

**Breathed, Justified, Anointed, Enlightened, Filled:
The Churches' Life, Separation, and Hope in the Spirit**
Telford Work, Westmont College
40th International Ecumenical Seminar, July 2006, Strasbourg
Institute for Ecumenical Research

“Worshipped and glorified with the Father and the Son”: (Re)discovering the Holy Spirit. The years between the councils of Nicene and Constantinople demonstrated how central Christology had become to Christian theological imagination in an ironic way – with a new battle over the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Second Temple Judaism and apostolic Christianity had understood the Spirit of the Lord as an aspect of God like his arm, hand, finger, face, or word – as “his living impact here and now” (Heron 1983, 8). The New Testament took the Spirit’s presence to Jesus as the Father’s validation of Jesus’ lordship, not the reverse (Acts 2:33, Acts 10:36-38, John 3:34-35). By the time Basil of Caesarea wrote *On the Holy Spirit* in the middle of the fourth century, things had changed. Basil could take his audience’s incarnational theology basically for granted, at least rhetorically (chapters 6, 10, and 17), yet he needed to reassure them that the Spirit really is the Lord. The Father and the Son were by now firmly fixed in Christian imagination; the Spirit was the mysterious one.

The subsequent canonization of Trinitarian theology has not entirely remedied that situation. Many Christians still think of God in terms of “the Father, the Son, and ‘it’”. Even professional theologians rarely reflect on the Holy Spirit in the sustained way with which we reflect on the Son. Among some Christians the Holy Spirit is practically a *pro forma* theological claim, necessary for the purposes of formal adherence to the Trinitarian faith but materially dispensable to the shape of our lives and thinking.

Yet the Spirit has made a difference ever since the beginning. Consider Paul’s argument in Galatians. He immediately follows his main thesis (2:15-21) with this appeal:

Let me ask you only this: Did you receive the Spirit by works of the law, or by hearing with faith? ... Does he who supplies the Spirit to you and works miracles among you do so by works of the law, or by hearing with faith?" (Gal. 3:2-5 RSV).

Paul takes for granted not only the Galatians' knowledge that they have received the Holy Spirit but their understanding of when, how, and to what effect. Only after these rhetorical questions does he make exegetical and rabbinical arguments concerning the Messiah (3:6-39). In how many of our communities could we pull off an argument like that?

The Spirit has made a difference again and again: in Irenaeus' grand narrative of creation and perfection against the twisted tales of the Gnostics, in Athanasius' and the Cappadocians' clarifications after Nicea when the groundwork was done on what would become the Third Article of the Constantinopolitan Creed, in Augustine's Latinized Trinitarian theology and pneumatic ecclesiology, in Luther's and especially Calvin's articulated soteriologies, in Wesleyan renewal movements (an accessible guide is in Heron 1983, chapters 4-7), and in the rise of charismatic Christianities in the post-colonial west (which in 1906 included southern California) and now especially the southern hemisphere (Jenkins 2000). (Incidentally, the Spirit made such a difference in my own life in 1986. It was then that I first encountered charismatic Christianity and with it new and compelling pictures of God, Jesus Christ, creation, the Kingdom, the eschatological future, the Church, salvation, vocation, divine action, and of course the Holy Spirit himself.) (I will use masculine pronouns for the Spirit despite the Spirit's freedom from gender out of deference to the usual English rendering of Nicene language and to the Greek of the Gospel of John, and beg the pardon of those of you whom that may offend.)

At each of these moments pneumatology made *a* difference. It held an integral but still secondary place in an important development of the Christian faith.

Perhaps this pattern reveals an appropriate structural feature of orthodox theology in which the Spirit's supporting role manifests itself subtly. In that case, charismatic and Pentecostal Christianity offer opportunities to identify and explore an underappreciated aspect of the Christian faith (Florensky 1997 in Rogers 2005, chapter 1). Or perhaps the pattern is a sign of a persistent and practically universal defect in Christian theology in which binitarian sensibilities inappropriately marginalize the Holy Spirit – and even in those times when appreciation of the Spirit is being recovered. In that case, charismatic and Pentecostal Christianity offer fundamental corrections to the great tradition's tendency to overreact to “enthusiasm,” whether it comes as patristic Montanism, Reformation spiritualism, or modern “charismatic chaos” (Jenson 1993 in Rogers 2005, chapter 1).¹ Either way, we can take the triumph of Christology in theological imagination as appropriate while noting that pneumatology identifies decisive factors that the Church cannot afford to neglect.

This suggests a promising role for pneumatology in matters of ecumenical theology. Here, for purposes of simplicity, I will focus on *the Church's distinct relationships with the Spirit*. Various church practices embody those relationships. Note well: Our fellowships honor them all, though in varying degrees. Yet our churches have tended to favor one relationship *over* the others in our lives and theological imaginations. Sometimes we have let one relationship dominate and even control the others. When that happens, the tradition's pneumatology is narrowed and its 'Spirit' is weakened. Theological inadequacy and sectarian defensiveness result as each of our churches sets itself against the others' own weak 'Spirits.'

My scenario resembles Lesslie Newbigin's analysis of his own typology of ecclesiologies in *The Household of God* (Newbigin 1953). Newbigin's three accounts of the Church were the

¹ If the pattern characterizes not only subapostolic Christianity but the New Testament itself (a Markan and Matthean pattern?), a biblical faith will more wisely assume the former; if the Spirit's subtlety in the New Testament reflects its wide appreciation in Israel's worldview (a Lukan and Johannine pattern?), then the latter.

Catholic, the Protestant, and the Pentecostal, each of which favored one person of the Trinity. My project is different. I will explore five of our relationships with the Holy Spirit: as *before* (*pro*) the Church, *over* (*hyper*) the Church, *upon* (*epi*) the Church, *in* (*en*) the Church, and *into* (*eis*) the Church. Under each category I will describe the relationship using biblical narratives. Then I will associate it with particular ecclesial practices and traditions, and warn against the abuses that result when that vision dominates the others. My aim is to appreciate the pneumatological strengths of our own traditions and highlight the dangers of our over-reliance on those traditions to the exclusion of others. Finally I will conclude with a few synthetic observations.

(First, several caveats: To economize, I will offer for each category a dense collage of biblical texts and very little material demonstrating further theological development. I also acknowledge in advance that isolating these five types produces an artificial typology that only roughly approximates the more interdependent and less stark reality. Finally, associating each type with one or more ecclesial tradition in such a brief space inevitably and unfairly stereotypes it. I repeat: *All* of our traditions honor *all* of these relationships, not just formally but materially. We just do not honor them equally or fully, and we tend to hold one over the others. I hope the kernels of truth in my generalizations and the benefits of drawing these connections outweigh the risk that some will take my characterizations as more precise or sweeping than I mean them.)

“Giver of life”: *The Spirit before us.* The Holy Spirit is a beginning for others, “the giver of life,” the fashioner of all things (Wis. 7:22-27). The Spirit of God sweeps over the waters of creation (Gen. 1:2), populates the heavens (Ps. 33:6), and breathes life into God’s works (Gen. 2:7, Ps. 104:29-30). These beginnings look forward to more: Paul says that the blessing of Abraham is the promise of the Spirit (Gal. 3:14). The Spirit is also the beginner of the new

creation: conceiver of the incarnate Son (Matt. 1:18-25), agent of baptism's new creation (Matt. 3:11), its breath of new birth from water (John 3:1-10), and transformer of the mortal body and perishable soul into imperishable spirit (1 Cor. 15:42-49). The Breath of God stirs the waters of creation to heal and raise up its infirm and quicken its dead at the last day (Ez. 37:5, 8-10, 14).

The breath of God is the Spirit before us. The church practice that most directly honors that relationship is baptism.² Yet water does not signify the Spirit here (Mark 1:8). Baptismal water is the flood of God's final judgment on us as sinners (1 Pet. 3:20-21). It testifies *along with* the Spirit and the blood (1 John 5:6-9) to the one who came in them. The futurity of the new covenant is not to be found in circumcision's "endless genealogies" of gathered generations (1 Tim. 1:4), but in the baptismal death and birth in the Spirit who blows where he wills (John 3:8), who flies from the heavens to the Son (Mark 1:10), and who raises him (Rom. 8:11a). That new beginning concludes the genealogies of the old age (Luke 3:21-38), because the Father adopts us as fellow heirs of the Father's only Son and heirs of his Spirit (Rom. 8:13-17). There are no grandchildren in the Kingdom, and only one Father (Mark 10:29-30, Matt. 12:50).

There are "baptismal" traditions for whom the Spirit's new beginnings dominate its imagination. Indeed, one of the besetting conditions of Christendom is a sense of baptismal entitlement and the equation of baptism with citizenship or cultural identity along with the loss of baptismal discipline. It is as if the gospel's arrival created a Christian culture that now stands on its own, a new creation whose state of grace is a birthright. The Anglican Catechism of 1549 confesses baptism as "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness: for, being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace" (Schaff 3:521). Believer's baptist traditions have not escaped the consequences of emphasizing and

² "It is no mere conceit to connect the water of the font to the water of the Jordan, the water of creation, and the water of the womb," says Eugene F. Rogers, Jr. (Rogers 2005, 60).

overemphasizing regeneration. In the United States being “born again” is often regarded as a guarantee of eternal life regardless of one’s later life, and “born again” churches can be dismissive of the life to be found in pedobaptist traditions. At the logical extreme of this vision of the Spirit before us is Deism, which is little more than a doctrine of original creation (or even just a cosmological argument for God’s existence) with providence, baptismal redemption, and all other features of the apostolic faith stripped away. These reductions are influential in my own American history and self-image: America regards itself as God’s new creation, a *novus ordo seclorum* (the motto of the Great Seal of the United States), which nevertheless features a Deistic vision of governmental legitimation through respect of natural rights, and through which God intends to bless the whole world with democracy, liberty, and prosperity. Anglican complacency has also birthed a succession of ecclesial renewal movements, from Wesleyanism in the eighteenth century to the Keswick and Welsh revivals in the nineteenth to the charismatic revival in the 1960’s and Anglicanism’s current embrace of progressive liberalism. All these movements feature alternative visions of the Spirit as more than simply “before us,” suggesting to me that they are trying to compensate for a pneumatological lack.

“The Lord”: *The Spirit over us.* The Holy Spirit is the arm of God who lifted his chosen people out of slavery, divided the waters, led them through the depths, and gave them rest (Isa. 63:9-14). The Spirit is the finger of God whose signs and wonders Egypt’s magicians could not match (Ex. 8:19) and who wrote the Decalogue’s commands of absolute and exclusive fidelity for life in the land (Ex. 31:18). Here we have not just a creator but especially a redeemer, a *leader*, whose declaration of his people’s freedom makes a name for himself as Lord (Ex. 6:3-8, 7:5). In the fullness of time the Kingdom approaches with similar signs and wonders (Mark 1-8, Acts 2:22 and 2:33) and ushers in the Spirit’s direct rule of those who walk according to his law

(Rom. 8:1-8). The Spirit leads Simeon to present Jesus to the Lord for Israel's and the world's salvation (Luke 2:27-35). The Spirit leads and even drives Jesus in the wilderness (Luke 4:1, cf. Mark 1:12), and then on to a mission of restoration (Deut. 8 in Luke 4:4) in which he casts out demons by the same finger of God (Luke 11:20) whom he identifies as the Holy Spirit (11:13; cf. Mark 3:22-30 in which the identification is explicit). Finally the Spirit leads the Son to offer himself to God without blemish (Heb. 9:14). The sovereign Spirit vindicates the righteous, beginning with the Christ (1 Tim. 3:16, Rom. 1:3) and then in him sinners who believe and are justified (1 Cor. 6:11, Rom. 1:16-17, John 20:22-23). The Spirit's lordly deliverance, leadership, and lawgiving call for "the obedience of faith" (Rom. 1:5) that describes the Church's whole covenantal life of free submission to the Spirit (Acts 5:32, 1 John 3:24, 1 Cor. 6:18-20). Those who live by the Spirit are led and guided by the Spirit (Gal. 5:16-26) to hope to reap the Spirit's eternal life at the final harvest (Gal. 6:8).

The finger of God is the Spirit over us. Among the Church practices that most directly honor that relationship are preaching and hearing the scriptures, blessing and benediction, covenanting, and confession. All these acts position the Church to receive and acknowledge the Spirit's grace as his grateful and obedient subjects.

These ecumenical practices are distinctively developed in the Augustinian traditions of the west and especially in the Protestant movements that reinvigorated them. In fact, B.B. Warfield credits the Reformation exclusively for "the developed doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit" (Warfield 1956, xxxiii, quoted in Heron 1983, 99). Among Protestants the Spirit over us manifests his rule principally in our conversion, justification, and sanctification. "It is not of my own reason or my own strength that I believe in Jesus Christ my Lord," says Luther's Shorter Catechism.

It is the Holy Spirit that by the Gospel has called me, with his gifts has enlightened me, through genuine faith has sanctified and sustained me, just as he calls, gathers together, enlightens, sanctifies and sustains, by Jesus Christ, in true and proper faith, all Christendom” (Luther, Shorter Catechism chapter 3, quoted in Heron 1983, 100).

Calvin further developed Luther’s doctrine of the internal witness of the Holy Spirit to honor the Spirit’s absolute sovereignty and the freedom of his gracious election and perseverance (*Institutes* I.vi-ix in Heron 1983, 105). The forensic thrust of Protestant soteriology and the reshaping of Protestant liturgy embody the Reformers’ clear vision of the Spirit as sovereign over us in his justifying and sanctifying mercy.

The forensic preoccupation of subsequent Protestant scholasticism also represents a radicalization and possible narrowing of this pneumatological emphasis to dominate others. The sacraments become means of a grace and a union with Christ controlled by the category of justification. God’s determination to save shifts from an occasion for grateful response to a unilateral declaration of limited or universal atonement in which belief and obedience are merely effects to its cause. The life of obedience deteriorates into cold legalism, or our status as *simul iustus et peccator* becomes a license not so much to sin boldly as to shrug apathetically. The scriptures shift from being powerful unto salvation to being monolithically and uniformly inerrant. Finally, the persistence of moral and natural evil in cosmic history makes the Spirit’s hiddenness and mystery oppressive, distant, and menacing. The dissatisfactions that result have spawned Pietist movements in Lutheran settings and Arminian movements in Reformed ones that shift emphasis back on human response and divine intimacy, and soon afterwards a liberalism in which human action is initiating and even determinative, in which humanity rather than the Spirit is the Lord. The debate between champions of openness theology and exhaustive foreknowledge in American evangelicalism is a radicalization of the issues that arise between Arminians and Calvinists when the Spirit is conceived as primarily over the Church.

“Spoke through the prophets”: *The Spirit upon us.* The Holy Spirit is the mouth of God (Deut. 1:26, Deut. 8:3 in Matt. 4:4) whose word is every thing that Israel needs for its sustenance. The Spirit rests on Moses, Israel’s elders, Eldad and Medad, and even Balaam to prophesy his will (Num. 11:14-17, 11:24-30, 24:2). The Spirit comes upon Saul, God’s anointed king, and on his royal messengers, and they prophesy (1 Sam. 10:1-13, 19:18-24). The Spirit of the Lord falls upon prophets anointed to preach both destruction (Zech. 7:12 and Isa. 61:2b) and new creation (Isa. 61:1-2a). In the fullness of time, the newly baptized Jesus is that Anointed One upon whom the Spirit rests to bring God’s good news (Luke 3:21-22, Isa. 61:1-2a in Luke 4:18-19). The Spirit moves his prophetic and apostolic witnesses to proclaim his honor and glory before, during, and after his earthly ministry (2 Pet. 1:16-21, 1 Tim. 4:1). The ascended Jesus pours out the same Spirit upon his Church (Joel 2:28-32 in Acts 2) and they too testify to his good news (Acts 4:31) with the Spirit’s signs and wonders and mighty works (Acts 2:22, 3:7, etc.). The Spirit leads the Church on its various missionary journeys (Acts 13:1-5). Pentecost’s outpouring is a formative moment in Christ’s long messianic task of building a charismatic Church in which the Spirit is manifested and his gifts shared for the common good (1 Cor. 12:1-11) and the Lord’s glory and pleasure at his return (2 Cor. 11:2-4).

The mouth of God with its fiery tongue is the Spirit upon us. The church practice that most directly honors that relationship is ordination. There the church recognizes and seals the Spirit’s anointing of specific persons for specific tasks in the mission of God: apostles, prophets, teachers, workers of power, healers, assistants, leaders, speakers in tongues, and others (1 Cor. 12:27-28). The Spirit is conferred upon these kinds of leaders – or acknowledged to be upon them – by the laying on of hands (1 Tim. 4:14). The basic structure and the outcome are similar whether ordination happens with strict adherence to Cyprian’s standards for formal apostolic

succession, through other episcopal structures, through presbyterian or congregational processes, or charismatically through what Pentecostals call “the baptism of the Holy Spirit.” The Church publicly recognizes the Spirit’s prior involvement in the ministry of a candidate, articulates expectations of the Spirit’s future involvement, and prays and acts decisively to prepare the candidate for his or her tasks and install him or her into the office.

Several stand out for the ways they have extensively developed practices of ordination. On the one hand, Roman Catholic ecclesiology insists on its Cyprianic institution of apostolic succession and the Magisterium centered in Rome and focused in its bishop as a mark of truly apostolic Christianity. On the other hand, Pentecostal ecclesiology emphasizes the Spirit’s anointing and infilling as virtually a requirement for a believer’s full participation in Christian life, in a kind of synthesis of the Catholic emphasis on apostolic mission and the Protestant emphasis on the priesthood of all believers. (Pentecostals have even revived the title “apostle” for describing some of their leaders.) Vatican I’s Ultramontanist ecclesiology, adjusted but not repudiated by Vatican II, suggests a church focused on and even determined by the Spirit upon it. Pentecostalism’s historical preoccupation with tongues as the necessary evidence of Spirit-baptism and the goal of all Christian discipleship suggests the same. Some Pentecostal churches tally statistics of conversions, water-baptisms, and Spirit-baptisms. Since all are gifted by the Spirit, every believer is potentially ordained and accountable for how he or she deploys that gift for the Kingdom. The dominance of the Spirit upon the Church feeds both an overworked Catholic clergy and a frenzied Pentecostal spirituality.

Both traditions can tend to treat God as nearer to the ordained and further from the rest. Members of charismatic communities without sufficiently and demonstrably “spiritual” gifts or without compelling testimonies can become second-class citizens in Pentecostal and even

charismatic communities – the analogue of the Catholic laity who support the liturgy but who are not indispensable participants. For Pentecostals, churches in which the anointing seems absent are “dead churches”; for Catholics, churches outside the apostolic succession are, at best, “ecclesial communities.” (Each tradition also honors a bit of the other: Catholic prophets (the children of Fatima, for instance?) take on charismatic roles outside the formal hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons, while the incidence of glossolalia is declining in Pentecostal churches, and along with it demands for the practice of the “full gospel” to be integral to all believers’ and even pastors’ lives and worship.)

Ordination confers authority; and authorities quickly end up in competition with one another. Fatigue, apathy, and disillusionment afflict charismatics tired of shallow, artificial, and corrupt enthusiasm just as guilt, lapse, and cynicism afflict Catholics grown weary of formulaic penitence, unintelligible liturgy, and abuse of authority. These camps of disaffected disciples have long been the sources of renewal and reform movements within and without their traditions, from the European reformations of the sixteenth century that splintered western Christendom to ever-proliferating and ever-fracturing Pentecostal denominations and nondenominational churches worldwide. American Catholics are so rebellious that they are practically *ersatz* Protestants. George Barna has even identified what he calls a “revolution” underway in America in which some twenty million of the country’s most dedicated and fruitful disciples are purposefully focusing their energies in informal interpersonal networks, recovery (healing) groups, house churches, home schools, and parachurch ministries rather than the local institutional churches they find chronically disappointing (Barna 2005). These are not individualists or consumerists, Barna says, but seekers of the primitive apostolic life of faith described in the New Testament. They say they are deeply dedicated to the Church of Jesus

Christ. However, they have abandoned the old forms of ordination that dominate traditional churches – including charismatic churches – because they repeatedly found them unproductive. In a sense, they are asserting their own ordination; as Robert Duvall does in the film “The Apostle.”

“Proceeds from the Father”: The Spirit in us. The Holy Spirit is the eyes and wisdom of God. Joseph, sacrificed for the welfare of his own kin, sees and judges by the Spirit in him and so gains authority in Egypt (Gen. 41:38-40). Bezalel, employed in the construction of the tabernacle and its paraphernalia, knows and does his crafts by the Spirit in him (Ex. 31:1-5). The Lord’s sanctifying presence in Israel is its hope for knowing God (Num. 14:14) and prospering (Lev. 26:11). Joshua’s authority is his Spirit of wisdom in him (Num. 27:18, Deut. 34:9). Daniel has the enlightenment, understanding, and wisdom to read God’s writing and his authority to announce God’s future not from his innate talent or royal education but from his endowment with the Holy Spirit (Dan. 5:11, 14). The Spirit enlightens Israel’s sages and dwells with its righteous ones (Wis. 1:3-7, 7:7). What begins in the old covenant culminates in the new with the slain lamb. The lamb’s seven eyes are the seven spirits of God (Rev. 5:6) who are the Holy Spirit (Isa. 11:1-5 in Rev. 3:1), the third of the divine three (Rev. 1:4-5). In Revelation the Spirit inheres in Jesus rather than resting on him. He speaks apocalyptic wisdom to the churches (Rev. 3:6). Only the lamb’s eyes may look into the scroll that comes from the one on the throne (Rev. 5:1-14). He alone sees all we have ever done (John 4:39) – for he is filled with wisdom (Luke 2:40), and his Spirit searches both the human heart (Rom. 8:27) and the deep things of God (1 Cor. 1:10). Thus no other eye may see what God has prepared (1 Cor. 1:9). Yet by grace the vision and its interpretation is offered also to the suffering Church (Rom. 8:17) that receives the Spirit, understands his gifts, and relates God’s wisdom, all through the Spirit’s teaching (1 Cor.

2:6-13). The foolish blaspheme the Spirit in the Son as a demon or the prince of demons (John 10:19-21 and Mark 3:22-30). Meanwhile he opens the eyes of the blind to see and know him (John 9:32-39 and 10:7-18). The Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father abides in the now enlightened Church (1 Tim. 1:13-14, John 14:15-17), taking all that belongs to the Son and declaring it (John 16:12-15) in the new temple of his presence (1 Cor. 3:16-17, Eph. 2:22). The suffering Church receives the Spirit and submits to the Spirit's teaching and so relates the wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1:2).³ This happens through its deeds as well as its words, for the Church's servants have Joshua's Spirit in them and thus share Joshua's practical wisdom (Acts 6:3).

The eyes of God are the Spirit of wisdom in us. The church practices that most directly honor that relationship are contemplation, discernment, and interpretation. A tradition that especially privileges them is Eastern Orthodoxy, whose iconography brings beatific vision into earthly sanctuaries and whose Dionysian spirituality pursues heavenly ascent to the Father through the illumination of the Spirit in the uncreated light of the Son.

The prevalence of Platonism in learned circles before and during the patristic era often privileged vision over the more apparently materialistic senses. It also emphasized the spiritual, at times to the neglect of the physical. Origen's Platonistic theology had both Arian and Athanasian trajectories. The subordinationist path leads to spiritualism and Gnosticism that reduce salvation to the escape of the soul from its material body rather than perseverance through Christ's sufferings in hope of resurrection. I know this heresy well by its prevalence in my own American evangelical Christianity. Yet even the incarnational path can dominate our relationships with the Spirit in unhealthy ways. The consequences include theological idealism

³ In almost all of these texts there is an explicit connection between the Spirit, righteousness, seeing, and suffering. Wisdom is a lady of *pathos* whose enlightened heart is pierced by what darkened human hearts. Her painful mission of seeing and suffering is figured in the exchange between Simeon and Mary over Jesus' career (Luke 2:25-35).

and mysticism that lose contact with realities (as do some Orthodox ecclesiologies and soteriologies of *theosis*), Hegelian panentheism and process theology that turn eschatology into historical progress, and theologies of liberation that confuse the Spirit's vision with experiences of oppression and liberation. Subordinationism shuns the creation for the Spirit, while pan-incarnationalism collapses the creation into the Spirit. Neither extreme offers the true knowledge of God and of self that can come only from the Spirit dwelling in us.

“And from the Son”: The Spirit into us. The Holy Spirit is the living water of God (Jer. 2:13). This water is greater than the water from Abraham's wells, which could be stopped up (Gen. 26:15), from Isaac's wells, which could be usurped (Gen. 26:17-22), and from Jacob's well, whose water could not eternally satisfy (John 4:11-15). The Spirit is the Sustainer that proceeds from the rock of Christ (Ex. 17:6 in 1 Cor. 10:4) like a river to his thirsty people in the desert (Isa. 43:20-21, 1 Cor. 10:11). Israel's ever deepening river of living water flows only from the restored temple in Jerusalem (Ez. 47:1-12, Zech. 14:8) and out to all who wish to take it as a gift (Rev. 22:17). That temple is Christ's body (John 2:19-22). When it is lifted up and pierced it releases its water for the benefit of those who believe (John 19:34-35). From the Son's belly comes the Spirit who fills and quenches the thirst of all who come to him in faith (John 7:37-39, Rev. 21:5-7). The Spirit not only justifies the unworthy but washes and sanctifies them (1 Cor. 6:11). Yet because this water is not just sprinkled or poured but drunk, the Spirit cleanses and restores not just the outside (Ez. 36:25) but even the heart that it enters and fills (Ez. 36:26-27). In turn the cleansed become heirs of the Spirit of the Son (Gal. 4:6-7, Rev. 21:5-7) and partners with Christ. In him they too are springs of water gushing up to eternal life (John 4:14). They are not drunk with wine and debauchery but overflow with the Spirit and his gratitude (Eph. 5:18-20).

The water of God is the Spirit into and through us. The church practice that most directly honors that relationship is communion – especially when the prayer of *epiclesis* is invoked for the Spirit to come and when the wine is mixed with water as refreshment and sacramental sign of the flow from Christ’s side into his Church (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III Q74 A6). Orbiting communion are the sanctifying practices of Church discipline and asceticism. Church discipline respects the holiness of the body of Christ (1 Cor. 5:7-8). At first asceticism seems odd as a sign of the Spirit into us, but it honors the sufficiency of the Spirit’s infilling in the life of faith. Jesus the very wellspring denied himself and called his disciples to do the same. (Note the emphasis on the Spirit’s procession from the Son as the water of God compared to the stress on the Spirit’s procession from the Father as the eyes of God. Another church practice that honors the Spirit into us is confession of the *Filioque*. My typology both affirms the Spirit’s procession from the Son and distinguishes between the manner of the Spirit’s procession from the Father, as wisdom and sight, and his procession from the Son, as living and cleansing water. The intratrinitarian implications of this distinction are beyond the scope of my argument here, but they are intriguing and perhaps ecumenically promising for reconciling Eastern and Western Trinitarians.)

Among those who take the sanctifying work of the Spirit put into us with special seriousness are the renewal movements that arose as reactions to their traditions’ unsatisfying formalism: monasticism refreshed Orthodoxy and Catholicism and Pietism, Arminianism, and Wesleyanism refreshed magisterial Protestantism. Here disciples have sought tomorrow’s holiness today in their societies, Christian communities, and personal lives. Holiness Wesleyans have developed extensive accounts of multiple sanctifying blessings. Some (such as the Church of the Nazarene) stress the experience of “entire sanctification” through God’s filling them with

the love of Christ. They display a corresponding zeal for ridding themselves, their families, their fellow disciples, and their countries of injustices and addictions.

When this relationship dominates the others, renewal turns into arrogance among the “holy” and anxiety and despair among the “unholy.” Adoption is reduced to immanence, relationship to experience, spirituality to intimacy, and transcendence to absence. The indwelling Spirit becomes a domesticated ally of an individual, a group, or a nation that cleans up its act. Meanwhile, those who experience God as absent or view themselves as incorrigible live in self-imposed (or externally imposed) exile, unrelated to God in the way their tradition takes as normative. After enough of these struggles, some hear the Reformation’s account of the Spirit over them and rejoice, as Martin Luther rejoiced to be delivered from his quandary as a frustrated Augustinian monk. Others end their struggles by quitting the Christian life, or even quitting life altogether. Neither the winners nor the losers in this arrangement are particularly well suited to sharing their living water with those still thirsty – a telling outcome given the inherently missional aspect of this relationship with the Spirit.

“We believe”: *The Spirit of holiness.* “The Father is God over us, the Son is God with us, and the Spirit is God in us.” Put so starkly, this is modalism, not Trinitarianism. It is susceptible to a corrupting anthropocentrism in our talk of God, because it makes us creatures the vehicle for distinguishing the divine persons. My analysis here addresses different abuses that arise from a somewhat different failure. Deism, legalism, enthusiasm, spiritualism, and arrogance depart from the full gospel not because they are anthropocentric or unitarian but because they reduce our relationships with the Spirit to one dominating and overbearing aspect. However, interestingly, each of these theologies also becomes functionally anthropocentric and unitarian. With an abstract relationship in control, the Spirit can drop out of all of them at little cost, and

we can take the place of Jesus Christ as the object of the relationship at similarly little cost. This is not because these reductionist theologies formally deny or ignore persons of the Trinity as modalism does, but because in exalting any one relationship with the Holy Spirit over others they fail to honor the full shape of our graced relations with the Triune God whose relations are constitutive of their Trinity and trivialize the intratrinitarian relations in which the Church's relations utterly depend. For instance, in its zeal for the Spirit upon us and its favoritism for the biblical book that highlights that relationship, Oneness or "Jesus Only" Pentecostalism takes the truncated baptismal formula in Acts as a sign that the Spirit *is* the Son and the Father, reviving modalism.⁴

In Basil of Caesarea's time the Arian controversy had left churches confused and polarized over their liturgical practices of glorifying God. Basil defended the divinity of the Holy Spirit with an extended treatment of the grammar of the prepositions *with* (*syn*, *meta*), *through* (*dia*), and *in* (*en*). The proper liturgical use of one, he argued, implied the propriety and full significance of the others. So glory to God the Father *through* the Son *in* the Spirit is glory to God the Father and the Son *with* the Spirit. Today's challenge is not unrelated. Our traditions have turned prepositions into favorites and favorites into protectorates. With Basil, ecumenists in all traditions ought to insist that the proper use of one preposition implies full respect for the others, while the inordinate or exclusive use of one effectively depersonifies its object.

Charismatic and Pentecostal Christians will have our parts to play in that recovery of the Spirit's full involvement in the life of God, the Church, and the world, especially when the Spirit

⁴ A useful heuristic in determining whether a particular relationship with the Spirit is dominant or marginal in one's community is to ask which of these claims would sound natural there and which would shock. I tried this myself recently at a Sunday School class at a Wesleyan Holiness church in my area. Participants generally treated the Spirit's indwelling as conventional, but they found his lordship surprising and even troubling – with the exception of a stalwart Calvinist in the room, who was as reassured by talk of the Spirit's lordship as he was disturbed by talk of his charismatic gifts.

upon us is neglected. But we are only one party in what must be a whole exchange. Pentecostals did not invent pneumatology! In fact, I hope this analysis confirms that pneumatology is more integral to all of our ecclesial visions than we theologians often grant. Charismatics and Pentecostals have much to contribute, but even more to learn, because we have not honored our apostolic inheritance any more than those God raised us to help.

I have noticed in my teaching that there is a “catholic Paul,” a “Protestant Paul,” and a “Pentecostal Paul” available for partisans to exploit. Most believers seem to take advantage of them. But the canonical Paul is always knocking at our confessional doors with more to offer. The situation is similar with the Holy Spirit. There is a range of biblical texts and a respectable trajectory of holy tradition available for champions of any one of these relationships. Yet we who use them to settle for less than the full story of the Holy Spirit will find our communities impoverished, our spirituality thin, our prayer frustrating, other communities alien, and the *real* Holy Spirit something of a stranger. Our narrowness is sapping our unity, our holiness, our catholicity, and our apostolicity. Paul explodes our divisive pneumatological reductions in the same way that he explodes our exclusive and sectarian ecclesiologies. His message for the recalcitrant Corinthians in 2 Cor. 3 – to pick just one passage – falls cleanly into none of my five types but honors them all: His congregation is a new creation, a letter written by the Spirit who came *before* them (2 Cor. 3:1-3). They have heard of the new covenant *over* them, a glorious dispensation of the Spirit of glory (3:4-11). They have seen Paul’s hope shining *upon* his countenance with undiminishing radiance (3:12-13). *In* Christ the Spirit has taken away their veil of ignorance and opened them to understanding (3:14-17a), and the Spirit who has come *into* their midst still brings freedom and transformation from one glory into another (3:17b-18).

The Spirit is the Lord, *and* the giver of life, *and* the procession from the Father to and into, *and* through and from the Son into his conceived and baptized and gathered body, *and* speaker through the prophets. He is God's breath *and* finger *and* mouth *and* eyes *and* living water. The third person of the Trinity in whom we have put our trust is *the Holy Spirit*.

Bibliography

- Basil the Great, *On the Holy Spirit* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980).
- Florensky, Pavel, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, trans. Boris Jakim (Princeton: Princeton University, 1997).
- Heron, Alasdair, *The Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983).
- Jenkins, Philip, *The Next Christendom* (New York: Oxford, 2000).
- Jenson, Robert, "You Wonder Where the Spirit Went," *Pro Ecclesia* 2 (1993), 296-304.
- Newbigin, Lesslie, *The Household of God* (Friendship, 1952).
- Pinnock, Clark, *Flame of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1996).
- Rogers, Eugene F., Jr., *After the Spirit: A Constructive Pneumatology from Resources outside the Modern West* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).
- Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols. (New York: Harper, 1877).
- Kuyper, Abraham, *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956).
- Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960).
- Barna, George, *Revolution: Finding Vibrant Faith beyond the Walls of the Sanctuary* (Wheaton: Tyndale, 2005).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981).