

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

## ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

### XIII. THE HOLY SPIRIT.

IN no subject connected with Paulinism is it more necessary to be on our guard against a purely speculative or theoretic treatment than in that of the Holy Spirit. On this solemn theme above all the apostle's utterances are the echoes of a living experience, not the lucubrations of a scholastic theologian. The great question for him was not, what the Holy Spirit is, but what He does in the soul of a believing man; and to be faithful interpreters of his mind, we must follow the guidance of the same religious interest. In the light of this consideration one can see the objection which lies against allowing the discussion of the present topic to be dominated, as it is in some recent monographs, by the antithesis between spirit and flesh. It is true that this is a very prominent Pauline antithesis, and it is also true that handling the locus of the Holy Spirit in connection therewith need not lead us away from the practical, inasmuch as the antithesis, as presented in the Pauline literature, signifies that the Holy Spirit is the antagonist and conqueror of the flesh as the seat of sin. But all antitheses tend to provoke the intellectual impulse to abstract definition, and this one in particular readily raises questions as to what spirit is and what flesh is, and draws us into abstruse discussions as to what ideas are represented by the terms, and what theory of the universe underlies their use.

No such objection can be taken to the place here assigned to the doctrine of the Spirit as a topic coming under the general head of the Pauline Apologetic, and more parti-

cularly under that part of it which has for its aim the reconciliation of the Pauline Gospel with ethical interests. For this setting of the doctrine not only allows but compels us to give prominence to that which forms the distinctive contribution of St. Paul to the New Testament teaching on the subject, the great and fruitful thought that the Holy Spirit is the ground and source of Christian sanctity—a commonplace now, but by no means a commonplace when he wrote his epistles. Only one drawback is to be dreaded. The position of the doctrine of the Spirit's work in the Pauline Apologetic rather than in the heart of the Pauline Gospel might create in ill-informed minds an erroneous impression as to its importance, as if it were an afterthought to meet a difficulty, instead of being, as it is, a central truth of the system.

That the Divine Spirit was present in the community of believers, revealing there His mighty power, was no discovery of the Apostle Paul's. The fact was patent to all. By all accounts the primitive church was the scene of remarkable phenomena which arrested general attention, and bore witness to the operation of a cause of a very unusual character to which beholders gave the name of the Holy Ghost. The Pauline Epistles,<sup>1</sup> the Epistle to the Hebrews,<sup>2</sup> and the *Acts of the Apostles*, all refer to these phenomena in terms which show what a large place they held in the consciousness of believers. Among the manifestations of the Spirit's influence the most common and the most striking appears to have been *speaking with tongues*. The nature of this phenomenon has been a subject of discussion, chiefly on account of the difficulty of reconciling the narrative in *Acts* ii. with the statements of St. Paul in his first Epistle to the Corinthians. But following him, our most reliable authority, we arrive at the conclusion that the gift

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* especially 1 *Cor.* xii. and xiv.

<sup>2</sup> *Vide Heb.* vi. 4, 5.

consisted in ecstatic utterance, not necessarily in the words of any recognised language, and not usually intelligible to hearers. "He that speaketh in a tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God."<sup>1</sup> The speaker was not master of himself; he was carried headlong, as if driven by a mighty wind; he was subject to strong emotion which must find vent somehow, but which could not be made to run in any accustomed channel. To the onlooker the state would present the aspect of a possession overmastering the reason and the will.

It was in phenomena of this sort, preternatural effects of some great power, that the first Christians saw the hand of God. The miraculousness of the phenomena was what they laid stress on. The more unusual, and out of the ordinary course, the more divine. In accordance with this view the Spirit's work was conceived of as transcendent, miraculous, and charismatic. The power of the Holy Ghost was a power coming from without, producing extraordinary effects that could arrest the attention even of a profane eye—perceptible to a Simon Magus, *e.g.*,<sup>2</sup> communicating charisms, technically called "spiritual," but not ethical in nature; rather consisting in the power to do things marvellous and create astonishment in vulgar minds. The fact that so crude an idea prevailed in the Apostolic Church bears convincing testimony to the prominence of the preternatural element in the experience of that early time. And of course that prominence had for its natural consequence a very partial one-sided view of the office of the Holy Spirit. His renewing, sanctifying function seems to have been left very much in the background. He was thought of as the author not of grace (*χάρις*) as we understand the term, but of charisms (*χαρίσματα*), and "spiritual" in the vocabulary of the period was an attribute ascribed to the effects of a spirit of *power*, not to those of a spirit of *holiness*. This statement is

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Acts viii. 18.

warranted by some narratives of Apostolic Church history in the book of Acts, in which the communication of the Holy Ghost is represented as following, not preceding, the believing reception of the Gospel. So *e.g.* in the account of the evangelistic movement in Samaria.<sup>1</sup> It was after the Samaritans had received the word of God that Peter and John, commissioned by the Apostles in Jerusalem, went down and prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. It is indeed expressly stated, as a reason for the prayer, that "as yet He was fallen upon none of them; only they had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus." And to what effect they received the Holy Ghost in answer to prayer may be inferred from the fact that the result was immediately obvious to Simon the Sorcerer. They must have begun to speak with tongues and to prophesy, as happened in the case of the disciples at Ephesus, who had lived in ignorance of the gift of the Spirit till St. Paul came and laid his hands on them.<sup>2</sup> In these naive records, which have every appearance of being a faithful reflection of the spirit of the early Jewish Church, faith, conversion, is not thought of as a work of the Spirit, but rather as the precursor to His peculiar operations, which in turn are regarded as a seal set by God upon faith. We are not to suppose that any one meant deliberately to exclude the Holy Ghost from the properly spiritual sphere, and to confine His agency to the charismatic region. That the author of *Acts* had no such thought may be gathered from the fact that he ascribed Lydia's openness of mind to the Gospel to Divine influence.<sup>3</sup> Possibly, if the matter had been plainly put before them, all the members of the Apostolic Church would have acknowledged that the Holy Spirit was the source of faith, hope and love, as well as of tongues, and prophesyings, and miraculous healings. Only the latter phenomena appeared the more remarkable, and the former appeared a matter of

<sup>1</sup> *Acts* viii. 14-24.

<sup>2</sup> *Acts* xix. 1-7.

<sup>3</sup> *Acts* xvi. 14.

course ; whence it resulted that the gift of the Holy Spirit came in ordinary dialect to mean, not the power to believe, hope and love, but the power to speak ecstasically, and to prophesy enthusiastically, and to heal the sick by a word of prayer.

Very natural then and always ; for the same tendency exists now to prefer the charismatic to the spiritual, and to think more highly of the occasional stormy wind of preternatural might than of the still constant air of divine influence. But the tendency has its dangers. What if these marvellous gifts become divorced from reason and conscience, and the inspired one degenerate into something very like a madman ; or, still worse, present the unseemly spectacle of high religious excitement combined with sensual impulses and low morality ? Why then there will be urgent need for revision of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and for considering whether it be wise to lay so much stress on charisms, as distinct from graces, in our estimate of His influence. This was probably one of the causes which led St. Paul to study carefully the whole subject. For the possibilities above pointed out were not long of presenting themselves as sorrowful realities. Ananias and Sapphiras and Simons,—the whole fraternity of people who can be religious and at the same time false, greedy, sensual, bending like reeds before the swollen stream in a time of enthusiasm without radical change of heart,—soon began to swarm. They appeared everywhere, tares among the wheat of the kingdom ; they were unusually abundant in the Corinthian Church, where everybody could speak in one way or another, and virtue was at a discount,—a church mostly gone to tongue. Phenomena of this sort, familiar to him from the beginning of his Christian career, would set the apostle on musing, with the result of a deepened insight into the nature, scope and great aim of the Spirit's function among those who believed in Jesus.

These phenomena would give a thoughtful man food for reflection in a direction not yet indicated. They showed very clearly that Christian sanctity was by no means so much a matter of course as antecedent to experience many might be inclined to suppose. At first it was thought that the great thing was to get the charisms, and that the graces might be left to look after themselves. But when men arose who could prophesy in Christ's name, and by His name cast out devils, and do many other wonderful works, and yet remain bad in heart and in life,<sup>1</sup> then the wise would begin to see that Christian goodness was the important thing, and also the most difficult, and that the Holy Ghost's influence was more urgently needed as an aid against the baser nature of man than as a source of showy gifts of doubtful utility.

In some such way we may conceive the Apostle Paul to have arrived at his distinctive view of the Holy Spirit, according to which the Spirit's function is before all things to help the Christian to be holy. At all events, however he reached it, this undoubtedly is his view. By this statement it is not intended to suggest that the apostle broke entirely away from the earlier charismatic theory. He not only did not doubt or deny, he earnestly believed in the reality of the miraculous charisms. He even sympathised with the view that in their miraculousness lay the proof that the power of God was at work. He probably carried this supernaturalism into the ethical sphere, and saw in Christian holiness a work of the Divine Spirit because for him it was the greatest of all miracles that a poor sinful man was enabled to be holy. This may have been the link of connection between his theory of the Spirit's influence and that of the primitive Jewish Church; the common element in both theories being the axiom that the supernatural is divine, the element peculiar to his that the moral

<sup>1</sup> *Matt.* vii. 22.

miracle of a renewed man is the greatest and most important of all. But while giving the moral miracle the first place, he did not altogether despise the charismatic miracle. He criticised the relative phenomena, as one aware that they were in danger of running wild, and that they very much needed to be brought under the control of the great law of edification.<sup>1</sup> But he criticised in an ethical interest, not with any aversion to the supernatural. His criticism doubtless tended to throw the charisms into the shade and even to bring about their ultimate disappearance. But there is nothing in his letters to justify the assertion that he desired their discontinuance, or deliberately worked for it. Even his supreme concern for edification would not lead him to adopt such a policy. For the charisms were not necessarily or invariably non-edifying. The power to heal<sup>2</sup> could not be exercised without contributing to the common benefit. Even speaking with tongues might occasionally be edifying, as when one here and there in an assembly cried out ecstatically: "Abba Father," or uttered groans expressive of feelings that could not be embodied in articulate language.<sup>3</sup> The one phenomenon, even if it stood alone without any added prayer, was a witness of the Divine Spirit to the sonship of the believer. It was but a child's cry, uttered in helpless weakness, but the greater the helplessness the more conclusive the witness; for who could teach the spiritual babe to utter such an exclamation but the Spirit of its Heavenly Father? The other phenomenon was but a speechless sound, a groan *de profundis*, but then it was a groan of the Holy Ghost, and as such revealed His unspeakably comforting sympathy with the

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 26; πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 9; ἄλλω δὲ χάρισμα λαμάτων.

<sup>3</sup> Gunkel (*Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, p. 67), suggests that both these phenomena belong to the category of "Glossolalie." It is one of many fruitful fresh suggestions to be found in this book to which I gladly acknowledge my obligations.



sighing of the whole creation, and of the body of believers in Jesus, for the advent of the new redeemed world.

Yet withal the apostle believed that there were better things than charisms, and a better way than to covet them as the *summum bonum*. It was better, he held, to love than to prophesy or to speak with tongues, and to help a man to love a more worthy function of the Spirit than to bestow on him all the charisms. For in the charity extolled in 1 *Corinthians* xiii. he did recognise an effect of the Divine activity, as we learn from the Epistle to the Galatians, where ἀγάπη heads the list in the catalogue of the fruit of the Spirit.<sup>1</sup> What an immense step onwards in the moral education of the world this doctrine that love and kindred graces are the best evidence that a man is under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and that only they who love deserve to be called *spiritual*! In the Epistle to the Galatians love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and self-control are set in antithesis to the works of the flesh, as the proper fruit of the Spirit. It is an instructive contrast; but even more significant, because more unexpected, is it to find the apostle in effect setting these virtues in contrast to the charisms, and saying to the church of his time "the true proper fruit of the Spirit is not the gift of healing, or of working miracles, or of speaking with tongues, or of interpreting tongues; it is love that suffereth long and is kind, that envieth not, and boasteth not; that beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things."<sup>2</sup> No one possessing ordinary moral discernment can mistake the works of the flesh for the fruit of the Spirit, though here also mistakes are possible even in the case of religious men who confound their own private resentments with zeal for the glory of God. But how easy to imagine oneself a spiritual, spirit-possessed man, because one has prophesied, and cast

<sup>1</sup> *Gal.* v. 22.

<sup>2</sup> 1 *Cor.* xiii. 4-7.

out devils in Christ's name; and how hard on such a self-deceived one the stern repudiation of the Lord, "I know you not," and the withering contempt expressed in the words of His apostle: "if a man thinketh himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself."<sup>1</sup>

Divine action, when transcendent and miraculous, is intermittent. The speaker in a tongue does not always speak ecstatically, but only when the Power from on high lays hold on him. In the case of the charisms it does not greatly matter. But in the case of the graces it is otherwise. Here intermittent action of the Spirit means failure, for a man cannot be said to be sanctified unless there be formed in him fixed habitudes of grace manifesting themselves with something like the regularity of a law of nature. But where the action of the Spirit is intermittent there can be no habits or abiding states, but only occasional elevations into the third heaven of devout thought and holy emotion, followed by lapses to the lower levels in which unassisted human nature is at home. We can see what is involved by reference to the case of those who cried in ecstatic moods: *Abba ó πατήρ*. While they were in the mood they realized that God was their Father, that they were His sons. But the filial consciousness was not established in their hearts; when the transcendent influence out of which they spoke for the moment passed away, they sank down from the filial spirit to the legal, from trust to fear. To eliminate this fitfulness, and secure stable spiritual character, transcendency must give place to immanence, and preternatural action to action in accordance with spiritual law. The Divine Spirit must cease to be above and outside, and take up His abode in our hearts, and His influence from being purely mysterious and magical must be exerted through the powers and in accordance with the nature of the human soul. Without pretending that the

<sup>1</sup> *Gal.* vi. 3.

apostle anticipated the modern doctrine of Divine immanence it must be said that an indwelling of the Holy Spirit in man finds distinct recognition in his pages. He represents the Christian man as a temple in which the Spirit of God has His abode.<sup>1</sup> Even the body of a believer he conceives of under that august figure; as if the Divine Spirit had entered into as intimate a connection with his material organism as that which the soul sustains to the body.<sup>2</sup> And from that indwelling he expects not only the sanctification of the inner spiritual nature, but the endowment of the mortal body with unending life.<sup>3</sup> The idea of the believing man as the temple of the Spirit is introduced by the apostle as a motive for self-sanctification, as if out of respect for our august Tenant. But the same idea may be held to teach by implication the unintermitting, sanctifying influence of the immanent Spirit, whose constant concern it must be to keep His chosen abode worthy of Himself. His honour is no wise compromised by withholding for a season or permanently from any believer charismatic power. The withdrawal may even be an index of spiritual advance from the crudity of an incipient religious enthusiasm to the calm of self-control. But the temple of God cannot be defiled by sin without injury to His good Name, therefore for His own sake He is concerned to be constantly active in keeping the sanctuary holy.

The immanency of the Holy Spirit carries further along with it, as has been stated, that His influence as a sanctifier is exerted in accordance with the laws of a rational nature. His instrument must be truth fitted, if believed, to tell upon the conscience and the heart. This fact also finds occasional, though not very elaborate, recognition in the Pauline epistles. It is broadly indicated in the text in which the apostle tells the Thessalonians that God had chosen them unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. viii. 11.

and belief of the truth.<sup>1</sup> From this text the fair inference is that the Spirit sanctifies through Christian truth believed. We naturally expect to find useful hints on this topic in the epistles written to the Church in which the charismatic action of the Spirit was specially conspicuous, and in which at the same time there was a great need for sanctification. And we are not disappointed. And it is noteworthy that the hints we do find connect sanctification closely with Christ. "Sanctified in Christ Jesus,"<sup>2</sup> "Sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,"<sup>3</sup> "Christ made unto us sanctification."<sup>4</sup> The idea suggested in the second of these phrases may be that by the very name he bears the Christian is consecrated to God. But this ideal sanctification is of value only on account of the real sanctification of which it is the earnest. And the other two phrases teach that the material conditions of such sanctification are provided in Christ as an object of knowledge and faith. Christ fully taken advantage of in these ways will completely insure our sanctification. The Spirit dwelling in the heart sanctifies through Christ dwelling in the heart by faith, and by *thought* in order to faith. Hence it comes that the spirit and Christ are sometimes identified, as in the sentence "the Lord is the spirit,"<sup>5</sup> and the expression "the Lord the Spirit."<sup>6</sup> As a matter of subjective experience the two indwellings cannot be distinguished; to consciousness they are one. The Spirit is the *alter ego* of the Lord.

The truth as it is in Jesus, the idea of Christ, is the Spirit's instrument in sanctification. And whence do we get our idea of Christ? Surely from the earthly history of our Lord! It has been supposed that the apostle means to cast a slight on that history as of little value to faith when he says, "Even though we have known Christ after

<sup>1</sup> 2 *Thess.* ii. 13.<sup>2</sup> 1 *Cor.* i. 2.<sup>3</sup> 1 *Cor.* vi. 11.<sup>4</sup> 1 *Cor.* i. 29.<sup>5</sup> 2 *Cor.* iii. 17.<sup>6</sup> 2 *Cor.* iii. 18.

the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more." <sup>1</sup> But what he here says, like much else in his principal epistles, must be looked at in the light of his controversy with the Judaists. His opponents attached great importance to mere external companionship with Jesus, and because he had not, like the eleven, enjoyed the privilege of such companionship, they called in question his right to be an apostle. His reply to this in effect was that not outside acquaintance, but insight was what qualified for apostleship. The reply implies that the former may exist without the latter, which from familiar experience we know to be true. How ignorant oftentimes are a man's own relations of his inmost spirit! What is the value of any knowledge which is lacking in this respect? Knowledge of a man does not mean knowing his clothes, his features, his social position. I do not know a man because I know him to be a man of wealth who resides in a spacious dwelling, and is surrounded with many comforts, and adorned with many honours. Some are very ambitious to know a person of whom these things are true, and they would cease to know him if he were deprived of these advantages. This is to know a man after the flesh in Pauline phrase, and if the man so known be a man of moral discernment as well as of means and position, he will heartily despise such snobbish acquaintances who are friends of his good fortune rather than of himself. Somewhat similar was the apostle's feeling in regard to the stress laid by the Judaists on acquaintance with Jesus after the manner of those who were with Him during the years of His public ministry. To cast a slight on the words and acts spoken and done in that ministry, and on the revelation of character made thereby, was not, I imagine, in all his thoughts.

Of systematic absolute neglect of the history of Jesus the apostle cannot be charged in view of the importance he

<sup>1</sup> 2 Cor. v. 16.

attaches to one event therein, the crucifixion, and that in connection with the work of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit he represents as shedding abroad in our hearts the love of God as manifested in the death of Christ,<sup>1</sup> overwhelming us, as it were, with a sense of its grandeur and graciousness, and so materially contributing to our sanctification through the strong hope it inspires and the consciousness of obligation it creates. One fails to see why every other event and aspect of Christ's earthly life should not be made to contribute its quota towards the same great end, and the whole evangelic story turned into motive power for sanctification. It is quite true that St. Paul has not done this, and that he has restricted his attention very much to the death and resurrection. But that is no reason why we should draw our idea of the Christ by whose indwelling we are to be sanctified exclusively from these two events. The fuller and more many-sided our idea the better, the more healthy the resulting type of Christian piety. The entire gospel story is needed and useful. To those who believe in an inspired New Testament no other proof of this statement should be necessary than the simple fact that the gospels are there. The Gospels say little about the Spirit, at least the Synoptical Gospels, but they supply the data with which the Spirit works. The Pauline Epistles say much about the Spirit and His work, but comparatively little about His tools. Gospels and Epistles must be taken together if we wish to construct a full wholesome doctrine of sanctification. No good can ultimately come to Christian piety from treating the evangelic history as a scaffolding which may be removed after the edifice of faith in a risen Lord has been completed. Antæus-like faith retains its strength by keeping in touch with the ground of history. The mystic's reliance on immediate influence emanating from the ascended Christ, or from the Holy Spirit at His

<sup>1</sup> *Rom.* v. 5 ; cf. v. 8.

behest, without reference to the Jesus that lived in Palestine, exposes to all the dangers connected with vague raptures, lawless fancies, and spiritual pride. That the Divine Logos, or the Eternal Spirit of truth and goodness, can and does work on the human mind outside Christendom is most certainly to be believed. But that fact is no valid reason why endeavours should not be made to propagate Christianity among the heathen by missionary agencies, still less why there need have been no historical Christianity to propagate. In like manner it may be affirmed that, while it may be possible for the Divine Spirit in a transcendental way to exert an influence on Christians without the aid of the "Word," the results of such action are not likely to be of a kind to compensate for the loss of knowledge of the historical Christ. It is true indeed that the historicity of the Gospels may be more or less open to question. In so far as that is the case, it is our loss. The cloud of uncertainty enveloping the life of Jesus is matter of regret, not a thing to be taken with philosophical indifference as if it were of no practical consequence.

An apology is needed for making these observations, which to men of sober judgment will appear self-evident, but some present-day tendencies must be my excuse. And it is not irrelevant to offer such remarks in connection with the Pauline doctrine of the Spirit and the circumstances amidst which it was formulated. There can be little doubt that the religious enthusiasm of the apostolic age tended to breed indifference to the historical Christ. What need of history to men who were bearers of the Spirit, and were in daily receipt of revelations? I should be sorry to believe that the apostle sympathised with this tendency, though some have supposed that he did.<sup>1</sup> Be that as it may, what

<sup>1</sup> On this point Gloël (*Der Heilige Geist*, 173) remarks: "Paul is far removed from an enthusiastic subjectivism which consoles itself with personal experiences, but loses out of sight the historical foundations of the faith."

is certain is that the tendency was unwholesome. It was well that it had not the field altogether to itself, and that in spite of it the memory of Jesus was lovingly preserved. That memory saved Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

To rescue the name of St. Paul from being used as an authority for contempt of the historical, it may be well to cite another text in which he connects the work of the Spirit with the example of Christ. In *Galatians* vi. 1, he exhorts to considerate gentle treatment of such as have been overtaken in a fault. The exhortation is addressed to the *πνευματικοί*, *i.e.* those who are supposed to be specially filled with the Spirit, as if they were in danger of assuming a tone of severity, and so of reviving in the Church under a new Christian guise, the Pharisaic type of character. Forbearing conduct towards offenders is then enforced by the consideration, that it is in accordance with "the law of Christ." No facts are specified to justify the title, but the reference is evidently to a manner of action on the part of Jesus with which it was possible for the Galatians to make themselves acquainted through available sources of information. Christ's endurance of death on the Cross was the most signal instance of His bearing the burdens of others; but there is no reason for limiting the reference to it. The apostle doubtless writes as one familiar with the fact that Jesus detested the inhumanity of the Pharisees as represented in the behaviour of the elder brother of the parable, and in contrast to them pitied straying sheep and prodigal sons. In effect he sets before the Galatians as their model the Jesus of the Gospels, at once in His

<sup>1</sup> Gunkel says: "Not a pneumatic speculation like that of Paul, which offered no security that Christianity should keep in the tracks of the historically given Gospel, but the infinitely imposing impression of the historical Christ has brought about that Christianity has not lost its historical character. The memory of Jesus has in this respect paralysed the pneumatic phenomena of the apostolic age and survived them for more than a millennium." (*Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, p. 61.)



sympathies with the sinful, and in his antipathies towards the character of spurious saints, who, while boasting many virtues, lacked the cardinal grace of charity. The true *πνευματικός*, therefore, in his view is the man before whose conscience the enlightening Spirit of truth keeps the Christlike ethical ideal as an object of ardent admiration and earnest pursuit. If this be indeed the way the Spirit takes to make the Christian holy, then it cannot be doubted that His influence makes for real sanctity. His power may seem small, its very existence as something distinct from our personal effort may appear questionable—all immanent Divine action is liable to this doubt—but at all events it works in the right direction. In view of the extent to which the gracious spirit of Jesus has grown in the community, and of the deepened sense of responsibility for the welfare of others visible on all sides in our time, why should we have difficulty in believing that the power of the Holy Ghost is as mighty as it is beneficent? At last the Spirit of Truth has come to show us what Jesus was, and what true religion is: to teach us that orthodox faith by itself is nothing, and that Christlike love is all in all.

It cannot be said that the apostle has laid undue stress on the work of the Spirit in his Apologetic, as if taking refuge in a supernatural Power in absence of any other adequate guarantee in his system for holy living. It may be asked, Why should the Divine Spirit be available for the enlightenment or renewal of Christians exclusively, or even more than for that of other men? The reply must be, in the first place, that neither in the Pauline epistles, nor anywhere else in the New Testament, is it said or assumed that the Holy Spirit's presence is confined to Christendom. The underlying postulate rather is that the Spirit of God, like God Himself, is everywhere, even in the inanimate creation, working towards the birth of a new world wherein dwelleth righteousness. He is the atmosphere of

the moral world ready to enter into every human heart wherever He finds an opening. If therefore He is in the Christian world more than in other parts of humanity, it must be because He finds there a more abundant entrance. And that, again, must be due to the intrinsic and superior excellence of the Christian Faith. The Spirit of God is a sanctifier in Christendom more than elsewhere because He there has at command the best material for His purpose.<sup>1</sup>

A. B. BRUCE.

### AGRAPHA.

#### SAYINGS OF OUR LORD NOT RECORDED IN THE GOSPELS.

#### II.

A NEW interest has been given to this subject quite recently by a collection which has been published by Professor Margoliouth of the sayings attributed to Christ by Mohammedan writers.<sup>2</sup> The collection is interesting to Christians because it shows how much more frequent the appeal of Mohammedans to the authority of our Lord is than we had known, and so supplies a fresh hope of approximation in future years. But yet the general type of these sayings is strangely unlike the type of the Lord's teaching in the Gospels, and also the type of the non-canonical sayings retained in Christian tradition. Forty-eight of them are quoted, of which by far the greater number contain wise, shrewd, kindly advice, such as finds its analogy in the sayings of the Jewish Fathers rather than in the Gospels. They are the utterances of a teacher of knowledge rather

<sup>1</sup> The question how far St. Paul recognised a law of growth in sanctification will be considered in another connection.

<sup>2</sup> *The Expository Times*, November and December, 1893; January, 1894. "Christ in Islam."