

1

An Eschatological Orientation in Pneumatology

Pneumatology in the Protestant Tradition

THROUGHOUT the history of Western Christian thought, one of the most persistent difficulties has been the role of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit within theology. Consistent with the logic of the *filioque* clause, the Holy Spirit has been overshadowed by the preeminent figure of the Son. Consequently, the Holy Spirit has been “the forgotten Person of the Trinity,” and pneumatology has become a backwater of Western theology. It is not without reason that the Eastern tradition has accused the Western tradition of subordinationism and neglect of the Third Person of the Trinity.

Considering the tendency toward pneumatological imbalance in the West, it should come as no surprise that the theology of the Holy Spirit within Protestantism has been marked by a tendency toward bipolarity. The theology of the Holy Spirit has swung back and forth between what I will call an “institutional” tendency and an “experiential” tendency.

On one side stand Luther, Calvin, and the institutional churches of the Reformation. Whereas the Catholic church had located the work of the Spirit mainly in the sacramental function of the church, the Reformers emphasized its location not only in the sacraments but also in the Word. In addition, they also tied the Spirit to Christ. They identified the Holy Spirit as the agent through whom atonement in Christ is applied to all believing human beings. As it has worked out in the institutional churches of the Reformation, pneumatology has taken on a subordinationistic tone. The Spirit’s work has tended to be confined to ecclesiology (Word and sacrament) and christology. It has become a function of the church and Christ.

On the other side of the Protestant tradition is the long line of protest movements—the “enthusiasts,” Anabaptists, pietists, Methodists, Pentecostals, and charismatics—which have reacted to the institutional church’s subordination of pneumatology with a corresponding elevation of pneumatology. In particular, these movements have stressed the necessity of personal experience of the Spirit as a component of the authentic Christian life. They have been perceived as “enthusiasts” by the institutional churches for failing to exert proper controls on manifestations of the Spirit, and for seeking experience of the Spirit with what is seen as imprudent eagerness. In return, they have on occasion been highly critical of the institutional churches’ overly restrictive conception of the work of the Spirit. One can reference, for instance, the vituperation in Thomas Müntzer’s treatise directed against Luther: *Highly Provoked Defense and Answer against the Spiritless, Soft-living Flesh at Wittenberg, Which has Befouled Pitiable Christianity in Perverted Fashion by its Theft of the Holy Spirit*.

Thus, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has swung back and forth between an institutional tendency and an experiential tendency. I will argue that both of these tendencies make significant offerings to the ongoing understanding of the person and work of the Holy Spirit, but they also come with unwanted baggage. Rather than trying to rehabilitate one of these models, the burden of this dissertation will be to propose and explicate a third option that comes not out of the Protestant tradition but out of the original language of pneumatology: Christian eschatology.

The Institutional Tendency in Protestant Pneumatology: *Karl Barth*

One of the paramount figures in twentieth-century theology is Karl Barth. He is known for opposing Protestant liberalism with a theological vision defined by the sovereignty and otherness of God, and God’s gracious outreach to humanity in the person of Jesus Christ. Concerning the Holy Spirit, Barth serves as an illustration of the institutional tendency in Protestant pneumatology. To illustrate this point, I will discuss the pneumatological dimensions of two key doctrines: reconciliation and revelation.¹

¹ Barth’s pneumatology has received divergent interpretations. Philip Rosato takes a unique position, viewing Barth as a thoroughgoing pneumatologist. Rosato attempts to give pneumatocentric interpretations to all major themes of Barthian theology (*The Spirit as Lord*). The weaknesses of Rosato’s work have been raised by John Thompson in the last

Reconciliation between human beings and God comes through divine grace as enacted in the life, death and resurrection of Christ. It is the history of Christ, being epitomized in Calvary and the empty tomb, but also continued in Christ's presence in the church through the Holy Spirit and in his second coming. All of this takes place on behalf of humanity (and all of creation); it is the divine plan of redemption. In the history of Christ, God confronts humanity with the truth of humanity's need for salvation and the gracious offer of it. The saving work of God in Christ is the objective side of reconciliation. It is only by the objective work of Christ that human beings can be saved; not by their own efforts.

Corresponding to the objective side of the reconciliation of human beings with God there is a subjective side. Salvation involves the free and intentional act of believing in Christ by faith. But Barth is clear that the freedom and ability to believe are strictly gifts from God—specifically the Holy Spirit (*CD* IV.1: 645). The Spirit comes as the awakening power of the believing person.

The revelation of God to humanity, which is closely connected with the divine ministry of reconciliation, consists in large part of the unveiling of the mystery of Christ dying in shame on the cross and rising again for the sake of all human beings. This mystery is not accessible by means of human discovery; it must be revealed by God to human beings. Revelation takes on a three-fold form corresponding to the Trinity. It is a process involving God the Revealer making known to human beings his Word, the Revealed, the content of the revelation. Because sinful humanity is unable to independently comprehend the mystery of Christ, it is necessary for God to instill in human beings the power to grasp divine truth. This power is the Holy Spirit, who is referred to in this scheme as God's Revealedness. Thus, the Holy Spirit is the revelatory bridge between human beings who are predisposed to misunderstand God and that same God reaching out to them in mercy. In the Spirit, God empowers people from within to acknowledge divine truth.

Although Barth does not equate divine revelation with the written Word of God, he strongly believes that revelation happens in conjunction

chapter of his book *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Karl Barth*. Thompson and Thomas Smail ("The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit") both acknowledge the christocentric nature of Barth's pneumatology, although Smail tends to see Barth as being more radical in this regard. Whereas Smail argues that Barth so thoroughly subordinates the work of the Spirit to the work of Christ that pneumatology is in danger of being merged into christology, Thompson claims that such criticism is too harsh. He does not shy away from identifying the christocentric nature of all of Barth's theology, but he does not see the danger toward a functional binitarianism that Smail describes.

with the Bible. Natural theology is both superfluous and impossible, for God is unknowable unless he chooses to reveal himself to us. Revelation is an event in which the message of Scripture, either read or proclaimed, becomes the dynamic and effectual Word of God. The Word of God, in turn, is centered in the person of Christ. That is, Christ is revealed in the activity of the Holy Spirit, through the occasions of the reading or proclamation of Scripture.

Like reconciliation, revelation has an objective side and a subjective side. The objective side of revelation is its source and content. The subjective side is the ability given to human beings by the Holy Spirit to receive revelation. Since revelation is given to and for human beings for their reconciliation to God, and since they are incapable of receiving it on their own, it is necessary that God fill in the noetic gap for them by giving them the gift of the Spirit. Thus, revelation is not complete without both its objective and subjective sides operating together. In other words, only through God is God known.²

I have made an effort in these descriptions of Barth's notions of reconciliation and revelation to highlight the trinitarian dimensions of his thought. Both reconciliation and revelation are events involving Father, Son and Holy Spirit. On the other hand, Barth's understanding of reconciliation and revelation are fundamentally oriented toward christology. In fact, his christocentric orientation overshadows his trinitarian thought. John Thompson states that whereas Barth's theology is trinitarian from start to finish, "it is from the center in Christ—and the cross and resurrection in particular—that [Barth] begins and continues" (3).

Philip Rosato asserts that for Barth there can be no question of primary or secondary when it comes to the being and work of God in any of its aspects (112). This is correct, insofar as Rosato's point in the argument surrounding this assertion is that one cannot remove or reduce the role of the Holy Spirit in the process of redemption. Barth's intention is to give the Holy Spirit an "indispensable function" in his theology (111). In other words, reconciliation requires the full action of the Holy Spirit on humanity's behalf. This is a theologically safe assertion. However, the truth remains that Barth assigns to the Holy Spirit the subjective side of

² Thompson refines this point by arguing that for Barth God is known in two ways. First, the Word has a rational nature which is necessary in order for us to apprehend and interpret it. Second, God enables us by the Holy Spirit to accept the Word. Thus, human knowledge of the divine revelation, like Christ himself, has both a human and a divine character. Properly understood, human knowledge of the divine is neither exclusively rational nor pneumatic, but both (9).

reconciliation, and *the subjective side depends on and assumes the objective side*. The Holy Spirit makes subjectively real in the being of Christians “what is already objectively real in the being of Jesus Christ” (113). Barth is clear that the church community is not made the body of Christ nor its members the members of the body of Christ by the pentecostal gift of the Spirit or any works of the Spirit. Rather, “it became his body and they became its members in the fulfillment of their eternal election on the cross of Golgotha, proclaimed in his resurrection from the dead . . . There can be no doubt that the work of the Holy Spirit is merely to ‘realize subjectively’ the election of Jesus Christ and his work as done and proclaimed in time, to reveal and to bring it to men and women” (CD IV.1: 667). It is the work of the Spirit to bring to historical expression the eternal hiddenness of the prior election of Christ. Thus, the church—the reconciled community—cannot exist as such apart from the action of the Holy Spirit. Nevertheless, for Barth the church is first and foremost the body of Christ, which indicates that whatever its pneumatic aspects, the church is a christological phenomenon (Thompson: 105).

Revelation is also christologically driven. Barth differentiates between the Spirit and Christ—the two cannot be collapsed into one. However, while the Spirit and not Christ is the agent who activates revelation within human beings, “He is still to be regarded wholly and entirely as the Spirit of Christ, of the Son, of the Word of God” (CD I.1: 452). This means that all revelation in which the Holy Spirit participates is oriented toward the Word as its content. Jesus is the revelation of God to humanity, and the Spirit is the power of Christ which actuates that revelation within people. Similarly, when someone comes to faith, it is the Holy Spirit who unites that person to Christ in faith. Christ is the object of faith, and the Holy Spirit is the awakening power of faith.

Barth’s primary understanding of the Holy Spirit is reflected in this statement: “But fundamentally and generally there is no more to say of Him than that He is the power of Jesus Christ . . .” (CD IV.1: 648). For Barth the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. This is not to say that the Spirit is not also the Spirit of the Father, but preeminently for Barth he is the Spirit of Christ. He is the voice of Christ speaking to the church, he actuates faith in Christ, and he unites Christians to Christ. The Spirit’s work is constantly oriented toward Christ. This is the identifying mark that distinguishes the Holy Spirit from other spirits.

Barth regularly expresses himself in ways that reveal a strong christo-centric orientation in his pneumatology. He assigns certain actions to the Spirit, but he often describes these actions as being carried out *by Christ*

in the Spirit. For instance, Barth can sum up the Spirit's role in reconciliation by saying that "Jesus Christ attests his own reconciliation to us and does so by the Spirit" (Thompson: 92). The Spirit's power is the power of Christ (182). The Spirit's role in calling Christians to their vocation is Christ calling by the Word and the Spirit. The picture one gets is of Christ calling and using the Holy Spirit as the voice or breath by which he calls. The Spirit is a necessary part of the process of calling, but what agency can we attribute directly to him? In a similar vein, Barth describes the Spirit as the arm of Christ in his self-revelation to humanity (*CD* IV.2: 332). Once again the Spirit appears as an extension of Christ rather than a divine agent. These points can be summed up in Barth's statement, "And in great things and in small the presence and gift of [Christ's] Holy Spirit are directly [Christ's] own work" (*CD* IV.1: 694). It is remarks like this that draw Smail's criticism that the danger of Barth's pneumatology is "to fail to assert the distinction between [the Spirit and the Son] which formally he wishes to maintain, so that pneumatology is in danger of being merged in to Christology. . ." (108).

In conclusion, Thompson points out that in Barth's treatment of Christian faith there are trinitarian, christological, eschatological and pneumatic aspects that are all interrelated (134). Be this as it may, for Barth Christian doctrine primarily revolves around Christ. In general, Thompson correctly holds that the Spirit is integrated into Barth's total theological perspective, but this integration comes via christology (209).³

In evaluating Barth's christocentric orientation in pneumatology, we can begin by taking notice of his insistence that the agency of the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential to the processes of revelation and reconciliation. No fallen human being can understand God or gain a proper relationship with him without divine help. This help comes through the entire Trinity, but the subjective side of it is the work of the Holy Spirit. Thus, Barth incorporates the work of the Spirit into the grace of God and the action of the Trinity.

We can also appreciate the effort to which Barth has gone to give adequate treatment of the relationship between Christ and the Spirit. He rightly interrelates the activities of these two persons of the Trinity and further relates them to the Father. One question, however, is whether he has worked out such relations in a satisfactory manner. For if the Spirit

³ A more extreme form of Barth's christocentric paradigm for pneumatology comes in Hendrikus Berkhof's book, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*. Berkhof follows Barth's lead, but he argues for a more strict functional identity between the risen Christ and the Holy Spirit. The result is a theology that is more binitarian than trinitarian.

is functionally identified with Christ, thereby becoming little more than an extension of Christ or a mode through which Christ is present and active in the world, the relation between the Spirit and Christ becomes less characterized by cooperation and more by subordination. Additionally, the Spirit tends to evaporate as the third person of the Trinity, appearing instead as a thin veneer for Christ. This diminishment of the Spirit's identity is the chief danger of the christocentric pneumatology of Barth.

A second danger with Barth's christocentric pneumatology is the nature of the personhood one posits with regard to the Spirit. As reflected in the previous paragraph, in the theology of Barth the Spirit tends to take on the character of an extension of Christ. This is illustrated in the consistency with which he refers to the Spirit as a force through which Christ works or as the power of Christ. Barth also refers to the image of the Spirit as the arm of Christ. Treatments like this only serve to increase the difficulty Christians have conceiving of the Holy Spirit as being in some way personal.

Although Barth's theology is exceedingly christocentric, it nonetheless provides an example of the direction pneumatology can take in the stream of Protestantism that I have called "institutional." In keeping with the trajectory of mainstream Western theology, Barth makes Christ the centerpiece of theology and subordinates the Holy Spirit to Christ in the process. Such subordination creates difficulties with the trinitarian balance of Barth's notions of reconciliation and revelation, as well as other doctrines. As we have seen, it results in the vanishing of the Spirit as a divine person who is the equal of Christ, and in the relegation of the Spirit to being little more than an impersonal extension of Christ.

The Experiential Tendency in Protestant Pneumatology:

John Wesley

The experiential tendency in Protestant pneumatology can be illustrated in the work of John Wesley. As Wesley pursued a "vital piety," he was drawn into sharp debate with leaders in the Anglican church, and much of the controversy revolved around Wesley's understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Christian life. When he pushed the experiential aspects of interaction with the Spirit, Wesley drew the charge of "enthusiast" from his opponents. The debate between Wesley and his opponents illustrates the bipolarity of Protestant pneumatology.

As he worked his way through the issues of the Spirit's influence in the life of the Christian, Wesley developed a theological vision that has

resonated with millions of believers over the years. Donald Dayton has argued that the theological roots of holiness Christianity and modern Pentecostalism can be traced back to the influence of Wesley.⁴ Therefore, it is no exaggeration to state that Wesley's mark on twentieth-century theology is every bit as indelible as is Barth's. Although Wesley's pneumatology occasionally reflects the christocentric pattern of institutional pneumatology, his doctrine of assurance provides an apt illustration of the experiential tendency in Protestant pneumatology.

Characteristic of Wesleyan theology is the distinction between justification and sanctification. Justification is the pardon of the guilty sinner. Wesley writes that justification is "not the process of making a person just and righteous. This is *sanctification*, which is, indeed, in some degree, the immediate *fruit* of justification, but nevertheless is a distinct gift of God and of a totally different nature. The one implies what God *does for us* through his Son; the other, what he *works in us* by his Spirit" (Outler: 201). Thus, Wesley assigns justification to the agency of the Son, and sanctification to the agency of the Spirit, qualifying these claims with the medieval doctrine of appropriations (Staples: 93).

At the moment of justification the process of sanctification begins. Believers undergo a change of relation in terms of their status with God. At the same moment they undergo a change of being in terms of the new presence of the Holy Spirit within them. The process of inner renewal commences (Outler: 274). Simultaneously, and as a result of the presence of the Spirit within believers, their inner struggle begins between the conflicting principles of "flesh" and "spirit." Wesley holds that "spirit" can eventually win this struggle; the believer can reach a state of "perfection." By the word 'perfection,' Wesley means "loving God with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength," which in turn means that "a Christian is so far perfect as not to commit sin" (267). By 'sin' in this statement, Wesley means imperfections in thought or action other than those produced by simple mistakes in judgment. If every thought and action stems from perfect love, as it does for the perfected believer, then her mistakes along the way are not properly counted as sins (285).

Thus, the center of Wesley's pneumatology is the Holy Spirit's work of sanctification.⁵ The Holy Spirit indwells believers and impels them from

⁴ *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*.

⁵ The Spirit is also the agent of the prevenient grace by which human beings are convicted of sin and made aware of their need for God's forgiveness. However, in Wesley's writings this theme is not as important as that of the sanctification which begins when one actually confesses faith in Christ.

within toward greater holiness of life. Within the process of sanctification there are specific functions of the Spirit. One of these is the assurance produced by the inner witness of the Spirit. Wesley believed that the unique understanding of the nature and importance of the witness of the Spirit was a “grand part” of the testimony the Methodists could contribute to all of humanity (211).

The witness of the Spirit comes in two main forms for Wesley—direct and indirect. The direct witness of the Spirit can be either a testimony to the believer’s initial salvation or to her entire sanctification. The direct witness to salvation is given by the Holy Spirit to and with the spirit of the individual believer. Specifically the Spirit testifies that not only does God will to redeem the world to himself through Christ, but that God loves *me—the individual believer*—in this way. Accompanying this assurance is a “sweet calm” and satisfaction that God has forgiven the believer’s sins (212). This is the direct testimony of the Spirit to salvation—a direct awareness of the indwelling Spirit which communicates assurance that God’s grace is being applied to the individual believer.⁶

Regarding the direct testimony of the Holy Spirit to entire sanctification, Wesley teaches that, by the grace of God, some Christians reach such mastery over their own motives that their will is in regular conformity with the will of God. These Christians do not commit intentional and deliberate sins. At the point of entire sanctification believers experience “a death to sin and an entire renewal in the love and image of God . . .” (293). Accompanying this experience is the witness of the Spirit to the entire sanctification of the believer, once again taking the form of a direct awareness of the effects of the Spirit. This testimony is a necessary part of the process; no Christian should claim to have reached the state of perfection until such testimony has come (293).

The second main form of the witness of the Holy Spirit is the indirect testimony to salvation. It is the result of reflection on what is felt in the soul about one’s conduct. More specifically, it is the application of a logical progression drawn from Scripture to the qualities of one’s life. The argument is this. Scripture says that everyone who has the Spirit is a child of

⁶ Maddox describes the background to Wesley’s insistence on the direct witness of the Spirit: “Wesley championed the importance of the Spirit’s witness in conscious contrast to two alternatives more common in his day: (1) that the ultimate basis of our assurance is our clear conscience; and (2) that this basis is the presence of Christian virtues (the ‘fruit of the Spirit’) in our lives. Wesley did allow for these alternative factors a subsidiary role in assurance, confirming the Spirit’s direct witness . . . However, he denied that they were more reliable than, or foundational to, the direct witness” (129).

God. But how can the believer know whether she has the Spirit? Scripture also teaches that the Spirit produces certain “fruit” in the believer’s life. Therefore, the fruit of the Spirit can function as signs of the Spirit’s presence. The indirect witness of the Spirit is thus the rational conclusion that if the fruit of the Spirit is present, then the Spirit is also present, and thus the individual is a child of God (212). It is important to note that the fruit of the Spirit is not to be equated strictly with good works. It also has to do with affections such as joy and peace. Thus, the fruit of the Spirit that serves as the evidence of the presence of the Spirit is a reflection of the overall transformation going on within the believer. To put the matter in another way, if a believer reflects on her life and sees the signs of sanctification, she can be sure that she is filled with the Holy Spirit and therefore a child of God.

The prominence of personal experience in all three of Wesley’s forms of the witness of the Spirit is striking. Assurance comes from the experience of the peace given by the Spirit that one is a child of God (direct assurance of salvation) or has conquered willful sin (direct assurance of complete sanctification). Wesley makes it clear that the direct witness of the Spirit is a cooperative affair between the Holy Spirit and the individual’s spirit, for “the Spirit bears witness with our spirit.” This insistence on the necessary role of the believer’s spirit in the event of assurance ensures that the experience will be distinct and recognizable. Wesley defends his doctrine of the witness of the Spirit by asserting that it is founded on both Scripture and experience. One element does not diminish the other.

Likewise, in the indirect witness of the Spirit the consciousness of one’s own transformation serves as grounds for the conclusion that one is a Spirit-indwelt child of God. There are three ways in which experience is a part of the indirect witness of the Spirit. First is that the believer is aware that she has grown in the fruit of the Spirit. Her transformation is noticeable enough that she is able to use it as grounds from which to make an inference that the Holy Spirit is active in her life.⁷ Second is the inference itself. The believer experiences herself forming the argument. Third is the degree of assurance derived from the strength or weakness of the inference. The extent to which the believer is lastingly assured of her salvation depends on the confidence with which she can draw the conclusion of the presence of the Spirit based on the qualities of her life. If she understands her attitudes and behavior to consistently display the fruits of the Spirit,

⁷ This inference is made on the assumption that true love, joy and peace are not qualities which human beings have or can produce on their own.

then she gains a great deal of confidence that she has received redemption. By the same token, if she perceives only moderate correspondence between her attitudes and behavior and the fruits of the Spirit, the degree of assurance she gains will drop considerably.

Randy Maddox indicates that in the mid-1740s Wesley exchanged correspondence with one “John Smith,” and a central issue between them was the perceptibility of God’s grace as shown in believers’ hearts by the Holy Spirit. Wesley maintained that it cannot happen that a person be filled with the Holy Spirit and the gracious affections of peace, joy and love without perceiving it. He stopped short of claiming that all actions of the Holy Spirit are perceptible, but it remains true, says Wesley, that many episodes of God’s gracious work in the believer typically are (Maddox: 128–9). Throughout his career Wesley continued to insist on the perceptibility of the works of the Spirit, despite repeated charges of enthusiasm.

In summary, the basic orientation of pneumatology for Wesley is salvation as worked out and experienced in the day-to-day lives of Christians. Experience of God’s grace at work in oneself is what prevents Christianity from lapsing into a formal religion in which a living relationship with God is either lost or hampered. “Because of this fear of formalism there is in Wesley’s writing a constant stress on experience” (Williams: 33).⁸ It is experience that forms the test of whether believers are living in the promises of which Christian doctrine speaks (104). That is, when believers learn from Scripture that a Christian is filled with the Holy Spirit and transformed by the same Spirit into the image of Christ, they can search the patterns of their own lives to determine if God’s truth and presence is reflected in them. All along the journey which is the Christian life the believer should be experiencing the presence and work of the Spirit. This emphasis on experience is distinctive of Wesley’s approach to theology, and pneumatology is the arena in which the works of God directly affect human experience.

Wesley has had immense influence in the Protestant tradition in several ways. One of them is his concentration on the experiential aspects of one’s encounter with the Spirit. The contributions of such an approach are many, among them the attitude among believers that they can (and should) expect the presence of God to be an experience-able phenomenon. They gain confidence that God is truly present in their lives, and they anticipate that he will work in distinct and powerful ways.

⁸ Williams brings out this emphasis in Wesley’s writings, but he also presents the other side of the story—that Wesley also feared “any reliance upon experience which left the question of truth to the vagaries of individual or collective feeling” (34).

Furthermore, they understand these events to be brought about by the agency of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit's work is viewed as distinct from the work of Christ and the Father, but oriented toward the Father's will that all be saved and the Son's work in securing the conditions of redemption for the world. In other words, Wesley and those who follow him typically perceive the Holy Spirit to be acting in his own right—not as an extension of Christ. At the same time, the Holy Spirit never acts alone, but always in conjunction with the agency of the Father and the Son.

Unfortunately, just as there are strengths to Wesley's experiential orientation in pneumatology, so are there weaknesses. One of them is the tendency of Wesley to relate the Holy Spirit's work mainly to the individual believer. This is not a strict association, but it is the association that predominates when Wesley discusses the Holy Spirit. The most appropriate way to organize the pneumatological writings of Wesley would be in the form of an *ordo salutis* beginning with prevenient grace and continuing through justification, sanctification, and on into eschatology. What is significant about such an organization is that it is ordered according to aspects of the faith journey of the individual believer. Just as religious experience is primarily a matter for the individual, so is Wesley's experientially oriented pneumatology.

Another weakness of Wesley's pneumatology is that the work of the Spirit is tied almost exclusively to the present time. When the emphasis is on experiencing the works of the Spirit, the focus is on recognizing and enjoying those experiences in the present. The works of the Spirit in past historical periods or in the eternal future fade into the background behind those in the past, present and immediate future of the individual person.

There is a third weakness in the experiential orientation that does not show up in Wesley but sometimes does in those who share the experiential orientation. It is a tendency toward pneumatocentrism. One can occasionally see pneumatocentrism showing up in Pentecostalism.⁹ The driving force behind Pentecostal movements has been a perceived lack of spiritual power when the modern church is compared to the apostolic church as described in the book of Acts. The church of today lacks the zeal and power of the early church. What is needed is a "Holy Ghost revival," and many perceive that it has become a reality in Pentecostalism. Although the Pentecostal movement has made significant contributions to twentieth-century Christianity, its concentration on the Holy Spirit as the key to the

⁹ Donald Dayton makes the case that modern Pentecostalism derives theologically from Methodism in *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987).

restoration of the power of the earliest church does not reflect the type of balance which was also a part of the earliest church. The New Testament portrays the church as assuming the miracle-working presence of the Holy Spirit; there was never a lack of “power” to which the apostles needed to react. Thus, Paul recognizes the practice of speaking in tongues, but he subordinates this to the practice of Spirit-empowered *agapē* and service (1 Corinthians 12–14). Pentecostal leaders, on the other hand, struggle with the absence of overt signs of the Spirit and desire to see them restored to the church.¹⁰ This task leads them to seek the Holy Spirit as the key to the restoration of the form of the early church. The expectation is that as the Holy Spirit falls on the church in power, Christians will encounter the Spirit in particular experiences such as the manifestation of the spiritual gifts. In practice, Pentecostalism sometimes takes the form of a pneumatocentric search for experiences of the power of God.¹¹ It is natural for Christians to desire experiences of the Spirit, but when this desire elevates the Spirit above the Father and the Son the effects on theology are deleterious. In addition, when experiences of God become too prominent in the practice of Christianity the result is usually a lapse into the very fanaticism that many Pentecostal leaders rightly fear. Two centuries earlier, Wesley himself warned against such developments. His way of differentiating the persons of the Trinity was in terms of their most defining work: creation/providence (Father), redemption (Son), and sanctification (Spirit). On such terms “a ‘unitarianism of the Spirit’ could become enamored with

¹⁰ Aimee Semple McPherson, founder of the Foursquare Church, repeatedly uses two metaphors when discussing the Holy Spirit. One is ‘power.’ The church lacks it (as is evidenced by the dearth of holiness, miracles, and soul-winning zeal of many modern-day churches), but the Holy Spirit is waiting to supply it. The other is ‘fire.’ The earliest church was characterized by having hearts that burned with the fire of the Spirit. Not long after the New Testament era that fire burned out and was replaced with the coldness of worldly satisfaction. McPherson describes those hostile to the Pentecostal movement as “cold” or “frozen,” and refers to ecclesiastical formalism as “the refrigerator” (McPherson: 189). Combining the two metaphorical concepts of power and heat, McPherson writes, “The church has grown cold and backslidden, having a form of godliness and denying the power thereof” (173). Fortunately, starting with the Reformation and now especially in movements such as the Foursquare Church, she sees that fire as returning to significant portions of the church (172ff.).

¹¹ It is no coincidence that Pentecostalism tends to appeal to Christians who want more out of their relationship with God. They want more power to overcome sin and to evangelize, and they want to experience that power, just as Peter and the disciples did. Thus, the people drawn to Pentecostalism are those who realize that the church has set its expectations too low and has become content to live with a very small portion of the Spirit’s anointing, and who desire to live in the fullness of the power of the Spirit.

the Spirit's power per se, forgetting its purpose of effecting our recovery of the moral Image that the Father intended for us and Christ displayed to us" (Maddox: 140). Like Paul, Wesley placed more emphasis on the fruit of the Spirit than on the gifts of the Spirit (135–36).

In summary, the experiential tendency in pneumatology yields many valuable offerings for theology. This orientation recognizes that the Spirit indwells each individual Christian, and it seeks to examine thoroughly the phenomena associated with individual endowment by the Spirit. It also leads Christians to expect that the Spirit is indeed present and active in the church. On the other hand, an emphasis on experience of the Spirit typically is accompanied by individualism, a focus on the Spirit's work in the present time, and occasionally pneumatocentrism.

We have briefly reviewed two prominent orientations in Protestant pneumatology: the institutional and the experiential. In evaluating these orientations there are two criteria we can use. One is to take a telic approach, inquiring about what effects a given orientation has on pneumatological development. This is the approach we have taken in this section. Examining each of the orientations, we found that they make important contributions to pneumatology, but they also tend toward significant difficulties in how the Spirit is conceived within Christian life and doctrine.

The other primary criterion to consider when evaluating pneumatological orientations is how they reflect the content of the biblical witness to the Holy Spirit. We will see that what drives the institutional and experiential orientations is a departure from what drives pneumatological reflection in the New Testament. For the New Testament witness to the Holy Spirit is not driven by matters of ecclesiology, christology or religious experience. These are important themes, but they are secondary to the primary theme, which is eschatology. The New Testament pneumatological orientation (inasmuch as there is such a thing) is an eschatological orientation. That is, all reflection on the Holy Spirit in the New Testament takes place within an eschatological framework. It is the thesis of this dissertation that adopting an eschatological orientation in pneumatology is not only possible, but highly beneficial for the study of the work of the Holy Spirit in this age and the age to come.

Eschatology in the New Testament and in Systematic Theology

In order to set the stage for adopting an eschatological orientation for pneumatology, it is necessary to first discuss eschatology in more gener-

al terms. Therefore, in this section I will argue the following two major points. First, of the three major competing conceptions of eschatology, an inaugurated model emphasizing both the “already” and the “not yet” does the best job of handling all the New Testament evidence. Second, despite the fact that the locus of eschatology has tended to be defined in terms of the “not yet,” there are good reasons to adopt the stance of inaugurated eschatology in systematic theology.

It is a fundamental position in New Testament studies to identify eschatology as not only the matrix within which early Christianity developed, but also an indispensable feature of early Christianity itself.¹² I will accept this position without argument. What is debatable is how ‘eschatological’ is to be understood.

In Christian theology the term ‘eschatology’ refers to beliefs concerning death, the after life, judgment and the resurrection of the dead. In biblical studies as well, eschatology is commonly associated with events which include and follow the consummation of history (cf. Mowinckel: 149). However, there are difficulties stemming from the use of this definition that affect the interpretation of early Old Testament prophetic writings, later apocalyptic writings, and the New Testament material. First, by this definition ‘eschatological’ would be an inappropriate description of the element of hope and restoration in Israelite prophecy subsequent to Amos and Hosea, for they did not operate with the concept of an end of history with further events beyond it (Aune: 596). Such ideas are, however, characteristic of later apocalyptic writings. The problem here is that ideas about history coming to an end do not appear in apocalypticism with absolute precision (von Rad, II: 114). Finally, the New Testament does contain many apocalyptic claims about the return of Christ at the end of the age, but New Testament eschatology can hardly be limited to its apocalyptic predictions. For these reasons it is important to consider alternative conceptions of eschatology to gain a proper appreciation of Israel’s hope in the Old Testament Scriptures, as well as the combination of fulfillment and hope in the New Testament.

Working within Old Testament scholarship, Gerhard von Rad opens up the notion of the eschatological to include not only the later apocalyptic writings, but also those of the classical prophets as well. The conception of eschatology which he develops is of a new state in which the break with

¹² One hardly needs to cite sources for this, but a good example is David Aune’s opening statements when introducing the subject of New Testament eschatology for his article in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Since he frames the issue well, I have adopted some of his wording from p. 597.

the present state is so deep that it cannot be understood as the continuation of what has gone before (II: 115). At the same time, the determining factor for both states is the action of Yahweh; this is the primary element of continuity between the noneschatological and the eschatological (115). Regarding eschatological events, “the new is to be effected in a way which is more or less analogous to God’s former saving work” (117). For instance, the prophets speak of a new Zion, a new covenant, a new David, and the like. For the classical prophets these anticipated realities do not happen outside of history, but as events in future history. The key is not a scheme of time but the type of divine saving action under consideration. “The prophetic teaching is only eschatological when the prophets expelled Israel from the safety of the old saving actions and suddenly shifted the basis of salvation to a future action of God” (118).¹³ The language of prophetic expectation gradually took on the characteristics of later apocalypticism, which looks to a definite break between history and events beyond history. Despite this fundamental difference between pre-apocalyptic and apocalyptic thought, both types of writing can be set within von Rad’s broad definition. Both pre-apocalyptic and apocalyptic writers conceived of God’s saving actions as the pivotal impetus for events which can be classified as eschatological. For the pre-apocalyptic prophet, God’s saving actions alter the order of redemption through events in history. For the apocalyptic prophet, God brings history to an end, but the apocalypse is brought on by God as part of his plan of salvation and judgment.

Consistent Eschatology

Throughout the twentieth century biblical scholars have highlighted the profoundly eschatological character of New Testament theology. However, there have been several different construals of New Testament eschatology. Chief among them are consistent eschatology, realized eschatology and inaugurated eschatology. Consistent eschatology was championed by Albert Schweitzer in his two books, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (1901) and *The Quest for the Historical Jesus* (1910).¹⁴ Schweitzer parted ways with the Ritschlian school in emphasizing that the kingdom of God is not to

¹³ Aune follows von Rad: “The term eschatology can be meaningfully applied to the perspective of the 8th- and 7th-century Israelite writing prophets when the term is broadly defined as the expectation of imminent events brought about by the action of God in history accompanied by the dissolution of the old salvation history” (596).

¹⁴ The other main representative of consistent eschatology is Johannes Weiss, *Jesus’ Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*.

be equated with ethical conduct, but rather with a future apocalypse that Jesus worked to bring about. Jesus' views on the kingdom were completely shaped by first-century Jewish apocalyptic thought, and thus his message about the kingdom of God is exclusively about an apocalyptic age to come (Ladd, 1974: 5).

Schweitzer's work, along with that of Johannes Weiss, turned a corner in New Testament studies, for the two succeeded in recovering the significance of eschatology for understanding the proclamation of the kingdom in the Gospels. Many scholars followed Schweitzer and Weiss in advocating a consistent eschatology. Although the conception of the kingdom of God took on many different forms in these presentations, they all share the basic stance that the kingdom is strictly a future and apocalyptic reality.¹⁵ Still, all the advocates of consistent eschatology are compelled by the New Testament evidence to assert that something is happening in the present. Typically they understand the kingdom to be so near that it casts its shadow of influence on the present time.

Realized Eschatology

C. H. Dodd reacted strongly against the consistent eschatology of Schweitzer and Weiss. Dodd argued that the Gospel evidence shows that the kingdom of God is not an apocalyptic expectation, but rather a present reality. In the parables of the kingdom Jesus lays bare the eternal issues at stake. "It is the hour of decision. It is realized eschatology" (Dodd: 148). Thus, the kingdom of God is a reality presently impacting the souls of believing human beings. It is God reigning in the human heart (Hiers: 18).¹⁶ Because the kingdom is an eternal reality, it really has no past, present or future. It is timeless. "Thus, by definition, there could be no future coming of the kingdom of God, Son of man, judgment, or other eschatological events" (22).

Richard Hiers notes that Dodd's impact on Western theology has been significant. "Nevertheless, few other scholars have subscribed to Dodd's proposal that Jesus regarded the kingdom as *entirely* present. Instead, most have maintained that Jesus expected and proclaimed *both* that the kingdom of God was already present *and* that it (or its consummation) was

¹⁵ For an extensive discussion of various forms of consistent eschatology, see Ladd, 1974: 5ff.

¹⁶ Along similar lines, Bultmann interprets the eschatological in terms of what is ultimate or final in significance. Thus, the individual's confrontation with the gospel message is an eschatological moment for him/her—it is the moment of ultimate decision.

yet to come, whether in the near or indeterminate future” (24). The main problem with Dodd’s interpretation of the Gospels is that there are passages in which Jesus clearly proclaims a future coming of the kingdom of God, the Son of man, or a time of judgment. Dodd bypasses many of these passages, often by relegating them to inauthentic status. However, Dodd also retains a number of futuristic passages as authentic sayings of Jesus. These he either construes as references to historical crises of some sort or as symbolizing more transcendent but nontemporal meanings (21). Unfortunately for Dodd, these strategies have not convinced the majority of New Testament scholars.

Another consideration counting against realized eschatology has been uniquely expressed by John Macquarrie: “I think we must frankly say that if that was the end and this is the new age, and if it has all happened, then it does not seem to amount to very much. If eschatology has been realized, well, it is rather a damp squib” (117). A damp squib is a wet firework that looks great, promises to make a big bang, but when it is lit it simply fizzles out and does nothing. Both a damp squib and realized eschatology are disappointments. If eschatology is God’s plan for redemption, then surely he is capable of more.

Thus, realized eschatology contains two major faults: dealing unsatisfactorily with all of the New Testament data, and mischaracterizing the kingdom of God. By the same token, consistent eschatology commits its own versions of the same errors. It dismisses passages in the Gospels where Jesus speaks of the kingdom as being present (an important example is Mt 12:28), and it underestimates the experiential significance of the changes which the New Testament writings testify to have taken place in this, the messianic age.

Inaugurated Eschatology

For reasons like these, the majority opinion in New Testament studies is that Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of God as both a present and a future reality. This position is known as inaugurated eschatology. One of the foremost representatives of this kind of approach is George Ladd.¹⁷ In an autobiographical reference, Ladd revealed that his own interest in the problem of New Testament eschatology arose during his undergraduate

¹⁷ Other scholars who articulated their own versions of the inaugurated position that emerged in the post-World War II years were Oscar Cullmann, W. G. Kümmel, Ernst Käsemann, and Norman Perrin.

studies when he found that “no available interpretation of the kingdom of God seemed to square with the biblical data” (quoted in Epp: 46–47).

For Ladd, the rule of God was active in the Old Testament in the events of the Exodus and the captivity in Babylon where God was at work liberating and judging his people. At the same time, the kingdom was still to come, and it did in the person and ministry of Jesus (1993: 60–67). Ladd’s central thesis is that the Kingdom of God is the redemptive reign of God dynamically active to establish his rule among men, and that this Kingdom, which will appear as an apocalyptic act at the end of the age, has already come into human history in the person and mission of Jesus to overcome evil, to deliver men from its power, and to bring them into the blessings of God’s reign. The Kingdom of God involves two great moments: fulfillment within history, and consummation at the end of history. (1974: 218)

The reign of God is present in the human heart (cf. Dodd), but also in the person of Jesus Christ and in human history. The way in which the kingdom can be understood as both present and future is by taking a functional view of it—understanding it as the active rule of God rather than as a realm over which God rules (121). More properly, the kingdom is primarily God’s kingly rule and secondarily the realm of blessing inaugurated by the divine act of ruling (Epp: 50).

Thus, Ladd both incorporates and corrects the insights of realized eschatology and consistent eschatology. The kingdom of God is not only near; it is actually present in the person of Jesus and the ongoing ministry of the Holy Spirit. By the same token, those living in the blessings of the present kingdom still look forward to the time of apocalyptic consummation in the future (cf. Ladd, 1974: 120).

Finally, Epp notes that whereas Kümmel interprets the kingdom of God as including promise and fulfillment, Ladd includes promise, fulfillment and consummation (52). Thus, Ladd’s notion of the kingdom of God incorporates deep historical ties between the past, present and future. The present eschatological age is at the same time a fulfillment of past promises and also an anticipation of future consummation.

This is a summary of Ladd’s view of the kingdom of God, which is an important theme in the Synoptic Gospels, but what about the rest of the New Testament? He asserts that the source of unity of New Testament thought is that it is “all about the divine mission to the world.” The center of this mission is Jesus, the Spirit-filled Messiah and Son of God, who inaugurated the saving rule of God (1993: 712). Since the mission of Jesus is

the center of the New Testament message, for Ladd an inaugurated eschatology is fundamental to New Testament theology as a whole.

Inaugurated Eschatology and Systematic Theology

Ladd mounts a powerful argument that New Testament theology revolves around an inaugurated eschatology. Turning to contemporary theology, we make the noteworthy observation that there is a fundamental difference between eschatology as conceived in the New Testament and eschatology as taught in current systematic theology. In systematic theology since the early nineteenth century when the term was coined, eschatology has included the study of the parousia, the resurrection of the dead, heaven and hell—all events occurring at the future consummation. That is, systematic theology tends to view eschatology as pertaining to the end of the age, and not to the present age. As Stephen Travis puts it, eschatology “is concerned with things which have not yet happened” (13). On the other hand, according to Ladd and many other biblical scholars, the New Testament authors understood the new age to include things that have happened and have been happening since the earthly ministry of Jesus, and will continue with and beyond his parousia. The contrast between a New Testament inaugurated eschatology and systematic theology’s consistent eschatology is striking.

There is basic agreement between New Testament scholarship and systematic theology that eschatology deals with future events that consummate God’s universal rule. The disagreement is over their differing conceptions of the present. In biblical studies, the general understanding is that the early Christians viewed the time in which they lived as the beginning stages of the new age. This is because they experienced several events, centering in and around the coming of the Messiah, that constituted fulfillment of eschatological promises recorded in Scripture. In systematic theology, there is a persistent failure to think of the present age as an eschatological age. Inasmuch as the present age is eschatological, it is so in only a secondary sense as compared with the “real” eschatological age to come. For all practical purposes, it is not eschatological at all. There are several unfortunate effects on theology from taking this perspective.

First, there is an alienation of present-day believers from the thought world of the New Testament writers. The strong sense of fulfillment that characterized early Christian experience is largely lost on us today. Some of this is natural, for nearly two thousand years stand between us and them, and the excitement of the Messiah having just burst onto the scene

has faded. However, when theology disconnects eschatology from fulfillment that has already taken place, it does not offer assistance in fostering a sense of fulfillment in modern Christians. As a result, there is that much less connection between present-day believers and the thought-world of a good portion of their canonical writings.

Second, in Ladd's terms, consummation becomes severed from promise and fulfillment. That is, the continuity between promise, fulfillment and consummation disappears. Inasmuch as contemporary Christians hold out hope for the resurrection of the dead and the renewal of all things, they are not inclined to view these events as extensions of the blessings of the present age. In contrast, Paul refers to Christ as the first fruits of the resurrection (1 Cor 15:20, 23) and the Holy Spirit as the first fruits of our complete redemption (Rom 8:23), suggesting in both cases deep continuity between the present and the future that is constitutive of the understanding of each age.¹⁸ This perspective on Christ and the Holy Spirit arises from the apostle's "already/not yet" view of the present age.

Third, there is an inclination in systematic theology to treat eschatology as an addendum relegated to the end of theological treatises,¹⁹ because it is mired in exegetical difficulties surrounding the interpretation of the Bible's apocalyptic passages. What the "already/not yet" scheme means for eschatology is that the new age contains both historical and apocalyptic components. On the other hand, when eschatology is limited to events at the end of history, the eschatological is divorced from the historical, and eschatology is limited to apocalyptic phenomena. It becomes a theological category for the "not yet." Whereas most other theological loci can appeal to some extent to historical research and analysis of present experience, eschatology must rely on interpretation of cryptic divine revelation about the end of time.

Fourth, in Western systematic theology there is a correlation between this restrictive view of eschatology and a generally anemic pneumatology. The Western tradition has long focused its attention on the person of Christ. The theology of the Holy Spirit has been neglected by comparison, and when it has been worked out, it has typically taken on subordinationistic overtones. These tendencies have led to a conception of the present age as the time between the two appearances of Christ. It has been

¹⁸ See chapter 2 for a thorough discussion of the notion of first fruits in Pauline thought.

¹⁹ Not only did a particular understanding of eschatology cause it to take its place at the end of dogmatic treatises, but the organizational impetus of being placed at the end contributed in turn to an understanding of eschatology as referring to things yet to come. The two phenomena support each other.

viewed as inferior to these two highpoints in history—the rickety bridge between two strong towers. The negative view of this age and underdeveloped pneumatology coincide, for the influence of the Holy Spirit is the key to experiencing the present age as eschatological. This is true if we take seriously Paul’s understanding that the Holy Spirit is the first fruits of our complete redemption. It means that we are already experiencing the beginning phases of our complete transformation. Thus, there is a great deal of continuity between what goes on in this era and what will go on in the consummation. Continuity between the already and the not yet lends an eschatological character to the present age.

Because of these considerations, I shall argue that theology would be healthier operating with a notion of eschatology that is more consistent with what is reflected in the New Testament—a comprehensive vision of the divine plan of eschatological salvation as beginning with the first coming of Christ and carrying on through and beyond his second coming. Present eschatological realities are in continuity with promises received in the past, just as they are in continuity with events of the future consummation. At the same time, just as there is a strong theme of continuity between the present age and the age to come, there is also an equally strong theme of discontinuity. For the age of consummation will feature the complete establishment of God’s rule over all of creation.

What this stance means for pneumatology is that the gift of the Spirit in this age can be set within a framework that includes Old Testament promises regarding the Spirit, present fulfillments of those promises as reflected in New Testament writings and Christian experience, and anticipations of the future work of the Spirit in the consummation. All of these elements can be interwoven with each other in a great tapestry that will enlarge the scope of much current pneumatological work being done today.

An Eschatological Orientation for Pneumatology

To review this opening chapter, I began by identifying the two opposing tendencies of Protestant pneumatology—the institutional and the experiential—and noting that each of them has important contributions to make but is also hampered by significant weaknesses. I then asked whether there is another orientation we might adopt that will feature significant strengths while avoiding a good deal of the difficulties of the other orientations. The preliminary answer to this question is affirmative. An eschatological orientation (inaugurated eschatology to be specific) is one that

will satisfy two important criteria by which we can judge theological positions—the eschatological orientation is closer to the biblical witness to the Holy Spirit, and it is theologically salutary. It will be the burden of this dissertation to provide support for this two-pronged claim.

I will begin to develop the themes of an eschatological model for pneumatology by examining the writings of the apostle Paul. Of the three major pneumatologies in the New Testament—the Pauline, the Lukan and the Johannine—it is the Pauline which provides the broadest conception of the work of the Spirit in the life of the individual Christian and in the Christian community. James Dunn claims that Paul has been referred to as the New Testament’s “theologian of the Spirit,” because “he gives a more rounded and more integrated teaching on the Spirit than we find in any other literature of that time . . .” (1986: 700). Similarly, J. Christiaan Beker holds that “it is the merit of Paul to have been the first theologian of the Spirit in the New Testament, that is, to have thought through the implications of the experience of the Spirit. Luke and John, the other two distinctive theologians of the Spirit, each in their own way stand in Paul’s debt” (1958: 3). Alisdair Heron writes, “Everything from justification to the final manifestation of the children of God, from faith to prayer, from ethical behavior to calling God ‘*Abba!* Father!’, is enabled by the Spirit. This is a far wider canvas than in the Synoptics. Paul (a) discerns an integral connection of the Spirit’s work with the activity of God in Christ, and (b) depicts it as extending across the whole spectrum of Christian life, and as driving dynamically toward the *eschaton*” (46).

Not only is Paul’s contribution to pneumatology profound, it is also pervaded by intimate connections between the Holy Spirit and eschatology. Geerhardus Vos notes the irony that most Christians do not appreciate these connections.

The lack of recognition of this fact [that pneumatology and eschatology are intertwined], so common among even doctrinally informed Christians is mostly due to the eclipse which the Spirit’s eschatological task has suffered on account of his soteric work in the present life. The ubiquitousness and monergism of the Spirit’s influence in the gracious processes we now experience have, as it were, unduly contracted our vision, so that after having emphasized the all-inclusiveness of this work, we forget that we have forgotten, or merely counted in *pro forma* the other hemisphere pertaining to the Spirit, that dealing with the introduction into and the abode in the life to come. Paul has not left us in uncertainty or unclearness in regard to this part of the Spirit’s working. (1952: 159)

Although Vos is using the word ‘eschatology’ as referring strictly to the “not yet,” the situation he describes would point the inquirer who is interested in the connections between the Holy Spirit and eschatology to the writings of Paul. Consistent with Vos’ claim, in Chapters Two and Three, we will find that Paul’s reflection on the Holy Spirit is shot through with eschatological sensibilities, and his eschatological views depend in part on the present activity of the Spirit. Paul’s conception of the Christian faith is formed from within an understanding of eschatological redemption as having begun but not been completed. This foundational view of God’s activity in the world shapes the way Paul understands the gift of the Spirit, since the latter is essentially an eschatological reality for the apostle and others in the early church.

As valuable as Paul’s insights are, a contemporary construction needs to draw on later developments in trinitarian theology, pneumatology and eschatology. Of the theologians working in the present day, there is no one who is stronger in all three of these areas than Jürgen Moltmann. Chapters 4–8 will comprise a detailed examination of Moltmann’s work in eschatology and pneumatology.

With his *Theology of Hope* in 1964, Moltmann brought eschatology to center stage in systematic theology. Richard Bauckham observes, “One of the most important contributions of Moltmann’s theology has been to rehabilitate future eschatology” (1995: 8). Unfortunately, especially in his early theology, Moltmann emphasized future eschatology to the degree that the present age became less than eschatological. He was mainly operating with an eschatology that consisted of the “not yet.” As his theology has progressed, he has gained more appreciation for the role of the Holy Spirit in redemption and for the eschatological nature of the present. Still, the relation between the Spirit and eschatology remains inconsistent in Moltmann’s theology. It is precisely this gap that Pauline theology fills. Therefore, between the work of Paul and Moltmann, there are strong contributions in New Testament eschatology and pneumatology, and in contemporary eschatology, pneumatology and trinitarian theology. The two figures complement each other well. In chapter 9, drawing on both of them, I will lay out proposals for a contemporary formulation of eschatological pneumatology. Finally, I will return to the two dominant pneumatological orientations of the Protestant tradition—the institutional and the experiential—and argue that an eschatological model is both more faithful to the biblical texts and more salutary for theology than either of them.