman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 861.

[13]J. I. Packer, *Concise Theology: A Guide To Historic Christian Belief,* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993), 245.

[14]John B. Nielson would disagree. He writes: "Jesus limits the unpardonable sin to the intention of attributing the work of the Holy Spirit done in Christ to the power of Satan" John B. Nielson, "Blasphemy," in *Beacon Dictionary of Theology* (ed. Richard S. Taylor; Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1983), 79. However, on this view it is hard to understand why Jesus bothered to reason with his critics since they had just put themselves beyond the reach of divine forgiveness.

[15]John Paul II, *The Holy Spirit In The Life Of The Church And The World: Dominum et Vivificantem* (Boston: Pauline, 1986), 79.

[16]J. I. Packer, *Concise Theology*, 245. J. Kenneth Grider argues similarly: "the most important thing to remember about the unpardonable sin is that anyone who fears that he has committed the unpardonable it, and is concerned about the matter, hasn't." J. Kenneth Grider, "Unpardonable Sin," in *Beacon Dictionary of Theology* (ed. Richard S. Taylor; Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1983), 537.

[17]In my view this text is not relevant to the debate about irresistible grace between Reformed and Arminian theologians. For my reasons for this claim see my, *Engaging with the Holy Spirit,* 35-49.

[18]I. Howard Marshall comments on Stephen's accusation that his hearers were "stiff-necked" and "with uncircumcised hearts and ears": "Such obstinacy was particularly seen in *resisting the Holy Spirit* (Isa 63:10), who was regarded as speaking through the prophets and now through the Spirit-filled apostles and witnesses in the early church. There was a well-established tradition in Judaism that the Jewish people had been responsible for the deaths of *the prophets* (1 Kgs 19:10, 14; Neh 9:26; Jer 26:20–24; Luke 6:23; 11:49; 13:34; 1 Thess 2:15; Heb 11:36–38); Stephen takes up this accusation and repeats it." I. Howard Marshall, *Acts: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1980), 155.

[19]My emphasis.

[20]For more comprehensive discussions of these two sins see my *Engaging with the Holy Spirit*, 67-81and 83-97, respectively.

[21]Commentators divide on the question of the general versus the particular. For example, Robert L. Thomas argues with reference to quenching the Spirit that, "In particular, this is his impartation of specialized capabilities for ministry to others in the body of Christ." Robert L. Thomas, "1 Thessalonians," *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), CD-Rom version, comment on 1 Thessalonians 5:19-22. However, F. F. Bruce treats 1 Thessalonians as a coherent unit of thought with quenching the Spirit as referring specifically to prophecy. Bruce's position is to be preferred.

[22]Gordon Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 56.

[23]For example, Robert L. Thomas argues with reference to quenching the Spirit, "When Paul commands, 'Stop putting out the Spirit's fire,' as v. 19 might literally be translated, he advocates the cessation of something already being practiced," Thomas, "1 Thessalonians," comment on 1 Thessalonians 5:19. However, F. F. Bruce maintains: "It is doubtful if we should press the use of the present imperative … here and in v 20 to mean that the recipients are being told to stop doing something they have already begun to do. Like the positive imperatives in vv 16-18 and 21-22, the negative imperatives in vv 19 and 20 indicate what they must habitually do (or refrain from doing)," "I Thessalonians," comment on 1 Thessalonians 5:19.

[24]For this paragraph I have drawn upon my *Engaging with the Holy Spirit*.

[25]The verb, *sbennumi* is used of quenching fire or things on fire (e.g. Matt 12:20, 25:3; Mark 9:44, 46, 48; Eph

6:16, Heb 11:34 as well as 1 Thess 5:19). See G. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon Of The New Testament* (3rd ed; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1968), 403.

[26]There is some evidence in Acts that prophets could so use letters. For example, take Judas and Silas as prophets and the letter of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:22-32, especially vv. 30-32). I owe this insight to David Peterson. See his discussion, *Prophecy and Preaching: Acts and the Church Today* (Buxton: Fellowship of Word and Spirit, 1997), 5.

[27]See D. A. Carson, *Showing The Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 2003), 93-100, for a carefully qualified acceptance of Grudem's argument. Like Old Testament prophecy, New Testament prophecy exhibits both forthtelling of God's word and foretelling the future. On this, see especially, D. A. Carson, *Showing*, 92, n. 56.

[28]The verb "*dokimadzō*" is use primarily of testing, proving, trying metals (e.g. Prov 8:10, 17:3 LXX) of other thing (e.g. Luke 12:56) and men and women (e.g. 1 Tim 3:10). See G. Abbott-Smith, *Manual,* 120.

[29]Robert L. Thomas suggests: "*Ponerou* ('of evil') likewise presents two options: if it is taken as an adjective qualifying *eidous*, the phrase is 'evil kind,' or taken as a substantive, a practical equivalent of the noun *ponerias*, the phrase is 'kind of evil.' Though the anarthrous adjective in Paul is more frequently adjectival in force, the nature of the present contrast with *to kalon* (v. 21) resolves this particular issue in favor of the substantival use adopted by NIV," Thomas, "1Thessalonians," comment on 1 Thess. 5:22.

[30]See David Peterson, *Prophecy*, 7: "The sequence of events in Acts 2 suggests that Peter is acting as prophet when he proclaims the gospel so powerfully."

[31]Francis Foulkes, *Ephesians: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1989), 142.

[32]This is also the case in the Old Testament. This is not a new idea in the biblical testimony. Psalm 78 rehearses the history of Israel's disobedience up until the rise of David. Speaking of the wilderness period the psalmist says: "How often they rebelled against him in the wilderness and grieved him in the desert" (Ps 78:40). Isa 63:10 is more precise: "But they [Israelites] rebelled and grieved his Holy Spirit." In fact, a number of commentators have seen in Eph 4:30 a clear allusion to Isa 63:10. A different Greek word is used in the LXX version of Isaiah 63:10 (*paroxunō*: to provoke, to stimulate, to irritate). Paul's use of the full descriptor "The Holy Spirit of God" though does point to a deliberate allusion to Isa 63:10 with Paul correcting the LXX rendering of the Hebrew. See the discussions in Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 713, n. 175, and Frank S. Thielman, "Ephesians." in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 825-26.

[33]The argument, that grieving the Spirit is offending the Spirit and therefore runs the risk of losing the Spirit may have support in early church commentary but not in the Pauline text. This is the argument found in early church literature beginning with the *Shepherd of Hermas*. See Dennis W. Johnson, *Grieving And Quenching The Holy Spirit* (Thesis; Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1993), 12. Johnson understands Eph 4:30 as referring to "the outrage and indignation of a king who discovers a traitor among his most loyal subjects," ibid, 129. However, comparing 2 Cor 2:2-5, 1 Thes 4:13 and Eph 4:30 makes his suggestion doubtful.

[34]B. B. Warfield, *The Person and Work of Christ* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1950), 570.

[35]Ibid. Warfield knew great personal suffering in his life because of the chronic illness of his wife. This may account for his passion. See M. A. Noll, "B. B. Warfield," W. E. Elwell (ed.), *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1993), 27.

[36]J. I. Packer, "What Do You Mean When You Say God?" *Christianity Today* (September 10, 1986), 31. Contra Packer, I would argue that God's knowing grief and pain flows from his essential nature as love and is not satisfactorily accounted for by Packer's voluntarist metaphysic "chosenness."

[37]Fee, *Presence*, 713.

[38]Max Turner, "Ephesians, Book of," 189-90. Turner, following others, describes the letter as the "crown of Paulinism."

[39]Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo* in *The Christian Reader* (ed. Alister E. McGrath; 4th ed., Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 298.

"We Believe in the Holy Spirit": Revisiting the Deity of the Spirit

Matthew Barrett

INTRODUCTION

"We believe in the Holy Spirit." This short, succinct affirmation of the Spirit in the Nicene Creed leaves the reader wanting much more. While the creed clearly and specifically confessed the deity of the Son against the onslaught of Arianism, nevertheless, a more extensive confessional statement on the deity of the Spirit awaited. Athanasius, so famously known for his defense of Christ's divinity and equality with the Father, is less recognized for his defense of the Holy Spirit. But without question Athanasius affirmed the deity of the Spirit as well, arguing that the Spirit is "one with the Godhead which is in the unoriginated Triad."[1] The Spirit, said Athanasius, "has the same oneness with the Son as the Son has with the Father."[2] Therefore, contra Arianism, the Spirit does not have a beginning nor is he created at some point in time. Rather, he is *consubstantial* (i.e., *homoousios*) with the Father and the Son. And yet, at the same time, the Spirit is distinct from the Father and the Son. As Gregg Allison explains, "Although eternal and equal, the three are eternally and immutably distinct."[3] Athanasius's contribution was pivotal. His *Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit* (355–360) sought to refute the Tropici who affirmed the Son's divinity while rejecting the Spirit's divine equality, claiming instead that he is a created being.[4]

But Athanasius would not be alone in his affirmation of the Spirit's deity. The Cappadocian fathers—Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus—would likewise defend the Spirit's divinity. The Pneumatomachi (fighters against the Spirit; also called Macedonians) refused to worship the Spirit, arguing that the Spirit was not equal in deity to God. But in 376 Basil the Great (330–379) refuted the Pneumatomachians with *On the Holy Spirit*, where he argued for the full deity of the Spirit, and at the same time was clear that the Spirit is not to be confused with the Father and the Son but is a

Matthew Barrett is Assistant Professor of Christian Studies at California Baptist University.

He received the Ph.D. from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. In addition, he is the co-author, with Gregg Allison, of the forthcoming book *40 Questions About Salvation* (Kregel), and the author of the forthcoming *Reclaiming Monergism* (P&R, 2013).

distinct *hypostasis*. Therefore, while there is one, undivided divine *ousia*, there are three, distinct divine *hypostaseis*.[5]

Gregory of Nazianzus would be more forthright still. While Basil and Gregory of Nyssa were hesitant to title the Spirit *homoousios* with the Father and the Son "for fear of alienating potential supporters," Gregory of Nazianzus was not.[6] Gregory writes in his *Orations*, "What then? Is the Spirit God? Most certainly. Well then, is he consubstantial (*homoousios*)? Yes, if he is God."[7] The Spirit's deity was no abstract matter either. Worship and prayer, for Gregory, hinge on the matter. To worship or pray to one of the three (e.g., Spirit) is to adore all three persons given the equality of the three in deity.[8]

The issue progressed in 381 with the Council of Constantinople, which elaborated upon the Creed of Nicea resulting in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. We believe "in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and life-giver, who proceeds from the Father, who is worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, who spoke by the prophets." The Spirit is not a created being, nor subordinate in deity, but is the Lord and to be worshipped along with the Father and Son![9] And he is a *person*, one who speaks and gives life.

The debates of the fourth century over the deity of the Spirit seem so far removed from our twenty-first century context for a variety of reasons. [10] With the birth of the Pentecostal movement the attention has shifted in pneumatology from the deity of the Spirit to the gifts of the Spirit; from his divine person to his work in "Spirit baptism" and the debate over whether he bestows extraordinary gifts on the church today (e.g., tongues, prophecy). The shift in pneumatology towards the work of the Spirit can also be seen in soteriological controversies. Religious pluralism and inclusivism have raised considerable debate over whether or not the Spirit works in other religions, even apart from the gospel of Jesus Christ. In short, the *work* of the Spirit has taken center stage, and understandably since how we define the Spirit's work in salvation, sanctification, and the church is central to Christian faith and living.

However, if we, as evangelicals, simply relegate the subject of the *person* of the Spirit to an ancient era, then we neglect to see the Spirit's relevancy to Christian doctrine and doxology. In the twenty-first century, as Fred Sanders has observed, evangelicals face two dangers: (1) coldness toward the Trinity and (2) shallowness in regards to the Trinity.[11] And if this is the case with the Trinity at large, how much more so with the Holy Spirit in particular, who is often the forgotten member of the three? But as this study will demonstrate, not only is the person and deity of the Spirit biblically rooted, but it transforms how we think about the most important aspects of the Christian faith.[12]

Our purpose in what follows is to revisit the biblical doctrine of the person and deity of the Holy Spirit. In doing so we are seeking to put into practice a pneumatology *from above*, one that is faithfully grounded in the biblical text. In order to do so, three questions must be answered: (1) Is the Holy Spirit a person? (2) Is the Holy Spirit God? (3) What difference does the deity of the Spirit make?[13]

IS THE HOLY SPIRIT A PERSON?

Is the Holy Spirit a person, or is the Holy Spirit an impersonal force or power?[14] Scripture does connect the Spirit with the *power* of God (Mic 3:8; Zech 4:6; Luke 1:17, 35; 4:14; Acts 1:8; 10:38; Rom 1:4; 15:13, 19; 1 Cor 2:4; 1 Thess 1:5; 2 Tim 1:7).[15] However, God's power is never thought of in Scripture as impersonal. Rather, as John Frame asserts, "It is a power directed by God's intelligent plan to accomplish his purposes."[16] Additionally, to substitute "power" for "Spirit" is exegetically problematic since there are many passages where "power" and "Spirit" are both used in distinction from one another (Acts 10:36-38; Rom 15:13; 1 Cor 2:3-5). In some of these passages "power" is attributed to the Spirit, demonstrating his personhood. In other words, the Spirit is a person who possesses divine power, as he does other attri-

butes such as wisdom, love, holiness, omniscience, omnipresence, etc. But perhaps the most significant reason why it is erroneous to conceive of the Spirit as an impersonal power or force is because there are many indicators that the biblical authors affirmed the full personhood of the Spirit.

The Spirit Performs Actions that Can Only Be Attributed to Him If He Is a Person.

Consider two brief examples of personal actions that are credited to the Holy Spirit. First, the Holy Spirit *speaks*. In Acts 21 Paul is on his way to Jerusalem, but the prophet Agabus bound Paul's feet and hands with his own belt, saying, "Thus says the Holy Spirit, 'This is how the Jews at Jerusalem will bind the man who owns this belt and deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles'" (Acts 21:11). Notice, in this instance the Spirit is *speaking* and Agabus is the prophetic messenger.[17] Likewise, speech is credited to the Spirit in Galatians 4:6. Paul reassures the Galatian believers that though they used to be enslaved to the world, through Christ they have now been redeemed. Consequently, those in Christ are adopted as sons. "And because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba! Father!'" The Spirit speaks—no, cries out—within us, bearing testimony to the new reality that God is our Father.[18]

Second, the Holy Spirit *intercedes*. Not only does the Spirit come into our hearts so that we cry out "Abba! Father!" but the Spirit also mediates on our behalf. Paul writes, "Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness. For we do not know what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with groanings too deep for words. And he who searches hearts knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom 8:26-27). When we struggle and are weak, unsure what to pray for, it is the Spirit who personally intercedes on our behalf.[19] While we do not know the will of God, the Spirit knows God's will and therefore is able to mediate on our behalf before the Father. Some may object that Paul is utilizing impersonal language to personify the Spirit as a type of energy. How then can Paul say in verses 26-27 that the Spirit prays on behalf of the believer who does not know what to pray for? Certainly prayer is not the act of an energy but of a person.

Scripture has much more to say concerning the Spirit. Not only does he speak and intercede, but he also performs miracles (Rom 15:19; 1 Cor 12:9-10; cf. Matt 12:28), constrains (Acts 20:21), testifies (Acts 20:21), appoints (Acts 20:28), bears witness (Acts 5:32; Rom 8:16), bestows spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:9-11; Heb 2:3), pours out divine love within us (Rom 5:5; 15:30), sends (Acts 10:19-20; 13:2), teaches (John 14:26), adopts (Rom 8:15), sanctifies (Rom 1:4), indwells (Rom 8:9-11; 1 Cor 3:16; 2 Tim 1:14), renews (Titus 3:5), leads (Gal 5:17-25), etc. The testimony of Scripture is overwhelming when looked at as a whole. In every way the Spirit functions not as an impersonal power or force, but as a person.[20]

The Spirit Possesses the Qualities of a Person.

Not only is the personhood of the Spirit evident in his divine works, but also in the personal qualities designated to him, including intelligence, will, and affections, which have historically been identified as three basic characteristics of personhood.[21] To begin with, consider intelligence. If we return to Romans 8:27 we will notice that the Spirit is said to have a *mind*. Right after Paul affirms the intercessory role of the Spirit on behalf of the believer (8:26), he then explains that God, who searches hearts, "knows what is the mind of the Spirit [*to phronēma tou pneumatos*], because the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God" (8:27). Here is a clear affirmation of the Spirit's intelligence. He is not a mere force, power, or energy. Rather, he is a person who has a mind and on this basis he is able to pray for believers in a manner that is consistent with the divine will.[22] As Cole concludes, "Such a descriptor would be puzzling indeed if the Spirit

were simply divine energy."[23]

Additionally, the Spirit is said to have a *will* and to exercise his will. For example, in 1 Corinthians 12 Paul explains that there are varieties of gifts but the same Spirit (12:4). "To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good" (12:7). Paul goes on to identify some of these gifts of the Spirit as including wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, prophecy, the ability to distinguish between spirits, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. Paul concludes, "All these are empowered by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills" (12:11). The Spirit is the personal agent of the Trinity who gives these divine gifts to different believers in Corinth. And notice, the Spirit gives these gifts to different individuals "as he wills." In short, the Spirit is said to give, empower, and exercise his will as he wishes, all of which are descriptions of a personal agent, not a mere force. Or as Calvin asserts, "For if the Spirit were not an entity subsisting in God, choice and will would by no means be conceded to him. Paul, therefore, very clearly attributes to the Spirit divine power, and shows that He resides hypostatically in God."[24]

Finally, not only is intellect and will attributed to the Spirit, but so also are certain *affections*.[25] In Ephesians 4:25ff Paul exhorts the Ephesian believers to put away falsehood and instead live in a godly manner (e.g., speak the truth, do not steel, do not use corrupt talk). Paul then warns them, "And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by whom you were sealed for the day of redemption" (4:30). According to Paul, the Holy Spirit has sealed each believer for the day of redemption (cf. Eph 1:13) and therefore the Christian is not to grieve the Spirit by committing acts of wickedness, but to live in a way that is glorifying to God (cf. Isa 63:10-11). For our purposes it is crucial to observe the simple truth that the Spirit can be sorrowed, something that cannot be said of a mere force, power, or energy.[26]

A similar text can be found in 1 Thessalonians 5:19 where Paul concludes his letter by commanding Christians not to "quench the Spirit." Other biblical texts assert that the Spirit can be insulted by Christians as well (Heb 10:29). In relation to unbelievers, Stephen is clear in his martyrdom testimony that the Spirit is resisted by those who reject the Son of God (Acts 7:51). But perhaps the most serious offence against the Spirit is blasphemy (Matt 12:31-32; Mark 3:28-29). The sin of blasphemy against the Son is pardonable (Matt 12:32a). But if the Spirit is blasphemed, there is no forgiveness (Matt 12:32b). In regards to the personhood of the Spirit, James White puts the matter acutely, "We have no reason to believe that there would be any less personal element in their blasphemy when speaking of the Spirit than when speaking of the Son."[27] In summary, each of these passages demonstrates that the Spirit possesses certain affections that are characteristic of personhood.

The Spirit's Personhood is Comparable to the Personhood of the Father and the Son.

That the Spirit is a person is especially evident in how Jesus articulates the Trinitarian economy in the life of his disciples. Several passages stand out in this regard. In John 14:16-17 Jesus promises his disciples, "And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Helper, to be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him. You know him, for he dwells with you and will be in you." By assuring his disciples that the Father will send "another" (*allos*) Helper (*paraklētos*; "Counselor" in the NIV), the assumption is that Christ himself is the first Helper (cf. 1 John 2:1). Therefore, these two Helpers are comparable in their personhood.[28] As Letham observes,

> Jesus' comments here bring the Spirit into the closest possible conjunction with the Father and the Son. The Father will send the Spirit in response to the Son's request (John 14:16, 26). Jesus identifies the Spirit's coming with his, for it is as if Jesus himself is to come in person (John

> 14:18)…. The Spirit's coming to those who love Jesus is the equivalent of the Father and the Son coming (John 14:21, 23). The Holy Spirit will bring to the disciples' minds all that Jesus has said to them (John 14:26). So close is the connection here that Jesus can say that the presence of the Holy Spirit is interchangeable with that of the Father and the Son.[29]

Certainly we would not question the personhood of the first Helper, Christ. Nor should we then question the personhood of the second Helper, the Spirit, who is commissioned by the Father and the Son.

In John 15:26 Jesus makes a similar statement, "But when the Helper comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, he will bear witness about me."[30] Once again the Spirit is sent from the Father and the Son, and he is one who directs our attention to Christ, fulfilling his role as the Spirit of truth.[31]

Or consider John 16:7 where the disciples are filled with sorrow upon hearing of Jesus' future departure. Jesus, however, comforts them, instructing them that it is actually to their advantage that he leaves. "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth: it is to your advantage that I go away, for if I do not go away, the Helper will not come to you. But if I go, I will send him to you. And when he comes, he will convict the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment" (John 16:7-8). Only if the Spirit's personhood (and divine status) is equal to the Father and the Son, can he then proceed from the Father and the Son in order to convict the world.[32]

Likewise, in John 16:13-14 Jesus once again reiterates his promise to send the Spirit of truth. "When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth, for he will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you." Like John 15:26, Jesus attributes works to the Spirit that only a person can do. The Spirit will speak, declare, and glorify the Son.

IS THE HOLY SPIRIT GOD?

So far we have seen that in Scripture the Spirit is referred to in categories of personhood. But what about the personhood of the Spirit would lead us to conclude that he is more than a person, indeed, that he is a *divine* person, and not only a divine person but one who is *equal* to the Father and the Son in deity, sharing in the one divine essence of the triune God?[33]

The Spirit Shares the One Divine Name.

Scripture is replete with triadic passages in which either two or all three of the divine persons are mentioned together as co-equal partners in divine status. Scripture also abounds with passages where the Spirit and "God" are used interchangeably. In both types of passages the implication is that the Spirit is equal in deity to the Father and the Son. Stated otherwise, those passages where the Spirit is mentioned either alongside the Father and the Son or is mentioned synonymously with God demonstrate that the third person of the Trinity fully shares in the one divine name and by inference in the one divine essence as well.

First, there are numerous triadic passages where the Spirit is mentioned (and in some cases made visible; cf. Matt 3:16) alongside the Father and the Son.[34]

> And when Jesus was baptized, immediately he went up from the water, and behold, the heaven were opened to him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and coming to rest on him; and behold, a voice from heaven said, "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased" (Matt 3:16-17; cf. Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22).

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

> Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of service, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of activities,

but it is the same God who empowers them all in everyone (1 Cor 12:4-6).

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all (2 Cor 13:14).

For through him [Christ] we both have access in one Spirit to the Father. So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, in whom the whole structure, being joined together, grows into a holy temple in the Lord. In him you also are being built together into a dwelling place for God by the Spirit (Eph 2:18-22).

There is one body and one Spirit—just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all (Eph 4:4-6).

But we ought always to give thanks to God for you, brothers beloved by the Lord, because God chose you as the firstfruits to be saved, through sanctification by the Spirit and belief in the truth. To this he called you through our gospel, so that you may obtain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ (2 Thess 2:13-14).

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, To those who are elect exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in the sanctification of the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus Christ and for sprinkling with his blood: May grace and peace be multiplied to you (1 Pet 1:1-2).

But you, beloved, building yourselves up in your most holy faith and praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ that leads to eternal life (Jude 1:20-21).

John to the seven churches that are in Asia: Grace to you and peace from him who is and who was and who is to come, and from the seven spirits who are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of kings on earth. To him who loves us and has freed us from our sins by his blood (Rev 1:4-5).[35]

Similarly, there are also biblical texts where the Son and Spirit are mentioned together as equal partners.[36]

For I will not venture to speak of anything except what Christ has accomplished through me to bring the Gentiles to obedience—by word and deed, by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God—so that from Jerusalem and all the way around to Illyricum I have fulfilled the ministry of the gospel of Christ (Rom 15:18-19).

I appeal to you, brothers, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit, to strive together with me in your prayers to God on my behalf (Rom 15:30).
And such were some of you. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God (1 Cor 6:11).

So if there is any encouragement in Christ, any comfort from love, any participation in the Spirit, any affection and sympathy (Phil 2:1).
For we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God and glory in Christ Jesus and put no confidence in the flesh (Phil 3:3).

How much worse punishment, do you think, will be deserved by the one who has trampled underfoot the Son of God, and has profaned the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified, and has outraged the Spirit of grace? (Heb 10:29).

Second, there are other passages where

"Spirit" is used interchangeably with "God." One of the greatest examples is in Acts 5 at the inception of the NT church. We read that Ananias and Sapphira sold their property, kept back some of the proceeds, and then laid the rest of the proceeds at the apostles' feet. Sin, however, enters into the picture.

> But Peter said, "Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and to keep back for yourself part of the proceeds of the land? While it remained unsold, did it not remain your own? And after it was sold, was it not at your disposal? Why is it that you have contrived this deed in your heart? You have not lied to man but to God." When Ananias heard these words, he fell down and breathed his last (Acts 5:3-4).

Three hours later Sapphira enters the same room, not knowing what had previously taken place. She also lies to Peter.

> But Peter said to her, "How is it that you have agreed together to test the Spirit of the Lord? Behold, the feet of those who have buried your husband are at the door, and they will carry you out." Immediately she fell down at his feet and breathed her last (Acts 5:9-10).

To lie to the Spirit, says Peter, is to lie to God! Furthermore, when Peter encounters Sapphira he states that she and her husband have tested "the Spirit of the Lord" (5:9), again affirming the divinity of the Spirit. In summary, not only does Acts 5 support the personhood of the Spirit—after all, how can one lie to a mere force, power, or energy?—but the deity of the Spirit as well.[37]

Peter's reference to the Spirit as the "Spirit of the Lord" in Acts 5:9 is similar to Romans 8:9, "You, however, are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you. Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him." Here Paul associates the Spirit not only with the Father (i.e., the Lord), but with the Son as well (i.e., Christ). The divinity of the Spirit is further demonstrated in what Paul says next, "If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through his Spirit who dwells in you" (Rom 8:11). Again the Spirit is tied to the Father. But the Spirit is also said to be the divine agent through whom the Father raised Christ from the dead. Certainly such a supernatural act is only the work of God and yet it is predicated of the Spirit.

Additionally, this same Spirit who raised Christ from the dead will one day give life to our mortal bodies. It is the Spirit, says Paul, who dwells within the believer (Rom 8:11b).

> Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy him. For God's temple is holy, and you are that temple (1 Cor 3:16-17).

And again,

> Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, whom you have from God? You are not your own, for you were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body (1 Cor 6:19-20).

In the OT the temple, the "house of the Lord" (2 Chron 3:1), was the dwelling place of God, where he manifested his presence and glory to his people (2 Chron 7:1-2). But with the advent of our great high priest, Jesus Christ—whose death has ushered the sinner into the holy of holies, justified and clothed in the righteousness of Christ (Eph 2:11-22)—God no longer dwells in a building made with stone, but with his children directly (2 Cor 6:16). And he does so through the Spirit, as Paul makes clear in Ephesians 2:11-22.[38] It is through the Spirit that we have access to the Father, no longer being aliens and strangers, but members of the household of God. In Christ believers are "being built together into a dwelling

place for God by the Spirit" (Eph 2:22). Therefore, we can rightly conclude that the indwelling presence of the Spirit is the indwelling presence of God himself. As Augustine, and later Turretin, observed, if it is idolatry and sacrilege to erect a temple to a mere creature, what blasphemy it would be for Paul to call our own bodies temples of one who is not God.[39]

Finally, the deity of the Spirit is especially evident in Jesus' teaching on the sin of blasphemy. In Matthew 12 Jesus heals a demon-oppressed man who was blind and mute. While the people were amazed, asking themselves whether Jesus could be the Son of David, the Pharisees were infuriated. "It is only by Beelzebul, the prince of demons, that this man casts out demons" (Matt 12:24). Knowing their thoughts, Jesus responds that a kingdom cannot be divided against itself. How can Satan cast out Satan and stand? "But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Matt 12:28). Jesus' statement is telling. Notice, it is by the "Spirit of God" that Jesus expels demons. Surely the Spirit must be divine, otherwise it is difficult to explain (1) how he is titled the "Spirit of God," (2) how it is that Jesus could cast out demons through him, and (3) how the Spirit is able to have dominion and power over the demonic realm. But Jesus is not finished.

> Therefore I tell you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven people, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come (Matt 12:31-32).

To blaspheme the Spirit is to blaspheme God himself. The Pharisees were attributing the work of the Spirit to Satan. In doing so they were not merely resisting Jesus, but the gospel call of the Spirit to salvation.[40] Furthermore, the deity of the Spirit is evident in the fact that the sin of blasphemy is unforgivable. Truly, only if the Spirit is God does this sin have such dire consequences.

The Spirit Possesses Divine Attributes.

Not only is the Spirit included in triadic passages and not only does he carry the full meaning of the divine name, but the Spirit also is said to possess divine attributes. For example, in Isaiah 11:2 the divine attributes of the Spirit are also ascribed to the Messiah. "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord." Three observations deserve our attention. First, the deity of the Spirit is evident in his name, "The Spirit of the Lord." But second, the Spirit's deity is also in plain sight given the divine attributes associated with him: the Spirit of wisdom, understanding, counsel, might, knowledge, and fear of the Lord. And third, to make the issue especially clear, it is the Spirit, in all of his glorious attributes, that then rests upon the Messiah, Christ Jesus. As Gregory of Nyssa argued, if the Spirit is not divine then he cannot anoint Jesus as Christ, as king, as our divine Mediator.[41]

But perhaps the most obvious divine attribute can be found in the traditional label itself, the *Holy* Spirit.[42] The Spirit is the Spirit of holiness (Rom 1:4). Over one hundred times in Scripture the Spirit is said to be "holy" (e.g., Ps 51:11; Isa 63:10-11; Matt 1:18-20; 3:11; 12:32; 28:19). And rightly so since the Spirit is the very presence of God manifested within the believer, working within the holiness without which no one will see the Lord (Heb 12:14; cf. 2 Cor 7:1). Hence, Christians are called temples of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 3:16-17; 6:19-20).[43]

The Spirit also possesses the divine attribute of *omniscience*.[44] In 1 Corinthians 2 Paul expounds upon the wisdom that comes from the Spirit. Paul is clear that he decided to know nothing among them but Christ crucified. Paul did not approach the Corinthians using "lofty speech or wisdom" to make know the testimony of God. Rather, he says, "I was with you in weakness and in fear and much trembling, and my speech and my message were not in plausible words of wisdom, but in dem-

onstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith might not rest in the wisdom of men but in the power of God" (1 Cor 2:3-4). Paul, however, does not dismiss "wisdom" altogether. No, he writes, "we do impart wisdom" among the mature. However, it is not the wisdom of this age for the rulers of this age crucified the "Lord of glory." To the contrary, Paul imparts a "secret and hidden wisdom of God" (1 Cor 2:7). And how does Paul know this secret wisdom? The wisdom from God has been revealed to him "through the Spirit" (1 Cor 2:10). But what makes the Spirit qualified to be the agent through whom this secret and hidden wisdom of God comes? Paul answers: "For who knows a person's thoughts except the spirit of that person, which is in him? So also no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God" (1 Cor 2:11). In other words, the Spirit is the one who knows the very thoughts of God for he is the "Spirit of God." As Cole remarks, "Only God can know God in this way. Otherwise there would be two omniscient beings. Scripture allows no such metaphysical dualism."[45]

Paul goes on to then apply the Spirit's divine knowledge to the individual believer. "Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is from God, that we might understand the things freely given us by God. And we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual truths to those who are spiritual" (1 Cor 2:12-13). According to Paul, there is a clear antithesis between the spirit of the world and the Spirit of God. Those possessed by the former are doomed to pass away, for they have a wisdom of this age that is foolishness, leading to death. However, those who possess the latter have a wisdom that comes from God because the Spirit, who knows and searches the depths of God, has given them understanding (v. 13). The message of Christ crucified, which to the world appears to be foolishness (see 2:13, 14), is actually the secret and hidden wisdom of God that the Spirit makes known to believers.

Much more could be said about the work of the Spirit in making the wisdom of God known to the sinner, turning him from a "natural" person into a "spiritual" person. But the present study draws our attention specifically to the knowledge of the Spirit. The Spirit's deity is not only emphasized in his title, "Spirit of God," but in his ability to comprehend the very depths of God. Unless the Spirit is fully God, not only would he be incapable of comprehending the thoughts of God (2:11), but he could not reveal to us the "things freely given us by God" (2:12). He is the divine interpreter, interpreting spiritual truths to those who are spiritual (2:13).

The omniscience of the Spirit is a biblical segue into the *omnipresence* of the Spirit. Psalm 139, for example, begins with David praising the Lord for his omniscience.

> O Lord, you have searched me and known me!
> You know when I sit down and when I rise up;
> you discern my thoughts from afar.
> You search out my path and my lying down
> and are acquainted with all my ways.
> Even before a word is on my tongue,
> behold, O Lord, you know it altogether.
> You hem me in, behind and before,
> and lay your hand upon me.
> Such knowledge is too wonderful for me;
> it is high; I cannot attain it (Ps 139:1-6; cf. vv.13-18).

What does David conclude from the piercing, penetrating, and all-encompassing knowledge of God?

> Where shall I go from your Spirit?
> Or where shall I flee from your presence?
> If I ascend to heaven, you are there!
> If I make my bed in Sheol, you are there!
> If I take the wings of the morning
> and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea,
> even there your hand shall lead me,
> and your right hand shall hold me (Ps 139:7-10).

Some have interpreted David negatively, as one who is frustrated, unable to escape the Spirit. But

quite the opposite is in view. David rejoices in the presence of the Spirit. It is precisely because the Spirit is everywhere (from heaven to Sheol) that David can rest assured that his God will lead him and that his "right hand shall hold" him secure.

The Spirit's omniscience and omnipresence always assumes the Spirit's *omnipotence*. Even in Psalm 139 the Spirit's omnipresence is meant to display the power of God, whose works are wonderful (139:14), who determines our days before they begin (139:16), and whose thoughts are vast (139:17). Throughout Scripture the Spirit is referred to as the power of God (Mic 3:8; Luke 1:35; Acts 1:8; 10:38; 1 Cor 2:4; 1 Thess 1:5; 2 Tim 1:7). As we have seen, such a reference does not negate the Spirit's personhood. It does, however, highlight his attribute of omnipotence (e.g., Rom 15:13, 19).[46] In Luke's birth narrative, for instance, the angel Gabriel appears to Mary with the incredible news that the child in her womb is the "Son of the Most High." Mary responds, "How will this be, since I am a virgin?" Gabriel answers, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy—the Son of God" (Luke 1:33-35). What is physically impossible with man, is absolutely possible for God because of the Spirit who descends upon Mary with divine power. Therefore, the Spirit is often titled the *Spiritus Recreator*, for he creates not only physical life, but spiritual life as well. As we will see, the Spirit's divine power takes the dead sinner and breaths new life into him, making him a new creature in Christ (John 3:5-8), exhibiting his divine omnipotence in salvation (cf. Matt 19:26).[47]

Finally, the Spirit is *eternal*. In the book of Hebrews we read,

> But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation) he entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the sprinkling of defiled persons with the ashes of a heifer, sanctify for the purification of the flesh, how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify our conscience from dead works to serve the living God (Heb 9:11-14).

The entire ministry of Christ is characterized by the presence of the Holy Spirit. In Hebrews 9 Christ is spoken of as our great high priest who has entered into the holy place once for all by means of his own blood and in doing so has secured an eternal redemption (Heb 9:12). But the author goes on to specify that Christ offered himself up on the cross as a blood sacrifice without blemish "through the eternal Spirit." Consequently, believers have a conscience that is purified from dead works and liberated to serve the living God (9:14). Two observations are in order: (1) Hebrews 9 is explicit in affirming that the Spirit is eternal, not created at some point in time (contra Arianism); and (2) Christ's sacrifice secures an eternal redemption but this eternal redemption is only possible through an *eternal* Spirit. As O'Brien observes, "the Holy Spirit anointed Jesus as high priest for every aspect of his ministry, including his sacrificial death."[48]

Certainly many other divine attributes could be mentioned, but what has been seen with attributes like holiness, omniscience, omnipresence, omnipotence, and eternality is that the Spirit is fully God, possessing the very attributes of God.[49]

THE SPIRIT PERFORMS THE WORKS OF GOD.

One of the strongest pieces of evidence in support of the deity of the Spirit can be found in the *divine works* that Scripture attributes to the Spirit. If the Spirit shares in the one divine nature, being equal in deity to the Father and the Son, then we

would expect the Spirit to also perform the very works of God, thereby attesting to his divinity. When we examine the Scriptures, this is exactly what we find.

The Holy Spirit Creates and Sustains the Universe.

Scripture begins with the creation of the universe. From the very start we learn not only that God is the creator of the heavens and the earth, but the text hints that the Spirit is involved as well. Genesis 1:2 reads, "The earth was without form and void, and darkness was over the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters." Verse 2 is the launching pad for the rest of chapter 1, for it communicates that something supernatural is about to happen, namely, God is going to begin creating everything that exists. But it is the Spirit of God who is hovering over the waters in preparation for creation.[50] In other words, it is through the Spirit that God speaks into existence all of creation.[51] As John Calvin remarks, Genesis 1:2 shows that "the beauty of the universe (which we now perceive) owes its strength and preservation to the power of the Spirit."[52]

The role of the Spirit in creation is elaborated upon in Psalm 104, which highlights the greatness of God in creation. The psalmist begins by praising the Lord who is "very great!" He is the one who stretches out the heavens like a tent (104:2), lays the beams of his chambers on the waters (104:3), makes the clouds his chariot, and rides on the wings of the wind (104:3). He "set the earth on its foundations, so that it should never be moved" and "covered it with the deep as with a garment" (104:5-6). The psalmist proceeds, explaining that God sets the boundaries of the earth in place and is the creator and sustainer of all things (104:7-29). And then verse 30; "When you send forth your Spirit, they are created, and you renew the face of the ground" (cf. Ps 33:6; Job 26:13; 33:4, 14-15).[53] Surely this work of creation and renewal is the work of God and only can be attributed to the Spirit if he is fully God. Calvin summarizes the matter well, "For it is the Spirit who, everywhere diffused, sustains all things, causes them to grow, and quickens them in heaven and in earth. Because he is circumscribed by no limits, he is excepted from the category of creatures; but in transfusing into all things his energy, and breathing into them essence, life, and movement, he is indeed plainly divine."[54]

The Holy Spirit Breathes out Scripture.

It should not surprise us that the Spirit is the divine person by which the Scriptures are inspired. He is not only the Trinitarian agent through whom the heavens and the earth are created, but he is the one through whom the Scriptures are created by means of human authors. He is the *rûach* (OT) or *pneuma* (NT) of God. Therefore when the biblical authors say that the Scriptures are breathed out by God (*theopneustos*) they are affirming that the Scriptures are the product of the Holy Spirit.[55] For example, in 2 Timothy 3:16-17 we read, "All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work." But in 2 Peter 1:21 we discover how exactly the Scriptures are "breathed out by God." Peter writes, "For no prophecy was ever produced by the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit." So Scripture is God-breathed (*theopneustos*) by means of the Holy Spirit who is said to have "carried along" the human authors so that what they wrote was not their own invention, but exactly what God intended (they "spoke from God"). In both of these texts it is evident that the inspiration of Scripture is the work of God. Therefore, it follows that if this work is attributed to the Spirit he must be God.

Other passages support the Spirit's role in divine inspiration as well. Throughout the OT it is the Spirit who comes upon the prophets so that they speak the word of God (Num 11:25; 24:2; 1 Sam 10:10; 18:10; 19:23; 2 Kings 2:9; 2 Chron

18:23; 24:20; Isa 61:1; Ezek 2:2; Mic 3:8). And it is the Spirit whom Jesus promises to send for the Spirit is the one who will speak through the disciples (Matt 10:19-20; Mark 13:11) and teach them what they should say (Luke 12:12). One of the most persuasive passages, however, is Acts 28:25-26 where Paul quotes from Isaiah 6:9, saying, "The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your fathers through Isaiah the prophet: 'Go to this people, and say, You will indeed hear but never understand, and you will indeed see but never perceive'" (Acts 28:25-26). But when we look at Isaiah 6:9 the text does not mention the Spirit but simply says that God spoke through Isaiah ("voice of the Lord" in 6:8). In other words, "Lord" and "Spirit" are used interchangeably by Paul. The Spirit is the divine person by whom the Lord speaks through his prophet. By substituting "Spirit" for "Lord" Paul is assuming the deity of the Spirit.[56]

The Holy Spirit Regenerates Sinners.

The Spirit not only creates the universe and the Scriptures, but he also creates new life within dead sinners and therefore can be titled the *Spiritus Recreator*.[57] To clarify, the work of redemption as a whole is by nature Trinitarian. All three persons of the Trinity work together (*opus commune*) to accomplish salvation and, as Robert Letham states, "not one of the persons works by himself in isolation from the others."[58] Or as Augustine asserted, since the three persons are inseparable in their divine unity and essence, so also "do they work inseparably."[59] Therefore, there is a triadic pattern to our redemption whereby the plan of salvation "is brought about from the Father through the Son by the Holy Spirit."[60] Consequently, every act of redemption involves not just one but all three persons of the Trinity so that the *opera ad extra trinitatis indivisa sunt*. Or in the words of John Owen, "by whatsoever act we hold communion with any one person, there is an *influence* from every person to the putting forth of that act."[61] Such is the case in effectual calling, to take but one example. The Father calls (John 6:44, 65; 1 Cor 1:9; 1 Thess 2:12; 1 Pet 5:10), to and through his Son (Matt 11:28; Luke 5:32; John 6:44, 65; 7:37; Rom 1:6), by the power of the Spirit (Matt 10:20; John 15:26; Acts 5:31-32).[62]

Nevertheless, while each act of redemption involves each person of the Trinity, one of the three persons may take on the central role as the focal agent in any one particular saving act. For example, while the Father *plans* salvation (Eph 1:4-5), the Son is sent by the Father to *accomplish* salvation (Eph 1:7), and the Father and the Son send the Spirit to *apply* salvation (Eph 1:13-14).[63] Or, in the words of Johannes van der Kemp, "the Father ordained grace for the elect, the Son purchased it, and the Holy Ghost applies and dispenses it to the favorites of God."[64] As Augustine teaches, all three persons of the Trinity have a part in the work of each person and yet each work is attributed to one person in particular.[65] Such is the case in the application of salvation. It is the Holy Spirit in particular who takes on the focal role in Scripture as the one who makes the new birth effectual (John 3:3-5; Titus 3:5).[66] As the Nicene-Constantinople Creed states, the Holy Spirit is "the Lord and Giver of Life." Likewise, John Calvin concludes, "To sum up, the Holy Spirit is the bond by which Christ effectually unites us to himself."[67] In other words, it is the Spirit who brings about our union with Christ (Rom 8:10-11, 15; Gal 4:6). Therefore, it is specifically the Spirit who is the efficient cause of the new birth.[68]

For example, Jesus shocks Nicodemus when he says that he must be born again to enter the kingdom of God (John 3:3). But notice, this new birth is of "the Spirit" (John 3:7).[69] Therefore, Jesus can compare the Spirit to the wind. "The wind blows where it wishes, and you hear its sound, but you do not know where it comes from or where it goes. So it is with everyone who is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8). Likewise, Paul will attribute the new birth to the Spirit in Titus 3:5 where the "washing of regeneration" is connected to the "renewal of the Holy Spirit, whom he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior" (cf. Ezek 36:25-27). Or consider 1 Corinthians 6:11, "You were washed

[i.e., regeneration], you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God." Clearly Paul believed that regeneration was the work of the Holy Spirit. But who, other than God himself, has either the power or the right to take a condemned, dead, and corrupt sinner and breathe new spiritual life within him, so that he consequently repents and trusts in Christ? And yet this divine, sovereign, and supernatural work is credited to the Spirit!

The Holy Spirit Justifies and Sanctifies.

We cannot ignore the fact that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 6:11, not only says regeneration is the work of the Spirit, but so also is justification. We rarely speak of justification in such terms, acknowledging that it is the Spirit that brings about our justification. But it is the Spirit who not only breathes new life into our spiritual dead corpse (regeneration), but then grants us faith and repentance (Acts 13:48; Eph 2:8-10; Phil 1:29-30; 2 Pet 1:1; 2 Tim 2:24-26; Acts 5:31; 11:18), faith being the instrumental cause of our justification.

But perhaps the Spirit receives the most attention in relation to sanctification (Gal 5:22-23). In Scripture it is the Spirit of holiness who is qualified and able to lead the believer in the pursuit of holiness. In his opening letter Peter addresses believers as elect exiles "according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in the sanctification of the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus Christ and for sprinkling with his blood" (1 Pet 1:1-2). Sanctification can be defined in two ways, as definite and progressive. Definite sanctification is not a life long process, but, as John Murray calls it, a "once-for-all definitive act" (1 Cor 1:2; 6:11; Rom 6:2, 6, 14, 17).[70] A decisive breach with sin has occurred and the believer has been irreversibly and decisively united with Christ (Eph 2:4-6; Col 3:1; Rom 6:4, 11; 2 Cor 5:17).[71] On the other hand, progressive sanctification is an ongoing process where the Spirit is at work within the believer so that he grows in godliness, mortifies sin, becomes more like Christ, and seeks to do all things to the glory of God. Peter may have either in view.

But other passages speak specifically of the Spirit's work in a progressive manner. For example, Paul writes to the Romans, stating that those in Christ have no condemnation for "the law of the Spirit of life has set you free in Christ Jesus from the law of sin and death" (Rom 8:1). Grounding our confidence in the atoning death of Christ, Paul then moves to the Spirit, reminding us that since we are in Christ we are no longer to walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit (8:4). While the mind set on the flesh leads to death, the mind set on the Spirit leads to life and peace (8:8). But how do we know we are not of the flesh but of the Spirit? You are in the Spirit "if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you" (8:9). It is this same indwelling Spirit who will one day give life to our mortal bodies and he is able to do it since he is the one who raised Christ from the dead (8:11; cf. 1 Pet 3:18). Only if the Spirit is fully God can he be attributed with sanctifying the believer and one day granting the believer resurrection life as he did Christ Jesus.

Paul highlights the Spirit's work of sanctification in Ephesians as well. After discussing the mystery of the gospel Paul says,

> For this reason I bow my knees before the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, that according to the riches of his glory he may grant you to be strengthened with power through his Spirit in your inner being, so that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith—that you, being rooted and grounded in love, may have strength to comprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ that surpasses knowledge, that you may be filled with all the fullness of God (Eph 3:14-19).

According to Paul, Christ dwells in our hearts through faith when God strengthens believers through the Spirit. In doing so believers possess the strength they need to comprehend the love of Christ and be filled with God's fullness. Surely the

Spirit is divine if he is the one who brings about the fullness of God within the believer, as he does wisdom and knowledge (Eph 1:17).[72]

Paul's focus on the Spirit and Christ is reiterated in 2 Corinthians 3. Paul begins by emphasizing the newness of the new covenant. Those in the new covenant no longer have the law written on tablets of stone but rather on the tablets of their hearts (3:2; cf. Exod 24:12; 31:18; 32:15; 34:1; Deut 9:10), as promised in Jeremiah 31:33 (cf. Ezek 11:19; 36:26; Heb 8:10). God has written on the heart not with ink but with "the Spirit of the living God" (3:3). Therefore, says Paul, he is a minister of "a new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit." The letter kills, but "the Spirit gives life" (3:6). Paul continues, arguing from the lesser to the greater, that if the ministry under Moses brought glory with it (a "ministry of condemnation" as he calls it), how much more "the ministry of the Spirit," which is a permanent ministry of righteousness (3:8)? Paul then concludes,

> Since we have such a hope, we are very bold, not like Moses, who would put a veil over his face so that the Israelites might not gaze at the outcome of what was being brought to an end. But their minds were hardened. For to this day, when they read the old covenant, that same veil remains unlifted, because only through Christ is it taken away. Yes, to this day whenever Moses is read a veil lies over their hearts. But when one turns to the Lord, the veil is removed. Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. And we all, with unveiled face, beholding the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another. For this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit (2 Cor 3:12-18).

Christ has removed the "veil" over our hearts. How so? Paul explains that it is through the Spirit for the "Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom." Therefore, because the veil has been lifted, we are able to behold the glory of the Lord as we are being transformed into his likeness. But this can only take place if it is the Lord's doing, specifically the "Lord who is the Spirit." Paul's language, which connects "Lord" and "Spirit," in no way confuses the persons (i.e., modalism), but rather preserves their distinctiveness while at the same time highlighting their unity in purpose, namely, the salvation of the sinner.

One more point deserves attention. As those who are being transformed by the Spirit, we also can say that the Spirit dwells within us. Texts like 1 Corinthians 3:16-17 and 6:19-20 teach that we are temples of the Holy Spirit. And in Ephesians 5:18 Paul commands us to be filled with the Spirit (cf. Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 9:17; 13:9, 52). Clearly, in Paul's mind, if one is indwelt or filled with the Spirit one is indwelt or filled by God himself. As Paul makes evident in 1 Corinthians 3:16-17, "Do you not know that you are God's temple and that God's Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God's temple, God will destroy him. For God's temple is holy, and you are that temple." Therefore, Erickson correctly states, "By equating the phrase 'God's temple' with the phrase 'a temple of the Holy Spirit,' Paul makes it clear that the Holy Spirit is God."[73]

To conclude, many other divine works are accomplished by the Spirit. The Spirit is said to baptize the believer (Matt 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16; 1 Cor 12:13), seal the believer (Eph 1:3), make the believer aware of his adoption (Rom 8:15), indwell the believer (John 14:17; 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19), pour out God's love in our hearts (Rom 5:5), confer gifts on God's people (Judg 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 1 Cor 12:4-11; Eph 4:11; Heb 2:4), intercede as an advocate on behalf of God's children (John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7; Rom 8:26), judge the wicked and the righteous (John 16:8-11), convict the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment (John 16:8), give physical life (Gen 2:7; Job 33:4; Ps 104:30; John 3:5-8; 6:63; Rom 8:11; 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 3:6),

etc. Each and every one of these divine works only serves to verify the deity of the Spirit.

WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THE DEITY OF THE SPIRIT MAKE?

What difference does the deity of the Spirit make? According to Enlightenment philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), "The doctrine of the Trinity, taken literally, has no practical relevance at all, even if we think we understand it; and it is even more clearly irrelevant if we realize that it transcends all our concepts."[74] Should Kant's dismissal of the Trinity in all things pastoral and practical be adopted, then the deity of the Holy Spirit matters little, if at all, for the Christian life. But what we see in Scripture is a very different picture than the one Kant has painted. Indeed, we see the exact opposite. Everything hinges on the reality of the Trinity. And likewise with the Spirit; the divinity of the Spirit could not have greater practical relevance for Christian faith and living.

Pneumatology and Soteriology

What would be lost if the deity of the Spirit is not true? Feinberg's answer is sobering:

> As to the Holy Spirit, if he is not fully God, the implications for salvation are again serious. Scripture teaches that the Holy Spirit regenerates believers and indwells and fills them, but if the Holy Spirit is a lesser God or no God at all, how can we be sure that he can do any of these things? Moreover, unless he is coequal in being and purpose with the Father and the Son, what guarantees that even if he tried to do such things, the Father and the Son would recognize his actions as appropriate and relate to us accordingly?[75]

Though this study has not focused on the Spirit's essential role in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, it is certainly the case that apart from the Spirit we have no atonement for our salvation. As Fred Sanders observes, even the title "Christ" implies that Jesus is the "Son of David anointed by the Spirit." Therefore, "without the Spirit there could be no Christ to accomplish salvation."[76] As Hebrews makes clear, the blood of Christ purifies our conscience from dead works because Christ offered himself to God without blemish "through the eternal Spirit" (Heb 9:14).

But not only is it through the Spirit that we have redemption accomplished, but redemption applied as well. As seen above, regeneration, conversion, justification, adoption, sanctification, and perseverance are all the works of the Spirit. But if the Spirit is not divine, then each of these works are emptied of their salvific effect. Stated positively, it is the *deity* of the Spirit that is the very basis of the *work* of the Spirit. Athanasius and the Cappadocian fathers firmly established that if Christ is not fully God, then he has no power to save. Can we not say the same about the Spirit? If the Spirit is not fully God, then he has no power to save. Therefore, our salvation, from the moment of the new birth to our glorification, rests entirely upon the divinity of the Spirit.

Furthermore, if the Spirit is not divine, not only is it impossible for him to apply the work of salvation within us, but the work of the Father and the Son remain incomplete. In other words, what the Son has done *for us* means nothing if the Spirit's work *in us* is incomplete due to a divine deficiency. Sanders, quoting Puritan John Flavel, explains, "The reason God's work waits on the fulfillment of the Spirit is that the Spirit is God. It would be insulting to say that 'all that the Father has done... and all that the Son has done' is ineffectual until completed by some outside force. Flavel's point is that the Spirit is not some outside force, but a force internal to the being of God, of the same substance as God the Father and God the Son."[77]

Pneumatology and Doxology

We opened this study by quoting the Nicene-Constantinople Creed: We believe "in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and life-giver, who proceeds from the Father, who is worshipped and glorified together with the Father and the Son, who spoke

by the prophets." The Spirit is to be *worshipped and glorified* with the Father and Son. What is lost if the deity of the Spirit is not true? Answer: Christian worship.

Robert Letham argues that in the West the Trinity has been removed from the center of Christian worship and instead has been marginalized. However, says Letham, when we look down the halls of church history, we see a different story. Reformers like Calvin and Puritans like Owen not only argued for the deity of all three persons, but argued "forcibly for the distinct worship of the three."[78] What distinguishes Christianity is its worship, which is distinctively and thoroughly Trinitarian. As John Owen writes,

> The proper and peculiar object of divine worship and invocation is *the essence of God*, in its infinite excellency, dignity, majesty.... Now this is common to all three persons, and is proper to each of them; not formally as a person, but as God blessed for ever. All adoration respects that which is common to all; so that in each act of adoration and worship all are to be adored and worshipped.[79]

Owen goes on to argue that our communion with God is a communion with the Trinity. How incomplete our communion with God is if the personhood and the deity of the Spirit are denied. Letham, relying on Calvin, observes that while our salvation comes down to us from the Father through the Son by the Spirit, in the church's worship the "reverse movement" occurs—by the Holy Spirit through Christ to the Father.[80] But apart from the Spirit, our worship of and communion with the Father and the Son is impossible. It is the Spirit who grants us faith in Christ and ignites our affections for Christ. Should his personhood and divinity be abandoned, we no longer have a basis for our entire relationship with God, nor an ability to worship in "Spirit and in truth" (John 4:23-24). May we not forget that when we call upon our Father, on the basis of his Son's blood, we do so in the power of the Spirit.[81]

ENDNOTES

[1] Athanasius, Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit, 1.21, in *Letters of St. Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit* (trans. C. R. B. Shapland; New York: Philosophical Library, 1951), 121. Also see idem, Statement of Faith, 4, in *Nicene- and Post-Nicene Fathers* (ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, Philip Schaff et al., 2nd ser., 14 vols.; Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1994), 4:84.

[2] Athanasius, Letters to Serapion on the Holy Spirit, 1.2, in *Letters of St. Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit*, 64-65.

[3] Gregg R. Allison, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to Christian Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 239.

[4] Robert Letham, *The Holy Trinity: In Scripture, History, Theology, and Worship* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2004), 141; Joel C. Elowsky, "Introduction," in *We Believe in the Holy Spirit, vol. 4 of Ancient Christian Doctrine*, (ed. Thomas C. Oden; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009), xxiv-xxv.

[5] For the pneumatological development at Nicea, see Khaled Anatolios, *Retrieving Nicaea: The Development and Meaning of Trinitarian Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011), 133-48, 204-12, 287-88.

[6] Letham, *The Holy Trinity*, 162.

[7] As quoted in ibid.

[8] Ibid.

[9] For the debate over why homoousios is not used by the creed, see ibid., 172-83.

[10] The exception to the rule would be Oneness Pentecostalism where not only the deity and person of the Spirit are compromised, but the entire Trinity is reconfigured in a heretical direction.

[11] Fred Sanders, *The Deep Things of God: How the Trinity Changes Everything* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010), 11-12.

[12] "Very often, believers assume that Jesus walks with them and the Father guides them but the Spirit has little practical relevance. The Spirit, however, is important and central to, and immanently involved in, his creation, the church, and individual believers—more often and more regularly, more intentionally and strategically, than most believers realize." Keith Warrington, *The Message of the Holy Spirit* (Downers

Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2009), 13.

[13]Space does not permit a detailed overview of the Spirit from OT to NT, but see Warrington, *Holy Spirit*, 15-244; Graham A. Cole, *He Who Gives Life: The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2007), 95-280; Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 431-508.

[14]In their *New World Translation*, Jehovah Witnesses translate "Holy Spirit" as "holy spirit," refusing to include the article, all in an effort to deny the personhood and deity of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is a mere force or power (an "it" not a "he"). They also appeal to the use of the neuter gender in the Greek in reference to the "Holy Spirit." However, as James White observes, "Inanimate things can have masculine and feminine genders, and personal things can have the neuter gender. We cannot automatically insert the pronoun 'it' when referring to every neuter noun any more than we should always insert the pronoun 'she' for 'love,' since love in Greek is feminine." Additionally, while in Greek pneuma (spirit) is neuter, often times when the New Testament authors use the word they apply a masculine pronoun with it (e.g., John 14:17, 26; 16:14; 1 Cor 12:11). James White, *The Forgotten Trinity: Recovering the Heart of Christian Belief* (Minneapolis: Bethany House, 1998), 140. However, see footnote 31 for the debate over the masculine pronoun.

[15]Notice, however, that the "Spirit" is associated not only with "power" but with other qualities such as "wisdom" (Exod 28:3; 31:3; 35:31; Deut 34:9; Isa 11:2; Dan 5:11, 14; Luke 1:17; 2:40; Acts 6:101 Cor 2:4; 12:8; Eph 1:17).

[16]John Frame, *The Doctrine of God* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2002), 691.

[17]The Spirit speaks directly to the church in Acts 13:2, "Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them." Or consider Acts 10:19-20, "And while Peter was pondering the vision, the Spirit said to him, 'Behold, three men are looking for you. Rise and go down and accompany them without hesitation, for I have sent them.'"

[18]Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians* (Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 271-72.

[19]Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998), 443, 446; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 523-24, 526-27.

[20]Some may object that the Spirit is not a person because Scripture says we are baptized in the Spirit. After all, how can someone be baptized into another person? However, does Scripture not affirm our baptism into Christ (see Rom 6:3; Gal 3:27)? Consequently believers are said to be "in Christ." If our baptism into Christ is not doubted, why would we question our baptism into the Spirit? See White, *The Forgotten Trinity*, 147.

[21]Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2004), 878.

[22]When I refer to the "mind" or "will" of the Spirit, I am using these terms to highlight and defend the personhood of the Spirit. However, it needs to be clarified that I am not arguing that the Spirit has a distinct or separate "mind" or "will" from the Father and the Son. Rather, I hold the view that there is one divine mind and one divine will in the Triune God, rather than three minds and three wills. In short, it is not as though the Father has his own mind and will, the Son has his own mind and will, and the Spirit has his own mind and will. To the contrary, there is one divine mind and one divine will in God that each person of the Trinity shares completely and fully. For debate on this issue, see Michael C. Rae, "The Trinity," in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophical Theology* (ed. Thomas P. Flint and Michael C. Rea; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 403-29.

[23]Cole, *He Who Gives Life*, 68.

[24]John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (ed. John T. McNeil; trans. Ford Lewis Battles; vols. 20–21; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), 1.13.14.

[25]Others may prefer the word "emotions." I am avoiding this word due to the baggage that our postmodern era attaches to it.

[26]Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids:

Eerdmans, 1999), 347-48; Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians* (Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 306. Calvin also observes how in passages like Isa 63:10 "grieving" the Spirit demonstrates his divinity. "Again, where God complains that he was provoked to anger by the stubbornness of his people, Isaiah writes that 'his Holy Spirit was grieved' [Isa. 63:10 p.]." Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1.13.15.

[27]White, *The Forgotten Trinity*, 145.

[28]Carson points out that "Helper" may not be the best word choice since it "has overtones of being subordinate or inferior, overtones clearly absent from John 14-16." D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 499.

[29]Letham, *The Holy Trinity*, 58. Also see Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 436-38.

[30]Many of the fathers appealed to the Spirit's eternal procession (or spiration) from the Father and the Son as proof of the Spirit's deity and personhood as well. See Letham, *The Holy Trinity*, 205.

[31]There is debate as to whether or not the masculine pronoun ekeinos ("he") in John 14:26; 15:26; and 16:8, 13-14 lends support to the personhood of the Spirit. Take John 14:26, for example. J. I. Packer, Millard Erickson, and many others make the argument that "Spirit" (pneuma) is neuter, but John intentionally uses the masculine pronoun "he" (ekeinos) instead of the neuter "it" (ekeino) in order to emphasize the personhood of the Spirit. J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1984), 61; Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 876. However, Daniel Wallace argues that such a grammatical argument is erroneous and instead the case for the personality of the Spirit must be made on the basis of what Jesus says about the Spirit. Daniel Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 331-32. Also see Andrew Malone, "Essential Theology: The Personhood of the Holy Spirit and Masculine Pronouns in John's Gospel," *Essentials* (Autumn 2005): 7-8; Cole, *He Who Gives Life*, 69.

[32]One qualification, however, is needed. In Scripture, the mission of the Spirit is so closely connected to the mission of the Son that Scripture can speak of the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ (Rom 8:9-10; 2 Cor 3:17-18). This does not mean that the Spirit is identical to the Son (or the Father) as a person. While the Spirit and the Son and the Father are one in being (essence; *ousia*), nevertheless they are distinct in personhood (i.e., three persons; *hypostaseis*). Such a qualification is essential if we are to avoid the trappings of both modalism and Tritheism.

[33]By "share" I do not mean that the Spirit has one-third of the divine essence, as do the Father and the Son. Instead, I am using "share" to mean that the Spirit is fully, one-hundred percent God, completely possessing the one, undivided divine essence.

[34]Also see, Rom 1:1-4; 5:1-5; 6:4; 8:1-17; 15:16, 30; 1 Cor 6:11; 8:6; 12:4-6; 2 Cor 1:21-22; 3:3-4; 5:5-8; 13:14; Gal 4:6; Eph 1:3-14; 2:18-22; 3:2-5, 14-17; 4:4-6; 5:18-20; Phil 3:3; Col 1:6-7; 3:16-17; 1 Thess 1:2-6; 5:18-19; 2 Thess 2:13-14; 1 Tim 3:15-16; Titus 3:4-6; Heb 2:3-4; 6:4-6; 9:14; 10:29-31; 1 Pet 1:2; 4:13-19; 1 John 4:2, 13-14; 5:6-12; Jude 20-21; Rev 1:4-5.

[35]In my view, "seven spirits" is a reference to the Holy Spirit. See Rev 3:1; 4:5; etc. Seven represents perfection.

[36]Other passages seem to reference only the Father and the Spirit (e.g., Acts 9:31).

[37]Likewise, consider Acts 7:51 where Stephen says that the Jews, as did their Fathers, always resist the Holy Spirit. In looking back on the OT, however, it is evident that Israel resisted God. Again, the inference of deity is present.

[38]See Hamilton, *God's Indwelling Presence*. For a recent study of the Spirit in the OT, see David G. Firth and Paul D. Wegner, eds., *Presence, Power, and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2011).

[39]See Richard A. Muller, *The Triunity of God, vol. 4 of Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: The Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 368.

[40]For the distinction between the gospel call and the effectual call, see Matthew Barrett, *Reclaiming Monergism: The Case for Sovereign Grace in Effectual Calling and Regeneration* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2013), chapter 2.

[41]See Anatolios, *Retrieving Nicaea*, 209.

[42]Cole notes, "In Scripture, God's name is about identification.… Brevard S. Childs comments, 'God's identity has been made known through his name.' The name of God says something about his very nature. Charles H. H. Scobie goes so far as to argue that, '. . . God's name is an expression of his essential nature.'" Cole, *He Who Gives Life*, 70. See Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 371; Charles H. H. Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An Approach to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 108, emphasis original.

[43]Other names that are attached to the Spirit demonstrate his possession of divine attributes as well (e.g., "Spirit of truth" in John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; Eph 1:3; 1 John 4:6).

[44]By omniscience I am referring to God's exhaustive, meticulous knowledge of the past, present, and future (contra open theism).

[45]Cole, *He Who Gives Life*, 71. Cole observes that this same point was made by Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles of Saint Thomas Aquinas*, (trans. Joseph Rickaby; London: Burns & Oates, 1905), 4.17.7.

[46]The omnipotence of the Spirit is a theme that can be traced throughout the pages of the Old and New Testaments. To take just one OT example, in Judges 14:6 "Spirit of the Lord" is said to have rushed upon Sampson empowering him to tear a roaring lion into pieces. And in Judges 14:19 the "Spirit of the Lord rushed upon" Sampson again, enabling him to strike down thirty men, and then once again in order to defeat the 1,000 Philistines with the jaw bone of a donkey (Judg 14:14-16; cf. 1 Sam 11:6-7).

[47]See Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 874.

[48]Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Hebrews* (The Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 325.

[49]For example, the Holy Spirit is said to be the grace and love of God given to believers for progress in godliness (Rom 5:5; 15:30; 2 Cor 6:6; Gal 5:16-17; Phil 2:1; Col 1:8). Elsewhere Scripture seems to say (or infer) the Spirit is incomprehensible (Isa 40:13), good (Ps 143:10), and possesses the divine glory (1 Pet 4:14).

[50]Both the ESV and NIV translate rûach as "Spirit," but the NRSV translates the verse as "a wind from God swept over the face of the waters." But even evangelicals divide on the matter. Gordon J. Wenham offer yet another translation, capitalizing the "W" in wind: "And the Wind of God hovered over the waters." Wenham sees the "Wind of God" as a "concrete and vivid image of the Spirit of God." Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Word Biblical Commentary; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987), comment on Gen 1:2. On the other hand, John H. Sailhamer argues that "Spirit" is a superior translation since hovering is a description of God's creation in the tabernacle (Exod 31:3), as well as Moses' description of God hovering like an eagle over its nest (Deut 32:11). John H. Sailhamer, "Genesis," in *Genesis-Leviticus* (rev. ed.; Expositor's Biblical Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), comment on Gen 1:2. Cole agrees with Sailhamer. "I find it hard to imagine a wind that hovers (or a breath that hovers, for that matter). But I can imagine a hovering eagle and such a metaphor used of a living reality such as the Spirit of God." Cole, *He Who Gives Life*, 99. Furthermore, to read Gen 1:2 through a Trinitarian lens (or as Christian Scripture) is, I believe, justified for it takes into consideration the dual authorship of Scripture (2 Tim 3:16; 2 Pet 1:21), as well as the progressive nature of divine revelation from OT to NT. See Cole, *He Who Gives Life*, 109. Also see Stephen G. Dempster, "Geography and Genealogy, Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible," in *Biblical Theology: Retrospect and Prospect* (ed. Scott J. Hafemann, Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), 67-68.

[51]In Col 1:16 we discover that the Son is involved in creation as well ("For by him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible"), demonstrating that creation is a Trinitarian work through and through.

[52]Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1.13.14.

[53]Calvin observes how many of the early church fathers also appealed to Psalm 33:6. "They [the Patristics] thought it justifiable to cite from David, 'By the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all their power by the spirit of his mouth' [Ps 33:6 p.], to prove that the universe was no less the work of the Holy Spirit than the Son." However, Calvin does not believe this is the best argument. "But since it is common practice in The Psalms to repeat the same thing twice, and since in Isaiah 'spirit of his mouth' means the same things as 'the word' [Isa. 11:4], that was a weak reason." Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 1.13.15.

[54]Ibid., 1.13.14. Also, see Abraham Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (trans. Henri De Vries; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 22-27.

[55]Both terms can mean "wind," "breath," or "spirit." Context is key in determining the meaning.

[56]The same point can be seen in comparing: Heb 3:7-11 with Ps 95:7-11 (cf. Deut 9:24-25; 32:12); Heb 9:7-10 with Lev 16:1-34; Heb 10:15-17 with Jer 31:31-34; 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:16 with Lev 26:11-13; Isa 63:10 with Ps 95:1, 8-9.

[57]Regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit to unite the elect sinner to Christ by breathing new life into that dead and depraved sinner so as to raise him from spiritual death to spiritual life, removing his heart of stone and giving him a heart of flesh, so that he is washed, born from above and now able to repent and trust in Christ as a new creation. Moreover, regeneration is the act of God alone and therefore it is monergistic in nature, accomplished by the sovereign act of the Spirit apart from and unconditioned upon man's will to believe. In short, man's faith does not cause regeneration but regeneration causes man's faith. For an extensive treatment of the Spirit's work in regeneration, see Barrett, *Reclaiming Monergism*, chapter 4.

[58]Letham, *The Holy Trinity* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2004), 157. Here Letham is summarizing Gregory of Nyssa. Letham continues, "Every work of God originates from the Father, proceeds through the Son, and is perfected in the Holy Spirit. However, these are not three different things, but one and the same work of God."

[59]Augustine, *The Trinity: De Trinitate, in The Works of Saint Augustine* (ed. John E. Rotelle; trans. Edmund Hill; New York: New City, 1991), 70. Elsewhere Augustine states, "Therefore, as there is an equality and inseparability of the persons, not only of the Father and the Son, but also of the Holy Spirit, so also the works are inseparable." *Tractates on the Gospel of John 11-27* (trans. John W. Rettig; The Fathers of the Church; Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1988), 166. Also see *Augustine, Sermons: III (51-94) on the New Testament, The Works of Saint Augustine* (ed. Jon E. Rotelle; trans. Edmund Hill; New York: New City, 1991), 50-52.

[60]Letham, *Holy Trinity*, 81, 95.

[61]John Owen, *Communion with the Triune God* (ed. Kelly M. Kapic and Justin Taylor; Wheaton: Crossway, 2007), 105-06. Also see J. Van Genderen and W. H. Velema, *Reformed Dogmatics* (trans. Gerrit Bilkes and Ed M. van der Maas; Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2008), 159.

[62]Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2003), 57.

[63]Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics* (ed. John Bolt; trans. John Vriend; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 3:570.

[64]Johannes van der Kemp, *The Christian Entirely the Property of Christ, in Life and Death, Exhibited in Fifty-three Sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism* (trans. John M. Harlingen; Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage, 1997), 5, quoted in Muller, *The Triunity of God*, 4:274.

[65]Augustine, *Tractates on the Gospel of John 11-27*, Tractate 20. Also see Letham, *Holy Trinity*, 187, 404-05; John S. Feinberg, *No One Like Him: The Doctrine of God* (Foundations of Evangelical Theology; Wheaton: Crossway, 2001), 488 (cf. 470); Genderen and Velema, *Reformed Dogmatics*, 159-60.

[66]"While the term 'regeneration' is not strictly associated with the work of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, the idea of inauguration into the kingdom of God as a Spirit-wrought new birth is widespread and is in fact foundational in Johannine theology." Sinclair Ferguson, *Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 118.

[67]Calvin, *Institutes* 3.1.1. Calvin states in his commen-

tary on John 14:16, the role of the Spirit "is to make us partakers not only of Christ Himself, but of all his blessings." Calvin, Commentary on the Gospel According to John (trans. William Pringle; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 92-93. Also see "The Westminster Confession," in *Creeds and Confessions of the Reformation Era, vol. 2 of Creeds & Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* (ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Valerie Hotchkiss; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 24.3.

[68]On the Spirit as the principal efficient cause, see Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (ed. James T. Dennison, Jr.; trans. George Musgrave Giger; Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1994), 2:524.

[69]John mentions "water" along with "Spirit," which I take as symbolic language that conveys the Spirit's ability to spiritually cleanse the sinner, building off the promise in Ezek 36:25-27. Paul will use similar language in Titus 3:5 and 1 Cor 6:11.

[70]John Murray, "Definitive Sanctification," in *Collected Writings of John Murray* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1977), 2:277.

[71]See Anthony A. Hoekema, *Saved by Grace* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 203-204.

[72]O'Brien, *Ephesians*, 257-58.

[73]Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 864.

[74]Immanuel Kant, *The Conflict of the Faculties* (trans. Mary J. Gregory; New York: Abaris Books, 1979), 65. Similarly, see Karl Rahner, *The Trinity* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1970), 10-11. Thomas R. Thompson correctly concludes from Kant's Trinitarian skepticism that in "modernity the Trinity's practical and ethical significance has largely been lost on the Western church tradition." Thomas R. Thompson, "Trinitarianism Today: Doctrinal Renaissance, Ethical Relevance, Social Redolence," Calvin Theological Journal 32 (1997): 10.

[75]Feinberg, *No One Like Him*, 440. Cole, *He Who Gives Life*, 69, makes this point as well.

[76]Sanders, *The Deep Things of God*, 148.

[77]Ibid.,144. Flavel's words cannot be improved upon: "The Father has elected, and the Son has redeemed; but until the Spirit (who is the last cause) has wrought his part also, we cannot be saved. For he comes in the Father's and in the Son's name and authority, to complete the work of our salvation, by bringing all the fruits of election and redemption home to our souls in this work of effectual vocation." John Flavel, *The Method of Grace: In the Holy Spirit's Applying to the Souls of Men the Eternal Redemption Contrived by the Father and Accomplished by the Son* (New York: American Tract Society, 1845), 19.

[78]Letham, *The Holy Trinity*, 409. See Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion, 1.13*; John Owen, *Of Communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Each Person Distinctly in Love, Grace, and Consolation* (1657), in *The Works of John Owen* (ed. William H. Goold; reprint, London: Banner of Truth, 1965-68), 2:1-274.

[79]Owen, *Of Communion*, 2:269.

[80]Letham, *The Holy Trinity*, 414. See Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 3.1.1.

[81]White also notes how the Spirit impacts Christian fellowship: "Believers have fellowship with the Father and the Son (1 John 1:3). The fact that the Spirit indwells all believers, and provides the ground of our supernatural unity, results in true Christian fellowship—a sharing that knows no bounds. It is a divine fellowship, brought about by a divine person, the Holy Spirit of God, the eternal third person of the blessed Trinity." White, *The Forgotten Trinity: Recovering the Heart of Christian Belief*, 151.

The Holy Spirit, *the Charistmata*, and Signs and Wonders: Some Evangelical Perspectives from the Eighteenth Century[1]

Michael A.G. Haykin

The emergence of Pentecostalism at the turn of the twentieth century, along with the rise of the Charismatic Movement in the 1960s and the more recent development of the Association of Vineyard Churches have ensured that the work of the Holy Spirit has been keenly debated within the ranks of evangelical Christianity in the last century or so. The way in which this discussion has often been conducted, however, has caused many of its participants to be blind to the fact that this is *not* the first time in the history of the church that the activity of the Spirit has come under such intense and prolonged scrutiny. For instance, eighteenth-century evangelicals on both sides of the Atlantic—heirs to the in-depth analysis of the Spirit's work by the Puritans and with their interest in things pneumatological quickened by their experience of revival—were involved in an extensive debate over such fundamental questions of pneumatology as the indwelling of the Spirit, the doctrine of assurance, the Spirit's work in sanctification, and the experience of the Spirit's power.[2] The study of a previous pneumatological debate like that in the eighteenth century is, of course, valuable in its own right. Examination of the eighteenth-century evangelical experience of and reflection on the work of the Holy Spirit, however, can also generate some fresh perspectives on current debates about the Spirit's activity. For, as William DeArteaga has recently noted, there are definite parallels between the evangelical revivals of the eighteenth century and renewal movements in the present day.[3]

Michael A.G. Haykin is Professor of Church History and Biblical Spirituality at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

He is also Adjunct Professor of Church History and Spirituality at Toronto Baptist Seminary in Ontario, Canada. Dr. Haykin is the author of many books, including *"At the Pure Fountain of Thy Word": Andrew Fuller As an Apologist* (Paternoster Press, 2004), *Jonathan Edwards: The Holy Spirit in Revival* (Evangelical Press, 2005), and *The God Who Draws Near: An Introduction to Biblical Spirituality* (Evangelical Press, 2007), and *Rediscovering the Church Fathers: Who They Were and How They Shaped the Church* (Crossway, 2011).

THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY REVIVAL

Before launching into a focused discussion of this aspect of eighteenth-century evangelical experience and reflection, a few words about the eighteenth-century Evangelical Revival are in order. The revival began in the 1730s and found its center in the English-speaking world on both

sides of the Atlantic. As it ran its course, thousands were swept into the kingdom of God. In New England alone, for instance, thirty to forty thousand were converted during the three-year period from 1740 to 1742. In England, the Arminian Methodists, those evangelicals adhering to the views and beliefs of John Wesley (1703–1791) and his brother Charles (1707–1788), grew from around 22,000 in 1767 to over 88,000 by 1800. Central to the revival was the leadership of a number of gifted and Spirit-anointed preachers. In New England there was Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758), a brilliant theologian whose writings were characterized by a deep understanding of the human heart and a passion for God's glory. Even a superficial perusal of his writings reveals a mind and heart permeated with the beauty and excellence of the Triune God, and a desire to communicate this beauty and excellence to his fellow human beings. In Great Britain, there was the Englishman George Whitefield (1714–1770), who, more than any other figure, epitomized the revival. Over the thirty-four years between his conversion in 1736 and his death, he preached around 18,000 sermons, and, in a day of laboriously slow travel, visited Scotland fifteen times, traversed the Atlantic thirteen times, and crisscrossed much of the English and Welsh countryside. A pioneer in open-air preaching, he often spoke to huge crowds of 10,000 or more. Alongside Whitefield, there were the Wesley brothers—John, an indefatigable evangelist like Whitefield, and Charles, "the supreme poet of love to Jesus" in this period of revival[4]—and the Welshmen Howel Harris (1714–1773) and Daniel Rowland (1711–1790), whose preaching and spirituality set the tone and character of the Welsh people for the next century and a half. As these men, and a host of others, opened their mouths to preach and to teach, the Spirit of God descended upon their hearers, enlightening and converting them, building them up and strengthening them, melting their hearts and setting them aflame for Christ.[5]

PHILIP DODDRIDGE AND HIS BIOGRAPHY OF COLONEL JAMES GARDINER

Known to his friends as "the happy rake," James Gardiner (1688–1745), a Scottish military officer and dragoon, was regarded by his friends as one of the most fortunate men alive during the second decade of the eighteenth century.[6] Tall, stately in his bearing, and gifted with a fine constitution, he had distinguished himself a number of times on the field of battle and seemed destined for a brilliant career. Although he had been raised by a mother who had taken great pains to "instruct him with great tenderness and affection in the principles of true Christianity," Gardiner had long since rejected this childhood instruction.[7] Stationed in Paris during the 1710s as an aide-de-camp to the British ambassador, John Dalrymple (1673–1747), the second Earl of Stair, Gardiner went from one sexual encounter to another in an unbridled pursuit of pleasure. In the words of Philip Doddridge (1702–1751), the Dissenting minister who was later his close friend and biographer, "if not the whole business, at least the whole happiness of his life" consisted of these sordid affairs.[8] This immersion in a lifestyle of sex, seduction and lust, though, was not without some pangs of conscience. On one occasion, when some of his companions were congratulating him on the felicity of his way of life, a dog happened to enter the room in which they were seated, and Gardiner could not help but think to himself, "Oh that I were that dog!"[9] A few spurtive attempts to mend his ways always proved far too weak to resist the force of temptation. But, when he was thirty-one, Gardiner underwent a conversion so striking that Doddridge would later describe it with words such as "astonishing," "remarkable," "extraordinary," and "amazing."[10]

Towards the middle of July, 1719, Gardiner had spent an evening in the company of some friends, the party breaking up around eleven o'clock. Gardiner had a rendezvous with a married woman planned for midnight, and, not wanting to arrive early, he decided to kill the intervening hour by reading. Quite unintentionally, it was a religious

book that he picked up to read: *The Christian Soldier; or Heaven taken by storm* (1669) by the Puritan divine Thomas Watson (died *c*.1686). While he was reading, an unusual blaze of light suddenly fell upon the book, which at first he thought might have been caused by a nearby candle. Lifting up his eyes, though, he saw, to his utter astonishment, a vision of Christ. In the words of Doddridge:

> There was before him, as it were, suspended in the air, a visible representation of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross, surrounded on all sides with a glory; and [he] was impressed, as if a voice, or something equivalent to a voice had come to him, to this effect (for he was not confident as to the very words): "Oh sinner! did I suffer this for thee, and are these thy returns?" … Struck with so amazing a phenomenon as this, there remained hardly any life in him; so that he sunk down in the arm-chair in which he sat, and continued, he knew not very exactly how long, insensible.[11]

When he opened his eyes, the vision had gone, but not the impression it had forever made upon his heart and life. He completely forgot his midnight appointment.

> He rose in a tumult of passions not to be conceived, and walked to and fro in his chamber, till he was ready to drop down, in unutterable astonishment and agony of heart, appearing to himself the vilest monster in the creation of God, who had all his lifetime been crucifying Christ afresh by his sins, and now saw, as he assuredly believed, by a miraculous vision, the horror of what he had done. With this was connected such a view, both of the majesty and goodness of God, as caused him to loathe and abhor himself, to repent as in dust and ashes. He immediately gave judgment against himself, that he was most justly worthy of eternal damnation.[12]

The rest of the night he spent meditating on God's purity and goodness, his spurning of God's grace, and many of the providential escapes from death that he had experienced. His former lifestyle now appeared to him as utterly abhorrent, his sexual addiction was gone, and he was determined to spend the remainder of his time on earth in God's service. Indeed, from this extraordinary conversion till he fell at the Battle of Prestonpans on September 21, 1745, fighting against the Jacobite army of Charles Edward Stuart (1720–1788), otherwise known as Bonnie Prince Charlie, his was an "exemplary and truly Christian life."[13]

Now, occasionally gracing the Evangelical Revival, which began in the mid-1730s, were scenes every bit as "extraordinary" as that which had attended the conversion of Gardiner. It is not surprising, therefore, that in Doddridge's biography of Gardiner, which was written in 1747, two sections of the biography were devoted to this revival. Doddridge particularly mentions the Scottish revival at Cambuslang in February of 1742 and the preaching of William McCulloch (1691–1771), the minister of Cambuslang—at that time a rural parish a few miles to the southeast of Glasgow—which was instrumental in the inception of this revival. McCulloch was far from being an accomplished speaker. In the jargon then current, he was a yill- or ale-minister, a term that was used of ministers whose preaching was so dry that when their turn came to preach at the large outdoor communion gatherings then held once a year by the Scottish churches, many of the audience would leave to quench their thirst from nearby ale barrels provided for refreshment.[14] Yet it was under McCulloch's preaching in mid-February, 1742 that, according to Doddridge, around one hundred and thirty people, most of whom had sat under McCulloch's preaching for a number of years, "were awakened on a sudden to attend to it, as if it had been a new revelation brought down from heaven, and attested by as astonishing miracles as ever were wrought by Peter or Paul."[15] In July of the same year, George Whitefield arrived at Cambuslang, where he was soon preaching to huge, receptive audiences. In August, for instance,

some 30,000 attended an outdoor communion service, where Whitefield preached a number of sermons over the course of a three-day weekend. Alexander Webster, a minister from Edinburgh, whose description of this event was read by many, including Doddridge,[16] wrote of some of the happenings of that weekend:

> During the time of divine worship, profound reverence overspread every countenance. They hear as for eternity … Thousands are melted into tears. Many cry out in the bitterness of their soul. Some … from the stoutest man to the tenderest child, shake and tremble and a few fall down as dead. Nor does this happen only when men of warm address alarm them with the terrors of the law, but when the most deliberate preacher speaks of redeeming love.[17]

Doddridge also received an account of the Cambuslang revival from Gardiner, who regarded it as "a matter of eternal praise."[18] Doddridge went on to say that Gardiner was of the same frame of mind when it came to "intelligence of a like kind from England; whether the clergy of the established church, or dissenting ministers, whether our own countrymen, or foreigners, were the instruments of it."[19] Gardiner, Doddridge wrote, had particularly mentioned to him one minister—in the biography Doddridge leaves him unnamed—"who had been remarkably successful in his ministry," but who had been ill-treated by some. Gardiner remarked: "I had rather be that despised persecuted man, to be an instrument in the hand of the Spirit, in converting so many souls, and building up so many in their holy faith, than I would be emperor of the whole world."[20] Here Doddridge is actually quoting from a letter, still extant, which he had received from Gardiner in 1742. In this letter, dated November 16 and written to Doddridge from Ghent, in what was then the Austrian Netherlands, Gardiner mentioned that he had recently been the recipient of a letter from George Whitefield. He then proceeded to express the very sentiments with regard to the Anglican evangelist that have just been cited from Gardiner's biography.[21] Presumably Doddridge left Whitefield unnamed in his life of Gardiner for the basic reason that Whitefield was still living as he wrote.

In detailing Gardiner's views towards the revival, Doddridge was also clearly indicating where his own sympathies lay. Doddridge himself had first written to Whitefield on December 12, 1738, and enquired as to whether he had any intentions of coming near Northampton, where Doddridge lived. Although the two had never met, Doddridge wrote that he would "gladly undertake a day's journey to meet and confer" with Whitefield, so that he might, as he puts it, "light my lamp by yours and gain that assistance in my way heavenward which a knowledge of you will, I hope, give me."[22] It appears that the two men met for the first time on May 23, 1739, when Whitefield preached in the open air to around 3,000 people at Northampton. In his *Journal* Whitefield mentions that prior to his preaching he had been "most courteously received by Dr. Doddridge."[23] The following month Doddridge thanked God in his *Diary* for "adding to me the friendship of some excellent persons, among whom I must mention Mr. Whitefield and Colonel Gardiner."[24]

Four years later, Doddridge preached for Whitefield at his Tabernacle in London, which caused quite a stir among his fellow Dissenters. For example, Isaac Watts (1674–1748), Doddridge's mentor and friend, wrote to him and stated that he had been the recipient of "many questions" about Doddridge's preaching or praying at the Tabernacle, and "of sinking the character of a Minister … among the dissenters so low thereby."[25] When Doddridge reciprocated by having Whitefield preach at his church in Northampton in October of that year, Watts and other Dissenters were deeply concerned.[26] Central to their concern was the fear that Doddridge's support of the evangelist was simply aiding and abetting that chief of eighteenth-century phobias, "enthusiasm."[27]

"ENTHUSIASM" AND THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL

The *mentalité* of the eighteenth century, which gloried in reason, moderation and order, regarded "enthusiasm" in religion as a particularly unsavory phenomenon. To be charged with enthusiasm in this sphere was to be accused of claiming extraordinary revelations and powers from the Holy Spirit, though the word could be used more loosely to denote any kind of religious excitement.[28] John Locke (1632–1704), in his epoch-making work *An Essay concerning Human Understanding* (1689), used the word to denote the mindset of those who have "an Opinion of a greater familiarity with GOD, and nearer admittance to his Favour than is afforded to others," and have thus persuaded themselves that they have an "immediate intercourse with the Deity, and frequent communications from the divine Spirit."[29] Such a mindset, Locke was convinced, arises from "the Conceits of a warmed or over-weening Brain."[30] Clearly dependent upon Locke, the lexicographer Samuel Johnson (1709–1784) defined enthusiasm as "a vain belief of private revelation; a vain confidence of divine favour or communication."[31] To all intents and purposes George Whitefield agreed. "The quintessence of enthusiasm," he declared in a sermon first published in 1746, was "to pretend to be guided by the Spirit without the written word." All inner impressions must be tried by "the unerring rule of God's most holy word," and if found incompatible, rejected as "diabolical and delusive."[32] From personal experience Whitefield knew of the dangerous shoals of enthusiasm, for he later realized that in the first few years of his ministry he had been occasionally imprudent in relying on subjective impressions.[33]

However, if Whitefield and other leaders in the revival were wary of falling prey to enthusiasm, their critics were certain that they had succumbed. Two early criticisms can be taken as representative of the charges levelled against the revival and its participants throughout the eighteenth century. John Barker (1682–1762), an English Presbyterian minister and correspondent of Doddridge, wrote to the latter on May 24, 1739 to tell him that he had heard Whitefield preaching in London in the open air and later also at Bath. Though he thought him sincere, Barker told Doddridge:

> I still fancy that he is but a *weak* man—much too positive, says rash things, and is bold and enthusiastic. I am most heartily glad to hear of piety, prayer, reformation, and every thing that looks like faith and holiness, in the North or South, the East or the West, and that any *real* good is done anywhere to the souls of men, but whether these Methodists are in a right way, whether they are warrantable in all their conduct, whether poor people should be urged (through different persons, successively) *to pray from four in the morning till eleven at night*, is not clear to me; and I am less satisfied with the high pretences they make to the Divine influence. I think what Mr. Whitefield says and does comes but little short of an assumption of inspiration or infallibility.[34]

Joseph Butler (1692–1752), the bishop of Bristol, also criticized Whitefield and his fellow evangelist John Wesley for what he perceived to be enthusiasm. In an interview with Wesley on August 18, 1739, Butler accused both of the evangelists of "pretending to extraordinary revelations and gifts of the Holy Ghost," which he found "a horrid thing—a very horrid thing." Wesley denied this charge and stated that he sought only "what every Christian may receive and ought to expect and pray for."[35]

If he had been present Whitefield would also have strongly disputed the accuracy of Butler's accusation, for he was adamant that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, such as prophecy, *glossolalia*, and miraculous powers, had ceased with the passing of the apostles. In his sermon "The Indwelling of the Spirit, the Common Privilege of All Believers," which Wesley helped him edit for publication in the summer of 1739, Whitefield declared that Christ's promise of the Spirit

in John 7:37-39 has nothing to do with receiving power "to work miracles, or show outward signs and wonders." Whitefield suggested that such signs and wonders occurred only when "some new revelation was to be established, as at the first settling of the Mosaic or gospel dispensation." Indeed, he continued:

> I cannot but suspect the spirit of those who insist upon a repetition of such miracles at this time. For the world being now become nominally Christian (though God knows, little of its power is left among us) there need not outward miracles, but only an inward cooperation of the Holy Spirit with the word, to prove that Jesus is the Messiah which was to come into the world.[36]

The only major group of individuals in the English-speaking Protestant world at that time who insisted upon the "repetition" of the miracles which occurred in the early church were the French Prophets. This group had its origins among the Protestants of southern France. Following the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, these Protestants had been savagely persecuted by the French Roman Catholic state. In this crucible of persecution a movement had arisen replete with visions, prophecies, *glossolalia*, and trances, in which young people were especially prominent. The summer of 1706 saw the appearance of three prophets from this movement in London. Within the space of a couple of years there were close to four hundred French Prophets, as they came to be called, and their charismatic manifestations had caused considerable public interest and consternation among the churches in the English capital. A turning-point for the movement, though, came in the summer of 1708 when it was prophesied that one of their number who had died, Thomas Emes, would be resurrected on May 25 from his grave in Bunhill Fields, the burying-ground for London Nonconformists. When the predicted resurrection failed to transpire, the French Prophets became increasingly withdrawn and quiescent.[37]

With the beginning of the Evangelical Revival in the mid-1730s, however, the voices of the French Prophets once again were heard in Great Britain as they sought to win recruits for their own movement from among those in involved in the revival.[38] It is plain from the text cited above that Whitefield would not have at all been impressed with the claim of the French Prophets to possess the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. From his perspective, genuine manifestations of these gifts occurred only to authenticate the giving of fresh revelation. "The world being now become nominally Christian"—that is, the "world" having intellectually accepted the truth of Christianity—the Spirit's work was circumscribed to making this intellectual commitment a reality in heart and life. Even from the vantage-point of the eighteenth century, there seems to be a certain theological *naïveté* in Whitefield's remark that the world which he knew was "nominally Christian."[39] Nevertheless, in arguing for a cessationist position with regard to the gifts, Whitefield was simply affirming what had come to be a theological axiom for most eighteenth-century, English-speaking Protestants.[40] Doddridge, for instance, in his response to a deistic attack on Christianity by Henry Dodwell (died 1784), plainly stated:

> It is of great importance … to recollect … that many things in Scripture, which relate to the operations of the Spirit of God on the mind, have a reference to those extraordinary gifts, which were peculiar to the apostles, and in which we of these later ages have no further concern, than as the general knowledge of them may establish our regard to the writings of those eminent servants of Christ, who were wisely and graciously distinguished by their divine Master, by such extraordinary endowments, to fit them for the extraordinary office they sustained.[41]

It should be noted, however, that John Wesley questioned this axiom, for he was thoroughly convinced that the miraculous gifts of the Spirit

definitely continued beyond the close of the New Testament era. Christian literature from the second and third centuries, Wesley maintained, contains clear evidence for the existence of these gifts. It was only when Constantine came to imperial power in the first quarter of the fourth century and began to favor the church that these gifts started to disappear. In a sermon on 1 Corinthians 12:31, which first appeared in the July and August 1787 issues of *The Arminian Magazine*, Wesley declared:

> It does not appear that these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were common in the church for more than two or three centuries. We seldom hear of them after that fatal period when the Emperor Constantine called himself a Christian, and from a vain imagination of promoting the Christian cause thereby heaped riches, and power, and honour, upon the Christians in general; but in particular upon the Christian clergy. From this time they almost ceased; very few instances of the kind were found. The cause of this was not (as has been vulgarly supposed) "because there was no more occasion for them," because all the world was become Christian. This is a miserable mistake: not a twentieth part of it was then nominally Christian. The real cause was: "the love of many"—almost of all Christians, so called—was "waxed cold." The Christians had no more of the Spirit of Christ than the other heathens.... This was the real cause why the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were no longer to be found in the Christian church—because the Christians were turned heathens again, and had only a dead form left.[42]

These reflections on the history of the gifts in the early church are not necessarily the best source for actually discovering what happened in these early centuries.[43] Notwithstanding, this is an important text, for Wesley succinctly rejects the reason posited by Whitefield for the cessation of the gifts. In no uncertain terms he labels it a "miserable" misconception. Wesley grants that there did occur a cessation of the gifts, but he located it in the middle of the fourth century and not, as Whitefield and most other eighteenth-century, English-speaking Protestants were wont to do, at the end of the first. Wesley finds the reason for the cessation of these gifts in the words of Matthew 24:12: the love of the church "waxed cold," that is, her love for God and the charismatic presence of his Spirit decreased in proportion as her material wealth and temporal influence increased. Moreover, Wesley tempers his assertion with regard to the cessation of the gifts with the adverb "almost." The Methodist leader is not prepared to assert dogmatically that genuine occurrences of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit cannot be found in the history of the church after the fourth century. In fact, the reason which he gives for their disappearance leaves open, in principle, the possibility of their being found in any age of the church. Where God is loved and the charismatic presence of his Spirit relished as in the pre-Constantinian church, there the gifts *might* be found.[44]

A similar allowance for the occurrence of extraordinary charismatic phenomena in the history of the church appears in another of Wesley's sermons, "The Nature of Enthusiasm," which was first published in 1750. Speaking of those who expect to be directed by God through "visions or dreams," the Methodist leader did not "deny that God has, of old times, manifested His will in this manner; or, that He can do so now: Nay, I believe He does, in some very rare instances."[45] Yet, he went on to emphasize, pride and "warm imagination" frequently mislead people into ascribing visions, dreams, and mental impressions to God's authorship, which, when closely examined, are found to bear no divine imprint. Wesley knows of only one fitting description for such behavior: it is "pure enthusiasm."[46] Earlier in the sermon Wesley had specified other types of individuals whom he also considered to be guilty of this eighteenth-century bugbear. For instance, those who imagine "themselves to be endued with a power of working

miracles, of healing the sick by a word or a touch, of restoring sight to the blind" are all clear-cut enthusiasts, as are those who think they have the power to raise the dead, "a notorious instance of which," Wesley adds, "is still fresh in our own history."[47] This "notorious instance" is probably the failed prediction of the resurrection of the French Prophet Thomas Emes.

Thus, both Whitefield and Wesley insisted that it was completely inappropriate to view Methodism as a species of enthusiasm. Public opinion, though, thought otherwise, and the charge of enthusiasm was regularly hurled at those committed to the revival. One reason for this was the fact that there were some in the leadership of the revival who did lay claim to miraculous powers of the Spirit. For instance, George Bell (died 1807), a former corporal in the Life Guards who was converted in 1758, was involved in the healing of a woman with painful lumps in one of her breasts in 1761, a healing that Wesley continued to endorse as genuine many years later.[48] Soon Bell claimed that he and a coterie of London Methodists possessed the power to heal the sick regularly, and they proceeded to attempt to give sight to the blind and to raise the dead. Bell himself also believed that he possessed broad prophetic powers, including the gift of the discernment of spirits. These he sought to exercise in 1762 when he predicted the end of the world on February 28, 1763. At this point Wesley stepped in, disowned Bell as a Methodist, and denounced his prediction as fraudulent. He defended his actions with regard to Bell: "The reproach of Christ I am willing bear; but not the reproach of Enthusiasm if I can help it."[49] Indeed, for many years afterwards the memory of the Bell affair continued to confirm people's suspicions that the Methodists were *bona fide* enthusiasts.[50]

Nor were matters helped by the fact that eighteenth-century evangelicals opposed deistic trends of thinking by emphasizing that the indwelling of the believer by the Holy Spirit was an affective experience. As Whitefield declared: to "say we may have God's Spirit without feeling it … is, in reality, to deny the thing itself."[51] When the Spirit of God takes up residence in a person's life, his presence has an impact on the entire personality; the mind, the will, the emotions—and even on occasion the body—are touched and affected. For instance, in a description not atypical of certain periods of the revival, Howel Harris, who has been described as "the greatest Welshman of the eighteenth century,"[52] informed Whitefield in March, 1743 of what God the Holy Spirit was doing through the preaching of his fellow evangelist and countryman, Daniel Rowland.

> I was last Sunday at the Ordinance with Brother Rowlands where I saw, felt and heard such things as I cant sent on Paper any Idea of. The Power that continues with Him is uncommon. Such crying out and Heart breaking groans, Silent Weeping and Holy Joy, and shouts of Rejoicing I never saw … Tis very common when He preaches for Scores to fall down by the Power of the Lord, pierced and wounded or overcom'd by the Love of God and Sights of the Beauty and Excellency of Jesus, and lie on the Ground … Some lye there for Hours. Some praising and admiring Jesus, free Grace, Distinguishing Grace, others wanting the words to utter.[53]

In 1759 similar scenes took place in Cambridgeshire under the preaching of John Berridge (1716–1793), the eccentric, evangelical vicar of the village of Everton. An account of these scenes has been preserved in the pages of John Wesley's *Journal*. Four, possibly five eyewitnesses, including Berridge and a certain John Walsh,[54] sent Wesley reports of the revival at Everton, which Wesley then brought together into a single account. For instance, Walsh wrote to Wesley that on the afternoon of Sunday, July 14, Berridge was compelled to preach in the open air due to the large number of people who had come to hear him. As Berridge preached—and Walsh says nothing about the content of the sermon—a number of people who "were … pricked to the heart were affected in an astonishing man-

ner." One man, he reported to Wesley,

> would have dropped [to the ground], but others, catching him in their arms, did, indeed prop him up, but were so far from keeping him still that he caused all of them to totter and tremble. His own shaking exceeded that of a cloth in the wind. It seemed as if the Lord came upon him like a giant, taking him by the neck and shaking all his bones in pieces.... Another roared and screamed in a more dreadful agony than ever I heard before.... I saw one who lay two or three hours in the open air, and, being then carried into the house continued insensible another hour, as if actually dead. The first sign of life she showed was a rapture of praise intermixed with a small, joyous laughter.[55]

Given the mindset of the eighteenth century, it is not surprising that such emotional and physical manifestations were regarded as sheer madness by many contemporary observers. Thomas Morgan (1729–1799), a Welsh Calvinistic minister who in 1763 became the pastor of the Congregationalist church in Morley, West Yorkshire, was scandalized by similar displays of emotion that he witnessed in North Wales in 1762. "To all true and serious Christians," he wrote to a friend, the Welsh Methodists "are stark mad, and given up to a spirit of delusion, to the great disgrace and scandal of Christianity."[56]

Wesley's life-long approval of such displays of emotion also contributed to the charge of enthusiasm. While he was well aware of the possibility of over-valuing such manifestations, he felt that it was just as dangerous "to regard them too little, to condemn them altogether; to imagine they had nothing of God in them, and were a hindrance to his work."[57] On the other hand, as early as 1739, Whitefield had come to a somewhat different perspective. It was

> tempting God to require such signs. That there is something of God in it I doubt not; but the devil, I believe, does interpose. I think it will encourage the French Prophets, take people from the written word, and make them depend on visions, convulsions, etc., more than on the promises and precepts of the Gospel.[58]

Whitefield does not deny that some of these manifestations could issue from God. Yet, he is rightly convinced that such manifestations can easily become the focus of attention and interest rather than the Scriptures, the unalloyed revelation of God.

JONATHAN EDWARDS, THE "THEOLOGIAN OF REVIVAL"

The most incisive eighteenth-century perspective on these unusual displays of physical and emotional behaviour comes from the pen of Jonathan Edwards, whom Martyn Lloyd-Jones has identified as the "theologian of revival."[59] Between the years 1736 and 1748 Edwards wrote a series of works defending the fact that the revivals that took place in New England during the 1730s and 1740s were indeed the work of the Holy Spirit.[60] Edwards, however, was not uncritical of the extremism and excesses which had accompanied these revivals. His criticism is most trenchant in *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* (1746), in which the American theologian wrestles with such fundamental questions as: What is the nature of true Christian experience? What place do the "affections" have in the Christian life? What are the marks that distinguish a genuine work of the Spirit from religious "enthusiasm"?

The extremism at which Edwards is taking aim in this work is evident in some of the assertions of James Davenport (1716–1757), a Congregationalist minister from Southhold, Long Island, and Davenport's friend, Andrew Croswell (1709–1785), the pastor of a Congregationalist church in Groton, Connecticut. At the height of the revival in New England in the early 1740s, both of these men assured individuals who either fell to the ground, or experienced bodily tremors, or saw visions during the preaching of God's Word that

such experiences were a sure sign of the Spirit's converting work. In Croswell's words, only those who have had such "divine Manifestations… know what true Holiness means."[61] He asserted that "God never works powerfully, but men cry out disorder; for God's order differs vastly from their nice and delicate apprehensions" of him.[62] Davenport, for his part, claimed to have the ability to distinguish who was among the elect of God, a "gift" that he especially sought to exercise when he called into question the spiritual state of certain ministers who had refused to allow him to preach from their pulpits. Prominent also in Davenport's ministry was a devotion to loud, boisterous singing. While vibrant singing has regularly been a mark of movements of revival in the history of the church, some of the lyrics written by Davenport were cause for deep concern. For instance, in *A Song of Praise for Joy in the Holy Ghost* (1742), Davenport wrote the following of the Holy Spirit's work in the believer's life:

> This makes me Abba Father cry,
> With confidence of soul.
> It makes me cry, My Lord, My God,
> And that without control.[63]

To profess the loss of self-control as the work of the Spirit of God was worrisome to both advocates and critics of the revival.[64]

Although both Davenport later confessed that he had been wrong in much of what he had said and done, he and Crosswell had helped to spark a "wild-fire" spirit, which in many places made havoc of the revival. Moreover, they had furnished anti-revival forces with ammunition for their attacks. These forces were captained by Charles Chauncy (1705–1787), co-pastor of the most prestigious Congregationalist church in Boston, who could say of Davenport in particular: "he is the *wildest Enthusiast* I ever saw."[65] Edwards himself was convinced that Davenport did more "towards giving Satan and those opposers [of the revival] an advantage against the work than any other person."[66]

Now, among other things, *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* tackles head-on the assertion by both Davenport and Croswell that the experience of unusual bodily phenomena is unmistakable evidence of conversion. "Great effects on the body," Edwards maintains, "certainly are no sure evidences" that "the affections" which give rise to them come from the Spirit of God, "for we see that such effects oftentimes arise from great affections about temporal things, and when religion is in no way concerned."[67] Moreover, as Edwards observed on another occasion:

> The Spirit of God may act upon a creature, and yet not in acting communicate himself. The Spirit of God may act upon inanimate creatures; as, *the Spirit moved upon the face of the waters*, in the beginning of the creation; so the Spirit of God may act upon the minds of men in many ways, and communicate himself no more than when he acts upon an inanimate creature.[68]

The Holy Spirit can produce effects in many things, both animate and inanimate, to which he does not communicate or impart his nature. Thus, in Genesis 1:2, it is stated that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of waters, but in doing so he did not impart his nature to the waters. In other words, a person may well be the subject of powerful spiritual experiences and not actually be indwelt by the Spirit. On the other hand, Edwards knows of no reason why "a view of God's glory should not cause the body to faint."[69] Indeed, there are a number of Scriptural texts which indicate that "true divine discoveries, or ideas of God's glory, when given in a great degree have a tendency, by affecting the mind, to overbear the body."[70] Edwards refers his readers at this point to passages like Psalm 119:120, where the Psalmist expressly states that his "flesh trembleth for fear" of God, or Revelation 1:17, where, at the vision of the Risen Christ, the Apostle John "fell at his feet as dead."[71] Those who say that God cannot or will not "qive the

like clear and affecting ideas and apprehensions of the same real glory and majesty of his nature" in his day, Edwards considers "very bold and daring."[72]

Not only could Edwards quote Scripture in support of his appreciation of such phenomena, but he could also turn to the experience of his wife Sarah (1710–1758). In *Some Thoughts concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New-England* (1743), Edwards had devoted a section of this book to detailing, without naming her, his wife's experiences.[73] From 1736 on Sarah had frequently had "extraordinary views of divine things," which had deprived her body of "all ability to stand or speak." For instance, on one occasion Sarah was given an "extraordinary sense of the awful majesty, greatness, and holiness of God," which, her husband tells us, took away her bodily strength. Another time, it was "an overwhelming sense of the glory of the work of redemption, and the way of salvation by Jesus Christ" that caused her body to faint. On yet another occasion, "a sense of the glory of the Holy Spirit, as the great Comforter, was such as to overwhelm both soul and body."[74] Her husband was at pains to point out that Sarah's experiences were never "attended with any enthusiastic disposition to follow impulses, or any supposed prophetical revelations." Edwards is ever insistent that the Spirit of God always leads those whom he indwells to view the Scriptures as "the great and standing rule for the direction of his church in all religious matters, and all concerns of their soul, in all ages."[75] Enthusiasts, on the other hand, "depreciate this written rule, and set up the light within or some other rule above it."[76] Sarah's experiences were also accompanied by "an increase of humility and meekness," "a gentleness, and benevolence of spirit," and "a great alteration" for the better with regard to her former weaknesses and failings.[77] Without the presence of these God-centered affections, the physical manifestations would have been of no spiritual value. Little wonder that Edwards can burst out at the conclusion of his account of Sarah's experience:

> Now if such things are enthusiasm, and the fruits of a distempered brain, let my brain be evermore possessed of that happy distemper! If this be distraction, I pray God that the world of mankind may be all seized with this benign, meek, and beneficent, beatifical, glorious distraction![78]

One of Edwards' final works devoted to the subject of revival was *An Humble Attempt to Promote Explicit Agreement and visible Union of God's People in Extraordinary Prayer for the Revival of Religion and the Advancement of Christ's Kingdom on Earth, pursuant to Scripture-Promises and Prophecies concerning the Last Time* (henceforth referred to as the *Humble Attempt*). This treatise was inspired by information that Edwards received in 1745 about prayer meetings for revival which had been started by a number of Scottish evangelical ministers, including William McCulloch of Cambuslang. In order to implement a similar "concert of prayer" in New England, Edwards gave a sermon in February, 1747 on Zechariah 8:20–22, in which he sought to demonstrate how the text supported a call for believers to meet together to pray for revival. Within the year a revised and greatly expanded version of this sermon was published as the *Humble Attempt*.

The treatise opens with a number of observations on Zechariah 8:20–22. Edwards argues that this passage predicts a time when "there shall be given much of a spirit of prayer to God's people, in many places, disposing them to come into an express agreement, unitedly to pray to God in an extraordinary manner, that he would appear for the help of his church, and in mercy to mankind, and pour out his Spirit, revive his work, and advance his spiritual kingdom in the world, as he has promised."[79] In order to hasten this glorious time, Edwards infers that God's people in the American colonies should gather together and, with "extraordinary, speedy, fervent and constant prayer," pray for those "great effusions of the Holy Spirit" which will dramatically advance the king-

dom of Christ.[80] In the second part of the treatise Edwards provides a number of reasons as to why Christians should participate in this concert of prayer. Our Lord Jesus, for example, shed his blood and his tears, and poured out his prayers in order to secure the presence and power of his blessed Spirit for his people.

The sum of the blessings Christ sought, by what he did and suffered in the work of redemption, was the Holy Spirit….The Holy Spirit, in his indwelling, his influences and fruits, is the sum of all grace, holiness, comfort and joy, or in one word, of all the spiritual good Christ purchased for men in this world: and is also the sum of all perfection, glory and eternal joy, that he purchased for them in another world.[81]

Edwards rightly concludes: "If … this is what Jesus Christ, our great Redeemer and the head of the church, did so much desire, and set his heart upon, from all eternity, and which he did and suffered so much for, offering up 'strong crying and tears' [Heb 5:7], and his precious blood to obtain it; surely his disciples and members should also earnestly seek it, and be much and earnest in prayer for it."[82] Furthermore, the Scriptures are full of commands, incentives and illustrations regarding prayer for the Holy Spirit. For instance, there is the encouragement given to believers in Luke 11:13: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" As Edwards read these words of Christ, prayer for the Holy Spirit is one request that God the Father is especially delighted to answer in the affirmative.[83] Or one might consider the example of the early disciples who devoted themselves to "united fervent prayer and supplication … till the Spirit came down in a wonderful manner upon them," as it is related in Acts 1–2.[84] In essence, the *Humble Attempt*, like Edwards' various other works which relate to the revival, seeks to develop and recommend a "fullblown theology of radical dependence on the Spirit."[85]

THE CALVINISTIC BAPTISTS OF ENGLAND

The *Humble Attempt* bore its greatest fruit more than twenty-five years after the death of Edwards. In the spring of 1784 an English Calvinistic Baptist pastor by the name of John Ryland, Jr. (1723–1825) received a copy of the *Humble Attempt*, which had been sent to him by John Erskine (1721–1803), a Scottish Presbyterian minister. When Erskine was in his twenties he had been present at the revival at Cambuslang. Later he had entered into correspondence with Edwards, and had imbibed many of the theological perspectives of the American divine. Erskine's correspondence with Ryland appears to have begun in 1780 and lasted till the former's death in 1803. Erskine sent the Baptist pastor not only letters, but also on occasion bundles of fascinating books and tracts which he was seeking to promote. So it was in April, 1784 that Erskine mailed to Ryland a copy of Edward's *Humble Attempt*.

Ryland and his pastoral colleagues—notably Andrew Fuller (1754–1815) and John Sutcliff (1752–1814)—were so deeply impacted by the force of Edwards' argumentation in the *Humble Attempt* that a concert of prayer was begun that very year in the English Midlands by the association of churches to which they belonged, the Northamptonshire Association.[86] This prayer movement had profound consequences for the Calvinistic Baptists in England. Many of their congregations were revitalized after decades of stagnation or even decline, and numerous new works were begun. Moreover, it was among these Northamptonshire Baptists that the modern missionary movement was born, as the Baptist Missionary Society was founded in 1792 and William Carey (1761–1834) sent to India as the Society's first missionary.

In the early years of the Evangelical Revival Howel Harris had once compared the Nonconformist denominations, which would have included the Calvinistic Baptists, and his friend Whitefield: "whilst they are in their warm rooms, he ventures his life for God."[87] As Geoffrey F. Nut-

tall has pointed out, this telling contrast can be given both a spatial and a spiritual interpretation. By and large eighteenth-century Nonconformist ministers stayed within their meeting-houses to proclaim the Word of God, whilst the early Methodists who had been impacted by the revival took the gospel into the open air, into the highways and byways. To be sure, there were legal restrictions that sought to confine Nonconformist preaching to the meeting-house. For many Nonconformist pastors, however, obedience to these laws was as much grounded in a spiritual "settledness" as in a desire to be law-abiding citizens. All too many of the Nonconformist pastors whom Harris knew well were content to live on past experience and displayed little hunger for the presence and power of God in their lives.[88]

By the 1780s and 1790s the situation was markedly different. There was now a growing openness to the revival amongst the Nonconformists, including the Calvinistic Baptists. And Edwards' works on revival had played a vital role in the change of perspective. The revival which came to the Calvinistic Baptist denomination between the 1780s and the 1820s did so with remarkably few of the unusual manifestations which occurred in the early years of the Evangelical Revival. And in continuity with most other eighteenth-century evangelicals, there was of course no seeking the so-called extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. For example, in a sermon that John Ryland preached on 1 Corinthians 14:8 in 1813, he unequivocally declared regarding the abuse of *glossolalia* in the first-century church of Corinth that "no one is *now* in danger of falling into precisely the same mistake, because the gift of tongues has long ceased."[89] Like George Whitefield, Ryland believed that the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit were given to the Church in the apostolic age in order to validate the initial preaching of the gospel. Such gifts were bestowed "for the purpose of attesting the truth, at its first publication."[90] Ryland regularly drew a contrast between the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit and his "ordinary influences." As he stated in a sermon entitled "The Love of the Spirit", which was based on Romans 15:30:

> The ordinary influences of the Holy Spirit are of far more importance to the individuals who partake of them, than his extraordinary gifts; that is, it is better to be a saint than a prophet; better to be made holy, than to be inspired; better to be directed into the love of God, than into the knowledge of futurity. Herein the blessed Spirit communicates himself in his own proper nature, as the Spirit of holiness.[91]

Why did Ryland believe that the "ordinary influences of the Holy Spirit" are of greater import than "his extraordinary gifts"? The former impart personal holiness, and it is only those who have experience of these "sanctifying influences" of the Spirit who can have any legitimate assurance of eternal life. Those who are indwelt by the sanctifying Spirit are "sealed to the day of redemption" and stamped for an eternity in heaven. The "extraordinary gifts" of the Spirit, on the other hand, give no such assurance, for there is no inseparable connection between the gifts and holiness. In other words, the presence of the fruit of the Spirit is evidence of salvation, whereas that of his gifts is not.

As for the unusual manifestations witnessed during the early years of the Evangelical Revival, Baptists like Ryland were quite willing to acknowledge their genuineness. However, they were not at all convinced that they were necessary for the advance of God's kingdom. Ryland's close friend, the so-called "father of modern missions," William Carey (1761–1834), wrote a marvellous letter to his sister Mary in 1789 that discussed these manifestations. Evidently she was wrestling with assurance of salvation, and he asked her:

> Do you doubt because you have not seen visions, heard voices, or felt impulses? This I know is what many Christians place dependence upon. But suppose that you have felt nothing of all this, there is no reason for you to despair; and if

you have been favoured with repeated instances of this nature this is no proof of your Christianity. I apprehend that too many place too much confidence in things of this nature and make a shining light, an audible voice, or the sudden application of a passage of Scripture an evidence of their being the children of God. But where is the part of God's Word that informs us of any such evidence of religion as these are? Or if a person had no other evidence than such, would you, could you encourage him to depend or take comfort from this? That these are extraordinary interpositions of Divine Power upon extraordinary occasions I don't deny but 'tis God and not us that must judge of the emergency of our case; and even if he does interpose in a singular way, 'tis the matter and not the manner of his interposition that we ought to depend upon, and that not as an evidence of grace but as a Divine support in the path of duty. No doubt but the tempter is aware of the taste of the age and therefore endeavours to seduce us by things miraculous to which the mind of man is much prone, and while we thus listen to his devices and limit the Holy One of Israel we distress ourselves and dishonour him. But we have a more sure word of Prophecy whereunto we do well that we take heed.[92]

Carey did not deny that such unusual phenomena as "a shining light"—may well be an allusion to Gardiner's conversion, an account that Carey knew well—or "an audible voice" could be from God. But such occurrences were given according to God's sovereignty, and not man's desire. Moreover, these experiences were no proof that the subject of them genuinely knew God. "Real religion," Carey went on to emphasize in the letter, consisted of things quite different: "repentance, faith, obedience, submission, zeal and consolation."

Yet it bears remembering that late eighteenth-century Calvinistic Baptists like Ryland and Carey, nurtured on the writings of Jonathan Edwards, had a great hunger and desire for the Spirit's presence and power, as the following text bears witness. It was written by Ryland in 1792, at the height of the French Revolution, as part of a circular letter sent out by the Northamptonshire Association to its member churches.

> Surely the state both of the world, and of church, calls loudly upon us all to persist in wrestling instantly with God, for greater effusions of his Holy Spirit.... Let us not cease crying mightily unto the Lord, "until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high" [Isaiah 32:15]; then the wilderness shall become as a fruitful field, and the desert like the garden of God. Yes, beloved, the Scriptures cannot be broken. Jesus must reign universally. All nations shall own him. All people shall serve him. His kingdom shall be extended, not by human might, or power, but by the effusion of His Holy Spirit [cf. Zechariah 4:6].[93]

This text is redolent with the pneumatological thought of Jonathan Edwards, especially in its emphasis on patient but diligent prayer for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and its optimism regarding the irresistible advance of Jesus' kingdom throughout the world by the power of the outpoured Spirit. Such are the signs and wonders that Ryland and Carey, genuine heirs of Edwards and the Evangelical Revival that he promoted, longed to see.

THREE LESSONS

What then do we learn from our evangelical forebears in the eighteenth-century with regard to this issue of "signs and wonders"? First, eighteenth-century evangelicals by and large limited what they described as the "extraordinary" gifts of the Spirit—gifts such as speaking in tongues, miraculous healings, prophecy—to the apostolic era. Yet, they longed for, and *were granted*, the experience of the Spirit's power in revival, and this to such a depth that the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century has acquired an almost paradigmatic quality. The only Protestant group in the Anglophone world at that time that did press

for a full restoration of all the apostolic gifts were the French Prophets, a rather insignificant sect whose major role in the revivals was to act as an object-lesson of fanaticism.

Second, there did occur a variety of unusual physical and emotional manifestations in many areas touched by this revival, such as uncontrollable trembling and weeping, jumping, falling to the ground, striking dreams and visions. Evangelicals displayed a range of responses to these manifestations, but never rejected them *in toto*. In fact, these manifestations were instrumental in prompting the New England divine Jonathan Edwards to write an entire series of works defending the revival, in which he sought to elucidate the Spirit's work in such a way that the unique aspects of the Spirit's activity in the apostolic era were safeguarded "without unnecessarily limiting the Spirit's mysterious work in regeneration and sanctification."[94]

Third, it was these writings of Edwards that God used to revitalize the Calvinistic Baptists and in the process initiate the modern missionary movement, by means of which evangelical Christianity was spread to the four corners of the earth. This dissemination of the gospel was certainly not achieved by mere human might or determination. It was nothing less than a wondrous work of the Spirit. As William Carey had once remarked: "If a temple is raised for God in the heathen world, it will not be "by might, nor by power," nor by the authority of the magistrate, or the eloquence of the orator; "but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts" (Zech 4:6).[95] In other words, we must recognize the Spirit's power in the full range of his activities throughout the history of the church, and not confine him within the limits of what some today call "signs and wonders."

ENDNOTES

[1] An earlier and somewhat shorter version of this article appeared in *The Baptist Review of Theology*, 3, no. 2 (1993): 4-27. It, in turn, had its origin in an address given at a conference sponsored by Central Baptist Seminary, Toronto, in the fall of 1992 as part of a response to the so-called Toronto Blessing.

[2] Timothy L. Smith, "Foreword" to Harald Lindström, *Wesley and Sanctification* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), n.p. Cf. the remark of Alan C. Clifford, "The Christian Mind of Philip Doddridge (1702–1751): The Gospel According to an Evangelical Congregationalist,"*Evangelical Quarterly* 56 (1984): 236: "With the advent of the Methodist revival, attention became focused on the doctrine and work of the Holy Spirit." See also Ronald Reeve, "John Wesley, Charles Simeon, and the Evangelical Revival," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 2 (1956): 203-14, *passim*. For eighteenth-century evangelical reflection on (1) the indwelling Spirit, see Thomas Templeton Taylor, "The Spirit of the Awakening: The Pneumatology of New England's Great Awakening in Historical and Theological Context" (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1988), *passim*; (2) the doctrine of assurance, see Arthur S. Yates, *The Doctrine of Assurance With Special Reference to John Wesley* (London: Epworth, 1952); David Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain, A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (1989 ed.; repr.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 42-50; (3) the sanctifying Spirit, see Timothy L. Smith, "George Whitefield and Wesleyan Perfectionism," *The Wesleyan Theological Journal* 19, no. 1 (1984): 63-85; *idem*, "Whitefield and Wesley on Righteousness by Grace," *TSF Bulletin* 9, no. 4 (1986): 5-8; (4) and for the power of the Spirit, see R. Tudur Jones, "The Evangelical Revival in Wales: A Study in Spirituality" *An Introduction to Celtic Christianity* (ed. in James P. Mackey; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 237-67.

[3] *Quenching the Spirit: Examining Centuries of Opposition to the Moving of the Holy Spirit* (Lake Mary, FL: Creation House, 1992). 29.

[4] James I. Packer, *God In Our Midst: Seeking and Receiving Ongoing Revival* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant, 1987), 18.

[5] See a letter that Howel Harris wrote to George Whitefield in 1743 (cited in Eifion Evans, *Daniel Rowland and the Great Evangelical Awakening in Wales* [Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1985], 243).

[6] Philip Doddridge, *Some Remarkable Passages in the Life of the Honourable Col. James Gardiner* 22 (*The*

Works of the Rev. P. Doddridge [Leeds, 1803], IV, 19). Further references to this work will cite it as *Life of the Honourable Col. James Gardiner* and further identify these references according to paragraph numbers. The complete story of Gardiner's conversion may be found in *Life of the Honourable Col. James Gardiner* 30-37 (*Works of the Rev. P. Doddridge*, IV, 24-29). A brief account of Gardiner's life and conversion may be found in F. W. B. Bullock, *Evangelical Conversion in Great Britain 1696-1845* (St. Leonards on Sea: Budd & Gillatt, 1959), 16-21.

[7] Ibid., 9, IV, 11.

[8] Ibid., 22, IV, 19.

[9] Ibid., 23, IV, 19.

[10] Ibid., 28, 29, 36, IV, 22, 23, 27.

[11] Ibid., 32, IV, 25.

[12] Ibid., 33, IV, 25.

[13] Ibid., 35, IV, 27. While Doddridge clearly regarded Gardiner's conversion as most unusual, he did mention that he was aware of at least one other like it. He did not name the individual, who was still living at the time when Doddridge wrote his biography of Gardiner in 1747. He merely stated that the individual of whom he was speaking was "one of the brightest living ornaments" of the Church of England, a man who has both an "exemplary life" and a "zealous ministry" (Ibid., 36, IV, 27-28). The man in question was George Thomson (1698-1782), vicar of St. Gennys, a windswept village in North Cornwall perched atop the cliffs overlooking the Atlantic. For a couple of years after his coming to St. Gennys Thomson had lived a careless life, characterized by "debaucheries" and similar in many ways to that of Gardiner before the latter's conversion. Yet, in 1733 or 1734, Thomson was awakened from his benighted state by a dream, which was repeated three times in one night with ever-increasing terror. In the first instance of the dream, he was told: "This day month, at six in the afternoon, you must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to give an account of the dreadful abuse of all your talents, and the injuries done the souls committed to your care." Thomson woke in alarm, but soon shrugged off the dream with the thought, "Glad I am it was no more than a dream; I am no old woman to mind dreams," and promptly fell back asleep. The dream was repeated "with greater circumstances of terror," and Thomson awoke again, this time deeply shaken. After much tossing and agitation, he was able to go back to sleep once more, only to be awakened after the dream had been repeated yet a third time. Thomson, now "filled with horror" and convinced that he had but a month to live, called together his friends and the leading individuals in the parish. He recounted his dream to them, told them to find someone to fill his place, and to return to conduct his funeral in a month. He then shut himself up in his home and for two weeks was "in the depth of despair," since he was persuaded that it was not consistent with God's honor for him to forgive one who had brought such dishonor upon his holy name. After a fortnight of distress, however, Thomson was led to Romans 3, where he "clearly saw that God could be glorified in his salvation, through the propitiation of Christ's most precious blood." Thomson returned to his pulpit and began to preach those doctrines which would soon be the hallmark of the Evangelical Revival: the atoning death of Christ and the imputation of his righteousness, the necessity of the new birth, and the absolute need of the Holy Spirit's power and presence to begin and carry on a saving change in heart and life. For the full account of Thomson's conversion, see I. Davidson, "Some Account of the Rev. George Thomson," *The Evangelical Magazine* 9 (1800): 221-25. This account consists of a letter written by Davidson in 1772. For a good study of Thomson's ministry, see G. C. B. Davies, *The Early Cornish Evangelicals 1735-1760. A Study of Walker of Truro and Others* (London: S.P.C.K., 1951), 30-34, 37-52.

[14] Michael J. Crawford, *Seasons of Grace: Colonial New England's Revival Tradition in Its British Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 160.

[15] Doddridge, *Life of the Honourable Col. James Gardiner* 135, IV, 88.

[16] Ibid., 135, IV, 88.

[17] Cited in Arnold A. Dallimore, *George Whitefield: The Life and Times of the Great Evangelist of the Eighteenth-Century Revival* (Westchester, IL: Cornerstone, 1980), 2:128. For further details and discussion of

this revival, see especially Arthur Fawcett, *The Cambuslang Revival: The Scottish Evangelical Revival of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Banner of Truth, 1971); Crawford, *Seasons of Grace, passim*.

[18]Doddridge, *Life of the Honourable Col. James Gardiner* 135, IV, 88. See also Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *Calendar of the Correspondence of Philip Doddridge (1702–1751)* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1979), 147.

[19]Doddridge, *Life of the Honourable Col. James Gardiner,* 136, IV, 88.

[20]Ibid., 136, IV, 89.

[21]Nuttall, *Calendar,* 161.

[22]Graham C.G. Thomas, "George Whitefield and Friends: The Correspondence of Some Early Methodists," *The National Library of Wales Journal* 27 (1991–92), 65.

[23]*George Whitefield's Journals* (London: Banner of Truth, 1960), 273. For Doddridge's sympathies with the leaders in the revival, see especially Alan C. Clifford, "Philip Doddridge and the Oxford Methodists," *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* 42 (1979), 75-80. As W. R. Ward puts it: by the 1740's Doddridge "was a Methodist in the sense of an adherent of the movement of revival and reform" (*The Protestant Evangelical Awakening* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992], 348).

[24]*The Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge* (ed. John Doddridge Humphreys; London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, 1831), V, 401.

[25]Nuttall, *Calendar,* 183. On Watts's relationship to Whitefield, see K. L. Parry, "Isaac Watts and 18th Century Dissent," *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* 16 (1949–1951), 21-22; David G. Fountain, *Isaac Watts Remembered* (Worthing: Henry E. Walter, 1974), 92-94.

[26]See Clifford, "Philip Doddridge and the Oxford Methodists", 77-78; Malcolm Deacon, *Philip Doddridge of Northampton 1702–1751* (Northampton: Northamptonshire Libraries, 1980), 88.

[27]See especially the letters of Nathaniel Neal to Doddridge, dated October 11 and 15, 1743: *The Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge* (ed. John Doddridge Humphreys; London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, 1830), IV, 241–81.

[28]Henry D. Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast. John Wesley and the Rise of Methodism* (London: Epworth, 1989), 276.

[29]*An Essay concerning Human Understanding* 4.19.5 (ed. Peter H. Nidditch [1975 ed.; repr. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984], 699).

[30]Ibid., 4.19.7, 699.

[31]*A Dictionary of the English Language* (London, 1755), s.v. "Enthusiasm."

[32]"Walking with God" in *Select Sermons of George Whitefield* (London: Banner of Truth, 1958), 104. For the position of John Wesley, the other key figure in the Evangelical Revival, with respect to enthusiasm, see Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 275-78, 334-42, 539-40; Lowell O. Ferrel, "John Wesley and the Enthusiasts," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, 23, no. 1 and no. 2 (Spring-Fall 1988): 180-87.

[33]Arnold A. Dallimore, *George Whitefield. The Life and Times of the Great Evangelist of the Eighteenth-Century Revival* (1970 ed.; repr. Westchester, Illinois: Cornerstone Books, 1979), 1:540; Christopher J. L. Bennett, "The Great Awakening of 1740 and the Problem of Phenomena" in *Perfecting the Church Below* (London: Westminster Conference, 1990), 73.

[34]*Correspondence and Diary of Philip Doddridge* (ed. John Doddridge Humphreys; London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, 1830), III, 381.

[35]*The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley*, A.M. (ed. Nehemiah Curnock; 1911 ed.; repr.; London: Epworth, 1960), II, 256-57, n.1.

[36]*Sermons on Important Subjects* (London: Thomas Tegg, 1833), 432. For the historical circumstances surrounding the publication of this sermon, see Timothy L. Smith, "Whitefield and Wesley on Righteousness by Grace," *TSF Bulletin* 9, no.4 (1986), 6-7.

[37]For studies of the French Prophets, see Hillel Schwartz, *Knaves, Fools, Madmen, and that Subtle Effluvium: A Study of the Opposition to the French Prophets in England, 1706–1710* (Gainesville: The University Presses of Florida, 1978); idem, *The French Prophets. The History of a Millenarian Group in Eighteenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980); Clarke Garrett, *Spirit Possession and Popular Religion: From the Camisards to*

the Shakers (Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), *passim*.

[38]For contacts between the French Prophets and those involved in the Evangelical Revival, see Schwartz, *French Prophets*, 202-208; Garrett, *Spirit Possession*, 79-85.

[39]For brief discussions of Whitefield's perspective on the gifts of the Spirit, see Victor Budgen, *The Charismatics and the Word of God. A biblical and historical perspective on the charismatic movement* (Welwyn, Hertfordshire: Evangelical Press, 1985), 162-63; Taylor, "Spirit of the Awakening," 299, 317-18.

[40]Robert Bruce Mullin, "Horace Bushnell and the Question of Miracles," *Church History* 58 (1989), 461. In the previous century, the Puritans—except for such left-wing groups as the Quakers—had maintained a similar position. See Garth B. Wilson, "The Puritan Doctrine of the Holy Spirit: A Critical Investigation of a Crucial Chapter in the History of Protestant Theology" (Unpublished Th.D. thesis, Knox College, The Toronto School of Theology, 1978), 296-300; J. I. Packer, "John Owen on Spiritual Gifts" in his *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life* (Wheaton: Crossway, 1990), 219-30.

[41]*Three Letters to the Author of a late Pamphlet, entitled Christianity not founded on Argument* (*The Miscellaneous Works of Philip Doddridge* [London: William Ball, 1839], 1161). See also Doddridge's *A Course of Lectures on the Principal Subjects in Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity* (*Miscellaneous Works*, 397).

[42]"The More Excellent Way" [*The Works of John Wesley* (ed. Albert C. Outler; Nashville: Abingdon, 1986), 3:263-64]. For the following discussion of Wesley's position on the gifts of the Spirit, I am indebted to Lycurgus M. Starkey, Jr., *The Work of the Holy Spirit: A Study in Wesleyan Theology* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 73-77; Ted A Campbell, "John Wesley's Conceptions and Uses of Christian Antiquity" (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Southern Methodist University, 1984), 194-204; *idem*, "John Wesley and Conyers Middleton on Divine Intervention in History," *Church History* 55 (1986): 39-49. Popular Pentecostal historiography has frequently misrepresented Wesley's "open" position on the gifts by depicting him as a forerunner of Pentecostalism. Undoubtedly, Pentecostalism emerged from a theological matrix that owed its shape and structure to the theology of Wesley. But it is one thing to admit this indebtedness of Pentecostalism to Wesley's theology; it is quite another thing to argue that Wesley was a proto-Pentecostal.

[43]Campbell, "Divine Intervention in History", 48.

[44]See also his statement in his response to an anti-Methodist tract written by William Warburton (1698-1779), the Bishop of Gloucester: *A Letter to the Right Reverend The Lord Bishop of Gloucester* II.16 (*The Works of John Wesley*, volume 11: *The Appeals to Men of Reason and Religion and Certain Related Open Letters* [ed. Gerald R. Cragg; Oxford: Clarendon, 1975], 514-15).

[45]"The Nature of Enthusiasm" 21 [*Wesley's Standard Sermons* (ed. Edward H. Sugden; 4th ed.; London: Epworth, 1956), II, 95-96].

[46]Ibid., 21 (*Standard Sermons*, II, 96).

[47]Ibid., 18 (*Standard Sermons*, II, 93).

[48]Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 338; see also *idem*, "Doctors, Demons and Early Methodist Healing" in *The Church and Healing* (ed. W. J. Sheils; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982), 149.

[49]Cited in Susie I. Tucker, *Enthusiasm: A Study in Semantic Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 34.

[50]For the details of the Bell affair, see L. Tyerman, *The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, Founder of the Methodists* (5th ed.; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1880), II, 433-44, 460-62; Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, 338-41.

[51]"Indwelling of the Spirit" (*Sermons*, 433).

[52]Jones, "Evangelical Revival in Wales," 238.

[53]Ibid., 251-52.

[54]John Walsh was a converted deist. For a few details regarding his life, see *The Works of John Wesley. Volume 26: Letters, II: 1740–1755* (ed. Frank Baker; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 616, n.1.

[55]*The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley* (ed. Nehemiah Curnock; London: Epworth, 1913), IV, 336. For a good discussion of these events at Everton, see Nigel R. Pibworth, *The Gospel Pedlar: The Story of John Ber-*

ridge and the Eighteenth-Century Revival (Welwyn, Hertfordshire: Evangelical, 1987), 49-70.

[56]Jones, "Evangelical Revival in Wales," 251.

[57]*Journal* (November 25, 1759), IV, 359. See also the comments on Wesley's position in this regard by Garrett, *Spirit Possession*, 83, 87-89.

[58]Cited Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, 1:328.

[59]"Jonathan Edwards and the Crucial Importance of Revival" in his *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1987), 361.

[60]For fuller discussion of these works, see Michael A. G. Haykin, *Jonathan Edwards: The Holy Spirit in Revival* (Durham: Evangelical Press, 2005).

[61]Garrett, *Spirit Possession*, 115.

[62]Ibid.

[63]Taylor, "Spirit of the Awakening," 325.

[64]For a discussion of the role of Davenport and Croswell in the Evangelical Revival, see Garrett, *Spirit Possession*, 114-15, 119-26; Iain H. Murray, *Jonathan Edwards: A New Biography* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1987), 223-29; Taylor, "Spirit of the Awakening," 322-31; Robert E. Cray, Jr., "More Light on a New Light: James Davenport's Religious Legacy, Eastern Long Island, 1740–1840," *New York History*, 73 (1992): 5-27.

[65]A *Letter from a Gentleman in Boston, to Mr. George Wishart, One of the Ministers of Edinburgh, Concerning the State of Religion in New-England* in *The Great Awakening. Documents on the Revival of Religion, 1740–1745* (ed. Richard L. Bushman; New York: Atheneum, 1970), 121.

[66]Murray, *Jonathan Edwards*, 225.

[67]*The Religious Affections* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1986), 59.

[68]*A Divine and Supernatural Light, Immediately Imparted to the Soul by the Spirit of God* in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (1834 ed.; repr. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1974), 2:13.

[69]*Religious Affections*, 60.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Ibid., 61.

[72]Ibid., 62.

[73]*Works of Jonathan Edwards*, 1:376-78.

[74]Ibid., 1:376, 377.

[75]*The of a Work of the Spirit of God* in *Jonathan Edwards on Revival* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1965), 113-14.

[76]*Distinguishing Marks*, 114).

[77]*Works of Jonathan Edwards*, 1:376, 378.

[78]*Works of Jonathan Edwards*, 1:378.

[79]Stephen J. Stein, ed., *Humble Attempt* in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1977), 5:317.

[80]Ibid., 5:320.

[81]Ibid., 5:341.

[82]Ibid., 5:344.

[83]Ibid., 5:347-48.

[84]Ibid, 5:356.

[85]Richard Lovelace, "Pneumatological Issues in American Presbyterianism" *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 31 (1986): 345-46.

[86]For further discussion of the circumstances surrounding this prayer movement, see Ernest A. Payne, *The Prayer Call of 1784* (London: Baptist Laymen's Missionary Movement, 1941); Michael A. G. Haykin, "John Sutcliff and the Concert of Prayer," *Reformation and Revival Journal* 1, no.3 (1992): 65-88; *idem*, " 'A Habitation of God, Through the Spirit': John Sutcliff (1752–1814) and the Revitalization of the Calvinistic Baptists in the Late Eighteenth Century," *The Baptist Quarterly* 34 (1991–1992): 309-11.

[87]Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *Howel Harris 1714–1773. The Last Enthusiast* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1965), 46.

[88]Ibid., 46.

[89]*The Necessity of the Trumpet's giving a certain Sound* (Bristol, 1813), 4.

[90]"The Design of Spiritual Gifts" in *Pastoral Memorials: Selected from the Manuscripts of the Late Revd. John Ryland* (London: B. J. Holdsworth, 1828), II, 67.

[91]"The Love of the Spirit," II, 42. See also Ryland's remarks in a sermon that he delivered in 1802 at the ordination of Thomas Morgan (1776–1857): *The Difficulties of the Christian Ministry, and the Means of surmournting* (*sic*) *them: with the Obedience of Churches to their Pastors explained and enforced* (Birmingham, 1802), 18-19. Also see his "The Desirableness of a Spiritual Taste" in *Pastoral Memorials: Selected from*

the Manuscripts of the Late Revd. John Ryland (London: B. J. Holdsworth, 1826], I, 118); *idem*, "Remarks on the Quarterly Review" in *Pastoral Memorials*, II, 348; "Remarks upon the Notion of Extraordinary Impulses and Impressions on the Imagination" in *Pastoral Memorials*, II, 417-19.

[92]Letter to Mary Carey, December 14, 1789 (Baptist Missionary Society Archives, Angus Library, Regent's Park College, Oxford). Some of the punctuation has been added to make this section of the letter read better.

[93]*Godly Zeal, Described and Recommended* (Nottingham, 1792), 1-2, 15. See also Richard Lovelace, "Baptism in the Holy Spirit and the Evangelical Tradition", *Pneuma* 7 (1985): 115. On Ryland's pneumatology, see Michael A. G. Haykin, "'The Sum of All Good': John Ryland, Jr. and the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," *Churchman* 103 (1989): 332-53.

[94]Taylor, "Spirit of the Awakening", 290.

[95]*An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens* (1792 ed.; repr.; Didcot, Oxfordshire: Baptist Missionary Society, 1991), 103.

He Will Glorify Me: Evaluating the Pneumatology of Inclusivists and Pluralists[1]

Todd L. Miles

INTRODUCTION

In Acts 4, Peter and John were summoned before the rulers, elders, and scribes in Jerusalem to explain how they had healed a man lame from birth. They responded, "Let it be known to all of you and to all the people of Israel that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead-by him this man is standing before you well. This Jesus is the stone that was rejected by you, the builders, which has become the cornerstone. And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved." This conviction motivated Peter and John, and the rest of the apostles, to endure persecution for the sake of Christ and relentlessly proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ to the nations.

That simple statement of the uniqueness of Jesus did not preach well to the sensibilities of Peter and John's audience. Nor does it preach well in our current postmodern context. To suggest that there is only one way to be reconciled to God is seen as offensive, intolerant, and just plain rude. Nevertheless, Peter and John were correct. Based upon the biblical evidence, I am convinced that one must hear and believe the gospel in order to be saved, and that the biblical response to the question of "What about those who have never heard?" is "Go tell them!" This conviction is not shared by an increasing number of evangelicals. For reasons of their own, many are uncomfortable with the narrow exclusivity described above and are proposing different ways of interpreting the text of Acts 4:12 and others like them, to allow for a wider hope and a less restrictive stance. Further, many are turning to pneumatology as the starting point for their proposals. Believing that the church has illegitimately circumscribed the mission of the Spirit by the mission of the Son, some inclusivists and pluralists are suggesting that maintaining a relative independence of the Spirit from the Son will create the theological

Todd L. Miles is Assistant Professor of Theology and Hermeneutics at Western Seminary.

He earned the Ph.D. from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and he is the author of *A God of Many Understandings? The Gospel and a Theology of Religions* (B&H, 2010).

SBJT 16.4 (2012): 74-95.

space necessary to justify their inclusivist and pluralist proposals. The purpose of this article is to describe those proposals and then to demonstrate that a turn to pneumatology to create theological space for a "wider hope" fails on biblical theological grounds. That is, the Bible's presentation of the person and work of the Holy Spirit is self-consciously Christocentric. The Holy Spirit works to bring glory to the Son (John 16:14).

TERMINOLOGY

In this article, I will utilize the fourfold taxonomy that is typically used for discussing the relationships between salvation, the unique claims of Jesus Christ, and world religions of exclusivism (often called particularism or restrictivism), inclusivism, pluralism, and universalism.[1]

Exclusivists maintain that salvation is possible only through conscious faith in Jesus Christ. That is, there is an ontological necessity and an epistemological necessity to the death of Christ in order that any be saved. Only the death and resurrection of Christ can atone for sin and one must submit to Christ in repentance and faith in order to be reconciled to God. Exclusivism has historically been the majority position in the Church.

Inclusivism, on the other hand, is no less committed to the work of Christ as the basis for salvation, but its adherents question the need for explicit faith in Christ in order to be saved. That is, the work of Christ on the cross is ontologically necessary for salvation (Christ's death and resurrection had to happen in history), but it is not epistemologically necessary (one does not need to believe in Christ's death and resurrection in this life to be saved).

Pluralism, which is outside the boundaries associated with evangelical Christianity, abandons the necessity of Christ's atoning work on the cross altogether and sees nothing privileged or unique about Jesus Christ and Christianity in comparison with the other religions of the world. Rather, pluralists believe that one can find salvation, however it is individually construed, through various religious traditions, belief systems, and ethics. Though not all find salvation, there are many roads that lead to God.

Universalists are convinced that all will ultimately be reconciled to God, hell (if it ever existed in reality and was populated) will be emptied out, and universal salvation will be effected with no individual excepted. Universalism comes in two varieties: evangelical and pluralist. Evangelical universalists believe that the basis for universal reconciliation lies in the atoning work of Christ on the cross. Pluralistic universalists root universal reconciliation in the love of God, who may work through a variety of prophets, sacred texts, and world religions, without any necessary recourse to the work of Christ.

Prior to the twentieth century, the response of the church to world religions was consistently negative with regard to their salvific potential. Convictions on how the religions of the world fit into the redemptive purposes of God were articulated, not in formal statements on those religions, but in the response of the church fathers to schismatics. Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, set the stage by declaring, "Be not deceived, my brethren: if anyone follows a maker of schism, he does not inherit the Kingdom of God; if anyone walks in strange doctrine he has no part in the passion."[2] Irenaeus, to whom current advocates of a pneumatological approach to theology of religions most often appeal, pronounced, "For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace; but the Spirit is truth."[3] The gravest condemnation of the possibility of salvation outside the church came from Cyprian: "For they cannot live out of it, since the house of God is one, and there can be no salvation to any except in the Church."[4] Thus the principle that guided the church for the better part of two millennia, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* ("no salvation outside the church"), was articulated.

INCLUSIVIST AND PLURALIST PROPOSALS THAT TURN TO PNEUMATOLOGY

Many are now questioning whether indeed there is no salvation outside the church and are seeking grounds for the possibility that the unevangelized may yet be saved apart from faith in Christ. A Christian theology of religions is the study of how the other religions of the world fit into the redemptive purposes of God (if at all). There have been no lack of proposals that find room for salvation for the unevanglized, but the exclusive claims of Christ as recorded in Scripture are difficult to overcome. Lacking epistemological certitude, some appeal to hope and pneumatology. As inclusivist Clark Pinnock writes, "There is no way around it—we must hope that God's gift of salvation is being applied to people everywhere. If so, how else than by the universal presence and activity of Spirit?"[5]

In what follows, I would like to summarize the proposals for pluralism and inclusivism that focus on the role of the Holy Spirit. I will begin with non-evangelicals before summarizing a couple evangelical proposals. We will find that there is not much new in the evangelical inclusivist arguments. Many of the same pneumatological arguments were made by non-evangelical inclusivists and pluralists many years before.

Roman Catholicism

Two Roman Catholic popes, both named Pius (Pius IX in 1856 and Pius XII in 1943), represent some of the earliest nuances of *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, effectively opening the door just a crack for inclusivistic and pluralistic influences. In 1856, Pope Pius IX demanded that those who fall under the witness of the church must enter the church to be saved, but he made provision for the one who did not know of the gospel or Church "through ignorance beyond his control" [6] or "invincible ignorance." [7]

In 1943, Pope Pius XII, in the papal encyclical *Mystici Corporis*,[8] also left the door open when he spoke of those who were separated from the Catholic Church who nevertheless had an "unconscious desire" and have a "certain relationship with the Mystical Body of the Redeemer."[9] He gave no definition of "unconscious desire," nor did he explain how one can have a "certain relationship" with the body of Christ apart from the church. It is evident, however, that room was allowed for the possibility of salvation outside the church.

Vatican II

The door left ajar by Pius IX and Pius XII was opened wide at the Second Vatican Council. At first glance, the teaching of Vatican II concerning world religions is uncompromising. *Lumen Gentium* ("light of the nations"), while specifically mentioning Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism, still declares that the church is "necessary for salvation."[10] Protestants, who have entered into faith in Christ and submitted to Christian baptism, though they do not "profess the Catholic faith in its entirety" are still joined to the Catholic Church "in some real way" by the Holy Spirit.[11] Only those who know the necessity of the Catholic Church and consciously reject it cannot be saved.[12] Those who have not heard of the necessity of the church do not share such condemnation.

Those in any religion who have not heard the gospel "through no fault of their own" may "seek God with a sincere heart, and, moved by grace, try in their actions to do his will as they know it through the dictates of their conscience—those too may achieve eternal salvation."[13] In perhaps the most specific statement of the work of the Holy Spirit in world religions, *Gaudium et Spes* ("Joy and Hope," one of the Apostolic Constitutions of Second Vatican) declares that among those who are being saved, there is a universal work of the Spirit that brings the benefits of redemption:

> This holds true not for Christians only but also for all persons of good will in whose hearts grace is active invisibly. For since Christ died for all, and since all are in fact called to one and the same

> destiny, which is divine, we must hold that the Holy Spirit offers to all the possibility of being made partners, in a way known to God, in the Paschal mystery.[14]

This is perhaps the earliest affirmation in official Catholic teaching of what has become the standard inclusivist position with emphasis on the role of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is at work in *all* who are not Christians, including, then, those who have no knowledge of Christ or the teaching of the church, enabling them to become participants and beneficiaries of the work of Christ apart from gospel proclamation.

After Vatican II

The Roman Catholic Church, since Vatican II, has seen a steady departure from the principle of *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*.[15] The papacy of John Paul II saw the greatest departure from an exclusivist position. In his encyclicals *Redemptoris Hominis* (1979)[16] and *Redemptoris Missio* (1990), he elevated the role of the Holy Spirit in the life and the church and mission, specifically stating that the Spirit is at work outside the confines of the church, but discernment of that work is the responsibility of the church.[17]

According to *Dialogue and Proclamation*, a joint document of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue and the Congregation for Evangelization of Peoples,[18] the basis for interreligious dialogue is the presence of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the participants. This dialogue is possible because the Holy Spirit is "mysteriously present in the heart of every person, Christian or otherwise" who engages in authentic prayer.[19] Although there is but "one plan of salvation for humankind, with its center in Jesus Christ," there is an "active presence of the Holy Spirit in the religious life of the members of the other religious traditions which causes a mystery of unity … in spite of the differences between religious professions."[20] The Holy Spirit calls people to unity in Christ even if some are "unaware" of the fact. Their saving faith manifests itself in a "sincere practice of what is good in their own religious traditions and by following dictates of their conscience."[21] Such practice constitutes a positive response to God's invitation to salvation in Christ, "even while they do not recognize or acknowledge him as their saviour."[22] This is a clear articulation of the inclusivist proposal that the Holy Spirit is at work in religious others, applying the work of Christ to those who do not possess conscious faith in Christ.[23]

Pluralists

Peter Hodgson

A recent proposal by Peter Hodgson, the Charles G. Finney Professor of Theology, Emeritus, in the Divinity School of Vanderbilt University, for a pluralistic theology of religions built upon pneumatology demonstrates the revisionism of biblical doctrines that is taking place in the quest to accommodate pluralistic sensibilities. Hodgson believes that "Spirit" is "a more universally available religious symbol" than "Christ" and should be embraced by Christians as the starting point for a theology of religions.[24]

Jacques Dupuis

The Belgian-born Jesuit, Jacques Dupuis (1923-2004), articulated what he called a "theology of religious pluralism" that was intentionally Christocentric, so actually bears more in common with inclusivism than religious pluralism.[25] For Dupuis, that God saves those outside the Christian faith was axiomatic. He also believed that all salvation is ultimately through Christ, but not necessarily through the gospel. In the mystery of salvation, "every authentic experience of God, among Christians as among others, is an encounter of God in Jesus Christ with the human being."[26] In other words, one experiences the salvation of God through Jesus Christ, but not necessarily through Christianity.[27] Dupuis turns to pneumatology to bridge the gap between the particularity of Christ and the cosmic salvific intentions of God manifest

in religious others. The experience of God in other religions is due to the "active presence and life-giving influence of the Holy Spirit."[28]

Paul Knitter

Paul Knitter, former Divine Word missionary and Professor Emeritus of Theology at Xavier University, is perhaps the most influential Catholic voice in America on the topic of interreligious dialogue. Knitter calls his pluralistic schema, "theocentric Christology."[29] Jesus has a relational uniqueness (though not ontological) to God the Father compared to the significant figures in other religions, but he made no exclusive or normative claims, nor is his revelation of God definitive or normative in any sense. There may be other savior figures among the different religions.[30] In order for Knitter's theology of religions to be pluralistic and Christian, he turns to pneumatology. Knitter posits that the Holy Spirit is at work redemptively in the world, and neither his work, nor his person can be subordinated to the Son. Any commonalities between the ministries of the Son and the Spirit are the result of both the Son and Spirit having theocentric, yet independent, missions. This allows for significant discontinuities in the economies of the Son and the Spirit, while affirming continuity as each relates to God.[31]

Stanley Samartha

Samartha (1920–2001), an ordained Indian Methodist, was convinced that the ministry of the Holy Spirit could not be circumscribed within the ministry of Christ. A leading advocate of interreligious dialogue for the purposes of mutual theological instruction, Samartha insisted that there is evidence of the activity of the Holy Spirit in religious others, seeing continuity between the work of the Spirit in the Old Testament prophets, Jesus Christ, the apostles, the Buddha, Muhammad, and perhaps even Gandhi, Marx, and Mao Tse Tung.[32] Profitable interreligious dialogue is possible because of the mutual presence of the Spirit in the participants and the Spirit's work to continually breathe life into the sacred writings of the different religions.[33]

Georg Khodr

Georg Khodr grew up in Tripoli, Lebanon, studied theology in Paris, and was elected to the episcopate in 1970. Khodr long advocated taking the Spirit as the starting point for a theology of religions. Doing so allows one to discard the categories of exclusivism and inclusivism. Khodr's largest contribution to the theology of religions project came in his appeal to Irenaeus and the "two hands of God" metaphor to explain how the Son and Spirit can have distinct economies.[34] Using the metaphor as a platform, Khodr affirmed a "hypostatic independence" where the "advent of the Holy Spirit in the world is not subordinated to the Son, is not simply a function of the Word."[35]

Different economies does not mean that there is division in the mind or purposes of God. The economies of the Son and Spirit are differing aspects of the mission of God to create the cosmos, sustain the cosmos, and redeem the cosmos. All redemptive work is unified in God, but whereas the existence and mission of the church is necessarily circumscribed by the economy of the Son, non-Christian religions are seen as arenas where the Spirit is at work redemptively. He applies the work of Christ through the contours of each religion, even when Christ is not named. He also illuminates the sacred texts of each religion in much the same way that he illuminates the Bible for the Christian.

Evangelicals

Inclusivism has established a powerful and growing presence in the evangelical church. Among the evangelical scholars that have proposed an inclusivist understanding of salvation are such notables as John Sanders, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, Terrance Tiessen, Amos Yong, and the late Clark Pinnock and Stanley Grenz.[36] Because Pinnock's and Yong's inclusivistic models are more intentionally pneumatocentric, I will focus on

their proposals. Again, time does not permit a full description of their models, but I will highlight the salient points. Clark Pinnock and Amos Yong have provided the most developed investigations into the salvific role of the Holy Spirit outside the proclamation of the gospel, so their proposals will be explained in detail.

Clark Pinnock

Clark Pinnock (1937–2010), the long time professor of Systematic Theology at McMaster Divinity College in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, made his most significant contributions to the theology of religions debate in his books, *A Wideness in God's Mercy* (1992),[37] his article "An Inclusivist View," in the edited volume *Four Views on Salvation in a Pluralistic World* (1995),[38] and his pneumatology monograph, *Flame of Love*, published in 1996.

The first axiom of Pinnock's theology of religions is an affirmation of the unbounded and universal love of God for the world. It was this love that led Pinnock to possess a general optimism for the salvation of the world. To Pinnock it was inconceivable that God would not love everybody equally or that he would be miserly in his invitation to salvation.[39] Responding to the claims of religious pluralists, Pinnock was unable to believe that the grace of God is limited to the confines of the church.[40]

The second axiom of Pinnock's theology of religions is a high Christology. He was adamant that Jesus Christ is the one mediator between God and man. However, that does not mean that one needs to believe the gospel to be saved. For evidence, he pointed to the "pagan believers" such as Melchizedek and Job.

Pinnock refered to his hope for the salvation of the unevangelized as pneumatological inclusivism. He did not believe that one need possess conscious faith in Christ in order to enjoy redemption through Jesus. In Pinnock's view, it is highly probable that the Holy Spirit is working in the lives of those outside the church of Jesus Christ. God may or may not use other religions to effect salvation through the Spirit based upon the work of Christ (modal inclusivism).

The role of the Holy Spirit (Gen 1:2) in creation is paradigmatic for the work that the Spirit performed throughout all of redemptive history and continues to this day. Creation establishes the omnipresence of the Spirit in the world. Having identified the unique role and work of the Holy Spirit in creation, Pinnock built on this foundation to claim that the Holy Spirit has never ceased to fill the singular role that he began at creation. Because the Spirit continues a like role in redemption, any attempt to subordinate his efforts to the Son is to dishonor the third member of the Trinity. He wrote, "Let us stop demoting the Spirit, relegating him to spheres of church and piety. His role in the creation is foundational to these other activities…. One does not properly defend the uniqueness of Jesus Christ by denying the Spirit's preparatory work that preceded his coming. Let us try to see continuity, not contradiction, in the relation of creation and redemption."[41]

Predictably, Pinnock was highly critical of the *filioque* clause. Pinnock denied the reality of double procession because it subordinates the person and economic role of the Spirit to that of the Son and does not allow the relational autonomy necessary for the Spirit to fulfill his full range of creative and salvific work. Denying double procession allowed Pinnock to establish a measure of independence for the work of the Spirit from that of the Son.[42]

Pinnock believed that the relationship between the Son and Spirit is reciprocal. He based this on the submission of the Son to the Spirit's guidance during the first advent. Because the Spirit was active in the world prior to the incarnation, led the Son during the first advent, and is not active in the world where Christ is not named, it makes more sense to see Christology in the context of the Spirit's global operations.[43] He employed Irenaeus's "two-hands of God" metaphor to create relative autonomy of the Spirit from the Son and called

for a pneumatocentric theological speculation: "Let us see what results from viewing Christ as an aspect of the Spirit's mission, instead of (as is more usual) viewing Spirit as a function of Christ's."[44]

With the Holy Spirit freed from a functional dependence on the Son, the Spirit is also freed from the constraints of the Son's church. Pinnock explained, "Spirit is not confined to the church but is present everywhere, giving life and creating community.... Because Spirit works everywhere in advance of the church's mission, preparing the way for Christ, God's will can be truly and credibly universal."[45] To Pinnock, the presence of the Spirit is always a presence of grace to bless and to save. General revelation and natural knowledge of God are always "gracious revelation and a potentially saving knowledge."[46] Jesus may not be named in other faiths, but the Holy Spirit is still present and may be encountered there.[47] Because the work of the Spirit is always potentially salvific, Pinnock suggests that it is legitimate to look for redemptive activity in other religions.[48] Activity of the Spirit in religious others can be discerned on the basis of piety and accompanying Christ-like works.[49] Any suggestion that the work of the Spirit could be confined by boundaries established by the explicit proclamation of the Christian gospel is an artificial ecclesiastical construct and was offensive to Pinnock.

Pinnock explained the existence of world religions on the basis of the prevenient grace of the triune God, therefore world religions can play a part in redemptive history. This would include the Holy Spirit, whose activity can be seen in human culture and in the various religions of humanity.[50] Discerning the work of the Holy Spirit in religious others is difficult, but he ultimately calls for cognitive and ethical criteria. Does the person fear God? Are the fruit of the Spirit manifest in his life? One can tell where the Spirit is at work around the world when one finds people who look like Jesus; that is, they exhibit the fruit of the Spirit and an ethic that matches Jesus' instruction on the kingdom.[51] Therefore, the sanctifying work of the Spirit is not limited to Christians. This also suggests that saving faith depends only ontologically on the work of Christ, not epistemologically.[52]

Amos Yong

Amos Yong currently serves as the J. Rodman Williams Professor of Theology at the Regent University School of Divinity. Yong's contributions to evangelical theology of religions began with *Discerning the Spirit(s): A Pentecostal-Charismatic Contribution to Christian Theology of Religions*.[53] He continued to develop his position in *Beyond the Impasse; The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology*; and more recently in *Pneumatology and the Christian-Buddhist Dialogue; and The Cosmic Breath: Spirit and Nature in the Christianity-Buddhism-Science Trialogue*.[54]

Yong's Pentecostal background has made him particularly sensitive to the role of the Holy Spirit. He believes that a pneumatological theology of religions will reframe the soteriological question, by allowing serious regard for the person and work of Jesus, without subordinating that work to the church. When the redemptive work of the Spirit is not limited to the confines of the church, then the offer and application of salvation become available to those outside the reach of the church as well.[55]

Yong is unconvinced by the primary proof texts of exclusivists (e.g., Acts 4:12; John 3:17-18; Rom 10:10-13). His conclusion is that the Bible is silent on the fate of the unevangelized and that exclusivism is properly a category that applies only to the evangelized.[56] But he is not satisfied with the typical arguments of inclusivists because they have a Christological starting point. The main point of religious others in such inclusivist systems is that they are non-Christian. This will be the case for any theology of religions that begins with Christological assumptions. But like Pinnock, Yong asks, "what if one begins with pneumatology rather than christology?"[57] The end result is that Yong wants to conduct a Christian investigation of other religions, not through

the lens of Christology, but of Pneumatology.

Yong recognizes that modifications to orthodox doctrines of the procession and mission of the Holy Spirit will have profound effects on virtually every other doctrine of Christian theology.[58] Wanting to emphasize the distinction between the economies of the Son and Spirit, he refuses to subordinate the role of the Spirit to the Son or the Son to the Spirit, but sees them overlapping dimensionally.[59] This has a two-fold impact on pneumatology: (1) it does not allow for the subordination of the work (or person) of the Spirit to the work (or person) of the Son and (2) it also allows a certain relational autonomy. The Spirit is not to be defined according to the Son, nor is the Son to be defined according to the Spirit.[60] Yong does not want to allow for any subordination of the Spirit to the Son because when the mission of the Spirit is subordinated to that of the Son, soteriology is defined ecclesiologically—salvation is limited to those who belong to the church of Jesus Christ.[61]

Like Pinnock, Yong's model is built on the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit to bless, who was poured out on all flesh, all humanity in a universalistic fashion, at Pentecost.[62] At Pentecost, the Spirit was active in reversing the Tower of Babel curse, using language and culture. Since language and culture cannot be separated from religious life, the Spirit must be using the religions of the world as well. This does not mean that everything in all religions is good however. It does mean that the Spirit is working redemptively in the midst of them. Because the economies of the Son and Spirit are distinct but overlap, non-Christian faiths can be understood as "belonging to both economies, but in different respects. For starters then, it allows that they be conceived in pneumatological terms, related but not subordinated to or redefined by the economy of the Word."[63] Yong is unable to say specifically how the Spirit works in the context of religious others, but he is certain that the Spirit is at work in some sense:

> I think it is undeniable that the possible experience of the divine apart from an explicit knowledge of Christ supports the contention that there is an experience of the Spirit that is not explicitly christological. The ancient Israelite experience of Yahweh was certainly mediated by the Holy Spirit, whom they recognized only as the "divine breath." Can we be so certain that present day Jewish and Muslim experience of the divine is not that of the Holy Spirit?[64]

To discern the work of the Spirit in religious others, Yong turns to praxis over doctrine because a pneumatological approach is "much better able to account for the diversity of beliefs that are linked to and shaped by different social, moral, and religious practices."[65] Establishing criteria is difficult and Yong cautions against either importing criteria that are established by other religions or exporting a Christian set of norms in the mutual evaluation of human religious experience. Yong therefore sees a dialogue between Christianity and other religions as necessary to establish "complex and sophisticated descriptive categories" in order to "respect the importances and the particularities of the different traditions … which emerge during the course of interreligious engagement."[66] The sophistication that Yong calls for is exemplified with regard to the development of Christian Scripture. On the basis of the Bible's complex and variegated history, Yong rejects the idea that the sacred writings of religious others are not inspired by God and are therefore not revelatory.[67]

This Spirit-given ability manifests itself in the Christian evangelist who must "convert" to other religions, which is necessary for authentic dialogue. Yong describes conversion as an attitudinal change that occurs when the testimony of a religious other is taken seriously.[68] Conversion is predicated on the workings of the Spirit of God, therefore, "conversion to other faiths enabled by the Spirit will not contradict or compromise our commitment to Christ" because religious conversion "will emphasize the need to be led by and

to discern the Spirit in and through the dynamic process of encounter with those in other faiths."[69] Furthermore, Yong is convinced that Christians can learn from religious others. Just as Christians have learned from the findings of science over the centuries and have adjusted their theology in light of those findings, so Christians should be open to adjusting their theology in light of the "dynamically reconstituting" religions of the world. To refuse to do so will deny Christians the ability to formulate a "Christian theology *for the twenty-first century*."[70]

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY AND REDEMPTIVE HISTORY

What does one do with the inclusivist and pluralist models outlined above? In order to posit an independent salvific work of the Holy Spirit apart from the proclamation of the gospel of Christ, a radical change in perspective in theological method is required. Pinnock summarizes this best by suggesting, "Let us see what results from viewing Christ as an aspect of the Spirit's mission, instead of (as is more usual) viewing Spirit as a function of Christ's."[71] The question before us is whether such a change in perspective is permissible. Is reading Scripture pneumatocentrically a legitimate option or is the Bible to be read Christocentrically?

Pinnock claims that "it lies within the freedom of theology to experiment with ideas."[72] But is such freedom actually permitted? Is theological inquiry and formulation a free-play where the only boundaries are those of the theologian's imagination, or are there limits arising from the nature of the discipline itself and its subject matter? The development of any theological doctrine necessitates the justification of the resulting claims and conclusions. In other words, the theological method of a theologian is implicitly on trial with every proposal. When the object of investigation is Scripture, then it is incumbent on the interpreter to follow the lead of the Bible itself.

Pneumatological inclusivism rests upon a theological method that demands that Scripture be read through a pneumatological lens; but is this legitimate? Can redemptive history be seen and understood accurately in this light? I believe that it is illegitimate to begin theological formulation with the universal work of the Spirit. It is speculative and illegitimate to view Christ "as an aspect of the Spirit's mission," because it ignores the categories, structure, and plot of the Bible. Furthermore, it runs contrary to the way that Jesus Himself and His apostles have told us to read Scripture. Pneumatological inclusivism fails because it has been developed from an unwarranted and illegitimate theological method; that is, it fails on biblical-theological grounds. In short, it violates the way that Christ instructed us to read Scripture.

The Nature of Biblical Theology

Biblical theology involves the study of the history of God's dealings with his creation.[73] As such, it traces the outworking of God's plan for the redemption of his creation through his interaction with his people.[74] This plan for redemption is played out in a series of divine acts. Special revelation records the divine speech acts of God, which includes both commands and interpretations of historical acts. It is stating the obvious that the sourcebook of biblical theology is the Bible,[75] but this truth entails a necessary understanding of the supernatural revelation contained therein.

According to Geerhardus Vos, a pioneer in the area of biblical theology, the first characteristic feature of supernatural revelation is its historical progress. Truth does not come to us as a static entity, rather, it is dynamic. The dynamic nature of divine revelation suggests that there is a movement forward which Vos believes the Bible self-identifies as the redemption of creation:

> It constitutes a part of that great process of the new creation through which the present universe as an organic whole shall be redeemed from the consequences of sin and restored to its ideal state, which it had originally in the intention of God.... As soon as we realize that revelation is at almost every point interwoven with and conditioned by

> the redeeming activity of God in its wider sense, and together with the latter connected with the natural development of the present world, its historic character becomes perfectly intelligible and ceases to cause surprise.[76]

It therefore follows that the degree to which one misunderstands the structure of the biblical plot, is the degree to which one's exegesis will be inaccurate. Vos understands special revelation to be inseparable from the activity of God which he calls redemption. "Now redemption could not be other than historically successive, because it addresses itself to the generations of mankind coming into existence in the course of history. Revelation is the interpretation of redemption; it must, therefore, unfold itself in installments as redemption does."[77]

Finally, divine revelation is organic. Each subsequent increase in revelation consisted in the unfolding of what was germinally there in the beginning of revelation. "So dispensation grows out of dispensation, and the newest is but the fully expanded flower of the oldest."[78] Because there is a progress to revelation which moves toward a divine end, it follows that there is a consistent theme or actor in this divine drama.[79] For Vos, the central character in this drama is Jesus Christ:

> Hence from the beginning all redeeming acts of God aim at the creation and introduction of this new organic principle, which is none other than Christ. All Old Testament redemption is but the saving activity of God working toward the realization of this goal, the great supernatural prelude to the Incarnation and the Atonement. And Christ having appeared as the head of the new humanity and having accomplished His atoning work, the further renewal of the kosmos is effected through an organic extension of His power in ever widening circles.[80]

Pneumatological inclusivists and pluralists ignore the purposive nature of redemptive history as given in Scripture. As will be demonstrated in the next section, it is illegitimate to begin with the universal work of the Spirit apart from the work of Christ because it ignores the categories, structure, and plot of the Bible. Jesus Christ is not only the one who reveals God to us. He is the very Word of God (John 1:1, 18; 6:46; 14:9). Because Scripture testifies to Jesus Christ and is inspired by his Spirit (2 Pet 1:16-21), even the nature of the telling of the redemptive story demands a close connection between Christology and Pneumatology.

The very idea of seeing the work of Christ through a pneumatological lens runs contrary to the way that Jesus told us to read Scripture (Luke 24:24-27; Matt 5:17; John 5:39-40). As I have written elsewhere:

> The twenty-fourth chapter of Luke records two critical teachings by the Lord Jesus Christ on the nature of Scripture. Following His resurrection, Jesus Christ walked with two disciples who did not recognize him. Responding to Cleopas and his companion who were troubled over the events of the recent days, Jesus called them "unwise and slow" to believe in their hearts "all that the prophets have spoken" (Luke 24:25). The use of the word "unwise" does not carry the sense of "moronic" in this context, but of "obtuse." The disciples were "slow of heart" because they did not understand the redemptive purposes of God. With this statement, Jesus laid claim to being the center of the biblical prophetic ministry. He then seized the opportunity, "beginning with Moses and all the Prophets," to interpret to them "the things concerning Himself in all the Scriptures" (24:27). Though we are not told which passages Jesus interpreted for His listeners, from Luke's perspective it does not matter. The ministries and teachings of Moses and all the prophets, just as all the Scriptures, point toward Christ and His glory through suffering. The two disciples had to have the Scriptures interpreted for them because they did not read them correctly.

In Luke 24:36–49, Jesus joined a larger gathering of disciples and taught them the same lesson. In v. 44, Christ claimed that His ministry was the focal point of "the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms" (metonymy for the entire Old Testament and its tripartite division). Just as Jesus opened the eyes of the two disciples so that they could recognize Him in v. 31, so in v. 45, Jesus "opened their minds to understand the Scriptures." The parallel establishes that one sees and understands Scripture correctly when one sees and recognizes Christ as pervasive throughout. Christ is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, but He is also the central figure in a divine drama that dominates all of human history. This is demonstrated by Christ's statement "This is what is written: the Messiah would suffer and rise from the dead the third day, and repentance for forgiveness of sins would be proclaimed in His name to all the nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (24:46–47). The use of the term "what is written" (*gegraptai*) indicates that Jesus is referring back to the Old Testament. Jesus' statement, however, was not an explicit quotation of any biblical passage, but was the implicit teaching of the entire Old Testament. The correct reading of Scripture, therefore, is not merely an academic exercise. Jesus claimed that the center and focus of the whole Scriptures was the proclamation of the forgiveness of sins through the work of the Messiah.

That the disciples understood this hermeneutical principle is evident from gospel proclamation in the book of Acts. Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost in Acts 2:14-41 concludes, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know with certainty that God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Messiah" (2:36). Peter did not arrive at this conclusion based upon naked assertion from the Old Testament texts to which he referred. But when the Old Testament is interpreted in the manner prescribed and modeled by Christ, then the Scriptures point in concert toward Christ. Toward the end of Acts, Paul summarizes his preaching ministry as "saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass: that the Christ must suffer and that, by being the first to rise from the dead, he would proclaim light both to our people and to the Gentiles" (Acts 26:22–23 ESV).[81]

Jesus himself drives us back to the Old Testament to read it through a Christological lens, teaching us that it will lead us back to him. We must read the Bible in the manner in which it specifies that we read it.[82]

I have argued to this point that pneumatological inclusivists and pluralists such as Pinnock and Yong, fundamentally misunderstand the nature of redemptive history and its Christocentric focus. A theology of religions which is pneumatic in character must be grounded in a proper biblical theological understanding of the relationship of the Son and the Spirit. As will be demonstrated below, pneumatological inclusivists' and pluralists' theologies of the Spirit are flawed because they disregard the relationship between the Son and the Spirit as played out in special revelation and redemptive history.

The methodology that controls my biblical theology of the Holy Spirit is structured around three essential guidelines.

First, there is the full authority and ontological uniqueness of Scripture. The authority of the Bible is inextricably tied to its divine origin. The Bible alone is the written self-revelation and self-expression of an all-authoritative God. Apart from the Spirit's movement in the human authors, Scripture can make no legitimate claim to divine authority. Some pneumatological inclusivists affirm the Spirit's role in Scripture's authority but seek to move the seat of authority from ontology to utility; that is, Scripture is authoritative because of what it does rather than what it is. For some inclusivists and pluralists, inspiration of the text is best defined by the Spirit breathing life into that text (what they are doing is conflating illumination

with inspiration). This allows them to posit that the Spirit, who is universally present, continually breathes life into the sacred texts of other religions. When this is done, there is no qualitative difference between the words of the Bible and the Qur'an or Gita.

Second, we must posit a biblical theology that is canonical. Scripture comes with its own themes and categories, indeed an entire storyline. Therefore, it cannot be said that the Bible is pre-theoretical. Scripture provides both the forms and the content for its own interpretation. When addressing typically systematic issues such as the role of the Holy Spirit in culture and world religions or the relationship between Christ and the Holy Spirit, our theological paradigm and method must be dependent upon the content of Scripture that the theological inquiry is seeking to illumine. Closely related to the concept of biblical theology, evangelical theology must be self-consciously canonical. If redemptive history constitutes the organizing structure of Scripture, then theological inquiry must reflect that structure by reading any text of Scripture across the canon in that context. Theological affirmations can only be said to be Christian to the degree that they take into consideration the contours and turning points of redemptive history. As I have written elsewhere:

> The problem with the methodologies of pneumatological inclusivists such as Yong and Pinnock is that they effectively treat the Bible as pre-theoretical, ignoring the form, content, and themes given in Scripture for doing theology, seeking to provide their own. Pinnock seeks to "view Christ as an aspect of the Spirit's mission" and explains that "it lies within the freedom of theology to experiment with ideas." This would be fine except that the Spirit-inspired Scriptures do not allow for that theological framework. The theologian cannot mine the Bible as if it were a sterile source book for theological construction, looking to find answers to a set of questions that arise out of the ambient cultural climate. Rather, the "interpretive matrix should be the interpretive matrix of the Scriptures" and "the structures of systematic theology ought to mirror in some important way the structure of biblical theology. The theological framework ought to be linked to the actual structure of the biblical text itself and not merely to the content of the Bible."[83]

It is illegitimate to suggest that the theologian, the church, or the interpretive community can claim relative autonomy in determining a theological framework. Prolegomena does not stand apart from the authority of Scripture. It is not on a different epistemological category from the theology that comes from it. The biblical texts, to which the theologian is beholden, do not stand in isolation from one another, but are organically linked. Yong and Pinnock err at this point because they are guilty of ignoring the organic unity of the text, thereby tearing the fabric of Scripture.[84]

Third, we must utilize a biblical theology that is Christocentric. If theology must follow the structure of redemptive history, and the apex of redemptive history is Jesus Christ, it follows that theology should be Christocentric. All things in Scripture point to Christ and Christ is the hermeneutical principle given by Christ himself. This does not mean that the exegete should attempt to find Jesus in every verse of the Old Testament by virtue of his imagination or creative interpretive skill. What is does mean is that Jesus, in obedience to his instruction, is himself the hermeutical key to understand both the Old and New Testaments.[85] Because Scripture is structured around redemptive history, of which Christ is the apex, our understanding of the stories of Moses and Abraham and Adam, or any other critical actors in redemptive history, will also be "greatly impoverished" if we fail to relate them to Christ.

A BRIEF CHRISTOCENTRIC BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

On the night that Jesus was betrayed, He gathered His disciples and told them that He would

soon be sending the Spirit to them. Jesus explained, "When the Spirit of truth comes, He will guide you into all the truth. For He will not speak on His own, but He will speak whatever He hears. He will also declare to you what is to come. He will glorify Me, because He will take from what is Mine and declare it to you" (John 16:13–14). I am convinced that Jesus was identifying the role of the Holy Spirit, not just in the lives of the apostles or the church age, but throughout all of redemptive history. What follows will be an altogether too-brief presentation of a proper biblical theology of the Holy Spirit that is faithful to the Bible's presentation of the text and is therefore Christocentric.

Creation

Genesis 1:2, in the creation narrative, recounts that the ruach elohim was already present "hovering over the face of the waters." This implies that God's spirit had been involved in his works from the very beginning, establishing the cosmic order.[86] The activity of the Spirit in creation is fundamental to the biblical narrative because it establishes the active role of the Spirit in redemptive history. Creation is the beginning of God's interaction with creation (redemptive history), not simply the beginning.[87] This is evident from Ezekiel 39:29 where the manifestation of the Spirit is promised "with a view to fulfilling a variety of goals in redemptive history."[88]

What is of special significance is that from the very beginning, there is a close association of the Spirit and the Word of God. In the creation narrative, God's Spirit is active as God speaks. The link between Spirit and Word is very evident with the prophets, particularly Moses (e.g. Num 11:17-29; 24:2). The link is sometimes only hinted at (as when Jeremiah argues in 5:13 that the prophets are nothing but wind and the breath of the Lord is not in them) but this reference only reinforces the necessary link between Word and Spirit.[89] Psalm 33:6 summarizes well the close relation between the Word and Spirit in creation.[90] The New Testament writers interpret the Genesis narrative's record of the activity of the divine Word in creation as a recognition of the preeminence of the Son of God in creation:

> In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him, and without him was not any thing made that was made (John 1:1-3).

> He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation. For by him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities–all things were created through him and for him. And he is before all things, and in him all things hold together (Col 1:15-17. cf. Heb 1:1-4).

It is precisely at this point, the creation narrative, that Pinnock illegitimately separates the Word from the Spirit, ignoring the cooperative roles of both the Spirit and the Son together. Pinnock affirms the work of the Son in creation in the sense that the Son is the pinnacle or archtype of creation—the differentiation between Father and Son serves as the space for creation.[91] He affirms the role of the Spirit in creation—the Holy Spirit is the life-giving force. But in these dual affirmations there is a duality of purposes. Pinnock utilizes the role of the Spirit in creation, relatively autonomous from the Son, to justify the same autonomy of role in the Spirit's action in redemptive history from that point on. But the affirmation of such a duality is illegitimate. The works of the Word and Spirit are irreducibly linked. There is no work of the Son in creation apart from the Spirit and there is no work of the Spirit in creation apart from the Son. This is the biblical teaching, but the interrelationship between the two is severed in Pinnock's model.

Special Empowerment

Just as redemption is progressively revealed in the history of Israel, so the work of the Spirit is

also progressively revealed. A second pneumatological Old Testament theme is that of special empowerment. From the patriarchs to the high point of the monarchy in Solomon, the Spirit's work is primarily a special endowment granted to God's chosen people for the purpose of mediating God's salvation, in all its various manifestations and driving redemptive history toward its appointed end in Jesus Christ.[92]

There are approximately sixty references to the work of the Holy Spirit in approximately a hundred individuals in the Old Testament. These occurrences are commonly broken into four categories of people: The Holy Spirit came upon craftsmen, civic leaders, judges, and prophets. In each case, the primary purposes of God in the sending of the Spirit are concurrent and synergistic: the protection and care for the chosen people of God and the active guiding of redemptive history toward the incarnation, cross, and the consummation of all things.

Craftsmen

The first category of Spirit-empowered individual is the craftsman. Bezalel was "appointed by name" by the Lord who "filled him with God's Spirit, with wisdom, understanding, and ability in every craft" (Exod 31:2-3). To Bezalel was given the task of making those items described to Moses by the Lord Himself. But Bezalel was not merely making beautiful things. He was designing and crafting the tabernacle—the center of Israelite religious, political, and social life. The implements of worship were "copies of the things in the heavens" (Heb 9:23), placed in a sanctuary that was "a model of the true one" (Heb 9:24). All these things were meant to teach the people of Israel of a higher reality: the one who "appeared one time, at the end of the ages, for the removal of sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb 9:26). The Holy Spirit uniquely gifted Bezalel to create artifacts that would serve to point the people of God to Jesus Christ. Far from asserting a relative autonomy from the Son, this empowerment of the Holy Spirit was working toward the glorification of the Son.[93]

Judges

The active role of Spirit as the instrument of salvation history is most apparent with the judges. With the judges, the Spirit came upon men at critical junctures in salvation history to rescue Israel in order to further God's grand redemptive purposes— leaving no doubt that the Lord was at work to save his people according to his plan the Spirit, (e.g. Judg 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14).. Empowerment of the judges was not an arbitrary, independent, or ad hoc activity. Rather, the Spirit was driving redemptive history toward the incarnation, the crucifixion, and the glorification of the Son.

Civil Rulers

There are four individuals specified in the Old Testament as uniquely empowered by the Holy Spirit for the express purpose of governing and leading the people of Israel: Moses (Num 11:17–29), Joshua (Num 27:18; Deut 34:9), Saul (1 Sam 11:6; 16:14), and David (1 Sam 16:13; Ps 51:11).[94] An important category of Spirit involvement in redemptive history is the role of the Spirit in the Davidic line and monarchy. David is seen as a "man after God's own heart" (1 Sam 13:13). The close association of Spirit with David at his anointing ("and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward" (1 Sam 16:13)) points to both the continuity of Spirit empowerment with the past (cf. 1 Sam 11:6) and the uniqueness of David as the forerunner of the Spirit-anointed Messiah.

When we consider the place of this account in redemptive history, it is evident that the work of the Spirit was necessary to save the people of God. Because of the role of the Spirit in the lives of Saul and David, it is clear that the monarchy was not a merely human institution, but its efficacy rested in the ministrations and power of the Spirit of God. The salvation of Israel, through the Spirit-empowered work of the first kings, was absolutely necessary for the plot line of redemptive history to advance and the Messianic line

to continue. The monarchy, more than just the human choice of a fickle people, established, through the Spirit, a throne upon which the coming Christ would reign. David, far more than a godly man and great king, was established by the work of the Spirit as a type of the one whose reign would endure forever (2 Sam 7:8–17).

Prophets

The Holy Spirit was especially identified with the prophets who were filled with the Spirit of God. The prophecy in the Old Testament about the Spirit focuses on the saving deeds of God and in the human agents upon whom the Spirit will rest to carry out these deeds. Centrality is given to the Messiah, the one anointed by the Spirit of God to save finally the people of God and effect lasting change, ushering in the final age.[95] Isaiah records two major prophecies of the Spirit-filled Messiah:

> There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch from his roots shall bear fruit. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. And his delight shall be in the fear of the Lord. He shall not judge by what his eyes see, or decide disputes by what his ears hear, but with righteousness he shall judge the poor; and decide with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall strike the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he shall kill the wicked. Righteousness shall be the belt of his waist, and faithfulness the belt of his loins. (Isa 11:1-5)

> The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to bring good news to the poor; he has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound; to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor (Isa 61:1-2a)

The Holy Spirit is the one who heralds the coming of the future world which is ruled by Messiah—the Spirit-anointed. It is the Spirit who inaugurates and introduces that age.[96] The Holy Spirit is also the source of the future new life. The Spirit becomes characteristic of the eschatological state itself.[97] In Rabbinic theology the role of the Messiah with respect to the Spirit is broadened. He is not merely the Spirit-anointed, but the one through whom the Spirit will be communicated to others. The Messiah pours out on men the Spirit of grace, so that henceforth they walk in the ways of God.

Incarnation

The gospels offer a record of the coming of the Messianic King. Jesus is the one to whom the biblical story had been pointing from its beginning pages (e.g. Gen 3:15; 12:1-3; 49:8-12). It is also Jesus who fulfills the promise of Messiah–the Spirit-anointed par excellence–the supreme bearer of the Spirit.

It is no mere tautology to state that it was not by virtue of the deity of Jesus, but rather by the anointing of the Holy Spirit that Jesus was the Christ. The essential interrelationship of pneumatology and Christology is evident in every aspect of Jesus' life. The birth and conception of Jesus is attributed to the power of Spirit (Matt 1:18; Luke 1:35).[98] In the second chapter of Luke, Jesus in his boyhood is said to be "filled with wisdom" (2:40) while the temple teachers are "amazed at his understanding" (2:47). Wisdom and understanding are prophesied as characteristic of the Spirit-filled Messiah in Isaiah 11:2. The Spirit-baptism of Jesus, where the "Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form, like a dove" (Luke 3:22) is prominently recorded in all four gospels. Immediately after his baptism, Jesus, full of the Spirit, "was led up by the Spirit in the wilderness for forty days, being tempted by the devil" (Luke 4:1). Jesus even inaugurates his ministry in Nazareth by reading of the Spirit-anointed Messiah in Isaiah 61:1-2.

The Holy Spirit plays a prominent role in the

ministry of Jesus. The healing power of Jesus is attributed to Spirit empowerment (Matt 12:15-21). Jesus communes and fellowships with the Holy Spirit (Luke 10:17-21). The Father demonstrates his love for his Son by lavishing the Spirit upon him "without measure" (John 3:34-35). The gospels make numerous references to the dunamis and exousia of Christ which Hawthorne argues is implicit reference to the power of the Holy Spirit in Jesus.[99] Hebrews 9:13-14 links the atoning death of Christ to the Holy Spirit. Finally, the testimony of the New Testament writers attributes the resurrection of Jesus to the Holy Spirit (Rom 1:4; 8:11; 1 Cor 6:14; cf. Ezek 37:13-14).

It is the explicit testimony of Scripture that Jesus has revealed the Father to us. But it is also evident that Jesus has revealed the Holy Spirit to us as well.[100] Perhaps the most important aspect of the pneumatological character of Christ's ministry is the revelation and sending of the Spirit. The major aspects of the Spirit's church-age mission (convicting the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment; guidance into truth; and glorifying the Son) provided by Jesus in John 15:26-16:15 are all specifically related to the ministry and authority of the Son.[101]

Clearly there is a strong relationship between Christ and the Holy Spirit in the life and ministry of Jesus.[102] But Jesus' teaching on the Spirit reaches beyond the incarnation. Jesus establishes a Christocentric nature to the mission of the Spirit that extends into the age of the Church and beyond.

Church Age

The work of the Spirit in the Church age continues the story of redemption without alteration to the interdependence of the roles between Spirit and Son. Jesus promised that the Holy Spirit would lead his disciples into all truth. Because Jesus Christ is himself the truth, the role of the Spirit is to lead others to, testify of, and glorify him (John 16:3; 14:6; and 16:14 respectively). An implicit, if not explicit tie could be made with the Spirit's role in inspiration with the testimony of Jesus.[103]

The Spirit is the guarantee of the inheritance that all who hope in Jesus will receive (Eph 1:12-14). The giving of the inheritance entails that believers are made joint heirs with Jesus (Rom 8:17; Eph 3:6). Those who are "in Christ Jesus" are to walk "according to the Spirit" (Rom 8:1-2). On the other hand, those who willfully sin "spurn the Son of God" and "outrage the Spirit" (Heb 10:29). In fact the entire goal of sanctification, which is an act of the Spirit, is to be transformed into the image of Christ (Rom 15:16; 1 Cor 6:11; 2 Cor 3:18; 1 John 3:2). How close is the relationship between Son and Spirit in apostolic writing? The identity of the Holy Spirit is "the Spirit of Christ" (Rom 8:9; 1 Pet 1:11, 2 Cor 3:17).

The preaching of the gospel for salvation is performed through the power of the Spirit (Rom 15:19; 1 Thess 1:5; 1 Pet 1:12). But what is the gospel? What are its priorities? While it is true that the Spirit gives faith, new birth, testifies to our hearts about Christ, and sanctifies those who love the Lord, these aspects of the Spirit's work in salvation are not the gospel. They are rather the fruit of the work of Christ, albeit a work that Jesus was Spirit-empowered to perform. But make no mistake, the gospel is thoroughly Christocentric (1 Cor 15:3-6).

The Proleptic Work of the Holy Spirit

A unifying theme within the Bible is new creation or regeneration. Since the fall, God has been in the process of restoring creation. This restoration has been enacted on the stage of history, playing out the divine drama of redemptive history. The Holy Spirit has a revelatory role to play in this drama. This is apparent from 1 Corinthians 2:12-13. Scripture teaches that the primary sphere of the Holy Spirit in the believer is the eschatological–that is, as the Spirit works in us, he is moving us toward what we shall one day be perfectly.[104]

In the New Testament, the possession of the Holy Spirit is the sign of acceptance from God, of participation in the privileges of the Christian state (Acts 10:45-47). Of primary importance in New Testament theology, and indeed in the

experience of believers, is the doctrine of resurrection. Those who participate in Christ are partakers of regeneration, re-creation, and look forward to the resurrection (1 Cor 5:17; 15:12-49; Rom 6:4-11). Paul makes clear that the resurrection is no small part of the Christian life–it is essential! If there is no resurrection of the dead, Paul's teaching is false and the lives, let alone the truth claims, of Christians are laughable (1 Cor 15:14-19). But the Spirit is given to the believer as a firstfruit—an anchor of the soul—to guarantee perseverance and bolster hope of what will happen (Rom 8:19-25).

Christ has been raised from the dead and the renewal, sanctification, and resurrection of the believer shares a vital connection to what was transacted in Christ. Jesus is the firstfruits of those who have died (1 Cor 15:20). As the resurrected Lord he becomes the life-giving Spirit (1 Cor 15:45). This latter point is instructive because it brings full circle the entire redemptive story. As was demonstrated above, a primary role of the Spirit in the Old Testament is that of life giver. In the end, the interrelationship of Son and Spirit is reaffirmed by the declaration of Jesus Christ as the life-giving Spirit.

An important implication of this relationship is that to be joined to the Lord is to be one Spirit with him (1 Cor 6:17). If the spiritual life of the believer shares in the spiritual life of Jesus Christ, then "it must to some extent partake of the eschatological character of the latter."[105] Because it was the Spirit who was the instrumental cause in the resurrection act, the Spirit is also the permanent ground of the resurrection life. The Spirit that raised Jesus from the dead is the very one that keeps, empowers, and will one day raise the believer (Rom 8:9-11, 2 Cor 13:4).[106]

This interrelationship cannot be severed. To overemphasize the role of the Spirit to the detriment of the Son because of the Spirit's personal, empowering interaction with the believer is to ignore biblical teaching, the redemptive story, the gospel, and eschatological promises.[107]

CONCLUSION

I have attempted to demonstrate that the current proposals for a theology of religions that separate, even cautiously, the works of the Son and the Spirit do not have biblical or theological warrant. The exegesis and theology of such pneumatological inclusivists and pluralists are fallacious because the methodology is fatally flawed. In particular, I have argued, first, it is illegitimate to begin with the universal and non-particular love of God (a dubious doctrine to begin with), propose the Spirit of God as the hope of salvation, and then begin reading Scripture searching for an independent pneumatic role and movement. To do so is to break the rules for reading Scripture provided by Jesus himself; distort the redemptive-historical drama; and ignore the Son-Spirit relationship established and argued from beginning to end of the Bible.

Second, Scripture makes no allowance for the bifurcation of ontology and epistemology in the work of Christ. Inclusivists seek to affirm the work of Christ as the only means of salvation while denying that one need consciously know of him to be saved, hoping that the Spirit can effect a work of salvation in the unevangelized. But Scripture gives no warrant for this hope. The Son-Spirit interrelationship is integral to the fabric of biblical theology.

Third, it is illegitimate to look for fruit to discern the work of the Spirit amongst people where Jesus is not known. Resurrection and regeneration in Christ is the basis for the same in the believer. There is irreducible continuity between the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of the believer. There is irreducible continuity between the spiritual and resurrection life of the believer and the God-man Jesus Christ because it is the Spirit of Jesus who indwells and empowers believers.

The burden of this article has been to demonstrate that the role of the Holy Spirit described by Jesus Christ in John 16:14, that the Spirit would glorify the Son, is representative of the relationship between the Son and the Spirit. The Holy Spirit always seeks to glorify the Son. In denying

this, pneumatological inclusivism and pluralism fails on Christological grounds and ultimately, ironically, distorts pneumatology.

ENDNOTES

[1] For a defense of the use of this taxonomy and discussion of the alternatives, see *A God of Many Understandings?*, 16-20.

[2] Ignatius, *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians* 3, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 80.

[3] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3.24.1, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*.

[4] Cyprian, *The Epistles of Cyprian* 61.4, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 358. This statement comes in a discourse on whether to allow back into the church those women who had made a vow of chastity who were subsequently found in the same bed with a man but had maintained their chastity.

[5] C. Pinnock, *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 188.

[6] Pius IX, *Singulari Quidem: On the Church in Austria* (17 March 1856) [cited 23 September 2004]. Online: http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius09/p9singul.htm.

[7] Pius IX, *Quanto Conficiamur Moerore* (10 August 1863), [cited 23 September 2004]. Online: http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius09/p9quanto.htm.

[8] Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi* [cited 23 September 2004]. Online: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_29061943_mystici-corporis-christi_en.html.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Paul VI. *Lumen Gentium* (November 21, 1964) [cited 4 February 2013]. Online: http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html.

[11] Ibid.

[12] See *Lumen Gentium*; *Ad Gentes Divinitus* 7.

[13] *Lumen Gentium* 15.

[14] *Gaudium et Spes*, 22.

[15] There are some exceptions. For example, in *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, given in 1975 by Pope Paul VI, there is an explicit statement of the necessity of belief in the gospel for salvation. Paul VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (8 December 1975), 5 [cited 10 September 2004]. Online: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/apost_exhortations/ documents/hf_p-vi_exh_19751208_evangelii-nuntiandi_en.html.

[16] John Paul II, *Redemptoris Hominis* (Rome: 4 March 1979), 11-19. The Latin title means, "Redeemer of Man."

[17] John Paul II, *Redemptoris Missio* (12 December 1990), 28-29. The Latin title means "Mission of the Redeemer."

[18] *Dialogue and Proclamation: Joint Document of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue and the Congregation for Evangelization of Peoples* (Rome: 19 May 1991) [cited 21 August 2004]. Online: http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/interelg/documents/rc_pc_interelg_doc_19051991_dialogue-and-proclamatio_en.html.

[19] Ibid. This is a quotation taken from John Paul II's address to the Roman Curia after the World Day of Prayer for Peace in Assisi in January 2002. It was the second such gathering of religious leaders (the first being in October, 1986) from around the globe representing many different faiths and traditions. John Paul was convinced that the basis for calling an interfaith day of prayer is the activity of the Holy Spirit in the lives of all those who seek God with sincerity.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

[23] In an elaboration on *Guadium et Spes*, 22, the *Dialogue* reads, Individuals may "have already responded implicitly to God's offer of salvation in Jesus Christ, a sign of this being the sincere practice of their own religious traditions, insofar as these contain authentic religious values. They may have already been touched by the Spirit and in some way associated unknowingly to the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ." Ibid., 68. The impact of Roman Catholic teaching on both non-evangelical and evangelical proponents of pneumatological inclusivism is unquestionably large. In a paper presented to the Evangelical Theological Society (ETS) in 2002, Clark Pinnock dedicated a significant portion of his address to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church since Vatican II. Approximately one-fifth of the paper discussed the teaching of the Catholic Church during the papacy

of John Paul II. C. H. Pinnock, "Religious Pluralism: A Turn to the Holy Spirit" (paper prepared for the annual meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Toronto, Ontario, November 2002) [cited 15 September 2004]. Online: http://www.mcmaster.ca/mjtm/5-4.htm.

[24]P. Hodgson, "The Spirit and Religious Pluralism," *Horizons* 31 (2004): 22.

[25]J. Dupuis, *Toward a Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997).

[26]Ibid., 147.

[27] Dupuis writes, "Apart from Christianity, God encounters human beings in Christ, but the human face of God remains unknown. In Christianity, God encounters women and men in the human face of the human Jesus, who reflects for us the very image of the Father. While every religion contains an approach to the human being on the part of God, in Christianity God's advance toward the human being becomes fully human." Ibid., 150.

[28]Ibid., 152. Dupuis's turn to pneumatology had implications at the most basic level of revelation. Though he was hesitant to grant equal status with the Old and New Testaments of the Christian Canon, the sacred texts of religious others are still the word of God, they are inspired, and they are holy Scripture because of the work of the Spirit. Ibid., 176.

[29]P. Knitter, *No Other Name? A Critical Survey of Christian Attitudes toward the World Religions* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985), 171-204.

[30]Ibid., 205.

[31]P. F. Knitter, "Can Our 'One and Only' also be a 'One Among Many'? A Response to Responses," in *Uniqueness of Jesus* (ed. L. Swidler and P. Mojzes; Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997), 182.

[32]S. J. Samartha, *Courage for Dialogue: Ecumenical Issues in Inter-Religious Relationships* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981), 65.

[33]Ibid., 74.

[34]For a critique of non-evangelical and evangelical appeals to Irenaeus and his "two-hands" metaphor to attempt bring the weight of church history to their inclusivist proposals, see Todd Miles, "Irenaeus in the Hands of Soteriological Inclusivists: Validation or Tendentious Historiography?" *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 12, no. 2 (2008): 4-17.

[35]G. Khodr, "Christianity in a Pluralistic World—The Economy of the Holy Spirit," *Ecumenical Review* 23 (1971): 126.

[36]S. J. Grenz, "Toward an Evangelical Theology of Religions,"*Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 31 (1994): 49–65; V. Kärkkäinen, "Toward a Pneumatological Theology of Religions," *International Review of Mission* 91 (2002): 187–98; J. Sanders, *No Other Name: An Investigation into the Destiny of the Unevangelized* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992); T. Tiessen, *Who Can Be Saved? Reassessing Salvation in Christ and World Religions* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004). See also M. J. Erickson, "Hope for Those Who Haven't Heard? Yes, But . . . ," *Evanelical Missions Quarterly* 11 (1975): 124; idem, *How Shall They Be Saved? The Destiny of Those Who Do Not Hear of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996).

[37]C. H. Pinnock, *A Wideness in God's Mercy: The Finality of Jesus Christ in a World of Religions* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992).

[38]C. H. Pinnock, "Inclusivist View," in *Four Views on Salvation in a Pluralistic World* (ed. D. L. Ockholm and T. R. Phillips; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 95–123.

[39]Pinnock, *A Wideness in God's Mercy*, 154.

[40]Ibid., 15.

[41]Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 63.

[42]Ibid., 196. For a thorough critique of the inclusivist call for a rejection of the *filioque*, see T. L. Miles, "Severing the Spirit from the Son: Theological Revisionism in Contemporary Theologies of Salvation," (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2006), 134–51.

[43]Ibid., 82.

[44]Ibid., 80.

[45]Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 192. See also id., "Inclusivist View," 102.

[46]Ibid.

[47]Ibid., 204.

[48]Ibid., 201.

[49]Ibid., 210-11.

[50]Pinnock, *A Wideness in God's Mercy*, 104.

[51]Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 209–11.

[52]Ibid., 195.

[53]A. Yong, *Discerning the Spirit(s): A Pentecostal-Charismatic Contribution to Christian Theology of Religions* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 2000).

[54]A. Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005); idem, *Beyond the Impasse: Toward a Pneumatological Theology of Religions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003); idem, *Pneumatology and the Christian-Buddhist Dialogue, Does the Spirit Blow through the Middle Way?* Studies in Systematic Theology 11 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012); idem, *The Cosmic Breath: Spirit and Nature in the Christianity-Buddhism-Science Trialogue*, Philosophical Studies in Science & Religion 4 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012). Unfortunately, the publication dates of the latter two books did not allow for timely interaction by the completion of this article.

[55]Yong, *Beyond the Impasse*, 21.

[56]Ibid., 25.

[57]Ibid., 27.

[58]Yong, *Discerning the Spirit(s)*, 57. Yong lists God's saving grace and love, the character of the kingdom of God, and Christian evangelism and missions, among others.

[59]Ibid., 62.

[60]Ibid., 69.

[61]Ibid., 64.

[62]A. Yong, "A P(new)matological Paradigm for Christian Mission in a Religiously Plural World," *Missiology* 23 (2005): 177.

[63]Yong, *Discerning the Spirit(s)*, 62.

[64]Ibid., 68.

[65]Yong, "A P(new)matological Paradigm," 179.

[66]Yong, *Beyond the Impasse*, 173.

[67]Ibid., 181.

[68]Ibid.

[69]Ibid., 183.

[70]Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh*, 240. Yong also appeals to the infinitude of God, who cannot be "*exhaustively* conveyed in finite time and words" to justify learning from religious others. Ibid.

[71]Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 80.

[72]Ibid. Yong also desires to do much the same thing with his foundational pneumatology. See, for example, Yong, *Beyond the Impasse*, 58-74.

[73]My understanding of biblical theology would be identified as "BT2" under the taxonomy of biblical-theological proposals in Edward W. Klink III and Darian R. Lockett, *Understanding Biblical Theology: A Comparison of Theory and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012).

[74]J. Frame, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1987), 207.

[75]Cf. the summary of BT1 and James Barr in Klink and Lockett, *Understanding Biblical Theology*, 29-56.

[76]G. Vos, "The Idea of Biblical Theology," in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos* (ed. R. Gaffin; Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1980), 8.

[77]Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments*, (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1975), 5-6.

[78]Ibid., 11.

[79]Michael S. Horton argues this point very persuasively in *Covenant and Eschatology: The Divine Drama* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 99-120.

[80]Vos, "The Idea of Biblical Theology," 12.

[81] Miles, *A God of Many Understandings?*, 262-264.

[82]G. Goldsworthy comments, "In doing biblical theology as Christians, we do not start at Genesis 1 and work our way forward until we discover where it is leading. Rather we first come to Christ, and he directs us to study the Old Testament in the light of the gospel. The gospel will interpret the Old Testament by showing us its goal and meaning. The Old Testament will increase our understanding of the gospel by showing us what Christ fulfills." Goldsworthy, *According to Plan: The Unfolding Revelation of God in the Bible* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), 55.

[83]Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology: A Prolegomenon to Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 270-71.

[84]Miles, *A God of Many Understandings*, 272-73.

[85]Christopher J. H. Wright, *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative* (Downers Grove. IL: InterVarsity, 2006), 31.

[86]Sinclair B. Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit*, (Downers

Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 19.

[87]Ferguson writes, "What is of interest is that the activity of the divine *ruach* is precisely that of extending God's presence into creation in such a way as *to order and complete what has been planned in the mind of God*." Ibid., 21.

[88]Ibid.

[89]Gary D. Badcock, *Light of Truth & Fire of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 17.

[90]Eichrodt notes that the association of the spirit of life with the creative word asserts the sovereignty of God over the dominant forces of nature: "It is, therefore as the possessor of the spirit of life that God utters the creative word." W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, (trans. J. A. Baker; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 2:48.

[91]Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 58-63.

[92]Goldsworthy, *According to Plan*, 214. See also Morris A. Inch, *Saga of the Spirit: A Biblical, Systematic, and Historical Theology of the Holy Spirit*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 32.

[93]Miles, *A God of Many Understandings*, 286.

[94]Ibid., 288.

[95]Isa 11:1-10; 28:5; 42:1; 59:21; 61:1

[96]Joel 3:1ff.

[97]Isa 32:15-17; 44:3; 59:21; Ezek 36:27; 37:14; 39:29.

[98]The language of Luke 1:35 seems to be an intentional attempt to remind the reader of creation where the Spirit hovered over the waters: "The Holy Spirit will come upon you and the power of the Most High will overshadow you.

[99]G. Hawthorne, *The Presence & the Power* (Dallas: Word, 1991), 154-60.

[100]See Ferguson, *The Holy Spirit*, 29.

[101]Ferguson notes the Christocentric nature of the revelation of the Spirit: "For it is not only because of Christ that we come to know the Spirit more fully, but actually in Christ. Indeed, it is apparently a principle of the divine Spirit's working that he declines to disclose himself in any other way (Jn 16:13-15). He will not be known as he is in himself apart from Christ. Before the Spirit rests permanently on all the faithful children of God, he first must rest on the uniquely faithful Son of God (cf. John 1:33)." Ibid., 30.

[102]Pinnock affirms as much in his work on the Holy Spirit. Pinnock, *Flame of Love*, 79-112.

[103]Goldsworthy is adamant about this: "Every word of the New Testament comes from the Holy Spirit's testimony to Jesus." Goldsworthy, *According to Plan*, 49-50. See also Rev 19:10.

[104]Geerhardus Vos, "Paul's Eschatological Concept of the Spirit," in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos* (ed. Richard Gaffin; Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980), 120.

[105]Vos, "Paul's Eschatological Concept of the Spirit," 114.

[106]Ibid., 108, 113-14.

[107]The evangelical who sees the inward transforming work of the Spirit as the key element of Christianity will soon lose contact with the historic faith and the historic gospel. At the same time he will come to neglect the historical acts of God in the Old Testament. The Christ enthroned in the human heart loses his own incarnate humanity, and the humanity of the Old Testament history will be soon discarded so that the 'inner spiritual' meanings may be applied to the 'inner spiritual' life of the Christian." Graeme Goldsworthy, *Gospel & Kingdom: A Christian Interpretation of the Old Testament*, (Exeter: Paternoster, 1981), 113.

The SBJT Forum

SBJT: Should Christians pray to the Holy Spirit?

Bruce Ware: Although this is a good and valid question, it is one for which we have no direct and explicit answer from the Scriptures. Here are three important factors that need to be considered.

First, the norm for prayer in the New Testament has a very clear Trinitarian framework in mind. Most prayers in the New Testament, and most instruction about prayer, encourage this pattern: Christians should pray to the Father, in the name of the Son, and in the power of the Holy Spirit. Why? The Father is the grand architect, the wise designer, of all that occurs in creation and in redemption. One might recall, for example, that even though Jesus, the Son, is taught in the New Testament to be the creator of all that is (John 1:3; Col 1:16), he nonetheless does his creating only as the agent of the Father who creates *through* the Son (1 Cor 8:6; Heb 1:1-2). And in redemption, clearly the Father designed all that the Son came to do, such that the work of salvation accomplished by the Son is a work of the Father *through* the Son (e.g., John 6:38; 8:28-29; Matt 26:39, 42). The Father, then, is rightly the primary object of Christian prayer, since he is the one who, as designer and architect of all things, has highest authority and position over all things. The Son, for his part, accomplishes the atoning work by which alone he may bring those who believe in him to the Father (2 Cor 5:18-20; 1 Pet 3:18). The Son, then, is not primarily the object of the Christian's prayers but rather the one through whom his prayers are brought to the Father. The Son is the one and only mediator between us and the Father, so our access to the Father is only through the Son (1 Tim 2:5). And the Spirit works within the believer so that what he prays is prompted by the Spirit's internal work while the Spirit himself also intercedes for the believer in ways only he could

Bruce A. Ware is Professor of Christian Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Prior to this, he taught at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, and Bethel Theological Seminary. Dr. Ware is the author of numerous books, including, *God's Lesser Glory: The Diminished God of Open Theism* (Crossway, 2000), *God's Greater Glory: The Exalted God of Scripture and the Christian Faith* (Crossway, 2004), and most recently, *The Man Christ Jesus: Theological Reflections on the Humanity of Christ* (Crossway, 2012).

do (Rom 8:26-27). One verse that helps us see this Trinitarian pattern well is Eph 2:18: "For through him [Christ] we both [believing Gentile and believing Jew] have access in one Spirit to the Father" (ESV). Notice the prepositions: *to* the Father, *through* the son, *in* the Spirit. So, normative Christian prayer is prayer directed to the Father, through the mediation of the Son, and in (or by) the power and prompting of the Spirit.

Second, there are some few examples of prayer to Jesus, but no examples recorded in the Scriptures of direct prayer to the Holy Spirit. Regarding prayers to Jesus, one might recall Stephen's final words to his Savior, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (Acts 7:59), and the final plea of the Apostle John's Apocalypse, "Come, Lord Jesus!" (Rev 22:20). But no such instances of specific prayers to the Holy Spirit appear in the Bible.

Third, the Holy Spirit is, as the third person of the Trinity, fully God. He possesses the one and common divine nature, and hence there is no distinction between the Spirit and the Father, or the Spirit and the Son, when it comes to the one divine nature that each possesses. Even though the Constantinople elaboration (A.D. 381) on the third article of the Nicene Creed (A.D. 325) chose not to say that the Holy Spirit was *homoousios* (i.e., of the same nature) with the Father and the Son (as had been said of the Son in relation to the Father at Nicea), clearly the Cappadocian theologians at Constantinople and the orthodox who followed believed this—and declared it in later writings. Indeed, the Spirit has the very same nature that both the Father and the Son have. Each Trinitarian person—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—possseses this one and identically same divine nature fully, simultaneously, and eternally. Hence, the Holy Spirit is fully God.

Given these three factors, what can we say on our question, "should Christians pray to the Holy Spirit?" Consider these two responses.

First, given that the Holy Spirit is fully God, it would seem inappropriate to say that prayer directly to the Holy Spirit was either inherently wrong or sinful, as it would be inherently wrong or sinful to pray, for example, to a saint, or to an angel, or to another supposed god. After all, the Holy Spirit deserves our highest praise and worship, along with the Father and Son, who together are the One God who is Three. Baptism that occurs "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt 28:19) shows how intimately related these three are in our worship —all of whom give expression to the one "name" (and nature) of God. So, given the full and uncontested deity of the Holy Spirit, I cannot say prayer to the Holy Spirit must be forbidden.

Second, while the Holy Spirit is fully equal with the Father and Son in nature, he clearly is under the authority of the Father and Son in the outworking of the work he is to do. The Spirit is sent from the Father and the Son (John 14:26; 15:26; Acts 2:33), and when the Spirit comes, Jesus says that the Spirit will not advance his own purposes, but rather he will advance the words, and works, and mission, and purposes of Christ (John 16:14). Given the place the Spirit has in the outworking of the purposes of God, here it seems best to follow the biblical pattern and pray, not directly to the Spirit, but pray in the Spirit's power, by the Spirit's enablement, and as directed by the Spirit's illumination. Since this is the role the Spirit has, it seems prayer, then, should best fit this pattern. If there are exceptions—as one might feel it appropriate to express gratitude for the Spirit's work or remorse for not yielding to the Spirit's leading—let the exceptions be just that: exceptions. May we see the wisdom and goodness in the pattern of prayer Scripture indicates. No insult to the Spirit occurs when we follow this pattern; in fact, just the opposite takes place as we put ourselves in the place where the Spirit can gladly carry out what he most wants to do—work in and through us and our prayers to bring glory to Christ, to the ultimate praise and honor of the Father! Normative Christian prayer, then, is not prayer to the Spirit, but "praying at all times in the Spirit" (Eph 6:18) for Christ's great work to be done.

SBJT: Why is it important to affirm that the Spirit is sent by both the Father and the Son?
Keith Goad: The Holy Spirit has been called "the mysterious member of the Trinity." The oneness of God is clear in the Old Testament, while the Father, specifically as Father of the Son, and Son are only vaguely revealed before the coming of Christ. The Father and the Son together being the one God is absolutely clear in the New Testament. While the Spirit's deity is clear from his actions in Scripture, the Spirit's relation to the Father and the Son is less clear. The fact that the first two major trinitarian councils (Nicaea and Constantinople) opted not to affirm the Spirit being *homoousios* with the Father and the Son, is evidence that the Church wrestled with the Scriptural data. In the end, they only affirmed the Spirit's existence and deity by his actions.

Keith Goad is Pastor of Jefferson Park Baptist Church in Charlottesville, Virginia.

He received the Ph.D. in Systematic Theology from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Some of the confusion surrounding the Spirit's role stems from the names we have for the Spirit. The Father–Son language of the first two persons makes their relationship and distinction clear. The third person being the Holy Spirit really gives little distinction because the nature of God is also described as holy and spirit. The other names and descriptions are "another" and "helper," neither giving a distinctive that could not also be applied to the Father or the Son. Defining the person and work of the Spirit was one of the most important and contentious questions in the early church.

One such debate regarding the Spirit's role and relationship in the Trinity was whether the Spirit was sent by the Father alone or the Father and Son. In 1054, the Eastern and Western church split over this question. The disagreement was over one simple term, filioque, "and the Son." The Eastern church, emphasizing the Monarchia of the Father, rejected that the Spirit was sent by the Father *and the Son*. In my view the best way to think of this relation is to say that the Father is the primary sender of the Spirit, while the Son sends the Spirit in cooperation with the Father.

Why is this issue important? Before I answer this question, let me first give some basic evidence from Scripture for the Son sending the Spirit with the Father. There are three main arguments for the Son sending the Spirit. First, the Son declares that he will send the Spirit in John 14:16; 15:26; 16:7. While the explicit declaration would seem to be enough to make the case, it must be observed that the Son says he will ask the Father, and the Father will give the Holy Spirit in 14:15. Jesus continues the teaching on the Spirit's mission stating that the Spirit will be sent in his name, which means the Spirit will remind the disciples of all that the Son has said. In John 15:26, the Son promises to send the Spirit from the Father.

The conclusion to be drawn is that the Father is the primary sender of the Spirit, but the Son participates in the sending as well since the Spirit is sent to complete the work of the Son, "bearing witness of him." In John 16, Jesus says it will be to the advantage of the disciples if he goes because the Spirit will come. This is not because the Spirit has a different ministry, but because the Spirit continues and completes the work of the Son.

Second, the Spirit is called the "Spirit of Christ" (Rom 8:9; 1 Pet 1:11) or "the Spirit of the Son" (Gal 4:6). Paul, in Galatians 4 and Romans 8, connects the work of the Spirit declaring in our hearts, "Abba father," to the Son coming from the Father. The Spirit is of Christ because he is the one who testifies about him and applies the work of the Son to the believer. Just as the Son does not say or do anything that he has not learned from the Father so also the Spirit does not accomplish a different work apart from the Father and the Son (John 5). He is the Spirit of Christ because he comes in his name to continue his work. The Son sends him to complete what the Father sent him to do. The three are working together for the same purpose.

Third, this leads us to the big picture of the Trinity where we see a hierarchy of persons, not a hierarchy or difference in nature. This hierarchy is first seen in the relationship of the Father and the Son. The Son declares the Father is greater than

himself (John 14:28), which must refer to their relationship and not their essence. The hierarchy is also demonstrated by the sending order. The Father sends the Son and the Spirit. The Father is never sent. The Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son, he never sends either from above.

The hierarchy among the persons is important because it helps us see the unity and order of the Trinity. The unity is clear because the three operate inseparably seeking to accomplish the same goal. We know the three are one God because they create and save sinners together. Only God can create *ex nihilo* and save sinners. The order is clear because the Father only sends and the Spirit is only sent. The Father is sending the Son and the Spirit for the same purpose. The Son and the Spirit choose to be sent to fulfill the Father's will. The Spirit is sent and chooses to be sent to complete the work of the Son.

Why is this issue important? What makes this issue so vital is that ultimately our salvation and spirituality are based upon the Spirit being sent by the Father and the Son. God descends to us in order from the Father, in the Son, and then in the Spirit. We ascend in the Spirit, through the Son, to the Father. How we come to God in salvation, as well as pray to and worship him, mirrors how God has come down to us. We only see the Son's salvation by the illuminating and regenerating work of the Spirit. We only know the Father through the Son's ascension and intercession.

Additionally, the doctrine of adoption illustrates the importance of the *filioque*. The Father has sent his Son for the purpose of adopting sinners to be his sons. This is only possible as we share the in the sonship of Jesus. There is no adoption apart from Jesus coming, dying, rising, and ascending. Furthermore, the Spirit of Christ is sent to indwell us so that we have the adoption sealed in our hearts. The Spirit finalizes the adoption with his seal that the Father initiated and the Son secured. The Spirit cannot adopt apart from the Son because there is no other sonship with God the Father to share with sinners.

The hierarchical order of the Godhead descending to us and our mirroring it in our ascension to God is seen in Christian prayer. We pray to the Father, in the name of the Son, in the Spirit. We are not called to pray to the Spirit, but in the Spirit to the Father. Our unique privilege to appeal to God as Father is based upon the Son coming down to secure our adoption and praying in his name.

The upshot of this entire discussion is that it is crucial in understanding the personal relations between the persons of the Godhead. The Spirit is sent from the Father primarily, but with the Son because the Spirit is completing the work of the Son. The three are seeking to save the same sinners and salvation is only found by faith in the Son. The Son and the Spirit are not sent on separate missions, but both do the will of the Father together. The Spirit is illuminating the hearts of those the Son has purchased and the Father has chosen. The application of the Spirit working to save those the Son has redeemed is that our preaching and gospel proclamation must focus on exalting the Son. Our goal is to make Christ known clearly. We then trust the Spirit to complete the work. We pray to see fruit trusting that the Spirit will use our work according to God's way. In the end, ministry is not measured by fruitfulness, but faithfulness in exalting the Son to the glory of the Father by the Spirit.

SBJT: How does John Owen contribute to our understanding of the Spirit's role in Christ's life?

Tyler Wittman: Renewed interest in "Spirit Christology" stems from a motivation to articulate the practical implications of Jesus' dependence on the Holy Spirit and how this offers a resource/example for Christian living. Jesus is a man who can sympathize with our weaknesses, who became like us in every way and was tempted just like us, sin excepted (Phil 2:7; Heb 4:15). If this is not a source of comfort and strength, then something is amiss with our Christology. While this aspect of the role of the Sprit in the life of Christ is important,

Tyler Wittman is a Ph.D. Candidate at King's College, University of Aberdeen.

it is how we parse the relational dynamic between Christ and the Spirit that makes all the difference. Owen contributes to our understanding of the Spirit's role in Christ's life by first carefully explaining how the Trinity's unity and relation *ad intra* (immanent Trinity) is the basis for the Trinity's action *ad extra* (economic Trinity) and then examining the Spirit's role within a traditional account of Trinitarian agency.

In order to understand Owen, we must step back and first consider Owen's doctrine of Trinitarian agency, which consists of two complementary affirmations. We can call the first affirmation "inseparable operation" and the second "Trinitarian operation." First, inseparable operation describes how the Father, Son, and Spirit share a common nature, power, and will, and that each action of the Trinity is common to them all. This foundational doctrine asserts that no divine person acts apart from the others and that in each act, all three persons act. This is how Scripture can attribute the resurrection to the Father, Son, and Spirit alike, for example (cf. Eph 1:20; John 10:18; 1 Pet 3:18). However, this must not be misunderstood as the combination or juxtaposition of three separate acts (the act of the Father, the act of the Son, plus the act of the Spirit). Owen emphasizes "every divine work, and every part of every divine work, is the work of God, that is, of the whole Trinity, inseparably and undividedly" (Owen, *Pneumatalogia* [Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1965], 94). Rather than contribute part of each operation, the three persons act according to their mode of subsistence, which brings us to the second affirmation.

Complementing inseparable operation is Trinitarian operation, which means all three persons work *ad extra* in a manner corresponding to their mode and order of subsistence *ad intra*. In short, this means that the Father always acts through the Son by the Spirit. Following traditional Trinitarian theology, Owen understands this order as based upon the relations of origin in the Trinity. Since the Father is without "principle," or "origin," then the Father is the beginning of all action. Since the Son is differentiated from the Father by eternal generation, then the Son always acts as Mediator, establishing and upholding all things. Likewise, since the Spirit is the bond of love who eternally spirates or proceeds from Father and Son, he finishes and perfects all the Trinity's actions. God's economic activity therefore reflects the eternal order (*taxis*) of relations in the Trinity (a superior guide to all these matters is Gilles Emery, *The Trinity: An Introduction to Catholic Teaching on the Triune God* [Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2011]). All of this is basic to Owen's Trinitarian theology, which is much indebted to Thomas Aquinas. Owen prefaced both of his more influential works, *Of Communion with the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* and *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ* with this account of Trinitarian agency and it is decisive for the whole of his theology.

Yet how can Owen maintain this doctrine when orthodoxy demands that the Son alone became Incarnate? This puzzle reveals a key ingredient in Owen's Trinitarian thought, essential to understanding how he relates the Spirit to Christ: the *terminus operationis* (term of operation) principle, which states that while any divine action is an action of the whole Trinity, it can still appropriatively "terminate" or "end" on one divine person. Owen's solution to the puzzle of the Incarnation follows Aquinas (who merely refined Augustine's solution): the act of assumption *begins* with the common divine nature of the Trinity but it *terminates* on the Son alone, who assumes human flesh. The Father designates the Son's flesh, the Spirit forms it, and the Son assumes it. Just as the voice at Christ's baptism terminated on the Father and the appearance in the form of a dove on the Holy Spirit, the assumption of human flesh was an undivided act of the Trinity but the Son alone is Incarnate. In this way the Reformed Orthodox attribute certain divine works to the whole Trinity, considered from the beginning of the works, while attributing these same works to one person, considered from the end of the works.

This background to Owen's doctrine of the Trinity enables us to interpret properly Owen's statements about the Incarnational role of the Holy Spirit, of which two examples will suffice (in addition to what follows, see Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen: Reformed Catholic, Renaissance Man* [Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007], 92-99). The first example enables us to see how Christ is both like and unlike us in his humanity. Owen believed that Christ's human nature was not sanctified by virtue of its union with Christ's divine nature in the Incarnation. Rather, the Holy Spirit sanctified Christ's human nature and equipped him with all grace and gifts necessary to complete his mission. While this may seem to be a very technical detail, it is a crucial theological move that protects the integrity of Christ's human nature: Jesus Christ's humanity was in need of the empowering grace of the Holy Spirit like any of us. There is a profound symmetry here between Christ and us, which would be beneficial to explore in more detail elsewhere. Nevertheless, Owen was also keen to articulate the asymmetry: whereas the Spirit is *external* to us as he empowers us with gifts, he is *internal* to Christ. The Spirit works *on* the creation, but *in* the Christ. The Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (he is *his* Spirit) but the Spirit is not the Spirit *of* any believer. Christ's relation to the Spirit is thus substantively different because while he is fully human, he is not merely human.

The second example enables us to see how this asymmetrical relationship between the Spirit and Christ works out in Owen's theology. Owen can clearly attribute Christ's miracles to the Holy Spirit because he not only applies the *terminus operationis* principle to the Son's assumption of human nature, but also to the Spirit's work in Christ's life. In other words, the Spirit's work on Christ's life is a work of the whole Trinity that terminates on the Spirit. Why do the miracles terminate on the Spirit if they are *Christ's* miracles? This is where Owen's commitment to Trinitarian operation comes into play: since the Father always acts through the Son by the Spirit, Owen understands the Spirit's role as the "*immediate, peculiar, efficient cause* of all external divine operations" (Owen, *Pneumatalogia*, 161). Owen believed the Son's assumption of human flesh and the union of this nature with his person was the only *immediate* act of the Son on his human nature. All other actions were voluntary and *mediated* by the Holy Spirit, who is the immediate cause of all *ad extra* operations. Along with the church fathers, Owen affirmed that Christ's human nature did not have personhood (nor did it exist) until the Incarnation and the hypostatic union. The significance of this distinction is to focus our attention on the humanity of the Mediator, rather than on the abstracted human nature in itself. All of Christ's actions are actions of the one person. *Thus, while Christ's miracles are still acts of the Son, they are acts of the Son by the Spirit (the efficient cause)*. In this way, the Spirit's work on Christ is really nothing more than the Spirit's economic mode of agency applied to Christ's human nature; crucially, the eternal order of relations in the Trinity is preserved in the Trinity's economic action. For Owen, the pastoral significance of the Spirit's work in Christ's life could not be based on a one-to-one correlation between the Son's dependence on the Spirit and our dependence on the Spirit.

As should be clear from the basic grammar of Owen's Trinitarian theology, the Spirit's action on Christ's human nature is an inseparable operation of the whole Trinity that terminates on the Spirit because of the Spirit's distinct mode of subsistence. As the Trinity is *from eternity*, so the Trinity acts *in the economy*—even in the Spirit's work on Christ's humanity. Unlike many modern accounts of Spirit Christology, which are often built on social doctrines of the Trinity, Owen gives the Spirit a role in Christ's life without dividing the Trinity's actions. If at any point we separate the acts of Father, Son, and Spirit and construe them as works stemming from distinct centers of operation (*a la* social Trinitarianism) rather than as relationally distinct aspects of the numerically same operation, then we have

divided the Trinity in a manner the overwhelming majority of Christians throughout the ages would recognize as heterodoxy. The superiority of Owen's view is that it holds together the Triunity of God with the two natures of Christ in such a way that we see more clearly the beauty and mystery of the Trinity.

Intentionally, I have said nothing specific about the pastoral application Owen derives from the Spirit's work in Christ. I encourage the curious to start reading more Owen!

SBJT: What is the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Scripture and especially the Spirit's work in our reading of Scripture?

Matt Wireman: As we consider the Spirit's relationship to Scripture, we must start with the dual work of the Spirit in inspiration *and* illumination. The same Spirit who gives life at the preaching of the word is the same Spirit who inspired the words in the first place (2 Tim 3:16). "Inspiration" refers to God's mighty action by which he works in and through biblical authors so what they write is what he wants written. In other words, by the mighty work of the Spirit, the very words of Scripture are simultaneously his breathed out word. "Illumination" refers to the work of the Spirit by which he convinces a person of the truth of the words (which he previously inspired). Another way of stating the difference between "inspiration" and "illumination" is that the former is an *objective* reality by which the text of Scripture is produced while the latter is a *subjective* reality that convinces and persuades readers of the truth of his word and enables us to put it into practice. In fact, in regard to illumination, the unique work of the Spirit is to bear witness to Christ and to make him know in the minds and hearts of people. Let us think about the Spirit's work in inspiration and illumination more specifically and practically.

Matt Wireman recently earned the Ph.D. in Systematic Theology from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, and currently serves as a church planting resident in Charlotte, North Carolina.

First, when speaking of the Spirit's work in relationship to Scripture it is important to emphasize his *convincing* work. As Christians it is important to give people proofs for the veracity of Scripture, but, as Calvin wrote many years ago,

> the testimony of the Spirit is more excellent than all reason. For as God alone is a fit witness of himself in his Word, so also the Word will not find acceptance in men's hearts before it is sealed by the inward testimony of the Spirit. The same Spirit, therefore, who has spoken through the mouths of the prophets must penetrate into our hearts to persuade us that they faithfully proclaimed what had been divinely commanded (*Institutes* 1.7.4; cf. 1.8).

Second, the Spirit's work is also to help us *understand* and *apply* Scripture to our lives. Due diligence is necessary to understand Scripture. We must read Scripture according to its literary form, the intention of the author, according to his grammar, and in light of its historical background, but these means are never independent of the Spirit of God in order to understand the biblical text. The same Spirit, in mighty power, who gave us the text through human authors, is the same Spirit who is effectually present with his word to apply it to the reader. Herman Bavinck captures this point when he writes, "[The] Holy Spirit is not an unconscious power but a person who is always present with [the] word, always sustains it and makes it active, though not always in the same manner" (*Reformed Dogmatics*, 4:459). In other words, the Spirit stands behind every jot and tittle of the text to make it effectual. Without him, our reading of Scripture is ultimately ineffectual. Without him, our reading of the text will be information gathering and not life-changing. Without him, the Bible will simply not be all that God intended it to be.

Third, the illumination of the Spirit cannot be conjured up through incantation; it is a *gracious gift of God*. We come to Scripture humbly and we ask God to bring light to our eyes when we open the pages of Scripture and to ignite the lantern for our

feet (Ps 119:105). As Gordon Fee has written, "The Spirit [is] the key to the proper understanding of the gospel itself, especially of [Paul's] preaching and [the Corinthians'] own gifts" (*1 Corinthians*, 110)." Furthermore, he writes, "Without the Spirit [people] lack the one essential 'quality' necessary for them to know God and his ways…. For Paul, 'to be spiritual' and 'to discern spiritually' simply means to have the Spirit, who so endows and enables" (*1 Corinthians*, 117).

In addition to discerning authorial intention of individual texts and books, it is also crucial to meditate on the *grand narrative* of God's work for his people. We understand God's word best and ultimately according to God's intention by the Spirit, when we read individual texts and books in light of the entire canon of Scripture. The Spirit bears witness to and applies his word both at the micro and macro levels. Scripture is God's covenant document, given to his people, by which we can learn how to know and please him in every aspect of our lives. In this way, Scripture is not merely a spiritual text but the script by which Christians find the stage direction for their lives. The Author gave clear, and sometimes difficult, teachings so that a baby can wade in its truth and an elephant could drown in its enormity.

When thinking about the Scripture–Spirit relationship, interestingly, the seal for Southern Seminary is appropriately a dove, symbolizing the Spirit, descending upon the Scripture. It pictures the task which all Christians are called to, namely, to participate in Spirit-empowered exegesis. It reminds us that without the Spirit our study of the Scripture will not be all that God intends for it to be. Without the Spirit our tendency is to puff ourselves up with fine-sounding arguments (1 Cor 4:6; Col 2:4) and to not achieve the unity of God's people, which Christ prayed for his church. Without the Spirit, we may read the Scriptures but we will inevitably walk away unchanged, like the man who walks away from the mirror and forgets what he looks like (Jas 1:23).

May God give his people a fresh taste of the sweetness of his word. May Scripture become our delight by his Spirit, which will only happen when we come with open hands, open hearts, and open minds in dependence upon God the Holy Spirit.

SBJT: Who is the father of the Pentecostal movement?

Chad Brand: Certainly the movement has roots in earlier traditions, such as Wesleyanism and the Holiness movement. But Pentecostals have certain distinctives over against earlier spiritual life traditions, the most important of which is their belief that Spirit baptism is subsequent to conversion/initiation and that it is evidenced by speaking in tongues. This is often referred to as the "initial evidence" doctrine and it is still maintained by most who classify themselves as traditional Pentecostals, in general contrast to those who consider themselves "charismatics."

In light of that, who is the father of the movement? Two candidates have been put forth by Pentecostals: Charles Fox Parham and William Seymour. Parham was the principal of a small Holiness college in Topeka, Kansas, in 1900. He left his students late in December for three days with instructions to study the Book of Acts to discern what is the sign of Spirit baptism. During a prayer meeting a twenty-nine year old woman named Agnes Ozman began to speak in tongues, tongues that she (or Parham) later concluded to be Chinese. The exact date of this experience is disputed by Pentecostal historians, but the purported date was January 1, 1901, a date that assumed mythological proportions in Pentecostal tradition as the first day of a new century. Later others also began to experience "*glossolalia*," including Parham.

Chad Brand is Professor of Christian Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He also serves as Associate Dean of Biblical and Theological Studies at Boyce College.

Dr. Brand is the author or editor of a number of books and articles, having co-edited *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (Holman, 2003), edited *Perspectives on Spirit Baptism: Five Views* (B&H, 2004), *Perspectives on Election: Five Views* (B&H, 2006), co-authored (with David Hankins) *One Sacred Effort: The Cooperative Program of Southern Baptists* (B&H, 2006), and authored a recent article in *Perspectives on Our Struggle with Sin: Three Views on Romans 7* (B&H, 2011).

Parham had long hoped for such experiences, believing that this gift of tongues would be the means for world evangelism, bypassing the need for language study. Later, a Pentecostal man named A. G. Garr would travel with his wife to India, believing that he would be given the ability to speak to the Indians in their native tongue when he arrived. When that failed to happen, Garr, to his credit, enrolled in a language study program in Hong Kong and established a mission work there. But Parham continued to believe that true *glossolalia* was actually *xenolalia*, the supernatural gift of speaking an actual language, as of course it was in the Book of Acts.

By summer, 1901, the building where the small college met had been sold, and Parham was forced to relocate. By 1905 he was teaching in a small Holiness school in Houston, TX. There, a black man named William Seymour, born to former slaves in Louisiana, attended Parham's lectures, lectures that featured regular testimony to what had happened in Topeka. Because he was black, Seymour was not allowed to sit in the lecture hall with the other students, but rather sat outside the door in an adjacent room. He came to affirm Parham's belief that *glossolalia* was the true sign of Spirit baptism, but came to reject the theory that tongues was actually identifiable languages. For Seymour, *glossolalia* was ecstatic utterance, what psychologists call "linguistic-free discourse," a phenomenon known around the world in many religions and even in non-religious settings.

In January, 1906, Seymour was invited to be the assistant pastor of a small multi-ethnic Holiness congregation in Los Angeles, a rapidly growing city that had experienced an influx of rural people and Holiness churches over the previous decade. He began preaching against the vice of the city and called for a revival that would be marked by a Spirit-baptism evidenced by speaking in tongues. On April 9th, Seymour and seven others fell to the floor smitten in their hearts and began to speak in tongues.

Within days the crowds attending the nightly meetings burgeoned to the point that a new meeting place was necessary, one that was found at 312 Azusa Street. In the months and years that followed, Azusa Street became a veritable "Jerusalem," as the place where the continuous Pentecostal revival first occurred. The mission there was comprised of whites, blacks, and Hispanics, and there appears to have been genuine fellowship, especially in the early months, between the races, with all groups experiencing the various revival phenomena, including, along with tongues, holy dancing, treeing the devil, holy laughter, and the jerks. This was all reminiscent of the camp meetings in Kentucky and other places a century earlier, with the exception that now tongues was prominent, and was interpreted as initial evidence of Spirit baptism. The "fellowship" included hugging one another, kissing one another's cheeks, and various other informal signs of spiritual affirmation that were common in Holiness churches, but that were very unusual at that time in a bi-racial setting.

Parham, whom Seymour claimed as his "father in the Gospel Kingdom," arrived in Los Angeles in October for a much-heralded "general union revival." He was disgusted at what he witnessed. Parham was a Ku Klux Klan sympathizer who believed in the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race; he was appalled at the specter of people from different races embracing one another in services of religious frenzy. He discerned that none of the tongues-speakers laid any claim to having the gift of actual languages; rather, he thought they were just "babbling idiots." This was certainly not a divine miracle of languages, as he thought the case had been in Topeka. There may have also been some amount of jealousy on the part of Parham. He had been unsuccessful in launching a "Pentecostal revival" that had endured for more than a few weeks. But by the time he arrived at Azusa Street the revival had been going on for six months and was only increasing in fervor, attracting people who travelled by train to witness the events, and

many of whom had taken "tongues" back to their own home churches, for better or ill. Though aberrations persisted, and certainly "aberration" is to some extent in the eye of the beholder, the revival in Los Angeles continued at a fever pace for over three years.

In the long run, it has been Seymour's version of Pentecostalism that has survived. Few if any Pentecostal scholars believe that *glossolalia* is actually *xenolalia,* and the few attempts to test it out on the mission field have failed. Pentecostal scholar Russell Spittler has noted that, "Glossolalia is a human phenomenon, not limited to Christianity nor even to religious behavior." Parham's theory about that died early, even though many Pentecostal adherents still see the practice as a gift given only by the Holy Spirit. Even the doctrine of initial evidence has fallen on hard times with many Pentecostals, such as Gordon Fee. Further, though racial prejudice died a hard death in America and most of the early denominations divided on racial lines, this was not the case in other countries, for the most part, and Pentecostalism quickly spread to other countries, even before the end of 1906. By the end of the century Pentecostalism was quickly losing its racial divisiveness in America, so that now Pentecostals and charismatics of different races often worship in the same churches.

It seems to me that the tradition that has endured in Pentecostal Christianity owes more to the vision of Seymour than to Parham.

Book Reviews

Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion, and Naturalism. By Alvin Plantinga. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011, 359 pp., $27.95 cloth.

For all the exacting philosophy Alvin Plantinga has brought us, his playfulness stands out in my experience. He is a happy warrior, supremely confident in his native (and regenerate) intelligence, his philosophical acumen, and the truth of Christianity. Thus armed, he takes on skeptics with a cheerful equanimity that must be as maddening and even unnerving to them as it is delightful to his fellow believers.

Those of us who came of age as Christians in philosophy in the 1970s were working more or less as servants in Caesar's palace. The lords of the manor were skeptics, children of the Enlightenment, offspring of Hume and Kant, of Ayer and Russell—and parents of Dawkins, Harris, Hitchens, and Dennett. They ruled and roared in the halls of the philosophical associations and major universities, both here and abroad. Yes, there were articulate saints in the realm, but they were relegated mostly to the back halls, where they could talk among themselves. The places of honor were reserved for such atheists as Quine and Wittgenstein, Heidegger and Sartre.

But somehow, by God's grace, Christians began to find their voice in the profession, or, more accurately, rediscover and reassert their voice. For their credibility had once for all been established by the likes of Anselm and Aquinas, Descartes and Pascal, Locke and Berkeley, to name a few. Philosophers began to take note of Mavrodes at Michigan, Yandell at Wisconsin, Alston at Illinois, and a cluster of Dutchmen in Grand Rapids, with curious names like Orlebeke, Mouw, Wolterstorff, Konyndyk—and, yes, Plantinga.

Heretofore, the skeptics' trump card was something like, "Well, I don't see that." Hearing this, the earnest believer would take a deep breath and then redouble the effort to please his audience, to make his point. But those of the Plantinga/Mavrodes school would more likely respond with something like, "So sorry to hear that. You may have a personal problem. Your

failure to see it doesn't entail anything about my ability to see it." It made for great theater.

Plantinga in particular seemed unimpressed with the conventional wisdom of the philosophical guild. For instance, he thought that the ontological argument (that "the being than which none greater can be conceived" must exist), long relegated to the list of ancient curiosities, deserved respect, so he wedded modal logic to Leibniz's eighteenth-century talk of possible worlds (as in "the best of all possible worlds") to resurrect it.

Taking on first one cause and then another, he coined fresh expressions, such as "properly basic" (to counter the empirical overreach of the positivists), "trans-world depravity" (to mount a free-will defense against the problem of evil), and "intrinsic (or "extrinsic") defeater-defeater" (to evaluate the rationality of a belief). He would generate page after page of precise modal logic (in *The Nature of Necessity*), accessible largely to professional philosophers, and then, in the popular vein, jab the pompous judge in the Dover case, who ruled the teaching of intelligent design in public school classrooms out of order (170-171). When the overreaching jurist presumed to exclude talk of the supernatural from the realm of testable discourse, Plantinga suggested he consider the statement that "an intelligent designer has designed and created 800-pound rabbits that live in Cleveland" (300).

For those who have not been reading Plantinga across the decades, this book brings much of what he has said before to bear on the question of whether Christianity and science are compatible. In these pages, one finds echoes, reassertions, and fresh applications of what he wrote earlier in such classics as *God and Other Minds* (1967) and *Warranted Christian Belief* (2000). Indeed, one might say the book is a valedictory, though he continues to be active in philosophy.

That being said, let's go back to what we might call his frisky, cheeky style: in arguing that the development of metaphysical and academically abstract thought fits the Darwinian model poorly, he observes that "it is only the occasional member of the Young Atheist's Club whose reproductive prospects are enhanced by holding the belief that naturalism is true" (349)—and the same holds true for "the occasional assistant professor of mathematics or logic that needs to be able to prove Godel's theorem in order to survive and reproduce" (133); he also mocks the histrionics of the anti-intelligent design crowd, noting their "screams of hysterical anguish, frenzied denunciations, accusations of treason (how could an actual scientist say things like this?), charges of deceit, duplicity, deviousness, tergiversation, pusillanimity, and other indications of less than total agreement" (228-229).

Along the way, he can spin a nice yarn, with attendant dialogue, as when he took on one group of philosophers trying to say that our remarkably tuned universe was not so special after all:

> Return to the Old West: I'm playing poker, and every time I deal, I get four aces and a wild card. The third time this happens, Tex jumps up, knocks over the table, draws his sixgun, and accuses me of cheating. My reply: 'Waal, shore, Tex, I *know* it's a leetle mite suspicious that every time I deal I git four aces and a wild card, but have you considered the following? Possible there is an infinite succession of universes, so that for any possible distribution of possible poker hands, there is a universe in which that possibility is realized; we just happened to find ourselves in one where someone like me always deals himself only aces and wild cards without ever cheating. So put up that shootin' arn and set down'n shet yore yap ya dumb galoot. (213-214)

This is fun reading, but it's also quite serious. And in between these moments of humor, he offers tight argument through pointed counter-examples, blunt counter-claims, and exacting definitions.

So what does he argue in this book? Very simply, that "there is superficial conflict but deep concord between science and theistic religion, but superficial concord and deep conflict between science and naturalism" (ix). Along the way, he

enlists theistic evolution, defends miracles, gives the intelligent design scientists some respect, and argues that you can't get truth-hunger out of Darwin or belief-motivated action out of neural states alone. He marshals scores of arguments, large and small, to make his case, and he engages a host of thinkers, from the venerable eighteenth-century Common Sense philosopher Thomas Reid to the modern skeptic Peter Atkins, whom he characterizes as "dancing on the lunatic fringe."

Despairing of doing his arguments justice in short space, let me simply highlight a few of the moves he makes:

1. Disagreeing with Richard Dawkins on the left and Philip Johnson on the right (and bemoaning the fact that the public at large has been convinced that evolution and Christianity are incompatible), he urges us to understand that "God could have caused the right mutations to arise at the right time; he could have preserved populations from perils of various sorts, and so on; and in this way he could have seen to it that there came to be creatures of the kind he intends" (11). Alternatively, God could have " set things up initially so that the right mutations would be forthcoming at the right times, leading to the results he wanted" (16). Only if we view evolution as operating in unguided fashion in a closed, material system do we stumble.

2. He explains that miracles are possible because the laws of nature are necessary only in the sense that "they are propositions God has established or decreed, and no creature—no finite power, we might say—has the power to act against these propositions, that is, to bring it about that they are false" (281). But, of course, God may act against them whenever and however he pleases, so it is proper to qualify statements of physical law with the antecedent clause, "When God is not acting specially . . . "(282).

3. He addresses the concerns of those in the Divine Action Project (DAP), who have a visceral objection to God's "violating" the natural order and human freedom by intervening in the world. He discounts their fears that God would be like the husband "sometimes treating [his] spouse's peccadilloes with patience and good humor and other times under relevantly similar circumstances responding with tight-lipped annoyance" (106). Rather, "there would be arbitrariness and inconsistency only if God had no special reason for acting contrary to the usual regularities; but of course he might very well have such reasons. This is obvious for the case of raising Jesus from the dead" (106). By Plantinga's light, their efforts somehow to insinuate God's actions through the wiggle room made by quantum mechanics is unnecessary and unsatisfying.

4. Drawing on the work of Patricia Churchland, he argues that you cannot get regard for truth or objectivity out of natural selection's "four F's: feeding, fleeing, fighting, and reproducing" (315). (One can't help but think of analogy between evolution and politics and wonder how, in either realm, a dispassionate interest in truth could ever surface.) To the one who objects that there is enormous adaptive value in "getting things right," as when the hungry frog correctly judges "the distance to the fly at each moment, its size, speed, direction, and so on," he insists that instinct is not belief (327-328). Similarly, he distinguishes between "mental states," which have propositional content, and "neuro-physiological properties," which don't, and this presents a big problem for the naturalist, who wants to reduce everything to material states (321-322). (Apparently, this latter argument is hitting home with one of his critics, Thomas Nagel, to the consternation of hard-core materialists. See Plantinga's review of Nagel's work and plight in the December 12 issue of *The New Republic.)*

On and on he goes, pulling the stinger out of first one skeptical wasp and then another. On one page, he says, in effect, "So what?" to Freud's dismissive claim that religion gives comfort and meaning to the insecure, for that alone does not make it false (148-149). On another, he answers those who say we do not need religion, now that we have science, with the retort that they have

said, in effect, "that now that we have refrigerators and chain saws and roller skates, we no longer have need for Mozart" (267). On yet another, he turns the tables on theologians who seek to explain away the simple believer's trust in miracles, suggesting that they "suffer from disciplinary low self-esteem" and "want desperately to be accepted by the rest of the academic, world," so they "adopt a more-secular-than-thou attitude." (74)

Along the way, he doesn't mind pulling the stinger out of a fellow-believer's argument, in this case Michael Behe's (*Darwin's Black Box*), with its claim that the "irreducible complexity" of, for instance, the human eye cannot emerge from the chance and brutal workings of natural selection. Plantinga replies that the case is not so airtight as all that, in that the emergence of such biological incidentals as spandrels and pleiotropy could conceivably pick up the slack (227). While he does give Behe credit for some success, for the "account of the structures he describes certainly do produce the impression of design" (259), he relegates Behe's work to "design discourse" rather than "design argument," with its higher canons of rigor. It fails, for instance, to match the tightness of Euclid's premise-to-conclusion demonstration that there is a greatest prime number (250-251). Rather, we are left with a compelling experience which leaves us with a conviction that is hard to shake, proof or no proof—the sort of thing we have with belief in the existence of other souls in the bodies around us (240-243). So Plantinga's affirmation is, in his own words, something of a "wet noodle conclusion" (264).

His hammer-and-tongs critique of foe and friend alike sets up the reader for cognitive dissonance, for when Plantinga presents his alternative account, the pattern of critical analysis gives way to sweeping assertion. One might call it a "destroy and dare" tactic: "Now that I've told you in great detail what's wrong with your ideas, I'm going to tell you my version of things and dare you to pick it apart." It is hard, though, not to ask, "Why don't you subject your own claims to the sort of scrutiny you've been exercising heretofore?" For once he has spun us up to a critical frenzy, it is hard to stop on a dime and say, "Oh, okay" to bold assertions about the world's "fascinating underlying mathematical structures of astounding complexity but also deep simplicity" (285) and the "*adequatio intellectus ad rem* (the fit of intellect with reality)" (296).

Where is the troublesome talk of "spandrel and pleiotropy" once he begins to wax eloquent on the congruence of algorithms with phenomena? Are there not recalcitrant cases and rival suggestions to wrestle into submission? And to go back, is macro-evolution so epistemologically winsome that it must be honored by all reasonable Christians? Is there nothing at all to consider in the puzzles raised by young-earth creationists over trans-strata nautiloid fossils, over massive limestone folds, and such in the Grand Canyon? And what about the way in which theistic evolution posits ages of "nature red in tooth and claw" before the Fall, when nature's torment is often thought to have begun (Romans 8:20-22)? In the short footnote he uses to dismiss the young earth perspective (10), can he not spare a single sentence on the possibility of "catastrophism" as opposed to "uniformitarianism"? After all, he has given a lot of space to other theories he has found wanting, even laughable.

While I think he succeeds admirably in his stated task of showing that there is no real barrier between science and theism—and a big barrier between science and naturalism—he could have done better in addressing the clash between biblical inerrancy and evolutionary science. He admits as much in a footnote, when he says, "Of course there are conflicts between science and particular religious beliefs that are not part of Christian belief as such: belief in a universal flood, a very young earth, etc." (144). While assent to a literal reading of Noah may not appear in the Apostles' Creed, doesn't it deserve better than this? (In his review of *Where the Conflict Really Lies* in *The New York Review of Books,* September 27, 2012, Thomas Nagel tweaks Plantinga at this point, suggesting

that his view that the gift of faith warrants believers to stand against hostile popular opinion might well serve to strengthen the spirit of the Genesis literalist who seeks to hold the fort against the Darwin.) And when Plantinga says that the "scientific theory of evolution as such is not incompatible with Christian belief" (63), one wonders whether this is more hopeful than true, along the lines of "Islam, at base, is a religion of peace."

Finally, in a realm of discourse where comparative plausibility is more to the point than airtight proof, he could have given Behe higher marks than he did. It may have been "discourse" rather than "argument" on Plantinga's model, but with discourse so powerful as this, who needs "argument"?

—Mark T. Coppenger
Professor of Christian Apologetics
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Miracles: The Credibility of the New Testament Accounts. By Craig S. Keener. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011, 2 vols., 1172 pp., $59.99 cloth.

Within the last twenty years, the name Craig Keener has come to be associated with many significant New Testament reference works, commentaries, monographs, essays, and articles. It is a remarkable list of publications. Keener, professor of New Testament at Asbury Theological Seminary, has set an example for other evangelical scholars by consistently seeking to instruct and edify the church while demonstrating the highest standards of scholarly research.

The two-part thesis of *Miracle*s is straightforward: (1) Many people, both ancient and modern, give credible eyewitness testimony that they, or people they know, have experienced miracles; and (2) therefore, when judging the historicity of ancient works that report miracles, scholars should not, at the outset, eliminate the possibility that genuine supernatural phenomena were observed. Keener speaks forthrightly about his own biases and experiences throughout his two volumes, and he rightly rejects the myth of scholarly objectivity.

Volume one contains three divisions. The first section investigates miracle claims in the New Testament, ancient miracle claims outside the New Testament, and then compares the two. Keener notes that hardly any scholar, even of the most liberal persuasion, will deny that Jesus and his contemporaries agreed that he performed miraculous healings. While most ancient pagans would have sought healings in healing sanctuaries, a few comparisons with Greco-Roman healers can be made. Keener notes for example that "the most significant pagan parallels to Christian miracle-worker stories, such as the only extant literary account of Apollonius of Tyana, first appear in third-century literature, after Christian miracle stories had become widely known, and Christian and pagan expectations influenced each other more generally" (46). Indeed, early Christian miracles have little in common with the malevolent magic found in the Greco-Roman world. Although ancient Jewish wonder-workers had more parallel miracles to Jesus, their wonders only came through prayer and lacked the nature of eschatological invasion (76). In the Christian tradition, one should also note the comparatively short amount of time between the miracle and its reporting—a distinctive of New Testament miracles.

The second section of volume one is entitled "Are Miracles Possible?" Here Keener addresses antisupernatural skepticism, both ancient and modern. Indeed, ancient writers were not all gullible simpletons accepting every report of the miraculous, but in fact, often demonstrated sophistication in detecting fabricated sensationalistic claims. With the radical Enlightenment in the West, however, a far more foundational and unwarranted skepticism became entrenched in the scholarly world. Much of this second section of the book focuses on explaining and critiquing eighteenth-century philosopher David Hume and his objection to miracles. Indeed, Hume's foundational principle of historical analogy (i.e., miracles cannot have happened because peo-

ple now do not see them happening) is undercut by literally hundreds (if not thousands) of eyewitness testimonies of the miraculous that Keener recounts in the third section of volume one. Keener rightly notes that Hume's views no longer reign in broader culture. In recent years the western world has taken a noticeable shift away from skepticism toward belief in the miraculous, albeit often unaccompanied by Christian beliefs. Keener concludes that "contemporary approaches lack necessary grounds for *a priori* rejecting potential supernatural explanations, whether they are more open due to modern physics or multicultural postmodernism" (207).

The third and final section of volume one is entitled, "Miracle Accounts beyond Antiquity." Here Keener uses scholarly jujitsu—employing Hume's very principle of analogy to dethrone anti-supernatural skepticism in New Testament scholarship. In this case, the analogy is to countless eyewitness testimonies to the miraculous. This section constitutes perhaps the most extensively researched and documented account of miracles in church history, the modern majority world, and the modern western world. Undercutting Hume's objection that the principle of analogy should lead us to conclude the miraculous does not exist, Keener leaves the reader encouraged and sometimes surprised by the variety and number of miracles reported by reputable eyewitnesses. We have no excuse for remaining in the skepticism we have inherited from our western forbearers. (Who, indeed, wants to be tied with a racist, ethnocentric, imperialist western viewpoint?)

In the subsection, the "Raising of the Dead," Keener reports the raising of his wife's sister, an event which took place in Africa years ago:

> When Thérèse was about two years old, Mme Jacque, as my mother-in-law is locally known, stepped out briefly to take food to a neighbor. When she returned, Thérèse was crying that she had been bitten by a snake, so Mme Jacques began strapping the child to her back so she could run to evangelist "Coco" Ngoma Moïse. She quickly discovered, however, that the child had stopped breathing. I later asked how long the child stopped breathing, so Mme Jacques estimated the time based on the approximate distance between her home and where she would have to run to reach Coco Moïse. She had traveled up a mountainous area and down the other side, and she calculated that Thérèse had stopped breathing for about three hours.
>
> Medical assistance was not available; once she reached Coco Moïse, they could only pray. They prayed, and the child began breathing; then they called Papa Jacques, who was at the time working in another town. He asked whether he should return home, but Coco Moïse assured him that the child would recover. Thérèse did begin to recover, and the next day she was fine. Today she is doing church work and recently completed her graduate-level seminary training in Cameroon. So far as humanly detectable to these person who knew firsthand the signs of death, a child who did not breathe for three hours recovered without medical treatment, without brain damage, and without ill effect (557-58).

Volume two responds to alternative explanations of miracles. Keener considers fraud, emotional arousal, psychosomatic healings, biases in studies, and the challenges of interpreting evidence. Keener claims that even though there are sometimes more reasonable nonsupernatural explanations for purported miraculous events, there still is plenty of evidence to undercut Hume's principle of historical analogy. Moreover, when one does not begin historical investigation with an antisupernatural bias, sometimes the miraculous is the best explanation.

Volume two concludes with more than one hundred pages of appendices, including Appendix A ("Demons and Exorcism in Antiquity"), Appendix B ("Spirit Possession and Exorcism in Societies Today"), Appendix C ("Comparisons with Later Christian Hagiography"), Appendix D ("Ancient Approaches to Natural Law"), and Appendix E

("Visions and Dreams"). It also includes more than two hundred pages of bibliographies, interview citations, and indices.

Keener's work has already earned high praise in the scholarly community. Craig Evans has called it "arguably the best book ever on the subject of miracles." Ben Witherington has referred to it as "perhaps the best book ever written on miracles in this or any age." The quality and importance of this work is without question, but any reader will inevitably have a few comments, questions, or concerns, and it is to these that I now turn.

First a few words of appreciation. I greatly appreciate two significant caveats that Keener makes clear in several places. For example, at one point, he writes: "One theological concern I do have is that no one reading this book thinks that I suppose that spiritual cures happen invariably—they do not, and most of those who supplied testimonies for this book recognize that they do not. Naturally we could fill books with stories where such cures did not happen. I could include there, for example, the eight miscarriages that my wife and I have suffered. But there seems little point in arguing a case that virtually no one questions. My interest in miracles is not triumphalistic, as if to play down biblical themes of suffering or justice that some writers contrast with the study of miracles. I have addressed these themes elsewhere; they are simply not my focus here. In the theology of the Gospels, signs are foretastes of the kingdom, not its fullness" (10-11).

So, here Keener importantly notes (1) that many healings desired by faithful Christians never happen, and (2) that both in the New Testament era and in modern times, healings are signs of the future wholeness found in a coming kingdom. Healings and miracles are not "universal guarantees of perpetual health" (736).

In section three of volume one, Keener recounts hundreds of eyewitness accounts of miracles, but at this point he suspends theological judgments since his point is simply to show that there is much credible eyewitness testimony for miracles. As an evangelical Protestant, however, I hesitate to place a believer's faithful prayer for healing alongside miracles supposedly performed in association with relics or religious pilgrimage in the Catholic tradition. Keener notes that the Catholic church has some of the most extensive medical documentation for the miraculous—at Lourdes, for example—but is not theological analysis inextricably linked to historical evaluation?

Another question concerns relegating the material on demonism to an appendix. This may suggest a concession to modern skepticism over demonism. The New Testament, however, does not give warrant to the idea that Jesus' exoricisms were any less important as public testimonies to the invasion of God's kingdom. Are they not also supernatural events? Is there not some unintended concession to Hume or other skeptics in failing to include testimonies to the miraculous defeat of the demonic alongside the miraculous defeat of disease? Western biases deriving from Hume and other scholars should not mislead us to segregate the exorcisms from the healings. The prominence, frequency, and placement of exorcisms in the synoptic gospels alongside physical healings argues for their inclusion in the body of the text.

The apparent triviality or incompleteness of some miracles that Keener includes invite theological analysis. For example, on page 739, footnote 152, Keener writes that "when as a young Christian I used to pray in a wooded area, my arms quickly filled up with mosquito bites; after I prayed for the bites (and for those of anyone praying with me, on occasions when anyone did), they vanished within a few minutes (at most half an hour), which had not been my usual experience before my conversion. This happened on numerous occasions and, at that time in my life, without exception." I think a skeptical scholar might ask why God did not keep the mosquitoes away in the first place and secondly, why God would intervene so directly and repeatedly in this instance but in points of more serious physical need in your family's life (some of which he relates quite transpar-

ently in his book), there would be no healing.

I think a cessationist would question the testimonial value of many of the partial healings recounted. So, for example, on page 738, note 147, he describes a woman who began walking after being confined to wheelchair, but Keener reasons that she had to use a walker because her muscles had atrophied during her years of confinement to the wheelchair. This healing (and other partial healings he mentions) seem quite different from the instantaneous and full recovery that recipients of miracles experienced in the New Testament. Granted, Mark chapter 8 reports a two-part healing of a blind man. To this formerly blind man, people did, at first, appear like trees walking around, but the full recovery of the man happened a moment later, and the placement of this two-part healing in Mark's narrative argues for an intended parabolic function for the momentary delay in full healing.

In a New Testament survey class of the gospels this semester, I had a student ask, "Did other people claim to do miracles in ancient times and what were they like?" Keener's work answers the question well. These volumes are lengthy but they can be well used as class textbooks. They may be too long to have students read them completely unless assigned for an elective seminar on miracles, but many portions will serve excellently as supplemental readings for classes in New Testament, philosophy, apologetics, epistemology, and church history.

—Robert L. Plummer
Associate Professor of New Testament Interpretation
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Parade of Faith: A Biographical History of the Christian Church. By Ruth A. Tucker. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011, 509 pp., $39.99 cloth.

One of the challenges for those of us who teach church history is finding a way to keep students engaged with the story of Christianity. For many students, church history—like history in general—seems like little more than a barrage of names, dates, and controversies. Throw in the loaded theological terms that are associated with church history (*communicatio idiomatum*, or infralapsarianism, for example) and many students get lost in the fray. Church historians would do well to spend some time reading Ruth Tucker.

Tucker is a historian who has taught at several evangelical seminaries, including Fuller Theological Seminary, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and Calvin Theological Seminary. Though she has written scholarly works related to gender roles and missions history, Tucker is best known as a master popularizer of the latter topic. Her award-winning book *From Jerusalem to Irian Jaya: A Biographical History of Christian Missions*, first published in 1983, is one of the most widely used popular introductions to the history of Christian missions. In *Parade of Faith: A Biographical History of the Christian Church*, Tucker applies this same method to general church history.

As with most church history surveys, Tucker adopts a more or less chronological structure in her book. Each chapter begins with a personal anecdote followed by some introductory comments to provide context. The bulk of each chapter, however, focuses upon key individuals who epitomize the era under consideration. Smaller information boxes provide biographical synopses of other prominent figures. The style is narrative, focusing upon events rather than ideas. Each chapter includes a helpful list of suggested readings, most of which are either classic studies or recent scholarly monographs.

Tucker's results are mixed. She provides an "earthiness" in her storytelling that is missing in many church history textbooks. She gives us a glimpse into the actual lives of noteworthy Christians from bygone eras, though at times it can be difficult to tell the difference between known historical facts and Tucker's own musings. Despite the possible presence of some speculative biographical work in some instances, the emphasis on

individual stories is a welcome contribution. Another major positive is the extensive treatment that missionary pioneers receive in *Parade of Faith*, not at all surprising considering the author's longtime interest in global missions. Tucker demonstrates as well as anyone that church history is, in many ways, the history of the advance of Christianity.

Unfortunately, there are some shortcomings to the work that detract from its usefulness. Tucker is a well-known proponent of egalitarianism, and her biases come out in nearly every chapter. On the one hand, her sensitivity to the stories of Christian women cause her to give helpful introductions to some of the more influential women in church history. Many readers will appreciate this facet of *Parade of Faith*. On the other hand, at times some of the choices seem forced. For example, Macrina receives greater treatment than the Cappadocian Fathers. While Macrina is no doubt an important, even inspiring figure, it is doubtful her role in Christian history is more influential than her brothers Basil and Gregory. Jacob Arminius is relegated to a small information box in a chapter where Susanna Wesley—important, to be sure—receives as much treatment as her far more influential son, John. The legendary "Pope Joan" gets a short section to herself, yet feminist theology, a very influential topic, is almost totally neglected, presumably because there is no evangelical-friendly role model to put forward. Tucker almost always tells us which male figures were progressive in their views of women and which were more regressive. These opinions are, of course, colored by her own views of the matter.

Two additional weaknesses in the book are its lack of attention to social history and its insufficient engagement with historical theology. This is no doubt due to Tucker's emphasis on personal biography. The result is an often overly "preachy" approach to church history that lacks nuance and treats ideas as secondary to narrative. The exception, of course, are figures with more proto-feminist ideas about gender roles or figures whom Tucker is attempting to rehabilitate for an evangelical audience (see her discussion of Peter Abelard, for example).

Though Tucker intends for *Parade of Faith* to be used as a college and seminary textbook, I cannot recommend it for classroom use at those levels because of the aforementioned shortcomings. The narrative, popular style seems better suited for use in Christian high schools, homeschooling families, and local church reading groups, though complementarian readers will need to note the egalitarian flavor of the book. Though *Parade of Faith* would not make an ideal church history textbook, every church history professor should keep it close at hand when preparing lecture notes. Whether you agree with Tucker or not, she is a master storyteller. She will no doubt help many professors to be better lecturers and introduce them to a treasure trove of helpful stories to share in the classroom. This will help professors to bring individuals from church history to life for students. Though it is not the wide adoption Tucker understandably hopes for, I would argue that this would be a most welcome legacy for *Parade of Faith*.

—Nathan A. Finn
Associate Professor of Historical Theology and
Baptist Studies
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary

Documents of the Christian Church, by Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder, eds. Fourth ed., New York: Oxford University Press, 2011, 528 pp., $29.95 paper; and *Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church, AD 337–461*. By James Stevenson, ed. Third ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012, 504 pp., $45.00 paper.

The student of the history of the Church faces an arduous task: he or she must read widely in close to two thousand years of Christian historical texts and must also have an awareness of the global reach of the faith, especially in the past two hundred years or so. Sourcebooks are an indispensable aid for such an endeavor, and church historians in the last fifty years or so have been well served by a number of standard readers like these two works, both of which have seen

a number of editions since their initial publication.

Henry Bettenson's *Documents of the Christian Church* was first published in 1943, when Bettenson was in his mid-thirties. Bettenson saw this valuable collection through a second edition in 1963, and since his death in 1979, it has gone through two further editions, in 1999 and now in 2011. This most recent edition by Chris Maunder, who teaches religious studies at York St. John University, contains a number of significant additions in such areas as the globalization of Christianity—including a passage from the excellent work of Philip Jenkins (439–440)—the challenges of world poverty and various economic issues (442–451), domestic violence and the sexual abuse of children (469–472), climate change (474–478), Islamic terrorism (478–482), genetic engineering (494–497), and the internet (498–500). What is missing, from the point of view of this reviewer, are more documents that illustrate the massive growth of evangelical and Pentecostal Christianity. There is a small section on Pentecostal theology on 440–442, where it is admitted that Pentecostalism is the "fastest growing [wing of the universal Church] in the twenty-first century" (440). But there is nothing about nineteenth- or twentieth-century evangelicalism—and precious little on that of the eighteenth century, for that matter (for a sole selection about Wesleyan Methodism, see 334–337)—and its successful propagation of the faith in the West and around the world. What is well illustrated is the troubled course of the Church of England. But can anyone familiar with the theological patterns of biblical orthodoxy in the first nineteen centuries of Christianity really deem most of modern occidental Anglicanism to be a faithful representation of those patterns? Thus, while the earlier sections of this work that deal with the church up until the seventeenth century are an extremely helpful selection of sources, there really is a need for a work that focuses on sources of evangelicalism in the last three hundred years.

James Stevenson (1901–1983), one-time Fellow of Downing College, Cambridge, intended his first edition of *Creeds, Councils and Controversies* (1966) to be a re-tooling of a work covering the same period of time by the Anglican minister Beresford James Kidd (1864–1948) that had been published in 1920. A second edition of Stevenson's work, revised by the Patristic scholar W. H. C. Frend (1916–2005), involved significant additions, especially with regard to the theology of the Cappadocians and the Christological controversies of the fifth century. Frend also reorganized the entire work so that the student of this era could more easily find all of the texts relating to the various Fathers. Thus, for example, all of the Augustine material was now grouped together in such a way as to provide an excellent documentary summary of the career and works of the North African theologian (239–281).

This third edition entails a re-typesetting of the entire work in an attractive format and font, as well as the correction of a few typographical errors of the second edition. It is probably inevitable that teachers of the era covered in this volume will feel that there are lacunae. This reviewer is no exception. I would definitely have included a longer section from Nyssen's life of his sister Macrina (for a small selection, see 112), which is quite a remarkable example of early monastic piety and, in the opinion of this writer, a much more attractive piece than Athanasius's life of Antony. Given the importance of Augustine's theological account of his conversion in his *Confessions*—to which a number of selections are devoted (see 239–248)—it would have been quite helpful to also have the account of Hilary's embrace of Christianity at the beginning of his important work on the Trinity. These quibbles aside, however, Stevenson's and Frend's selection is an excellent tool for the study of the Church's theology and experience in late antiquity.

—Michael A.G. Haykin
Professor of Church History
and Biblical Spirituality
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

The Early Church on Killing: A Comprehensive Sourcebook on War, Abortion, and Capital Punishment. By Ronald J. Sider, ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012, 216 pp., $27.99 cloth.

War, like poverty, is a constant feature of human life. Often fed by the love of empire and desire for domination, or ethnic pride and hatred of other peoples, or even religious zeal, men go into battle to kill or be killed. Wives are widowed, young women lose their sweethearts, children their fathers, parents their sons, sisters their brothers. In fact, in this past century, when "wars and rumors of wars" have abounded, more civilians have been killed than combatants. And in the latter half of this century of bloody conflict, there has also been a war waged against the unborn. In the past forty years, literally millions of unborn children in the West, to name but one area of the world, have been "legally" slaughtered in the womb. And while capital punishment has been banned in many Western democracies, the twentieth century witnessed the state murder of literally millions. Beginning with the Ottoman Empire's slaughter of the Armenians, other regimes like Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia, Maoist China, and the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia have killed massive numbers of their own citizens.

Now, how should Christians think about these devastating features of human existence? As with many other areas of human experience, it is helpful to reflect on the way our Christian forebears have thought about these issues. In this sourcebook Ron Sider provides a reader of early Christian literature that deals with these three areas of violent death. The sourcebook seeks to make available all of the literature on this subject of violent killing from the pre-Constantinian era (100–312). Sider also provides, in a lengthy "Afterword" (163–195) an evaluation of the evidence. It should occasion no surprise for those familiar with Sider's work that he concludes from the evidence that the pre-Constantinian Church was overwhelmingly opposed to the killing of any human being, whether in war, or by state execution, or through an abortionist's scalpel.

With regard to early Christian thinking about abortion, there has been little difference of opinion among scholars: "eight different authors in eleven different writings mention abortion" (165) and they all explicitly condemn it. Modern Christian opposition to abortion as unmitigated murder has a solid pedigree in the early church's witness. There is less material on the issue of capital punishment: four authors—Tertullian, Origen, Lactantius, and the *Apostolic Tradition*—all argue that a Christian must not participate in the execution of criminals, though there are two texts—from the pens of Adamantius and Methodius of Olympus—that would permit the execution of adulterers (166–168).

The greatest area of dispute has been in the whole realm of early Christian participation in war. A number of scholars, of whom John Helgeland, Robert Daly, and Peter Leithart are the most persuasive, have argued that early Christian problems with service in the military had much more to do with the idolatry of the Roman army than with a principled opposition to war. Drawing upon the evidence that he has assembled in this volume, Sider rejects this view and maintains that "up until the time of Constantine, there is not a single Christian writer known to us who says that it is legitimate for Christians to kill [in war] or join the military" (190). While Sider is quite prepared to admit that there were "certainly substantial numbers of Christians" in the army during the era covered by this book (185–190, quote from 190), he is adamant that the emergence of the just war tradition only came with the embrace of Christianity by the leaders of the Roman imperium. Yet, as Sider also admits, it is noteworthy that there is no evidence of any significant controversy about this change in attitude to war—as J. T. Johnson has noted in his *Quest for Peace*. And how does one account for the large presence of Christians in the Roman army if the pre-Constantinian church was overwhelmingly pacifist (193)? These queries need answering before Sider's thesis can be embraced. But he has given us a great place to begin answering these questions in this sourcebook of early Christian texts on violent death in late antiquity.

—Michael A. G. Haykin
Professor of Church History and
Biblical Spirituality
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Godly Ambition: John Stott and the Evangelical Movement. By Alister Chapman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012, 160 pp., $55.00 cloth.

Published the year after John Stott's death, Alister Chapman's *Godly Ambition* attempts to make sense of the man who was arguably the most significant evangelical thinker and writer on both sides of the Atlantic from the 1950s until the early twentieth century. Chapman, who teaches history at Westmont College, had access to Stott's papers to write this interpretation of Stott's life (162, fn. 14).

Chapman did not intend to write a biography of Stott. Instead he paints a picture of Stott's ministry that seeks to understand how the changes in his local church, his denomination, and his society led to changing emphases in Stott's ministry roles and doctrinal stances. He does this under the rubric of "ambition," trying to let readers into the mind of Stott as he navigated the changing landscape of the West. Stott was gifted intellectually. He was also driven to impact others and lead them. As Britain became more and more post-Christian, Stott first saw that his local parish provided him little opportunity to use his gifts. So he sought a wider ministry in Anglicanism and in broader evangelicalism. When even this sphere of influence shrunk, Stott changed his arena of ministry to the less developed world. The picture that emerges is of a man with great desires for influence ("ambition"). But his desires are in a godly direction, so he is forced to adjust his focus as the culture changes in directions that are less receptive to his godly influence.

Chapman's introduction clarifies his argument, drawing attention to Stott's context. During the early years of his ministry, evangelicalism was prominent and one of the fastest growing religious movements in the world (4). Stott rode that wave of success until things began to crumble in the 1960s. Stott went from the experience of "revival" to that of "marginalization" (7). But Stott still wanted Christianity to influence his world. As Chapman summarizes: Stott "was both a Christian seeking to honor God and a very talented man who believed he had key roles to play in God's work in the world and wanted to play them. In short, he combined two things that might seem incongruous: godliness and ambition." These, however, were hard to combine at times in Stott's experience, for "godly ambition and selfish ambition were sometimes hard to tell apart. . . . Being ambitious for Christ's sake was a heady mix" (8). "Ambitious" and "godly," though filled with tension, describe Stott's complex ministry.

The heart of the book consists of six chapters. In chapter one, "Conversion," Chapman gives readers insight into Stott's privileged family of birth and his distinguished education in English public (i.e., private) schools and at Cambridge. The most important event in his life happened while at boarding school, in Feb. 1938, where Stott converted to the evangelical faith and was born again (13) under the influence of Eric Nash, a conservative evangelical influenced by American fundamentalism (15-16). Nash targeted schools like Stott's because of the potential for leaders to come out of such privileged institutions (17). Stott embraced the fundamentalism of Nash. Against his father's wishes, partly because he was a pacifist, Stott pursued ministry in the Anglican church, being ordained in 1945 (30). Chapman highlights Stott's conflicted relationship with his father who wanted his gifted son to go into a lucrative career. Stott had two primary motivations as he entered a London pastorate in the mid 1940s. First, he wanted to prove to his father that he had not let him down by becoming a pastor: "Yes, he had decided to become a clergyman, but he was going to be a great one" (23). Second, Stott was optimistic about the future of Christianity in postwar Britain, especially a Christianity shorn of its fundamentalist accoutrements. Stott would lead the charge of a revived, heady evangelicalism in this optimistic era (29-30).

In chapter two, "Students," Chapman uses Stott's

ministry to students in London and on university campuses to distill "many of the opportunities and difficulties Stott faced in the changing culture of postwar Britain" (31). Two key features of Stott's ministry stand out. First of all, it was a time of great success in evangelism. Postwar Britain up until the turbulent 1960s was conservative. There was great moral and spiritual interest after the evil and devastation of the war, and the cold-war opponent was atheistic Communism. Stott saw tremendous spiritual fruit from evangelistic crusades, especially at the ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In this period Stott "dreamed of renewed cultural influence, of an age where church and society might be united again in a Christian moral order" (40). Second, Stott strategically shaped his ministry to influence students whom he knew would become the country's future leaders (33). His Enlightenment notion that the gospel was primarily intellectual gained a wide hearing in these days (36-37). In an effort to reach the postwar generation, Stott also shed more of his fundamentalist background, especially its belligerence (42, 46). He also willingly associated himself with Billy Graham when the American came to Cambridge in 1955 (34, 40), because of the way Graham encouraged him "to keep moving away from the margins of society" (41). Stott's successes in the 1940s and 1950s encouraged him in the hope that in the future Britain might be transformed for Christ (51). He just needed to figure out how to do it after the rebellion of the 1960s.

In the third chapter, "Parishioners," Chapman charts the course of Stott's ministry at London's All Souls Church, Langham Place, where he began on staff in 1945 and of which he became rector in 1950. Stott's drive and determination to make an impact in London are central in Chapman's telling as is Stott's high estimate of his abilities. "What was striking was Stott's drive and confidence. . . . Stott was not afraid of leadership: he desired, expected, and sought it" (56). Stott, who remained single his whole life to be better able to minister the gospel (63-4), poured himself into reaching the parish, with many innovations including two services—one for the educated class and one designed for the working class (68)—but he was frustrated by the lack of response. Society was changing in the 1960s and fewer people were interested in religious issues (68-72). Increasingly he saw Britain as in need of revival. "By the late 1960s, he was lamenting the demise of Christian England" (72). In addition, the staff of All Souls grew discontented with Stott's frequent absences and his concern for issues bigger than his local parish, so he resigned from his position there as rector in 1970 (75). As Chapman tells the story, the issue was largely Stott's desire for greater influence than he could have among the middle-class parishioners who were coming to All Souls (76).

Chapter four, "Anglicans," charts Stott's involvement in the politics of the Church of England, in light of his growing alienation with his own parish. The shift to denominational emphases, Chapman avers, demonstrates both "cultural changes in British society and Stott's evolving ambitions" (79). Stott's ministry within the Anglican church at first focused on getting as many evangelicals into parish ministry as possible. Again, though, he had greater ambitions, "a desire for greater responsibility within the Church of England" (89), specifically hoping to become a bishop (90), especially as his parish ministry was not as fruitful as he hoped. In this context, Chapman analyzes the strained relationship between Stott and Martin Lloyd-Jones, focused in 1966, seeing it primarily as indicative of two different approaches to a changing culture. "Lloyd-Jones and Stott made different responses to the unnerving reality of a post-Protestant Britain. The culture was changing, and Stott wanted to move with it" (95). As it became apparent that Stott would not be able to influence the church as a staunch evangelical, he was willing to be "much more open to other points of view" (99), alienating the more conservative wing of the church but never being a liberal theologically. Effectively, he became a man without a country and so backed out of Anglican politics by 1984 (101-7). Like J. I. Packer, Stott's most fruitful ministry would become outside the United Kingdom. "Abroad, he saw new places, preached to adoring crowds, and

enjoyed bird-watching" (110).

First, though, Stott tried one last-ditch effort to reach Britain for Christ, not abandoning the gospel but adding another emphasis to it. "Stott had become convinced that Christian engagement with wider social issues was crucial to the success of the gospel in England and beyond" (113). Chapman recounts this episode of Stott's career in chapter five, "Society." Whereas Stott preached in 1966 that "the commission of the Church . . . is not to reform society, but to preach the Gospel," the next year he emphasized that "social action was an integral part of the Great Commission" (117-18). Stott made a tactical decision that he had to distance himself from "his instinctual conservatism." Therefore, he "started to drift left" (121). Capitalism, evangelicals' pietistic bent, opposition to all abortions, and abuse of the environment—all these came under Stott's attack. Writing on Christian social action and seeking to get others involved in this new direction encompassed Stott's efforts in this area, which were, he said, his ambition or "the desire to succeed" (130).

The final chapter, "World," crystallizes the story Chapman tells us. Stott abandoned the dry fields of Britain for the fertile fields elsewhere, first western Europe and North America and then the two-thirds world. In the process, Stott was both quintessentially a British evangelical (with an emphasis on the understated presentation of truth and its reception in a person's intellect) and also more and more open to diverse theologies. He especially began to teach that Christians needed to engage in poverty reduction as well as gospel preaching. This led to his growing estrangement from established evangelical stalwarts like Billy Graham and J. I. Packer. Surprisingly, though, it also led to his prominence in the Lausanne movement and to greater prestige around the world. In fact, Stott became "the key figure in contemporary world evangelicalism. . . . He had become an evangelical icon" (141). In Chapman's telling of the story, these events happened because of Stott's ambition to be renowned and used. When he "did not receive the recognition in England that he desired," Stott intentionally sought for other areas of usefulness (133). Chapman discounts Dudley-Smith's contention that Stott had no desire for leadership of worldwide evangelicalism, charging instead that Stott knew what he was doing when, for instance, he challenged Graham to include social action in the Lausanne covenant (143). Stott knew he had a "role he wanted to play and believed he should play, for the sake of Christ's kingdom. But the line between godly and selfish ambition was sometimes hard to tell," and Stott thus had an uneasy conscience about it (143-44). The battle between "ambitious" and "godly" seemed to be won by the former.

Readers seeking biographical details about John Stott will be better served by Timothy Dudley-Smith's two volumes. Those who want to understand how Stott's changing theological emphases (a component of Stott's life sorely lacking in Chapman's book) mirrored changes in other evangelical leaders of the time will benefit from Iain Murray's *Evangelicalism Divided*. If, however, one desires to trace the way in which changes in the twentieth century culture were combated and also mirrored by one evangelical leader, and if one desires an attempt at understanding "why Stott did what he did and thought as he did" (6)—sometimes, I fear, without substantial support of the evaluations offered—then Chapman's book will be helpful. It is an interpretive book, especially helpful for American readers who are experiencing in our day some of the cultural shifts Stott lived through decades ago. As we seek to live faithfully in tumultuous times, learning from the good and the ill of John Stott's godly ambitions may help us to chart a God-honoring course.

—Shawn D. Wright
Associate Professor of Church History
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary