

“Power in the Seminary”

**20th Century Pneumatological Distinctives
at Southwestern Baptist Theological
Seminary**

Mr. Jason G. Duesing

**The Center for Theological Research
October 2006**

White Paper 11
Published by the Center for Theological Research
at www.BaptistTheology.org

© 2006 Jason G. Duesing

This essay was first written in Spring 2005 for a PhD Seminar on
Pneumatology at Southwestern Seminary.

Permissions: The purpose of this material is to serve the churches. Please feel free to distribute as widely as possible. We ask that you maintain the integrity of the document and the author's wording by not making any alterations. For special requests please contact the editorial board for the White Papers for approval at ctr@swbts.edu.

The Center for Theological Research
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, Texas
Malcolm B. Yarnell, III, Director

**“Power in the Seminary”:
Pneumatological Distinctives of the 20th Century’s Writing Theologians
at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary**

The Power in the Seminary

“I am convinced that my lack of contact with supernatural power was due to the pervasive influence of secular humanism...in our churches, Bible schools, and seminaries.”¹ In the book that recounts the development of a movement of pneumatological significance in the late twentieth century, C. Peter Wagner makes this surprising statement regarding the catalyst that sparked what he terms as the “Third Wave of the Holy Spirit.” The Third Wave movement is the name given to the final installment of an increase in the prominence of signs and wonders that its participants claim occurred in the form of a trilogy in the last century.²

Working under the premise that the Bible “is clear that divine power is to accompany the spread of the gospel,” Wagner recounts his frustration at the lack of such evidence in his own life and ministry. Indeed, in the second chapter of this influential book, Wagner explains how even his dean at Fuller Seminary grew perplexed at his own failure to reconcile his experiences in the 1980s with his education at Princeton Seminary. The dean, Paul Pierson, stated, “What I learned at Princeton Seminary did not prepare me to deal with this phenomenon.”³ As a result, Fuller Seminary, under the influence of Wagner, Pierson, and Third Wave pastor-theologian, John Wimber, transformed into an institution with a new emphasis on pneumatology that would never again put its graduates in the position of ignorance like Pierson after Princeton or frustration like Wagner. There was now “power in the seminary.”⁴

The claim that the Third Wave was in part the product of faulty theological education is surprising given the experiential nature of the movement. Yet most participants of ministerial training in this era will claim as an axiom, that what one is taught in seminary will have some sort of negative or positive effect on one’s theology. One could argue, however, that had Pierson or Wagner attended another institution for theological preparation, they would have been better equipped to clarify, answer, and defend both their experience and their “phenomenon.” This is not a commentary on the validity or invalidity of their conclusions or the Third Wave movement, but rather a statement on theological education at one institution versus another in light of Wagner’s own experience.⁵

It is here that the purpose and scope of this paper rests. If one were to broaden the issue in

¹C. Peter Wagner, *The Third Wave of the Holy Spirit* (Ann Arbor: Servant Publications, 1988), 21.

²Ibid. Wagner states, “The first wave was the Pentecostal movement, the second was the charismatic movement, and now the third wave is joining them.”

³Wagner, *The Third Wave*, 35.

⁴Title of second chapter in Wagner’s *The Third Wave*.

⁵For a concise resource that explains the Third Wave movement against the backdrop of other historical positions see Wayne Grudem’s *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996).

question to include not only the concerns and claims of those in the Third Wave, but also any issues that cause pneumatological confusion, a fruitful exercise would then be to see how a particular seminary has addressed those issues in the twentieth century. Hypothetically speaking, let us envision a student with various pneumatological concerns attending a specific seminary for the 100-year period of the twentieth century. From professor to professor, decade to decade, the student would encounter the various trends and theological developments that would shape and define that seminary. What would he be taught? How would his views be influenced? Would he leave frustrated like Wagner or under-prepared like Pierson? The answers to these questions, if obtainable, would reveal, at least for our purposes, the pneumatological distinctives and emphases of that particular institution.

This essay is an attempt at such a study for the development of pneumatology at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. From its inception in 1908 until the end of the twentieth century, Southwestern has maintained a consistent pneumatological emphasis among what will be defined as its primary “writing theologians” that have served to equip students with the knowledge of the person and work of the Holy Spirit.⁶ The purpose of this essay is to explicate the key pneumatological distinctives among theologians B.H. Carroll, W.T. Conner, and James Leo Garrett to provide a synthesis of their views showing what aspects of pneumatology were believed and taught at Southwestern during the twentieth century. To accomplish this task, time will be spent (1) classifying three main historical eras at Southwestern in the twentieth century, (2) describing and defining each era’s prominent writing theologian, (3) examining each writing theologian’s key pneumatological distinctives, and (4) synthesizing the distinctives manifested in all three theologians to show that had that hypothetical student been the recipient of an education received during a 100-year stint at Southwestern, he would have emerged with more than ample pneumatological preparation to *define*, *answer*, and *classify* any instance of confusion regarding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

A Writing Theologian

For the purposes of this essay, a “writing theologian” will be defined as a professor of significant stature who achieved recognized acclaim for the widespread use and influence of his published theological writings. As will be shown in the descriptions that follow, the three primary writing theologians at Southwestern Seminary in the twentieth century went about their craft in diverse ways. B.H. Carroll was primarily a homiletic theologian, W.T. Conner was primarily a systematic theologian, and James Leo Garrett is primarily a historical theologian. Nevertheless, as will be shown, these three best fit the definition and therefore will serve as the

⁶Southwestern, and other seminaries in the Baptist tradition, have historically not followed the path of Fuller Seminary and others of a more charismatic stripe. William Brackney notes, “There is a long tradition of Baptist recognition of the work of the Spirit, with increasing attention to the gifts of the Spirit and the Spirit-filled life in the later twentieth century... In terms of doctrinal statements, Baptists generally have stressed the personhood of the Holy Spirit and referred to the Spirit in the third person. Additionally, the Spirit is understood to have been active in Creation, the inspiration of Scripture, the exaltation of Christ, the calling of believers, cultivation of Christian character through presence in every believer, and the empowerment of believers for worship, evangelism, and service” in “Holy Spirit, Baptist Understanding of,” in *Historical Dictionary of the Baptists* (Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1999), 215, 216. Thus, the conclusions drawn as a result of this essay are really no historical surprise, but do serve to assert that Baptists were not agnostic or ignorant when it came to addressing pneumatology in the twentieth century.

representative “writing theologians” for the present discussion.⁷

The Twentieth Century at Southwestern

Speaking at his inauguration during the seminary’s seventh year, L.R. Scarborough classified Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary’s then short history as one of “growth.”⁸ Indeed, those first seven years were productive, but they were only a sliver of the total expansion and development pie that would grow to become the largest seminary in the world by 1983. This growth occurred over three distinct periods. These periods, or eras, easily find classification—with perhaps only a few points of historiographical contention—as the Founding Years (1908-1914), the Formative Years (1915-1942) and the Flourishing Years (1943-1999).⁹

The Founding Years (1908-1914)

The first years of Southwestern’s history were years of transition. At the age of 65, B.H. Carroll chose to undertake the endeavor of starting a seminary in the southwest instead of seeking retirement. Enlisting faculty, recruiting students, securing property, raising funds, changing locations, and settling in Fort Worth were all transpiring during these early years of this experiment in theological education. Stewart A. Newman, professor at Southwestern from 1936-1952, characterized these early years as “as a period of ferment.”¹⁰ Faculty, administration, local

⁷In Timothy George and David Dockery’s updated *Theologians of the Baptist Tradition* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001) of the 18 theologians listed, the three that have Southwestern tenures are Carroll, Conner, and Garrett.

⁸L.R. Scarborough, “The Primal Test of Theological Education: Installation Address of President L.R. Scarborough, D.D. May, 1915,” in *Bulletin of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary* 1 (May 1915): 2. Scarborough would also write a history of the Seminary for its thirtieth anniversary, *A Modern School of the Prophets* (Nashville: Broadman, 1939). Since that time there was a small biographical and historical work done for the fortieth anniversary edited by J.M. Price, *Southwestern Men and Messages* (Kansas City: Kansas Central Seminary Press, 1948), another essay for the fortieth by Jeff D. Ray, “The First Faculty of the Seminary” (Fort Worth: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1948), a report by the SBC Executive Committee, “Significant Events in the History of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary,” (Roberts Library, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1963), a large history by Robert A. Baker for the seventy-fifth anniversary, *Tell the Generations Following* (Nashville: Broadman, 1983), and a similar but much more expanded and updated work to Price’s compilation edited by James Leo Garrett, Jr., *The Legacy of Southwestern* (North Richland Hills: Smithfield Press, 2002).

⁹Many items contributed to the structure and formulation of this essay, but the initial catalyst was James Leo Garrett’s 1985 Founder’s Day Address at Southwestern, later published as “The Bible at Southwestern Seminary During Its Formative Years: A Study of H.E. Dana and W.T. Conner,” *Baptist History and Heritage* 21 (Oct 1986): 29-43. Here is where I first discovered the classification and distinction between Southwestern’s Founding Years (1908-1914) and Formative Years (1915-1942), and as a result it did not require too much creativity to classify the remaining years in the twentieth century as the Flourishing Years. Garrett’s thesis was “to investigate and to explicate what was believed and taught about the Holy Scriptures during the “formative years” of Southwestern Seminary” (29). Garrett accomplishes this by treating Dana first then Conner, followed by a summary of conclusions. This structure provided a helpful template for the crafting of the present essay.

Another helpful example was Justice C. Anderson’s 1997 Founder’s Day Address at Southwestern, later published as “The Missions Motif: Southwestern’s Integrating Principle,” *Baptist History and Heritage* 41:2 (Spring 1999):70-85. In that essay, Anderson describes the history of the Missions Department at Southwestern, but uses a similar classification as Garrett as to eras of ministry.

¹⁰Stewart A. Newman, *W.T. Conner: Theologian of the Southwest* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1964), 54.

community, and students alike were all engaged in the labor of the birth of a new seminary.

B.H. Carroll's legacy among Baptists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries mirrors in many ways the popularity and charisma of the nation's leader during that era, Theodore Roosevelt. Carroll's preaching ability, pastoral spirit, and visionary leadership cast a long shadow of influence whose impact has yet to reach an end. With regard to his classification as a writing theologian, one might want to challenge that title based upon the number of works he actually penned. Indeed, most of his written volumes are posthumous compilations of his sermons and lectures, a project he entrusted, prior to his death, to J.W. Crowder.¹¹ Therefore, it is necessary to consider Carroll as a homiletical theologian, but without doubt his writings carried significant influence, not only for Baptists throughout the twentieth century, but especially for Baptists involved in the work of Southwestern Seminary. As William Brackney recently stated, "In its earliest development, Benajah Harvey Carroll (1843-1914) was the shaper of Southwestern's theological position."¹² For these reasons he is the Founding Years' representative writing theologian.

The Formative Years (1915-1942)

James Leo Garrett categorizes the Formative Years as the years "from the beginning of World War I to the beginning of World War II, including the years of the Great Depression."¹³ Coinciding with Scarborough's tenure as president, these years mark an era of significant events that served to strengthen and establish the young school. While not the classical theologian of Carroll's caliber, Scarborough succeeded Carroll in visionary leadership and implementation as well as fundraising. His development efforts on behalf of the seminary would spill over into a nationwide fundraising effort for the entire Southern Baptist Convention. To this day, Scarborough is distinguished as only one of three seminary presidents simultaneously to serve his denomination as convention president.¹⁴

One of the features that enabled Scarborough to excel in the work of finding financial support for the seminary was the strength of the growing faculty, and particularly the presence of W.T. Conner. Hired by Carroll to teach theology, Conner spent his first years on the faculty, during the summers and sabbaticals, finishing a terminal degree and other studies. While at first only a student of Carroll, Conner sought other mentors via these outside studies, such as A.H. Strong and E.Y. Mullins.¹⁵ Under Scarborough, Conner rose in popularity in both the classroom

¹¹Crowder recounts, "Let it be understood once and for all that my relation to this work was and is Dr. Carroll's own arrangement, whether wise or unwise. I was with him nine years, four as a student and five years as his assistant...Suffice it to say that the work pleased him and that he made provision in his will for the part I was to play in the matter...I approached him one day and said, 'Dr. Carroll, it seems to me that our people are losing immeasurably in the fact that you are not putting your great discussions in permanent form.' He replied, 'You see what I have to do in building the Seminary.' Then I suggested a plan by which I thought it could be done. He accepted the suggestion and put the responsibility for its operation on me right on the spot." J.W. Crowder, ed. *Dr. B.H. Carroll, The Colossus of Baptist History* (Fort Worth: n.p., 1946): 168-169.

¹²William H. Brackney, *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought* (Macon: Mercer, 2004), 421.

¹³ Garrett, "The Bible at Southwestern," *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, 29.

¹⁴The three seminary presidents who have simultaneously served as Presidents of the Southern Baptist Convention were Edgar Young Mullins, Lee Rutledge Scarborough, and Leighton Paige Patterson.

¹⁵For a discussion of the significance of the influence on W.T. Conner see William H. Brackney, *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought*, 423-424; James Leo Garrett, Jr. "W.T. Conner: Contemporary Theologian," in *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 25:2 (Spring 1983): 46; W. Boyd Hunt, "Southern Baptists and Systematic

and the academy. James Leo Garrett recounts, “Not only did his teaching career form a connecting link between the administrations of the institution’s first three presidents—B.H. Carroll, L.R. Scarborough, and E.D. Head—but his theological position, classroom method, academic ideals, characteristic wit, and missionary zeal were woven into the fabric of this seminary.”¹⁶ In terms of writing, Conner made several contributions that “placed him among the most widely read theologians among Southern Baptists of the twentieth century.”¹⁷ The editions and revisions of his systematic theology texts would replace Mullins as the standard text used for most of the twentieth century at Southwestern.¹⁸ Conner was, in every sense of the classification, a systematic theologian. Few would find ground to dispute his representing the Formative Years as the representative writing theologian.

The Flourishing Years (1943-1999)

The final era of the twentieth century is the longest. Southwestern hosted four presidencies during this era of varying lengths and emphases. What makes grouping them all together in one era a logical decision is the fact that they were all characterized by expansive growth. The conclusion of World War II brought many students with government paid scholarships to enroll for classes on Seminary Hill, serving “to double its enrollment in less than three years.”¹⁹ The seminary’s growth, combined with the growth of the Southern Baptist Convention as a whole, resulted in a bold vision for expansion under presidents E.D. Head (1942-1953) and J. Howard Williams (1953-1958). An increase in denominational funding secured by Robert E. Naylor (1958-1978), allowed for the full implementation of that earlier

Theology,” in *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 1:2 (Apr 1959): 43-49; Clyde J. Hurst, “The Problem of Religious Knowledge in the Theology of Edgar Young Mullins and Walter Thomas Conner,” in *Review and Expositor* 52:2 (Apr 1955): 166-182; Reggie McNeal, “The Priesthood of All Believers,” in *Has Our Theology Changed? Southern Baptist Thought Since 1845*, ed. by Paul Basden. (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 216-217; and Newman, *W.T. Conner*, 61.

¹⁶James Leo Garrett, Jr., “The Theology of Walter Thomas Conner” (Th.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas), 1. As a further statement on the breadth of Conner’s influence Garrett notes, “First, Conner had a unique and pervasive impact on Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary...Second, Conner was probably the most influential Southern Baptist systematic theologian...between the death of E.Y. Mullins in 1928 and Conner’s physical incapacitation in 1949,” in “W.T. Conner: Contemporary Theologian,” 43-44.

¹⁷William H. Brackney, *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought*, 425. Brackney also says, “Conner was the principal writing theologian at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary from 1910 until 1949,” 423.

¹⁸James Leo Garrett explains, “From 1910 until 1917 Conner uses as a text in his basic systematic theology, required of all theological students, A.H. Strong’s *Systematic Theology. The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression* by E.Y. Mullins was used as the text from about 1918 until 1922. Conner began to use his own notes...in 1922...and his own publications from that point,” in “The Theology of Walter Thomas Conner,” 13. In 1980, Fisher Humphries wrote, “No systematic theology by a Southern Baptist has appeared since *The Christian Religion in Its Doctrinal Expression* by E.Y. Mullins, unless the two volumes by W.T. Conner, *Revelation and God* and *The Gospel of Redemption* may together be given that name,” in “Current Theological Trends Among Southern Baptists,” in *Baptist History and Heritage* 15:3 (Jul 1980): 48. Since that time, James Leo Garrett, *Systematic Theology*, and Dale Moody, *Word of Truth*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) have been the only other professors in a Southern Baptist seminary to be added to this list. (Both Millard Erickson and Wayne Grudem have Southern Baptist affiliation, but neither teaches in an SBC seminary.)

¹⁹Newman, *W.T. Conner*, 75.

vision.²⁰ Russell H. Dilday (1978-1994) inherited a freight train of growth that saw days where the sun never set on the ministry of a Southwestern student or graduate around the world.²¹ Kenneth S. Hemphill (1994-2003) served with distinction as the leader of the world's largest seminary into the early years of the twenty-first century.²²

James Leo Garrett's tenure at Southwestern follows a circuitous path compared to Carroll or Conner. A student of Conner's, Garrett taught at Southwestern from 1949-1959 before leaving for a twenty year period of service at two other Baptist institutions. His return in 1979 until his retirement at the end of the century is the reason why "he is primarily known as a Southwestern Seminary theologian."²³ Garrett continued where Conner left off as the seminary's principle writing theologian. While a competent and published systematic theologian, Garrett is also known as an astute historian specializing in a broad spectrum of fields including patristics, Roman Catholic theology, and Baptist studies.²⁴ It is these characteristics combined with his methodology, which will be discussed below, that allows for his categorization as an historical theologian.

²⁰As to the fervor of the ministry Robert A. Baker remarked, "For the men and women making up the faculty of Southwestern, the two decades of the Naylor administration were busy years," *Tell the Generations Following*. (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1983), 396. He also noted, "When [Naylor] assumed his task in 1958, there were 2,395 students enrolled in the classes of 53 teachers...By the time of his retirement in 1978, the faculty numbered 125 men and women serving as professors, teaching assistants, adjunct teachers, and guest professors," *Ibid.*, 387.

²¹Robert A. Baker chronicled, "By the close of the period in 1978 the cumulative enrollment at Southwestern Seminary had reached the astounding figure of 4,136 students in three schools...The facilities for the students were the best the school had ever known." *Tell the Generations Following*, 417-418. Enrollment would continue to increase in the early 1980s peaking at 5,120 in 1984.

²²One may want to argue that the Flourishing Era should really find its limits and conclusion in 1978 since the Naylor-to-Dilday-to-Hemphill transition led ultimately to a twenty year decline in total student enrollment. However, the case can be made that even though in slow decline Southwestern still remained "the largest seminary in the world" until at least 1999. The classification of any era in the recent past is better left to those a few generations removed to preserve objectivity in assessment.

While it is difficult to divide the final years of the twentieth century, it is clear that a new era has inaugurated in recent years with the election of Paige Patterson as president in 2003. A new century and millennium, the approaching 100-year anniversary of the founding of Southwestern, a new vision, and new faculty and students are all markers that a corner has been turned yet again in Fort Worth's seminary. Historians and students will have to wait and see what characteristics are born in this era. Likewise, with the retirement of James Leo Garrett, all will watch in earnest for the rising of the next "writing theologian" to lead once again from his unique venue on Seminary Hill.

Perhaps in another 10 years historians will be able to look back and draw a line at 1978, or 1994, as well as 2003, but for the purposes of this doctrinal study it is safe to leave all these eras huddled under one umbrella.

²³William H. Brackney, *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought*, 425.

²⁴Brackney also notes, "From an institutional perspective, James Leo Garrett (b.1925) was W.T. Conner's successor at Southwestern and belongs in his predecessor's tradition," *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought*, 425. Furthermore, he states that Garrett "is rightly considered A.H. Strong's successor in the second half of the twentieth century," 426.

B.H. Carroll: Practical Pneumatology²⁵

As a homiletical theologian, B.H. Carroll's pneumatology is practical in its expression. He sought to answer the "what" and "who" questions relating to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Initially, this is seen in his support of the *New Hampshire Confession*, which he set as the doctrinal basis for Southwestern Seminary.²⁶ In a commentary on that confession's second article, "The True God," Carroll affirms the nature of God as Spirit, a Nicene understanding of the Trinity, and a Western understanding of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan definition of the procession of the Spirit.²⁷ Furthermore, as a testimony to Carroll's frequent teaching and preaching on the Holy Spirit, Carroll's editor also published a volume on the doctrine, *The Holy Spirit*, in 1939.²⁸ For identifying key pneumatological distinctives within Carroll's work, it is helpful to note one place where Carroll has provided classification for the treatment of the doctrine. In a collection of sermons entitled *The Three Baptisms*, Carroll sees the work of the Spirit as (1) accrediting the Son, (2) giving power to the Son's disciples, and (3) convincing the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment.²⁹ When one uses that rubric as a filter to sift through Carroll's work, three key distinctives present themselves that serve as a practical help to the student to *define* "Who" the Spirit is and "what" he believes concerning some of the basic pneumatological issues: the Spirit and the Son, baptism of the Spirit, and the Spirit and inspiration for revelation.

²⁵No full treatments have been completed that treat specifically Carroll's pneumatology. James Spivey comments briefly on Carroll's view of the Holy Spirit in both "Benajah Harvey Carroll," in *Theologians of the Baptist Tradition*, ed. by David Dockery and Timothy George. (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 172, and "Benajah Harvey Carroll," in *The Legacy of Southwestern*, ed. by James Leo Garrett, Jr. (North Richland Hills: Smithfield Press, 2002), 7.

²⁶William H. Brackney, *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought*, 421.

²⁷B.H. Carroll, "Our Articles of Faith: Article II—The True God," in *The Southwestern Journal of Theology* 5:3 (Jul 1921): 10-16. A note of particular interest, Carroll states, "The commandment which says, 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve,' would make it blasphemy for anybody to worship one who is not God, and we do worship Jesus, and we do worship the Holy Spirit. The scriptures call the Holy Spirit God. The scriptures attribute to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit the work of creation. The scriptures attribute to each one of these three the great attributes of divinity, and we accept it that way," 16. For more on his treatment of *Filioque*, see B.H. Carroll, "Addresses, articles and reports of B.H. Carroll," compiled and arranged by J.W. Crowder. Archives, Roberts Library, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, 228-229.

²⁸In the foreword of J.W. Crowder's compilation (prior to Cranfill's published edition in 1939), Crowder noted that the presentation of Carroll's sermons on the Holy Spirit were not a part of a series, but rather various sermons given "as occasion demanded" to the "great church" in Waco, Texas. See B.H. Carroll, *Holy Spirit: Sermons*, compiled and arranged by J.W. Crowder. Archives, Roberts Library, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas. The only other noticeable difference between this version and the published volume is an additional sermon, "The Work of the Holy Spirit: The 'Second Blessing' and Christian Perfectionism." This volume served as the only organized pneumatological treatment by Carroll (and that posthumously). Various aspects and topics related to the Holy Spirit are often addressed by Carroll, but one has to sift through his works to piece together the doctrine. This is true for most doctrinal studies on Carroll since his work is the result of a biblical and homiletical theologian as evidenced by Wilson Lanning Stewart's unique dissertation, "Ecclesia: The Motif of B.H. Carroll's Theology" (Th.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1959).

²⁹Carroll, *The Three Baptisms* (Ages Digital Library, 2003), 24. J. Dee Cates in his ThD thesis, *B.H. Carroll: The Man and His Ethics* (Unpublished: SWBTS, 1962), classifies Carroll's pneumatology according to two truths: "(1) the 'Holy Spirit forms in each child of God the image of Jesus Christ,' and (2) every Christian has resident within him the power to overcome the world" (90).

First, Carroll's treatment of the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ is one of "divine witness," wherein the Spirit works and is present at Jesus' baptism, death, and resurrection.³⁰ At his baptism, the Holy Spirit functioned as a one-time "seal" that anointed God's Son as "as a preacher of the gospel...the true Messiah."³¹ On the cross, when Jesus shed His blood as a substitutionary sacrifice, the Spirit bore "witness to [the sacrifice's] appropriateness and its efficacy."³² And, at Jesus' resurrection, Carroll shows from Romans 8:11 that it was the Spirit who worked to raise Jesus from the dead and declared him "to be the Son of God."³³

The second key distinctive is Carroll's understanding and articulation of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. For Carroll, this was a singular event performed by Jesus on the infant church at Pentecost.³⁴ He likened it to the launching of a ship into open seas after it had spent time in local waters preparing for its maiden voyage.³⁵ The church was now ready to be empowered to fulfill the Great Commission.

Carroll's baptism of the Holy Spirit contains three clear aspects. First, Jesus is the administrator or baptizer.³⁶ He employs the element of the Spirit and baptizes Christians as the proper subjects within the locus of the local church.³⁷ This baptism is "not to benefit or exalt themselves, but [for] the edification of the church and the propagation of the gospel."³⁸ Second, the baptism of the Holy Spirit is limited only to those whom God calls.³⁹ This selective aspect is not to be understood in a salvific sense because, third, baptism in the Holy Spirit is "not conversion but an extraordinary gift for the effectual publication of the gospel."⁴⁰ The baptism of the Holy Spirit was not, and is not, a requirement for salvation, nor is it synonymous with the regenerating and indwelling work of the Holy Spirit at conversion. Carroll believes that the Spirit was intrinsically involved in all the soteriological events, but that these events were not the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

³⁰Carroll explains that "[The Holy Spirit] is the great witness to Jesus Christ. Our Lord Himself announced that fact, that when the Holy Spirit was come He would bear witness to Jesus, that He was the divine witness, and that the point of His testimony would be this: Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God; He is the fountain and author of eternal life," *Jesus the Christ*, compiled by J.W. Crowder, edited by J.B. Cranfill (Ages Digital Library, 2003), 64.

³¹Carroll, *Revival Sermons*, compiled by J.W. Crowder, edited by J.B. Cranfill (Ages Digital Library, 2003), 153. See also idem, *Jesus the Christ*, 64-66.

³²Carroll, *Jesus the Christ*, 66.

³³Ibid., 66-67.

³⁴Carroll, *The Holy Spirit*, ed. by J.B. Cranfill (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1939), 32-33. See also B.H. Carroll, *The Three Baptisms and An Interpretation of the English Bible*, Vol. 2, Chapters 3-5;9, and Vol. 13, Chapter 19, compiled and edited by T.W. Crowder (Ages Digital Library, 2003)

³⁵Carroll states, "But the church our Lord Jesus Christ build had been launched before this and it had made...what you would call trial voyages...confined to Jewish waters." The Pentecost event in Act 2 then is "not indeed the launching of the ship of the church but the putting out into open seas...of all nations and tongues and kindreds and peoples of the earth," *The Holy Spirit*, 35.

³⁶Carroll, "Addresses, articles and reports of B.H. Carroll," compiled and arranged by J.W. Crowder. Archives, Roberts Library, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, 114.

³⁷Ibid., 115-116.

³⁸Ibid., 117-118.

³⁹Ibid., 119-120.

⁴⁰Ibid., 123.

Furthermore, Carroll understands the reference to the baptism of the Spirit in 1 Corinthians 12 as “a baptism in miraculous power, for a temporary purpose, but that baptism, while it lasted, was to give credentials unto the church. Hence the baptism in the Spirit was a baptism *unto*, or *into*, the church.”⁴¹ The logical result of this view is a belief that all miraculous gifts associated with the baptism at Pentecost have ceased, now that the church has moved beyond the local waters into the open seas for 2,000 years.⁴²

Finally, B.H. Carroll speaks of the Holy Spirit’s role in the formation of Holy Scripture in his published volume, *Inspiration of the Bible*.⁴³ Carroll understood inspiration as “that influence of the Spirit...which qualifies its subject to receive a revelation, or to speak or write what God wills, so as to secure the infallible accuracy of the inspired declaration or record.”⁴⁴ While commenting on the first article of the *New Hampshire Confession*, Carroll states that biblical inspiration means “to breathe on or to breathe into for the purpose of conveying the Holy Spirit, in order that those inspired may speak or write what God would have spoken or written.”⁴⁵ Carroll believed God the Father used the Spirit to record the words he wanted to communicate to his people.

Had our hypothetical student spent time in class with B.H. Carroll at Southwestern during the Founding Years, he would likely have gained a greater appreciation for the work of the Spirit in the life of Christ, the inauguration of the church, and the formulation of Scripture. These key pneumatological distinctives are the practical expressions of an orthodox and classical pneumatology that when delivered in sermonic form doubtless enabled the recipient to *define* better his understanding of the Holy Spirit.

⁴¹Carroll, *The Holy Spirit*, 59.

⁴²To seek to find Carroll’s view on such contemporary subjects of doctrinal debate, such as the legitimacy of “private prayer languages” is to seek for something foreign to the historical context of Carroll. The early twentieth century encountered debate over the nature of tongue speaking but not in terms of the late twentieth century charismatic movement.

With regard to the phrase “for the Spirit himself intercedes for us with groanings too deep for words” in Romans 8:26, Carroll believed that this describes a situation where a Christian “has not the spirit of prayer and does not feel like asking. But God provides and advocate, the Holy Spirit, that puts into his heart the spirit of grace and supplication. And the Holy Spirit not only shows him what to pray for, but how to pray” in *An Interpretation of the English Bible*, Vol. 16, Chapter 17, compiled and edited by T.W. Crowder (Ages Digital Library, 2002), 149.

With regard to the phrase, “For one who speaks in a tongue speaks not to men but to God; for no one understands him, but he utters mysteries in the Spirit” in 1 Corinthians 14:2, Carroll believed that “this speaking in tongues meant to speak in a [known] language that a man had not acquired, and had not studied” and not to “speak ecstatically; that the man himself is, in a measure, unconscious, as if some mighty power had seized upon him causing him to mutter and say things...” For Carroll, “a great deal of emphasis in religious matters must be put upon the understanding” and his chief concern is that whatever is spoken must have as its end the edification of other people. See *An Interpretation of the English Bible*, Vol. 13, Chapter 21, compiled and edited by T.W. Crowder (Ages Digital Library, 2002), 178-180.

⁴³Carroll’s views on this issue would prove significant for Southwestern Seminary as it experienced the inerrancy controversy in the Southern Baptist Convention in latter part of the twentieth century. See L. Russ Bush and Tom J. Nettles’ (both of whom were professors at Southwestern at the time of the publication of the first edition) edited volume *Baptists and the Bible* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1980, revised and expanded, 1999), 277-292.

⁴⁴Carroll, *Inspiration of the Bible*, compiled and edited by J.B. Cranfill (Ages Digital Library, 2003), 47.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 12.

W.T. Conner: Doctrinal Pneumatology⁴⁶

In an article chronicling the history of Southern Baptist systematic theology, W. Boyd Hunt said that W.T. Conner's "theological contribution was manifold, but it continues to prove especially significant...perhaps most of all, [in] the doctrine of the Holy Spirit."⁴⁷ This could be in part because he was one of the few Southern Baptists writing systematic theology of any kind during the first part of the twentieth century. However, Boyd's comments definitely speak to the orthodox nature of Conner's pneumatology especially in light of a growing Pentecostal movement in America at the time. As a systematic theologian, Conner's pneumatology is doctrinal in its expression. He sought to answer the "why" and "how" questions relating to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. When one examines Conner's works with an eye for pneumatology, three key distinctives present themselves that serve as a doctrinal help to the student to answer the "why" and "how" of pneumatological relationships: reasons for emphasizing pneumatology, relation of the Spirit to Christ, and the relation of the Spirit to service.⁴⁸

Conner believed that "[t]he doctrine of the Holy Spirit has not been given the attention in treatises on theology that the subject deserves."⁴⁹ As a result, he provides four reasons why he believes pneumatology should be emphasized. The first is driven by the content of Scripture. From the second verse of Genesis to the last chapter of the Apocalypse, Conner explains that throughout the Bible there are "constant references to the presence and working of the divine

⁴⁶Only one scholar, and the third subject of this essay, has attempted to classify Conner's pneumatology. See James Leo Garrett, Jr. "The Theology of Walter Thomas Conner," 225-232, "Walter Thomas Conner," in *Theologians of the Baptist Tradition*, 209, and "Walter Thomas Conner," in *The Legacy of Southwestern*, 37. However, others have described it. Reggie McNeal, for example, referred to Conner's pneumatology as focusing on "the constitutive function in the life of the church" in *Has Our Theology Changed? Southern Baptist Thought Since 1845*, ed. by Paul Basden (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 216.

⁴⁷W. Boyd Hunt, "Southern Baptists and Systematic Theology," in *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 1:2 (Apr 1959): 47. Hunt notes that "The emphasis on the Holy Spirit is in line with Conner's stress on a practical theology" (f.n. 30). James Leo Garrett notes that this was representative of Carroll. He states, "Carroll's influence on Conner was probably greatest in the doctrines of the Holy Spirit and last things," in "W.T. Conner: Contemporary Theologian," in *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 25:2 (Spring 1983): 46.

⁴⁸W.T. Conner approached pneumatology in an organized fashion at least five times in his published works. In *A System of Christian Doctrine* (Nashville: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1924), 229-231, Conner provided a four-fold outline: "Reasons for Emphasizing this Doctrine," "Nature and Personality of the Spirit," "Relation of the Holy Spirit to Jesus Christ," and "The Work of the Spirit in Nature and Grace." In a revised version of this work, *Christian Doctrine* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1937), 106-117, Conner presents a five-fold outline based on the relationship of the Spirit to God, Christ, Salvation, Service, and the Church. In the first of the expanded two volume version of the works on Christian doctrine, *Revelation and God* (Nashville: Broadman, 1936), 284-320, Conner simplified his outline to the earlier four headings: "Reasons for Emphasizing this Doctrine," "The Nature and Personality of the Spirit," "The Relation of the Divine Spirit to Jesus Christ," and "The Work of the Spirit in Nature and Grace." In *The Faith of the New Testament* (Nashville: Broadman, 1940), 361-374; 459-466, Conner looked at the Spirit through the lens of Paul's and John's writings. Similarly, in *The Work of the Holy Spirit* (Nashville: Broadman, 1949), Conner presented a biblical pneumatology beginning with the Old Testament and continuing through to the book of the Apocalypse. In addition, the Holy Spirit is referenced and cited throughout Conner's other works (see "The Idea of the Incarnation in the Gospel of John" [Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1931], Archives, Roberts Library, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas, 117-124), but the predominant sources are sufficient for this essay.

⁴⁹Conner, *Revelation and God*, 285.

Spirit in the world.”⁵⁰ Second, whether Christians realize it or not, the Holy Spirit is “indispensable” for living the Christian life. In his revised systematic theology, Conner states that, “Christianity without the Spirit is not Christianity. It may be an ecclesiastical organization, but organization is not life.... Forms tend to petrify when life is disappearing.”⁵¹ Conner takes this concept further by defining what is and what is not meant in the New Testament by a spiritual life. Third, Conner believes that pneumatology should be studied to correct and discern “perverted” views of the Spirit.⁵² What he has in mind are ideas that equate the work of the Spirit with “highly wrought emotionalism.”⁵³ Finally, he makes an appeal based on the poor examples in history of neglect and misunderstanding of the Spirit. He states that “following the apostolic era, as well as for centuries later..., Christianity was not so much a vital experience of the presence and transforming power of God as it was a system of doctrine or a matter of ecclesiastical conformity.”⁵⁴ The purpose of this appeal is to prevent a similar neglect of pneumatology in the future.

Similar to B.H. Carroll, a key distinctive of Conner’s pneumatology is the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ. Where Carroll focused on the role of the Spirit in Jesus’ baptism, death, and resurrection, Conner emphasizes Christ’s subordination to the Spirit while he was on earth, and then the Spirit’s subordination to Christ after the resurrection. With regard to the former, Conner explains that every action of Jesus’ life and ministry, from His teaching to His miracles, was “under the power of the Spirit.”⁵⁵ With regard to the latter, Conner pictures the work of the glorified Christ as using the Holy Spirit to bring Christians to God the Father. Considering Paul’s pneumatology, Conner states, “[the apostle] speaks of the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ.... He so relates God, Christ, and the Spirit that they cannot be separated.... God is present in and through Christ.... And Christ is present in and through the Spirit.”⁵⁶ Conner brings forth an intriguing role-reversal when comparing the relationship between Christ and the Spirit. It is a reversal that is logical and essential given the change in mission from the Lord Jesus’ ministry on earth, to his ministry in Heaven. The result for the present day, Conner notes, is the Godhead’s clearly defined purpose for the Holy Spirit in bringing people to faith in Christ.⁵⁷

The final distinctive of note is Conner’s treatment of the Holy Spirit’s work in relation to

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid., 286.

⁵²Conner states that “. . . we need to consider this doctrine carefully because it is so easy to pervert the idea of the Spirit,” Ibid., 288.

⁵³Ibid., 288.

⁵⁴Conner, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, 7.

⁵⁵Conner, *Christian Doctrine* (Nashville: Broadman, 1936), 110.

⁵⁶Conner, *The Faith of the New Testament*, 364. See also his comments on Acts, “The relation of this outpouring [Acts 2] of the Spirit to Christ is indicated in the fact that it is the risen Christ who pours out the Spirit on his disciples. The power of the Spirit is not one and that of Christ another. It is the continuing work of Christ that Luke proposes to tell Theophilus about in the second treatise (1:1)... The living Christ works through the Spirit to bring his Kingdom on earth,” in Conner, *Teachings of the New Testament* (Lecture Notes, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1934), 56.

⁵⁷Conner states, “The Spirit’s whole mission, then, is to bring men to know Christ, to trust Him, honor Him and serve Him. Outside of this the Spirit has no mission in man’s religious life,” in “The Relation of the Work of the Holy Spirit to the Person and Work of Christ,” in *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 4 (Jan 1920): 33.

equipping the Christian for service. Conner explains that the Spirit's equipping function is a different work than the function of the Spirit in salvation, but he is quick to qualify, "This is not to say that one may not receive the Spirit in fuller measure subsequent to regeneration; he may and he should. . . . [A]ny subsequent reception of the Spirit is a deeper consecration to Christ and fuller reception of him."⁵⁸ Furthermore, Conner also cautions against seeking "spectacular" displays of the Spirit.⁵⁹ Rather, the Christian should be concerned with the work of God transforming his character, making him more and more like Christ.⁶⁰

Unique to Conner's pneumatology is his discussion of the role of the Holy Spirit in calling Christians into "special forms of work in the church or kingdom."⁶¹ Using the call of Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13 and 16 combined with the letters of Paul, Conner believes that the New Testament affirms "that each member had his place and function assigned by the divine Spirit."⁶²

Stewart A. Newman recounts how the last course Conner was able to teach in his long career, brought to an end by a besetting illness, was a course on the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.⁶³ Had our hypothetical student had the opportunity to study in that class, he would have gained confidence in the necessity of sound pneumatological studies, further instruction in the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ, and instruction in the relationship between the Spirit and Christian service. These key pneumatological distinctives are the doctrinal expressions of a systematic pneumatology that was bound to *answer* most any student's questions surrounding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

James Leo Garrett: Contextual Pneumatology⁶⁴

William Brackney offers a statement of dismay when discussing the structure of James

⁵⁸Conner, *Revelation and God*, 311.

⁵⁹Conner explains, "Men have thought too much of the power of the Holy Spirit in terms of the spectacular and the miraculous. Spiritual power is not spectacular in nature. God is not a spectacular God. Christ was not a spectacular Christ. (Refusing to hurl himself down from temple) Christianity can never conquer by using spectacular methods; it can conquer only in the character-transforming power of the Holy Spirit," in *Revelation and God*, 319.

⁶⁰Conner, *Faith in the New Testament*, 374.

⁶¹Conner, "The Holy Spirit in Missions," in *The Commission* 4 (Apr 1941):100-101.

⁶²Conner, *Revelation and God*, 319-320. Conner clarifies this statement saying that "the Holy Spirit is still to call the preacher or the missionary and to call him to a specific field of labor. . . . [But,] in the New Testament there is no division of Christians into 'clergy' and 'laity'; all are workers as the Spirit assigns to each his labor and gives grace to perform it."

⁶³Newman recounts, "The one class which he taught during the second semester of that year [1948-49] consisted of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He was stricken with a critical illness before the end of that semester and was unable to complete the term's work," *W.T. Conner*, 141-142.

⁶⁴The difficulty in ascertaining Garrett's pneumatology lies at the hands of his preferred theological methodology as will be discussed in this section. He is a descriptive theologian who provides exhaustive and complete pictures of the various views of a particular doctrine, but rarely advances or identifies a particular view for himself. Paul Basden notes that Garrett's "goal is not to present a finely honed thesis and then to argue and prove that thesis, but to let his readers in on an intergenerational discussion of the cardinal truths of Christianity. . . so the readers can make up their own minds," in "James Leo Garrett, Jr." in *The Legacy of Southwestern*, 142-143. This is definitely the case with pneumatology. His only organized treatment of the doctrine is found in his *Systematic Theology: Biblical, Historical, & Evangelical*, 2nd ed., Vol. 2 (North Richland Hills: BIBAL Press, 2001), 133-238.

Leo Garrett's *Systematic Theology*, "There is some disappointment in the new directions Garrett offers. More often than not, after surveying the extant literature on a particular issue, he accepts a predictable position or combines the best of several existing writers."⁶⁵ While Brackney intends this as a critique, it is actually a compliment for this type of doctrinal evaluation. For the purposes of pneumatological investigation (and essentially for any doctrinal topic), Garrett's structure helps provide a much needed historical framework. As a historical theologian, Garrett's pneumatology is contextual in its expression. He is seeking to answer the "where" and "when" questions relating to the person and work of the Holy Spirit. The three key pneumatological distinctives in the work of James Leo Garrett that present themselves and serve as a contextual help to the student to *classify* the "where" and "when" of pneumatology are: pneumatological methodology, relation of the Spirit to the Christian, and the relation of the Spirit to spiritual gifts.⁶⁶

As already introduced, Garrett's first key distinctive for pneumatology is his methodology. In the first of five chapters that address the person and work of the Holy Spirit, Garrett begins with a quote from Frederick William Dillistone on the informality of pneumatology in the Bible. The last portion of that quote reads, "Everything moves within an atmosphere of warm and vital experience, and this fact must never be forgotten when the attempt is made to work out a general account of the Spirit's nature and activity on the basis of Biblical evidence."⁶⁷ Garrett follows with a brief explanation, "Dillistone's denial of any creedal confession respecting the Holy Spirit...should not be taken to mean that in later centuries Christians did not formalize such. But the experience of the Spirit must necessarily be recognized as also having had a powerful impact upon the doctrine of the Spirit during later centuries."⁶⁸ This introductory interaction serves as an example of Garrett's preferred methodology. While he quotes a source, and comments on the quote, the reader is still left to determine what it is that Garrett believes about the nature and importance of the experience of the Spirit versus formalized pneumatological expressions. Garrett has perfected the ability to state an issue in such an objective fashion, that he almost removes his views entirely from the project.

What follows in Garrett's section on pneumatology is a brief history (with exhaustive bibliography) of how theologians have treated the doctrine of the Holy Spirit from four main Christian traditions. This provides the student with a context for the study of the Holy Spirit before engaging the various views and interpretations of the doctrine. Next is a discussion on the three primary methods theologians have used to organize the study of pneumatology. Some have approached it canonically, citing every occurrence of the Holy Spirit in each book of the Bible. Others have pursued a chronological approach, tracing the doctrine throughout the history of the church. Garrett's method of preference is systematic, in that it examines "the Holy Spirit's

⁶⁵Brackney, *A Genetic History of Baptist Thought*, 427.

⁶⁶Glimpses of Conner's chosen methodology in the 1937 version of *Christian Doctrine* show their influence as Garrett employs a five-fold classification referencing the Spirit's relationships to God, Jesus Christ, the Christian, the Church, and Spiritual Gifts. As with any systematic treatment of theology, however, the Holy Spirit is referenced and cited by Garrett throughout the two-volume work as well as in various journal articles a portion of which are quoted in this essay.

⁶⁷Frederick William Dillistone, "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," *Theology Today* (January 1947): 486 as quoted in Garrett, *Systematic Theology*, 133.

⁶⁸Garrett, *Systematic Theology*, 133.

relation to God, to Jesus Christ, to the Christian, to the church, and to spiritual gifts.”⁶⁹

The second key pneumatological distinctive that surfaces for the purpose of this essay is Garrett’s treatment of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Christian. This is significant because of Garrett’s unique historical treatment. While covering the “commencement, course, and consummation”⁷⁰ of the work of the Spirit in the life of the individual Christian, the majority of the discussion concerns the confusion over the interpretation of the baptism in or with the Holy Spirit.⁷¹ Characteristically, Garrett presents a through treatment that chronicles the views of “Pentecostals or Neo-Pentecostals,” “Roman Catholics or Anglo-Catholics,” and “Non-Pentecostal Protestants.” Garrett quietly sides with the non-Pentecostal Protestants who see this baptism as equivalent to “spiritual birth...but apart from any subsequent baptism in or with the Spirit as evidence by speaking in tongues.”⁷²

The final key distinctive for Garrett occurs in his treatment on spiritual gifts. Again, it is not that his conclusions are necessarily unique, but that his contextual method is profoundly helpful and, in this instance, rare as he notes that, “Until the 1960s Protestant theologians could write major monographs on the Holy Spirit without specific or detailed treatment of spiritual gifts.”⁷³ Here, Garrett categorizes the biblical data that can be assembled to refer to the *charismata*,⁷⁴ and then reviews briefly the understanding of spiritual gifts prior to and after the start of the twentieth century. This is followed by a focused analysis of the gifts of “tongue-speaking” and “prophecy.”

With regard to tongues-speaking, or glossolalia, Garrett focuses his discussion on the textual concern of the proper relationship between the tongues occurrence in Acts 2 and Paul’s teaching on tongues in 1 Corinthians 14. He provides seven possible proposals for understanding Acts 2 and rejects all but three.⁷⁵ Garrett sees as viable either (1) that the Acts 2 tongues were “intelligible foreign languages,”⁷⁶ or (2) that the Acts 2 event is the same “glossolalia that Paul mentioned in 1 Cor. 12-14,”⁷⁷ or (3) that these tongues were “intelligible utterance, either ‘mysterious’ languages...or understandable language.”⁷⁸ Garrett then examines three

⁶⁹Ibid., 139.

⁷⁰Ibid., 177.

⁷¹Ibid., 180-185. This represents almost one-third of the entire chapter on the Spirit and the Christian.

⁷²Ibid., 182. Elsewhere Garrett affirms that “If Baptists refuse to give a place to the Holy Spirit in life and worship, then we are wrong. But to say we have neglected the Holy Spirit is not to say that we make the teaching of the baptism in or with the Holy Spirit absolutely true as given by the Pentecostals,” in “Are signs and wonders still valid for today?” *Baptist Standard*, July 21, 1999.

⁷³Garrett, *Systematic Theology*, 215.

⁷⁴Ibid., 216. Garrett makes a distinction between this term for spiritual gifts, and *dorean*, which refers to the “gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed on and common to all Christians.” Also, he states that “Four lists of spiritual gifts as given by Paul and one brief list by Peter have been identified.” [1 Cor 12:8-10; 1 Cor 12:28-30; Rom 12:6-8; Eph 4:11; 1 Pet 4:10-11] “There is an overlapping of certain of [sic] gifts, but the lists are far from being identical. . . These lists should not be taken as exhaustive or complete,” 216-218.

⁷⁵Ibid., 229. Garrett presents seven views, and only the “first, sixth, and seventh interpretations are of major importance in any effort to correlate Acts 2:4b and 1 Cor. 12-14.”

⁷⁶Ibid., 227.

⁷⁷Ibid., 228.

⁷⁸Ibid.

possibilities for understanding how the Acts 2 event relates to 1 Corinthians 14. He states that either (1) “the two phenomena are radically or markedly different,”⁷⁹ or (2) they are “very similar, if not indeed identical,”⁸⁰ or (3) they are different, “but that both passages bear witness to valid workings of the Holy Spirit.”⁸¹

Garrett concludes the section on tongues with a list of eight suggestions as to how one who does not speak in tongues might respond to the contemporary claim by some that tongues-speaking is required evidence of one’s baptism in the Holy Spirit. However, as specific as some of these suggestions are, the reader cannot conclude which ones if any Garrett advocates or believes is accurate or necessary. In consistent fashion, Garrett supplies the reader with all the views while at the same time choosing not to advance a particular or personal conclusion. The great service he provides as a descriptive theologian ends at the line of classifying the various perspectives and he does not venture to reveal his personal preferences. It is almost as if he believes he would do the student a disservice to cloud the discussion with the advancement of his view.⁸²

Paul Basden writes of Garrett, “Who knows how many young seminarians had their minds broadened...or received flashes of inspiration” as the result of Garrett’s influence over the last fifty years of the twentieth century?⁸³ Had our hypothetical student studied with James Leo Garrett, the student would have been challenged by Garrett’s thorough and helpful methodology, found encouragement in the historical testimony of the understanding of the Spirit’s work in the life of a Christian, and received clarification on the complex debate regarding the role of spiritual gifts. These key pneumatological distinctives are the contextual expressions of a historical pneumatology that could only serve to *classify* a student’s lack of knowledge and confusion surrounding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

The Power in the Seminary Revisited

Proponents of the Third Wave movement at Fuller Seminary in the late twentieth century fostered instability with regard to the teaching of the Holy Spirit in an effort to experience true spiritual “power in the seminary.” By contrast, this survey has shown that Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, throughout the entire twentieth century, maintained and consistently equipped students in the area of pneumatology so that a course correction fueled by a change in one’s experience or frustration over one’s ignorance was not necessary to establish the power of the Spirit’s presence. Where Fuller Seminary was tossed back and forth by the waves of doctrinal instability, Southwestern sailed steadily among the calm seas of doctrinal stability.

⁷⁹Ibid., 229.

⁸⁰Ibid., 230.

⁸¹Ibid., 231.

⁸²For example, Garrett suggests, “[Non-tongues-speakers] should refrain from efforts to exclude or disfellowship those who exercise tongues-speaking within the Pauline perimeters,” *ibid.*, 234. But the footnote attached to the end of that statement reveals that he is referencing examples of such and not making a declarative statement of opinion. To say that James Leo Garrett believes this, while it may or may not actually be the case, can not be gathered or proved from this written work. This is the point of his methodology. Garrett’s ideal of a historical theologian refrains from such intrusions.

⁸³Paul A. Basden, “James Leo Garrett, Jr.” in *Theologians of the Baptist Tradition*, 298.

As the primary writing theologian during Southwestern's Founding Years, B.H. Carroll taught a practical pneumatology that helped students with the basics of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Taking Carroll's mantle and adding his own emphases, W.T. Conner taught a doctrinal pneumatology that provided students with clear answers to matters of pneumatological confusion during the Southwestern's Formative Years. As heir to the legacy of Conner, James Leo Garrett carried forth with a contextual pneumatology that brought a healthy classification for the student's historical foundation during Southwestern's Flourishing Years. Together, these three writing theologians ensured that a classical biblical understanding of the Spirit has always been powerfully present in the Seminary.

Jason G. Duesing

**PhD Candidate – Historical Theology &
Baptist Studies
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary**

