I. JOHN HESSELINK

I.

At first it might appear that the Reformed tradition and the approach and theology of the charismatic movement were basically different, if not antithetical, entities. For all the Protestant tradition, the Reformed has been noted for its emphasis on doctrine and theology as such. The charismatic movement, on the other hand, places great emphasis on experience. The Reformed churches are noted for their theologians, not their “saints” or evangelists. We glory in our confessions and catechisms, solid theology and pure doctrine. Charismatic and Pentecostal groups, on the other hand, boast of healings and ecstatic experiences. Reformed Christians tend to be cerebral, cool, and analytical. Charismatics promote enthusiasm, “letting go,” and warm feelings.

Many of the differences come to focus in divergent views of the church, ministry, and worship. The church, by Reformed definition, exists where the Word is preached in its purity, where the sacraments are properly administered, and where discipline is exercised. All of this is rather foreign to the charismatic who thinks of the church more in terms of an informal fellowship whose boundaries are fluid and where doctrinal requirements are minimized. Distinctions between lay and clergy are played down, with the leaders often being self-appointed and answerable to no higher judiciary. Believers’ baptism plays a very important role but, except for Catholic charismatics, the Lord’s Supper appears to receive little attention. In the Reformed tradition preaching is exalted, and the ideal is to do everything “decently and in order.” (A phrase which some people mistakenly think comes from a Reformed or Presbyterian book of church order! Ironically, it comes from the climax of the Apostle Paul’s discussion of spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians 14.) Among charismatics informal Bible study and unstructured exhortation takes the place of more formal preaching, and a premium is placed on informality and spontaneity.

Finally, is there not an irreconcilable barrier in the traditional belief of many Reformed and Presbyterian Christians (particularly ministers) that miracles ceased with the passing of the Apostles? By miracles is meant any so-called supernatural manifestations such as speaking in tongues, dramatic healings, prophecy, etc. Calvin, in reaction to Roman Catholic claims, maintained that “The gift of healing, like the rest of the miracles, which the Lord willed to be brought forth for a time, has vanished away in order to make the new preaching of the gospel marvelous forever” (Institutes IV, 19, 18). Centuries later a staunch American Presbyterian theologian, B. B. Warfield, was still maintaining that miracles ceased with the end of the apostolic age. (See his Counterfeit Miracles, 1918. Reprinted as Miracles: Yesterday and Today, Real and Counterfeit, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1953, 1965.)
In view of all this—and other factors could be cited—it would appear that there is indeed a basic, deep-rooted incompatibility between the Reformed tradition and the charismatic movement, even in its recent, more sophisticated manifestations. But this is only one side of the picture. A case could be made for a fruitful, even fairly natural, relationship between these two, although at certain points there will inevitably be some tension.

II.

It must be conceded at the outset that in many ways the Wesleyan and Baptist traditions are by nature more congenial to a Pentecostal approach or charismatic experiences than the Reformed-Presbyterian. However, the growth and spread of the new Pentecostal-charismatic movement seems to be no respecter of historical traditions or theological emphases. For there appear to be more charismatics among Catholics, Episcopalians, and Lutherans than among Methodists or Baptists; and one of the largest charismatic fellowships can be found among United Presbyterians. In fact, it could be argued that the charismatic movement flourishes most in denominations or groups which least emphasize personal experience, small groups and sharing, personal witnessing, prayer, and Bible study.

Whether this is true or not, I think a good case can be made for a certain compatibility of these two traditions, at least where both are interpreted according to their best insights and contributions. For the charismatic movement, like the traditional Pentecostal movement, is above all a movement which stresses and magnifies the personality and power of the Holy Spirit. Likewise, the Reformed tradition—at least certain strains of it—has placed great emphasis on the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Not only that; I am convinced that in Reformed theology there is a greater appreciation, deeper understanding, and more comprehensive and balanced presentation of the full-orbed power and work of the Holy Spirit than in any other tradition, including the Pentecostal tradition!

A—In the first place, recall that the mainstream Lutheran-Reformed reformation was in many ways a recovery of the freedom, presence, and power of the Holy Spirit. In Medieval Roman Catholicism the Spirit, like the whole concept of grace, had become “locked up,” in a sense, within an understanding of grace which was dispensed at the behest of the hierarchy. The Reformation was not only a rediscovery of the Word and the gospel; it also resulted in an assurance of forgiveness and a peaceful conscience. In other words, through the new outpouring of the Spirit, Christ was more accessible and more real to countless individuals than he had been in centuries. Many of the gifts of the Spirit were experienced in a marvelous new way; not tongues and healing so much as wisdom, knowledge, prophecy, discernment, and, above all, faith.

The German reformer, Martin Luther, deserves much of the credit for this discovery of the grace of God manifest in Jesus Christ and his Spirit. Regin Prenter, the Danish Lutheran scholar, even maintains that “The concept of the Holy Spirit completely dominated Luther's theology. In every decisive matter,” continues Prenter, “whether it be the study of Luther’s doctrine of justification, of his doctrine of the sacraments, of his ethics, or of any other fundamental teaching, we are forced to
take into consideration this concept of the Holy Spirit” (Spiritus Creator, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1953, p. IX).

Yet, without detracting from Luther’s accomplishent, the title, “theologian of the Holy Spirit” is more properly given to Calvin. (So B. B. Warfield, John Mackay, Bernard Ramm, and Werner Kruseh. See especially the latter’s Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes nach Calvin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957, p. 12; and Warfield’s Calvin and Augustine: Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1956, pp. 21-24, 107). This may come as a surprise to many Reformed Christians who are accustomed to hearing of the sovereignty of God or predestination as being the hallmarks of Calvinism. Granted, this is an aspect of Calvin’s theology which has often been aborted in traditional Calvinism where a rationalistic orthodoxy has squelched the dynamism of the Reformer’s faith and theology. This is not the place to substantiate in detail the thesis that Calvin’s theology is above all a theology of the Spirit, but a few points can be mentioned briefly.

1—In his accent on the sovereignty and freedom of God, Calvin wishes to make clear that all that we are and are able to do as Christians is ultimately due to God’s grace and is the work of his Spirit. The Christian life originates in and is continually renewed by the grace and power of the Spirit (Institutes III. 1. 3-4).

2—The Spirit of God is also at work in the world: preserving, restoring, guiding, inspiring. Apart from this more general work of the Spirit, the world would soon be in chaos and mankind would degenerate into bestiality. All that is good, true, and beautiful—even among pagans and atheists—is due to the Spirit of God (Institutes II. 2. 12-20). Calvin also stresses the cosmic dimensions of the Spirit’s work in a way rarely found in studies of the Holy Spirit. (See Simon van der Linde, De Leer van den Heiligen Geest bij Calvijn [Wageningen: H. Veenman en Zonen, 1943. Hoofdstuk 2]).

3—Calvin’s most original and enduring contribution to an evangelical understanding of the nature and authority of Scripture was his doctrine of the internal witness or testimony of the Holy Spirit. This is the keystone of his doctrine of the knowledge of God, the power and authority of the Scriptures, and the efficacy of preaching. Neither the written Word nor the proclaimed Word has any power or persuasion apart from the secret, inner working and witness of the Spirit (Institutes I. 9. 1-3; Commentary of John 14:25-26. Cf. W. Krusche, op. cit., pp. 77f, 206f.; Bernard Ramm, The Witness of the Spirit, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. Chapter III).

4—Calvin’s whole doctrine of the Christian life is developed and viewed from the perspective of the Holy Spirit. In the Institutes when Calvin moves from Christology in Book II to soteriology in Book III, from the objective work of Christ to the subjective application or reception of his benefits, the link or key is the Holy Spirit. For it is by the Spirit that “we come to enjoy Christ and all his benefits” (Institutes III. 1.1). He is “the bond by which Christ effectually unites us to himself” (Ibid.). Once again we see that apart from the Holy Spirit all that has been accomplished by the Savior avails nothing.
Under the comprehensive category of regeneration Calvin proceeds to develop his understanding of the Christian life. ("Faith flows from regeneration" and is followed by "Newness of life and other gifts of the Holy Spirit," Commentary on John 1:13.) This in itself is significant, for it is expressive of the dominant role the Holy Spirit plays in his theological approach. (See the fine discussion of this point by Hendrikus Berkhof, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964, pp. 68f.) Whatever the particular aspect of regeneration—calling, conversion, repentance, or justification by faith—Calvin's thought and language are suffused with the reality of the Holy Spirit. Especially noteworthy are his treatments of faith and sanctification. (On the former see the beautiful statements in the Institutes III. 2.7-8, 33-36.) In his discussion of faith be rings the changes on the importance of the feeling of full assurance (Ibid., III.2.15. Cf. III.2.14, 16), the very thing so earnestly desired by charismatics. Charismatics also ought to have no difficulty in identifying with a key motif in Calvin's doctrine of faith, viz., his beautiful doctrine of the mystical faith—union of the believer with his Lord (Institutes III 2.24: 11.5, 10. Cf. the excellent study by Wilhelm Kolhauß, Christusgemeinschaft bei Calvin. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1939).

Moreover, Calvin, no less than Wesley and the Pentecostals, was concerned about sanctification. (In terms of accent, Luther could be called the theologian of justification, whereas Calvin is the theologian of sanctification. See Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, IV, 2, pp. 509f.) Finally, it should be noted that Calvin is not even averse to using the expression "the leading of the Spirit." In fact, this kind of language is found frequently in his writings. (See Institutes I. 17.3; II. 3.10; III. 20.5; IV. 8.13.)

This brief overview of some of the pneumatological accents in Calvin's treatment of the Christian life confirms the judgment of Hendrikus Berkhof: "The famous third book of the Institutes contains great riches in the field of pneumatology, many of which have not yet been uncovered by Reformed churches" (Op. cit., p. 22).

5—A fifth facet of Calvin's pneumatological emphasis is seen in his doctrine of the church and sacraments. Calvin was a high churchman. He gladly repeated the famous words of the early church father, Cyprian: "For those to whom God is Father the Church may also be Mother... Away from her bosom one cannot hope for any forgiveness of sins or any salvation" (Institutes IV. 1.1, 4). He could say this because he was convinced that the church is "a union of Head (Christ) and members (believers) in love under the Spirit" (Kilian McDonnell, John Calvin, The Church and the Eucharist. Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1967, p. 183). Here we have an impressive ecclesiology of "inwardness and interiority which finds its roots in Christology and Pneumatology..." (Ibid., p. 181). This description by a contemporary Roman Catholic scholar agrees basically with that of a Czech-Austrian Reformed Calvin scholar of a past generation, Joseph Bohatec, who described Calvin's concept of the church as organic, i.e., an understanding of the church as a living organism in which there
is a dynamic interplay between Christ the head and the members of his body (Calvin's Lehre von Staat und Kirche. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1937, pp. 267f., 308f.).

More important, in view of our present concern is Bohatec's further point that overarching this intimate Christocentric view of the church is the sovereignty of the Spirit. He concludes that Calvin's view of the church can accordingly best be described not as a theocracy or Christocracy but as a pneumatocracy ("Pneumatokrie," ibid., pp. 432-3. Cf. McDonnell, op. cit., p. 183).

The role of the Holy Spirit in Calvin's doctrine of the sacraments is equally prominent. Again, everything depends on the work of the Holy Spirit. For it is "he who brings the graces of God with him, gives a place for the sacraments among us, and makes them bear fruit." They may be "visible signs" of God's grace manifest to us in Christ, but they have no efficacy unless God works in us "by invisible grace through the Holy Spirit" (Institutes IV. 14.18).

As in infant baptism (not to mention adult baptism) God in his sovereign freedom begins his work of regeneration and sanctification by his Holy Spirit (Institutes IV. 16.17, 18), so also in the Lord's Supper it is by the "secret power of the Holy Spirit" that our hearts are lifted up so that we are truly nourished by the body and blood of our risen Lord who is really present among us. It is the Spirit who "truly unites things separated in space" (Institutes IV. 4.17. Cf. Joseph Tylenda, "Calvin and Christ's Presence in the Supper—True or Real," Scottish Journal of Theology, February, 1974 [Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 72-3]).

B—So much for Calvin. It is not at all difficult to illustrate Warfield's thesis that Calvin was "the theologian of the Holy Spirit." But then the question arises, have the Reformed Churches been aware of and faithful to this magnificent theology of the Holy Spirit developed by Calvin? Unfortunately, the answer, for the most part, has to be no. In the seventeenth century a scholastic orthodoxy on the one hand and a one-sided pietism, on the other hand, dealt crippling blows to Calvin's balanced presentation of the work of the Spirit. These two movements were followed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by a liberalism which talked much about "spirit" but which knew little of the biblical understanding of the Holy Spirit.

However, within the Reformed fold there were some notable exceptions. In the Netherlands in the eighteenth century there developed an interesting—some would say an unhealthy—alliance of Reformed orthodoxy with pietism. One of the products of this movement was one of the first great evangelists in the United States, Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuyzen (1691-1747). (See the superb dissertation by James Tanis, Dutch Calvinistic Pietism in the Middle Colonies. A Study in the Life and Theology of Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuyzen. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967.) One could also include Gilbert Tennent, the Presbyterian revivalist who was influenced by Frelinghuyzen, and the leaders of the Great Awakening, Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield. All of them were Calvinists of a sort, and all were charismatic, if one uses the word in a non-Pentecostal manner.
In nineteenth century Scotland there were Presbyterian Puritan pastors and theologians who were especially interested in the work of the Spirit and who wrote solid, valuable treatises on this subject. Two whose works have been reprinted recently are James Buchanan, *The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit* (1843, Banner of Truth Edition, 1966); and Octavius Winslow, *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (1840, Banner of Truth Edition, 1972). Nor should we omit the important earlier works on this subject by the English Puritan, John Owen. (He actually wrote three works on the Holy Spirit, published in 1674, 1682, and 1693.)

On the Dutch Reformed side there has been an impressive, though not consistent, interest in the Holy Spirit. (The same cannot be said of the German theologians. See B. B. Warfield's lament in his "Introductory Note" to the American edition of Kuyper's book on the Holy Spirit, pp. xxix-xxxii.) The classic in this field, which has not yet been surpassed, is Abraham Kuyper's monumental work, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, completed in 1888 and published soon thereafter in the United States in 1900 (reprinted by Eerdmans in 1946). This interest in the Holy Spirit by Dutch theologians has continued down to the present. Not well known in the United States but influential in Germany as well as the Netherlands is the theologian O. Noordmans. (See his *Das Evangelium Des Geistes*, Zurich, EVZ Verlag, 1960. Tr. from the Dutch.) It is significant that when the well-known Leiden theologian, Hendrikus Berkhof, was asked to give the Warfield Lectures at Princeton Seminary in 1964, he chose the theme of the Holy Spirit (*The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964). Then there is the Dutch theologian of the Holy Spirit, par excellence, the late A. A. van Ruler of Utrecht. (See the Winter, 1973 [Vol. 26, No. 2] issue of the *Reformed Review* devoted to his theology.)

On the American side we have rather recent significant systematic treatments of this subject by Presbyterians George S. Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957. Revised edition, 1965); and Arnold Come's *Human Spirit and Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1939). More popular works on the Holy Spirit are legion, but when it comes to serious, comprehensive treatments, B. B. Warfield's judgment made in 1900 still holds, viz., that it is only among Calvin's spiritual descendants that the doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit has received adequate attention (*Op. cit.*, p. xxxiv)—except that we would now have to modify the word "only" with "primarily."

I think my thesis has been sufficiently well illustrated, viz., that nowhere has there been greater interest in and study of the work of the Spirit than in the Reformed tradition. The classical Pentecostals are late arrivals on the scene and have produced very little in the way of biblical-theological studies of the Holy Spirit. It is true that they can take credit for introducing a new awareness of and appreciation for the gifts ('charismata') of the Holy Spirit, which were largely, though not totally, ignored in the earlier works on the Spirit. But their understanding of the works of the Spirit, even judged by contemporary neo-Pentecostal (or charismatic) standards, was often superficial, one-sided, and bizarre. (See James W. Jones, *Filled With New Wine: The Charismatic Renewal of the Church*, New York: Harper & Row, 1974, pp. 34ff.) However, neo-Pentecostals would probably agree with the classical Pentecostals that,
whereas the Reformed tradition might claim to be superior in its theological interest in the Holy Spirit, it has shown little practical knowledge and experience of the power of the Spirit, especially as manifested in his extraordinary gifts.

Here the issue might be joined, but I would like to postpone a final verdict concerning this question until later. I would hope, in any case, that the neo-Pentecostals would not confront us in the Reformed tradition with the old liberal cliche: "What counts is not doctrine but life." This is a superficial, dangerous, and un-biblical alternative. Genuine, true doctrine and theology will produce good fruits. Conversely, authentic, wholesome Christian experience can only flourish if it is undergirded by and issued from evangelical truth.

Reformed-Presbyterians may be short on the experience of the reality, joy, and fullness of the Spirit. Pentecostals may be lacking in an adequate biblical understanding of the work of the Spirit. If so, we need each other and can complement each other. Coexistence, not a hot war—or even a cold one—would appear to me to be a logical and happy solution to our situation.

III.

A—I suspect that some people may be a bit restive about this whole line of reasoning and are not totally convinced of a possible compatibility between these two traditions. It might be judged that my presentation of the data has been rather selective and that I am much too sanguine about the possibilities of a rapprochement between these two seemingly antithetical approaches to the Christian life. I would like, therefore, to call in some witnesses whose names and reputations are far better established than mine. They are all Reformed-Presbyterian and they all view the Pentecostal development as not only extremely significant, but in a fundamentally positive light.

First, and most surprising perhaps, is the liberal Presbyterian, Henry Pitney Van Dusen, former president of Union Seminary in New York. I recall the shock I experienced in reading in the August 17, 1955 issue of The Christian Century (pp. 946-948) an article by Van Dusen where he related his positive impressions of the Pentecostal movement on the basis of a trip to the Caribbean Islands. His discovery of the vitality of the 8.5 million Pentecostals there led him to speak of them as representing "a new Reformation" and a new, powerful "third force in Christendom." Later, in 1960, he declared: "The Pentecostal movement ... is a revolution comparable in importance with the establishment of the original church and with the Protestant Reformation" (quoted in J. Rodman Williams, "The Upurge of Pentecostalism," in the Reformed World, December, 1971 [Vol. 31, No. 8], p. 340).

One of the first, however, in our tradition to recognize the importance and contributions of this movement was Bishop Lesslie Newbigin in his book, The Household of God (New York: Friendship Press, 1953, pp. 95f., Cf. p. 122). Similarly, John Mackay, former president of Princeton Seminary, has also had kind words to say about Pentecostals on various occasions. From a theological standpoint, the most significant observations come from Hendrikus Berkhof, the noted Dutch theologian. In the preface to his fine book, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit (1964), he notes that
“pneumatology is a neglected field of systematic theology” (p. 10). He points out that part of the difficulty is the bad experience the traditional churches have had throughout history with Spirit movements—from the Montanists in the second century to the Anabaptists and Quakers in the sixteenth century, and the Pentecostals at the beginning of our century. Words like enthusiasts, spiritualists, faith healers, etc., usually evoke negative emotions among most Protestants. The result is an unhappy and sterile alternative.

On the one hand, we see the established larger churches which are unwilling to focus their attention on the action of the Holy Spirit; in their midst faith is in danger of becoming something intellectual, traditional and institutional. On the other hand, we see the rapidly increasing Pentecostal movements, where the reality of the Spirit is often sought in the emotional, individualistic, and extravagant. Both parts live by the lacks and mistakes of the other, which give them a good pretext not to see their own lacks and mistakes, or the biblical truth represented by the other (p. 11).

Later, in the substance of his book, he raises the same kind of question. He feels that the revivalists and Pentecostals may well be correct in challenging our traditional analysis of regeneration as having only two aspects: justification and sanctification. They refer to a third aspect, that of the baptism or filling of the Spirit. Berkhof challenges the usual Pentecostal exegesis here, but he attempts to break through the “watertight partition-wall between these two groups” because this partition is a detriment to both parties (p. 85).

I concur with Berkhof and feel that it is high time we dealt with the neo-Pentecostal movement in particular with charity, openness and a sense of expectation. Too often we—and that includes most mainline Protestant theologians and ministers—have treated this development as a passing phenomenon limited to a lunatic fringe within the church. We have tried to psychologize, sociologize, and theologize it away, recognizing only the dangers and excesses of its adherents and rejecting the positive challenge, benefits, and blessings it often brings.

We have often hoped it would blow away, but instead it is blowing all over the land. David du Plessis, the well-known Pentecostal leader, reported at a conference on the Holy Spirit held recently in Des Moines, Iowa, (sponsored by the United Methodist Church) that there are now 10,000 charismatic pastors within denominations making up the National Christian Council of Churches. That means that almost ten percent of the ministers in ecumenical Protestantism (and Orthodoxy) are part of this movement (Christian Century, October 30, 1974, p. 1006).

The growth and significance of the neo-Pentecostal movement within American Roman Catholicism is even more striking. (See the June 22, 1973 issue of Christianity Today.) Many North Americans may also be unaware of the fact that the churches in Latin America are largely charismatic in character. Emilio Castro, a Methodist pastor and leader in Uruguay, states that “Latin American Protestantism is now made up for the most part of Pentecostal churches” (Christian Century, September 27, 1972, p. 955); and that includes the large Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist Churches as well as the traditional Pentecostal Churches.
After having said all these positive things about the charismatic movement, some people might conclude that I am oblivious to the errors and excesses of this movement. Not so. I have not only read more than a dozen books by neo-Pentecostal leaders, (including the recent fine work by James Jones, *Filled With New Wine* [New York: Harper and Row, 1974]); I have also attended a number of charismatic meetings both in Japan and in this area. Whereas I have tried to be as open and sympathetic as possible, and have often been positively impressed by what I witnessed, I have also found much that is contrived and repetitious, superficial and unbalanced. Scripture was not treated seriously and what passed for “prophecy” often impressed me as inanities unworthy of the Holy Spirit.

However, far more important than my personal impressions are some deep-seated theological reservations. This is not the place for a full-fledged biblical-theological analysis and critique. That has been provided by people like Frederick Dale Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), and James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1970), and the shorter studies by Anthony Hoekema, John Stott, and Bernard Ramm. (The latter’s book is the most recent to date, viz., *Rapping About the Spirit* [Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1974]. This is a popular, but solid, study).

My basic reservations are these:

1.—There is far too often a failure to take all of Scripture seriously. The result is a truncated gospel.

2.—One unfortunate consequence is an inadequate understanding of the Christian life, especially of the whole doctrine of sanctification. Pivotal here is what I feel is the Pentecostal misunderstanding of the so-called “baptism in or of the Holy Spirit” as something which is subsequent to, and distinct from, becoming a Christian. In the last analysis, it is a personal encounter with Jesus Christ and the concomitant transforming gift of the Spirit that makes a man a Christian. We must be filled with the Spirit again and again, and “stir into flame again the gift already received” (2 Timothy 1:6); but this is true of all Christians.

3.—My biggest difficulty with the Pentecostal-Charismatic movement, in the last analysis, is not that it stresses the work of the Holy Spirit too much, but too little! Its viewpoint is too narrow and myopic. We can learn much from it about the gifts of the Spirit, about power, freedom, and joy in the Spirit. But the charismatic theologians have much to learn from Calvin in particular, and the Reformed tradition in general, about the Spirit and creation, the relation of the Word and the Spirit, the Spirit and the church and sacraments, the Spirit and tradition, the Spirit and the Christian life. Pentecostal types tend to focus on the “individual-spontaneous” aspects of the Spirit’s work, whereas traditionalists stress the “continuing collective” manifestations of the Spirit (This distinction is made by John Stevens Kerr in his new book, *The Fire Flares Anew: A Look at the New Pentecostalism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).
Conclusion

Both are necessary—individual-spontaneous and the continuing-collective. Traditional Protestants, especially in the Reformed tradition, are often lacking in the former area—although many new winds of the Spirit, I trust—have been blowing in the Reformed Church in recent years. Pentecostals tend to be lacking in the latter category. As John Sherrill put it years ago in his best-seller, They Speak With Other Tongues, pp. 139-140, the Reformed tradition is strong on order and weak on freedom. The opposite is true of the charismatics. We need each other.

This, in conclusion, is my plea. That we are as ready to recognize our needs, weaknesses, and practical heresies as we are eager to point out the weaknesses of the charismatics. Ecclesia semper reformanda—by the Word and the Spirit. As Lewis Mudge, a Presbyterian theologian, wrote in 1963 (in his book One Church: Catholic and Reformed), our creeds and confessions do not do justice to the biblical emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit. “The result is that in reading what the Bible says about the Spirit we are blind and deaf” (p. 68). Many Pentecostals, I am sure, would say “Amen” to that!

The situation has changed and improved in many ways since Abraham Kuyper wrote the preface to his study of the Holy Spirit. Even so, his closing words are still quite apropos to our situation:

Even though we honor the Father and believe on the Son, how little do we live in the Holy Spirit! It even seems to us sometimes that for our sanctification only, the Holy Spirit is added accidentally to the great redemptive work.

This is the reason why our thoughts are so little occupied with the Holy Spirit, why in the ministry of the Word He is so little honored, why the people of God when bowed in supplication before the Throne of Grace, make Him so little the object of their adoration. You feel involuntarily that of our piety, which is already small enough, He receives a too scanty portion.