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It is the purpose of this paper to suggest an epistemological method for dealing with the ontological difficulty of distinguishing the human spirit from the divine Spirit. In *Table Talk*, Karl Barth is quoted as saying, "I personally think that a theology of the Spirit might be all right after A.D. 2000, but now we are still too close to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is still too difficult to distinguish between God's Spirit and man's spirit." Barth was acutely aware of the potential danger inherent within the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of "eclipsing" the Holy Spirit with man's subjectivity. On the one hand, this eclipse is most evident in the recent rash of evangelists who promote a powerful human spirit that is energized by the Holy Spirit resulting in the extreme of having the potential to will the day of one's death. Whether it be "possibility thinking" or "positive thinking," there appears a clear need to distinguish between the human spirit and the Holy Spirit as the recent charismatic movement has clearly indicated and indeed indirectly demands. On the other hand, any attempt at a merely two-dimensional analysis of the divine and human spirits quickly terminates in the term "mystery" because of the undisputed supremacy of the divine Spirit.

This confusion of Spirit and spirit is not simply linguistic. The use of religious language has at times been a serious hindrance to theological issues especially when there is an intensification of identify and intermingling as in the pneumatological-anthropological experience and the pneumatological-anthropological experience. If our understanding is based on sense experience, how can we distinguish between divine and human "spirit" experience? If we say along with Paul, that the Holy Spirit dwells in humanity, is there a manner by which we can distinguish and verbalize the experience of the human spirit and the experience of the Spirit of God? Religious language indeed further confuses an already difficult problem, hence all the more need for a method that would assist in the clarification and appreciation of what appears to be a binary religious experience.

Recent literature has recognized the problem but has not offered a clear solution. G. Hendry, in his study of the Holy Spirit, recognizes the problem stating that "the relation between the Holy Spirit and the human spirit is one that has been curiously neglected." He states that knowledge of God is only found in one's personal encounter with God in Christ, but, following Irenaeus, he suggests humanity has fallen into trichotomy, i.e., spirit, soul, and Holy Spirit, in that the created spirit no longer responds to the Holy Spirit. This seems to offer little clarity for distinguishing experientially and ontologically the human spirit and the divine Spirit. G. W. H. Lampe, in attempting to verbalize man's awareness of God, uses what he calls quasi-poetical bridging terms, one of which is Spirit. But these terms (i.e., Word, Wisdom, and Spirit) do not fully distinguish the divine Spirit and the
human spirit but rather maintain a mystical experiential oneness. Again, H. Berkhof indicates the severity of the problem when he writes that “the search for a relation between God’s Spirit and our spirit can easily seduce us to an interpretation of the Holy Spirit in terms of the human spirit, which means: in terms of recent anthropological and psychological opinions.”12 However, he then goes on to say “we limit ourselves to the statement that the Spirit comes to his own home [i.e. humanity]...we are unable to describe this relation in relevant terms. We do not know whence the Spirit comes and whether he goes.”13 N. Berdyaev refers vaguely to the Spirit as a “Divine breath, penetrating human existence and endowing it with the highest dignity.”14 He argues that “Spirit is neither an objective reality nor a rational category of being...The philosophy of Spirit should not be a philosophy of being or an ontology, but a philosophy of existence.”15 This is precisely the problem. Because Spirit lacks concreteness, unlike the human spirit which is ontologically established in humanity, the Holy Spirit needs an antological basis beyond itself. Berdyaev’s emphasis of an “existential subjectivity”16 does not offer a clear ontological equivalency. Indeed, the bipedal experience remains indistinguishable, J.D.G. Dunn, in his excellent volume Jesus and the Spirit, deals fully with the Jesus Spirit or the Christ Spirit17 but does not develop the relation between Christ’s humanity and the Holy Spirit. Dunn’s phrase “the Jesus Spirit” conceptualizes the intimate relation between the Holy Spirit and Christ so that “the character of Jesus became the clearest possible visible expression of the Spirit...Jesus himself became the charisma of God.” He concludes that “as the Spirit was the ‘divinity’ of Jesus, so Jesus became the personality of the Spirit.”19 But the volume stops short of clarifying the first Christian’s experience “of their dual relationship as men of Spirit,”19 allowing Christ-mysticism to be the final analysis.20 In effect, the humanity of Christ is left undeveloped with regard to the problem at hand.

Yet the potentiality for distinguishing the Holy Spirit from the human spirit must be there simply because they are not the same. As H. B. Swete wrote, “The Holy Spirit does not create the ‘Spirit in man’; it is potentially present in every man...Every human being has affinities with the spiritual and eternal.”21 But how can an ontological distinction be sought?

It would seem that the question of the working in humanity of the Holy Spirit should be raised afresh as Christological and not merely as two dimensional “anthropological-pneumatological.” Perhaps the Christological key, that modern day evangelists and charismatics and Christian thinkers in the tradition of Apollonianis fail to perceive clearly, is the humanity of Christ in relation to salvation. By focusing on Christ’s human nature, a common denominator or third dimension presents itself which seems to dynamically facilitate clarification of what is spiritually divine and spiritually human, what is holy and what is made holy, what is eternal and what is made eternal, what is Creator and what is creature.

By thinking through the difficulty on the basis of this third dimension, Christology presents an ontological equivalency (i.e., equivalent to the human spirit and human nature relationship) which concretely determines a philosophy of existence in the Holy Spirit “without confusion...without transmuting...without dividing...without contrasting them.”22 The advantages are immense: (a) the third person of the trinity is sufficiently separated from human subjectivity yet held in necessary relation; (b) the Holy Spirit is grounded in the Godhead Christologically, i.e., in the way God has given himself to be known; (c) the
Holy Spirit is given "personality" with regard to ontological action within creation. In a secondary sense, methodologically distinguishing the Holy Spirit and human spirit by way of the humanity of Christ enhances hermeneutically penetration into the scriptural record in that references concerned with the Spirit of God are allowed to become word-event once again without confusion by way of a bipedal experience.

Accepting a priori both the inseparable trinitarian relation between the Holy Spirit and Christ and also the humanity of Christ as one and the same with all humanity, it is proposed that insight into the relation between the Holy Spirit and humanity can be sought by inquiring into the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Christ's humanity. This is a formidable task which, demanding clarity, can only be theologically established as exegesis will allow. A seemingly proper place to begin is by practically, and therefore ontologically, identifying the stages of the key term Christos as biblically presented.

In the New Testament and perhaps earlier, "anoint" was interpreted messianically with a future reference. New Testament usage translates as "the anointed one" (Jn 1:4), "the Messiah" (Jn 4:25), "the Christ" (Matt 2:4), "Jesus the Messiah" (Matt 27:17 and 22). The word refers to an anointing by God with the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:38, 4:27: Lk 4:18). Generally, New Testament reference is to one "set apart" for God's special service, not only consecrated but also gifted and endowed for that holy service which demanded powers above and beyond those naturally belonging to a person. The authors of the four gospels write of the Holy Spirit in connection with the critical events in Christ's life: his birth, baptism, temptations, and resurrection/ascension. Hence the early church respected the experiences of Christ in the midst of their own experiences of the Holy Spirit. For the early Christians, the question of importance was "Who is Christ?" to the extent that any reflection on the Spirit's activity would have been asked in the context of Christology. As Dunn states with regard to first century Christianity, "The consciousness of grace is Christian only when it is also a consciousness of Christ, that is, when it is characteristically that grace which was most fully manifested in Jesus' life, death, and resurrection." Hence for Paul and the early church, "Christian experience can and must be called to account, tested, and measured against the event of Jesus Christ, against the character of the man Jesus, of his relationships and ministry, of his life and death." This was the "criterion of...charismatic experience."

Pneumatological Christology

Following the gospel accounts with regard to the practical occurrences of Christ's anointing, a summary can be attempted of the effects of anointing on Christ's humanity. These are presented in three important biblical theological stages.

(1) The first anointing stage of Christ by the Spirit occurred at the incarnation. Christ's humanity was sanctified or made holy by the Spirit. Hence it appears that the Spirit would have indirectly or directly influenced Christ's earthly life, becoming a vital, quickening principle of Christ's human nature. a) The Spirit communicated to the human nature of Christ eternal things, things which were attuned to the divine nature. These communications of the Holy Spirit would have drawn the human spirit of Christ closer and closer to the Father, creating trust and love and holy affections, casting and molding the image of God in all fullness. Humanity, as the naos (temple) of God, was prescribed by the Incarnate Son.
Holy Spirit had to have been given to Christ to such an extent that it was the link, the graft, between his human and divine natures making him inwardly conscious of his divine Sonship (Lk 2:10). His full awareness that he was the only Son of God flowed perpetually from the spirit so that any communication from the one nature to the other was by the Holy Spirit, the executive of all the works of God. The Godhead dwelling in him made all communication to his manhood by the Holy Ghost. Nothing could have been undertaken, nothing spoken, nor anything executed but by the Holy Spirit's assistance and direction. As a result, the personal life of Christ would have been the natural basis of all his official reconciliatory activity between God and man. In the incarnation, the very basis for the Spirit's activity within creation and on humanity is established and ontologically grounded.

(2) The second anointing occurred at Christ's baptism. Up until the time of Christ's baptism, one must assume that the Spirit was active, constantly forming, sanctifying and replenishing the human nature of Christ. At his baptism Christ was publicly inaugurated into offices. He was called to his life's work and equipped accordingly with a new anointing of the Spirit. The further anointing seems to have enabled him to carry out his ministry of reconciliation and communicate his miraculous power to humanity. He was enabled to bridge the distance between God and humanity.

It was suggested above that the Spirit was the link between the human and divine natures of Christ. Hence, at the event of his baptism, the Spirit would have prepared the two natures of Christ for the work of redemption. The Spirit was the efficient cause of Christ's divine operations. At the same time these operations of the Son of God upon his nature would have been effected by the Holy Spirit. Hence, through the work of Spirit, the divine nature did not absorb the human nature in the execution of the mediatorial offices, but both natures, united in one person, would seem to have remained distinct in their official activity. Assuming the Chalcedon definition (451 A.D.), the human nature did not have a separate personality but had its activity only in union with the Son of God who would have acted on the human nature through the power of the Holy Spirit. Christ's personal understanding, his obedience of will, his use of faculties and powers in religious things would then be due to the Spirit's immediate and inner guidance. After the baptism, Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness where he was tempted. In these temptations, the human nature was confirmed by the Spirit. The baptism of Jesus was the second great state of Christ's unction by the Spirit which publicly confirmed him and inwardly prepared him in his official mediatorial position as prophet, priest, and king. In each aspect of this high office, the divine nature of Christ was confirmed in its activity by the Holy Spirit while the human nature was fitted and prepared for his work with light and strength to carry out the will of the Son in accordance with the will of the Father by the constant power of the Holy Ghost.

(3) The third degree of Christ's unction by the Spirit was the Ascension. The humanity of Christ had been the receiver of the Spirit throughout his ministry. This situation changed in the person of Christ with the resurrection. In the resurrection, he became the giver of the Spirit or the bestower of the Spirit upon others, a gift so momentous that it may be understood as the gift in which all other blessings are included. The ascension, which points to the culmination of Christ's exaltations, would have given him the authority of baptising
with the Holy Ghost. The authority to give the Spirit was ascribed to the Son through his finished work. On the basis of his perfect atonement, he now has the opportunity and the dignity of sending the Spirit to fallen humanity. Hence, the gift of the Holy Spirit and the gift of Christ's finished work are precisely and exactly related, for once this work of atonement was completed and accepted by the Father, every barrier to the communication of the Spirit was removed. Christ in the fullness of his humanness, sends the Spirit to fallen humanity to glorify himself, fill the place of his own absence, and lead the disciples and those after them into all spiritual truth. The Spirit is sent as Christ intercedes for humanity and the Spirit acts as his deputy. In effect, Christ sends the Spirit of conviction, which leads humanity mysteriously to faith, and also the Spirit of adoption, which sanctifies and replenishes sinful humanity. Yet it would seem that the underlying fact is that in this third stage of Christ being anointed by the Spirit, Christ was quickened and raised up from the dead by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit that formed Christ's human body and gave it life restored life to him at the Resurrection.

Throughout these three stages or degrees of Christ's unction by the Spirit, it is clear that the Holy Spirit is in a joint mission with the divine nature of the Son while concurrently the Spirit perpetually replenished the human nature of the Son. Based on earlier creedal formulation (Chalcedon, 451; Second Council of Constantinople, 553; Third Council on Constantinople, 681; etc.), this supply of the Spirit flowed from the hypostatic union or was the natural effect of humanity being united into personal union with the Son. What seems to be biblically suggested is that at Christ's anointing the Spirit links the natures of Christ together in one person; the Spirit is the means by which Christ acts in his high office of Redeemer making atonement for sin; and the Spirit is the executive by whom Christ rules.

The anointing of Christ, and, in particular, the anointing of Christ's humanity by the Spirit, is held in full accord with basic traditional principles of Christology, i.e., (1) in all mediatorial work Christ acted as the God-Man and (2) in all his mediatorial action the godhead is the regulating principle. Theologically both of these principles are confirmed and asserted in that the Holy Spirit replenishes and sanctifies the humanity of Christ, thereby enabling his humanity to act in accordance with the divine nature.

However, this approach begs the question of the doctrine of the trinity and the filioque controversy. At the synod of Toledo in 589 A.D., the filioque clause was inserted into the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381 A.D. so that the creed no longer reads “proceedeth from the Father” but reads “proceedeth from the Father and Son.” The importance of the clause is witnessed in the manner which it has seriously divided the Christian Church between East and West. To argue in favor of the filioque clause (i.e., its insertion) follows the traditionally Western position put forward by Augustine in De Trinitate and further developed by Anselm and Aquinas.

Assuming the axiom that the Trinity as revealed in time and space is in fact the Trinity, the question must be asked as to the inter-relatedness of the Trinity and especially of the relation between Christ and the Spirit. T.F. Torrance has suggested that the filioque be rejected on grounds that the Alexandrian school of thought represented by Athanasius and Cyril have presented a sound insight into the Trinity. This school has argued that the Holy Spirit is homoousion with the Son and the Father. Hence the filioque is an unnes-
sary and cumbersome phrase that fails to correct the trinitarian problem of both East and
West.

Assuming the *homoousion* of the Trinity, the static formulation of the Father sending
the Son and the Son the Spirit can be re-asserted by a dynamic movement which retains
the classical interpenetration of the trinity (*perichoresis*) and the reciprocal relationship of
the three divine hypostases. Hence the relationships of the Trinity are the basis for their activi-
ties within the creation and therefore the realm of the experiential. Any activity of the Son
or the Spirit requires the understanding that the Trinity is fully active and participatory.
Nevertheless, one's experience of the Son must be distinguished from one's experience of
Spirit. As Professor Aldenhoven states,

The hypostatic difference between Son and Spirit is...due not to the fact that
the Son originates in the Father alone, whereas the Spirit originates both in
the Father and the Son but to the fact that Son and Spirit are related to each
other and, each in a different way, have their origin in the Father.39

This common origin, as Professor Aldenhoven points out, does not mean a common ex-
perience in that the experience of the Son (God's address or approach to humanity) is not the
experience of the Spirit ("humanity's equipment to respond believingly and to constitute a
community"). Conversely, "this differentiation between our experience of the Son and our
experience of the Spirit cannot be taken to imply any division between Son and Spirit."40

The reciprocity between the Holy Spirit and Christ is critical, yet in the end, this
reciprocity must remain *apophatic* in character, a mystery of God's being, impossible ade-
quately to conceptualize.41 Professor Bobrinskoy states the case very clearly:

All the theology of the Church, of salvation, of the new man, of the sacra-
ments is profoundly marked by this mysterious movement of reciprocity be-
 tween Christ and the Spirit who are manifest, give themselves, are sent in such
a way as constantly to ensure and renew the equilibrium in the life of the
Church between obedience and creative liberty, between institution and proph-
hecy.42

By way of the *homoousion*, the critical equilibrium and reciprocity of the Son and the
Spirit are preserved (or in biblical language, the anointing of the Son by the Spirit and the
sending of the Spirit by the Son), bringing the humanity of Christ into intimate relation
with the trinitarian Godhead. This re-asserts the tremendous work of the Son for humanity
and the tremendous work of the Spirit on humanity. The alternative is to revert to a
subordination of the Holy Spirit to Christ which allows—indeed encourages—a deeper
confusion between the Holy Spirit and human spirit. A further alternative results in "Chris-
tomonism."

The pneumatological Christology is possibly a solid groundwork for a consideration of
the two dimensional pneumatological anthropology. From the *Christos* of Christ's humanity
emanates the *agios*43 of all humanity. In the New Testament, *hagios* takes on a very
personal meaning. God's holiness is his omnipotence, his inner nature (Jn 17:11), and con-
sequently his name should be hallowed (Mk.6:9 & Lk.11:72). A personal attitude to the
holiness of God must be the basis for the one who prays that God's name be hallowed.
Jesus is referred to as holy because of his origin as the Son of God (Lk.1:35), because of his
baptism (Lk.3:22), because he offers himself as a sacrifice in the Spirit (Heb 9:14), and
because he is raised and exalted (Jn.20:23 & Rom.1:4). Jesus hence becomes the bearer of the Holy Spirit (who in fact sends the Spirit, Acts 2:33) who confronts the unclean spirits (Mk.1:24 & Lk.4:34).44 It would seem that these references are not to a messianic office or to a popular Messiah but to the pneumatic nature of Jesus. The Father has sanctified Jesus and now Jesus dispenses the anointing of the Spirit (1 Jn.2:20).

Pneumatological Anthropology

Even though references to Jesus as holy are rare (Mk.1:24, Lk.1:35, 4:34, Jn.6:69, etc.), the three stages of his anointing seem to make him hagios of God, the spearhead of a pneumatic age, identified by the koinonia or ekklesia described in the New Testament as the Body of Christ.45 This new ekklesia is a new kingdom, a new Israel, a new and holy humanity in the wake of Christ's atonement. In effect, it is Christ's human nature that essentially indicates the extent of the new humanity's holiness, based upon the “incarnation-baptism-ascension” anointing of the person Christ by the Spirit of God. Because the Spirit of God seemingly enabled Christ's humanity to accomplish the sacrifice necessary for the redemption of humanity, so the same Spirit from first to last applies what Jesus has accomplished to the human person. In the first instance, the Spirit is essential to Christ's work of justification,46 but now the Spirit becomes the “center of new actions”47 in the sanctification of all humanity. This is not apart from Christ's humanity but dependent upon Christ's humanity because from it there emerges a new image of God, the new naos, the Spiritfilled, redeemed humanity. This new humanity becomes divine48 and therefore demands a further dimension for understanding, a third dimension for insightful perception. Christ's humanity becomes the antithesis of the psychic, the psychikos anthropos49 or the natural man, yet not equal to the hagios of God. Hence the three stages of Christ's anointing serve as a useful schematic and ordinance map for examining the biblical ontology of a pneumatological anthropology.50

(1) The adoption of humanity: through the incarnation of Christ's person in the power of the Spirit and through the redeeming work of Christ (and the Spirit), humanity is offered hagios in that one can be translated into the family of God. The Spirit, it appears, becomes the great agent in this hagios adoption (Rom.8:15), as the Spirit was the great agent in the Incarnation. Here humanity is brought before God in the potentiality of a relation between a child and a parent. As in Christ's humanity, the Spirit now can become the great quickening principle. Because of Christ's humanity, the Spirit now is free to communicate to the human nature eternal things, deep communication which creates reciprocal trust and love and holy affections between a child and a parent. Now is possible, in time and through time, the very miracle of new life through Christ, the new life of God's hagiazó (Rev.22:11). The Spirit can now become the link of sonship so that the Spirit inhabits and replenishes the whole spiritual-physic person, from state and mind (understanding, will, and conscience) to action and service. Because the possibility now exists for the Spirit to prevaile, occupy, and inhabit humanity, the Spirit is able to form, sanctify, and replenish as with the humanity of Christ. In the instance of a newly adopted person, nothing can now be undertaken, spoken or executed but with the Spirit's direction, help, guidance, and inspiration with regard to holy things. The personal life of the newly adopted person becomes the basis for the hagios of humanity but at the same time is ontologically grounded in the concrete
hagios of Christ’s humanity. Each person now has the potential to become a miraculous, incarnate, participant in the pneumatic age, a living, moving, developing temple literally with a holy of holies, a pneumatikos anthropos, in the coming kingdom. The Spirit, on the basis of Christ’s humanity, now becomes the link who unites the atoned humanity with the very hagios of God thus making humanity holy. Hence the third dimension of Christ’s humanity guards against confusion, against transmutation from one “spirit” to the other, against division and against contrast “according to area of function.” Rather, definition, clarification, unity, and wholeness are the characteristic results between the Holy Spirit and the human spirit.

(2) Baptism: coinciding with the adoption of humanity is baptism into the humanity of Christ. Here is what appears to be an inauguration into an office of the kingdom, the Church, the body of Christ, which brings gifts of the Spirit enabling the new hagios person to communicate and share new talents and miraculous powers with fellow believers. Here the Spirit prepares the person for the execution of his new office and calling within the kingdom. The Spirit is the efficient cause of all hagios operations, being baptized, as Christ’s humanity, into the holy biblical offices of prophet, priest, and king, biblical offices fully dependent upon holy communications of adoption. The new humanity’s operations are only in union with the Son of God’s humanity through the holy Spirit. Personal understanding, obedience of will, use of faculties are all due to the Spirit’s guidance by way of the greater hagios of Christ’s humanity. In the wake of one’s baptism, temptation abounds to misuse the gifts of the Spirit. As Christ’s humanity was tempted, so all humanity is tempted to use the gifts for one’s own (material) gain (Lk.4:3 & 4), worshipping that which is not God—such as the spectacular or perhaps the very gifts of the Spirit (Lk.4:5-8), and to compromise holy baptism worshipping the “other” (Lk.4:9-12). Because Christ’s human nature overcame the temptations, so all humanity can overcome and must struggle to remain holy as he is holy. By way of these temptations, the new nature of hagios is continually confirmed by the Spirit and fitted for one’s work with insight to fulfill vocation, the will of the father. This is a life-long work accomplished by the activity of the Holy Spirit on humanity and hence the human spirit, making a holy humanity, a pneumatic anthropology which seeks always the will of the Father.

(3) The gift of eternity: as one is baptized in Christ’s humanity so one is resurrected with Christ in the now realized but yet to be completed eschaton, the Kingdom of God. Eschatologically the new humanity becomes the giver of the Spirit, a gift in which all other blessings are included. The adopted person, baptized in Christ, becomes the agent of the new humanity of the living Christ by way of the Spirit who unites the new living humanity (founded on Christ’s work of justification) with Christ’s ascended humanity. Even now the new humanity intimately communicates with the ascended humanity of Christ through the Spirit. Hence Christ is glorified and the new humanity is directed into all truth. The new person is quickened and spiritually raised from the dead slowly, steadily, eternally by the Holy Spirit. As a result, the Holy Spirit is the organ which links Christ’s humanity with the new humanity, making it forever holy as Christ’s humanity is holy. Hence in all activities the pneumatic anthropology acts together with God the Father, the divine Spirit being the regulating principle that enables action in accordance with the divine will, i.e., the coming kingdom. Hence the Father is glorified with the Son and the Spirit.
This new pneumatic humanity is the material, the stones, which form the naos hagios in which God dwells, i.e., the ecclesia, the holy people of God. Christ is the cornerstone, and the foundation is the apostles and the prophets. Or, following the Old Testament imagery, Christ is the stump and out of his humanity is sanctified the Judaeo-Christian trunk and the Gentile Christian grafts. The members of this new sanctuary are called or adopted (Phil. 1:1) to a new state of purity or baptism (Acts 18:6; 20:26) leading to a life of eternal worship and servitude. This new state is indicated in the humanity of Christ which is sanctified in “vocation” for its redemptive work so that it becomes the prototype of a pneumatological anthropology, God’s hagios ekklesia.

Conclusions

Epistemologically then, the humanity of Christ would seem to be a proper method for dealing with the ontological difficulty of distinguishing the human spirit from the divine Spirit. By basing analysis on this third dimension, the Holy Spirit remains a concrete experience that cannot easily be confused with human subjectivity. Indeed, it becomes not only a rationally sensible experience but a necessary experience in that the anointed and the anointer are integral to Christianity and the metanoia of humanity. Hence it would seem that a pneumatological anthropology can be established Christologically and must be established theoretically if the “charismatic” type problem is to be addressed and eventually integrated with the essence of Christian thought.

Ontologically, this allows the Holy Spirit to be viewed and potentially realized as an exciting, profound, and inclusive Christian experience. Theologically it guards against imbalance, i.e., an over-emphasis on gifts, speaking in tongues, self-healing, etc., and simultaneously does not exclude such possibilities based upon the humanity of Christ now residing with the Father. The personal quality of such an experience need not be feared, overemotionalized or perceived as devisive. Rather the hagios of Christ’s humanity, through the Spirit, becomes literally a “whole-some” factor in the spiritual journey of every Christian. How this is to be fully worked out on a practical basis is a topic for another occasion, but it would see that every pastor, theological student, and indeed every Christian should attempt to apprehend the work of the Spirit in and on humanity so that the “enthusiasts,” as the early Montanists could be called, can be retained and encouraged to grow within the body of Christ and not apart from it. Furthermore, this problem which literally dates back to New Testament times, seems to present the opportunity to establish some groundwork so that a theology of the Holy Spirit can surely be established after the year 2000.
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