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.