

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>

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Four Lectures

by

*Members of the Staff
of Wesley College, Headingley*

★

THE EPWORTH PRESS

(EDGAR C. BARTON)

25-35 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1

All Rights Reserved
First Published in 1937

Made in Great Britain

PREFACE

THE FOLLOWING LECTURES were given by the members of the Staff of Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds, on successive days from June 8 to June 11, 1937, to the students of the College and to a number of Methodist ministers of the Leeds District. Each Lecture was followed by questions and discussion, and, in view of the interest created, it has been thought well to publish the four manuscripts in the hope that they may prove to be of use to a wider circle of readers. The Lectures are published substantially as they were delivered. Although prepared independently, they form, we believe, a unity in which the biblical foundations of the doctrine, its history in the life and thought of the Church, and its theological implications are successively set forth in outline.

I

THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN JEWISH
THOUGHT

by

NORMAN H. SNAITH, M.A.

I

THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN JEWISH THOUGHT

(a) *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, spirit [*ruach*] is fundamentally an activity of God. The word 'activity' is used designedly, and in preference to such words as 'characteristic' and 'attribute'. The God of the Old Testament is not 'One Who Is', so much as 'One Who Does', and the essential activeness of God is nowhere more clear than in this idea of the Spirit of the Lord [*ruach-adonai*]. The *ruach-adonai* is the manifestation in human experience of the life-giving, energy-creating power of God. Almost without exception, it is His power in and through the lives of men. Because of it, men are able to do those things which, of themselves and in their own strength, they are incapable of doing. The exceptions, the rare occasions when the *ruach-adonai* is spoken of apart from its action definitely in and through the lives of men, together with all those instances where the word *ruach* is used of men in what we, with our modern categories, would call a psycholog-

ical sense, are to be explained either on the basis of the equation of breath and life, or by the association of the spirit and the wind. In any case, the association of *ruach* with life and power is firm and universal; and so also is the assumption that both life and power have their home in God, and always they belong to Him. The *ruach-adonai* is a gift to man direct from God. The *ruach* of man, whether used of his actual breath, of his stronger, more violent emotions, or even of his 'soul', is also of God. No man of himself has *ruach*, but only as it descends upon him from God, or is implanted in him by God. It comes to man from above, from outside.

I. THE 'RUACH-ADONAI' IS THE POWER OF GOD IN AND THROUGH THE LIVES OF MEN

The *ruach-adonai* is that power of God, descending upon men, by which they are enabled to do that which, in ordinary circumstances, is impossible. It is doubtful to what extent it is correct even to say 'they are enabled'. Rather it is God who works. This is always implicit, and is sometimes stated explicitly. It was not, for instance, Othniel son of Kenaz who saved Israel. That, of himself, neither he nor any mortal man could ever do, for salvation is of God alone. 'The *ruach-adonai* came upon him, and he judged Israel, and the Lord delivered Cushan-rishathaim king of

Mesopotamia into his hand; and his hand prevailed . . . ' (Judges iii. 10). Even more clearly, 'the *ruach-adonai* clothed itself with Gideon' (Judges vi. 34, R.V. marg.), or with Amasai (1 Chron. xii. 18). Cf. Judges xi. 29, xv. 18. When David was anointed by Samuel, 'the *ruach-adonai* came mightily upon David from that time forth' (1 Sam. xvi. 13). The next verse begins, 'Now the *ruach-adonai* had departed from Saul'. The inference is, as above, of Othniel son of Kenaz and his ability to judge Israel, that it was the *ruach-adonai* which made both Saul and David in turn capable of exercising kingly functions, and that, without the *ruach-adonai*, neither was 'sufficient for these things'. To slay a lion 'with nothing in his hand' is a feat expected not even of the strongest, but Samson so slew the lion 'when the *ruach-adonai* came mightily upon him' (Judges xiv. 6). Cf. Judges xiv. 19, xv. 14. Not only is all this true of physical strength and ability to rule; it holds also of other outstanding accomplishments. When Pharaoh exclaims, 'Can we find such an one as this, a man in whom the spirit of God [*ruach-elohim*] rests?' (Gen. xli. 38; E, not J), it is in the belief that 'interpretations belong to God' (Gen. xl. 8; cf. xli. 16). This skill to interpret dreams is ascribed to God, not only in the early Elohist tradition, but also in the late Daniel, where it is said, 'There is a God in heaven

that revealeth secrets' (ii. 28). In a similar way the Lord called Bezalel the son of Uri, and 'filled him with the *ruach-elohim*, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship' (Exod. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31; P), in order that he might be able to make all the furniture of the Tent.

In the earliest records, possession by the *ruach-adonai* is scarcely to be differentiated by us from demonic possession. In the time of Saul, for instance, there were companies of prophets parading the countryside, uttering weird cries and exhibiting a strange and contagious frenzy. This excitement, neither ethical nor religious in our use of the terms, is ascribed to possession by the *ruach-adonai* (1 Sam. x. 6, 10, xix. 20, 23), indistinguishable as it is from the habit of dancing dervishes or the custom of native witch-doctors. Compare 2 Kings iii. 15, where Elisha calls for a minstrel, and 'when the minstrel played, the hand of the Lord came upon him'. The ancient association of minstrelsy and prophecy is seen, somewhat surprisingly, in 1 Chron. xxv. 1-3, where the sons of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, the official musicians and singers of the Second Temple, are said to 'prophesy with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals'. All strange behaviour, however strange, was, in the earlier days of the kingdom, regarded as being due to the

ruach-adonai. In fact, the stranger the behaviour, the more definite was the ascription. Jehovah had everything to do with it. Volz (*Der Geist Gottes*, 1910, p. 5) postulates a 'ruach-demon', with which originally Jehovah has nothing whatever to do. This, presumably, is to say that from earliest times men have believed in, and have accepted the fact of, spirit possession. All abnormal behaviour, whether works of wisdom, feats of strength and prowess, or even antics in which no man in his senses would permit himself to indulge – all abnormal behaviour of whatever kind was ascribed to demon-possession; but one of the first developments of Jehovah-worship was to describe every manifestation of spirit-possession as definitely due to the *ruach-adonai*. Two clear instances of such transferences are Gen. xxxii. 22–32 (Jacob at Penuel), and Exod. iv. 24 (Moses at the inn), where in each case an original demon has become Jehovah. Even though the idea of witches and wizards lived on in popular superstition as vigorously as in popular English thought of yesterday, so that more than one king of Judah receives commendation for having positively and finally exterminated them all, Jehovah became established as the only source of power, and the *ruach-adonai* as the only means by which a man could receive that divine power. We may think this early view to be crude, or

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

even erroneous. It was many years ago; we claim to be wiser than they in the ways of God to men. In any case, the fact remains that it was one of the paths which led to monotheism. For us, it may be a timely reminder that monotheism, like patriotism, is not enough. It depends what kind of monotheism it is, and what kind of patriotism.

So long as Hebrew ideas of God were non-ethical, there was naturally nothing incongruous in thus ascribing every kind of unusual behaviour to domination by the *ruach-adonai*. With the rise of the ethical prophets of the eighth century, the distinction between good and bad was perforce gradually extended to all spheres of conduct. Already in 1 Samuel the effect of this ethicizing process is seen. Saul seems always to have been subject to fits of ungoverned behaviour. All such experiences as befell him between the time of his anointing (1 Sam. x. 1) and the time of David's anointing are ascribed, whatever they are, to the *ruach-adonai*. On the contrary, in respect of such experiences as befell him after the anointing of David (1 Sam. xvi. 13), the sacred writer carefully avoids the use of the term *ruach-adonai*. The process of dissimilation has not, however, gone far enough to deny that the *ruach* by which he was then dominated was from Jehovah. 'Now the *ruach-adonai* had departed from Saul, and an

evil *ruach* from the Lord troubled him' (1 Sam. xvi. 14). Here the abnormal behaviour is still regarded as being due to a *ruach* from *adonai*, though no longer to the *ruach-adonai*. In the next verse a further development is found. It was an evil *ruach-eloim*. The personal name Jehovah is not used, but in its place the general Semitic word for God which can be used of other gods than the god of Israel. And yet, though Saul is possessed by an evil *ruach-eloim*, and no longer by the *ruach-adonai*, his behaviour is still described as 'prophesying' (1 Sam. xviii. 10). Cf. 1 Sam. xix. 18-29, where the *ruach-eloim*, not evil and not the *ruach-adonai*, makes them all prophesy. Or, again, it could not be denied that the court prophets who prophesied falsely to Ahab (1 Kings xxii. 1-28) were inspired by Jehovah. Micaiah's explanation was that Jehovah had sent a lying spirit in order to entice Ahab to his doom. Here, remarkably, the *ruach* is personified, uniquely except that we may associate it with such pictures as that of the heavenly court described in Job i. 6-12. Similarly Jehovah is represented (Judges ix. 23) as having sent an evil *ruach* (i.e. a spirit to stir up trouble, not here in any way personified) between Abimelech and the men of Shechem, in order that Abimelech might the more speedily come to that timely, but unpleasant, end which the sacred writer is sure that he deserved.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The process is not complete even in Hosea. He blames both priest and prophet for the rebellious apostasy of Israel. He declaims: 'The prophet is a fool; the man that hath the spirit is mad' (ix. 7). He still defines the prophet as the man possessed by the *ruach*, but he can be a fool for all that.

The full and true prophetic inspiration appears in Mic. iii. 8: 'For truly I am full of power by the *ruach-adonai*, and of judgement, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin.' The process is complete. The *ruach-adonai* is that pre-eminent gift of power from the Lord by which a prophet is enabled, in words of grace and truth, to proclaim the ways of God to men. More than 'enabled', he is compelled. The testimony of Balaam is the witness of the prophet in every age, when the Spirit of the Lord has come upon him: 'If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord, to do either good or bad of mine own mind: what the Lord speaketh, that will I speak' (Num. xxiv. 13). Cf. Amos iii. 8; Mic. ii. 7.

It is not permissible to find this marked and definite ethical-religious content in the description of the effect of the descent of the *ruach-adonai* on Saul, whereby he was 'turned into another man' (1 Sam. x. 6). This is the gift of that 'mana'

which is a feature of primitive belief. So also for David, pre-eminently for Moses, and also for Elijah. Such men have more-than-human power. Elisha has a 'double portion' of such 'mana', and this is so powerful that even when he was dead a corpse revived immediately on coming into contact with his bones (2 Kings xiii. 21; cf. Eccus. xlviii. 13). This is on the same lines as the many primitive elements in the Elijah-Elisha traditions. The references to Joshua are of the same type (Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9; both P). This 'mana' is the '*ruach-Stoff*' of which Volz (p. 23) writes, 'It is not anything personal (*nicht etwas Personhaftes*), but a stuff, a fluid'. Originally the preposition 'in' is used of this continued possession of 'mana', and the preposition 'upon' of sudden and particular accessions of power. The man in whom this 'mana' dwells permanently is 'a man of God'; Deut. xxxiii. 1; Joshua xiv. 6 (of Moses); elsewhere, of Samuel, of Elijah, and most of all of Elisha. Of the same type, but more advanced in theory, is the gift of *ruach-adonai* to the seventy elders. They receive 'mana' from Moses, but the gift comes to them directly from Jehovah, even though two of them remain in the camp, and are not enveloped in the cloud (Num. xi. 23-9). They all 'prophesied' when first the *ruach* rested upon them (xi. 25), but never again, though the power of the spirit (mana) remained

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

with them to enable them to act as judges under Moses. It was by the 'mana' of these men, Moses, Joshua, and the seventy elders, that Israel was led of God from Egypt to Canaan. They were men of strange and wondrous power, terrible in wrath and mighty in deed and counsel. A late prophet describes it otherwise: 'Where is He that put His holy spirit in the midst of them?' (Isa. lxiii. 14; cf. Hag. ii. 5) – 'holy', of course, not from any suggestion of personification, nor as any forecast of the doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity, but because it is of God, and not of man. Compare Dan. v. 14, where the Aramaic 'the spirit of the gods' is translated 'holy spirit' in the Septuagint, but 'the spirit of God' in Theodotion.

In exilic and post-exilic writings the *ruach-adonai* is the power by which the prophet is inspired (Neh. ix. 30; 2 Chron. xv. 1; &c.). The phrase was not used by Isaiah of Jerusalem (unless xi. 1–9 be from his hand), nor by Jeremiah, but both certainly know the same compelling power (Isa. vi. 8; Jer. i. 8, xx. 9, 11; and 'thus saith the Lord'). The two ideas are combined in Ezek. xi. 5: 'And the *ruach-adonai* fell upon me, and he said unto me, Speak, Thus saith the Lord.' The *ruach-adonai* also is to bring in the New Age, and, as often in passages influenced by Deutero-Isaiah, this age is to be characterized by extraordinary

THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN JEWISH THOUGHT

fertility of fold and field (Isa. xxxii. 15). Jehovah says of the Servant, 'I have put My spirit upon him' (Isa. xlii. 1). The restoration promised both by Ezekiel and by Deutero-Isaiah is to be by the power of the Spirit of God (Ezek. xxxvi. 26 f., xi. 19, xxxix. 29; Isa. xlv. 3; and, of a later time, Zech. xii. 10).

To the greatest degree Messiah is to be inspired by the *ruach-adonai*. This appears from Isa. xi. 1 and lxi. 1 f., the latter being the lesson from the Prophets which our Lord read at Nazareth (Luke iv. 18 f.), and claimed its fulfilment that very day. Compare the Zadokite fragment in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 10, 'And through His Messiah He shall make them know His holy Spirit'. Indeed, in the glorious days of King Messiah, the power of the Spirit of God is no longer to be confined to this one or that one. One of the songs of the New Age (Joel ii. 28 f.) is that God will pour out His spirit upon all flesh, as though the fervent prayer of the Man of God, unique in Old Israel, was at last to be answered, 'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put His spirit upon them' (Num. xi. 29); and, indeed, more than answered, for even the servants and hand-maids will prophesy, and the spirit will be poured upon all flesh.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

2. THE SPIRIT IS LIFE

A live man breathes; a dead man has ceased to breathe. To the Hebrew, therefore, the breath is the life, equally with the blood. Accordingly, 'the Lord God . . . breathed into his nostrils the breath [*neshamah*] of life, and man became alive' [*nephesh chayyah*; *nephesh* being that which is alive in contrast to that which is dead] (Gen. ii. 7 f.; J). The word *neshamah* means ordinary, normal breathing, in contrast to *ruach*, which in this connexion signifies violent, abnormal breathing. There is no suggestion here of a divine element in every man, a necessary divine spark in the soul. No idea could be more foreign to Hebrew thought. The statement of Hos. xi. 9, 'I am God and not man', is true of every stage of Old Testament religion. Gen. ii. 7 is an anthropomorphic ascription to God of life in man, similar to other passages in the same account – God walking in the garden, or making coats for the guilty pair.

This idea, that the breath of God is the source of life in man, is found in various exilic and post-exilic passages. *Neshamah* is paralleled with *ruach*. They are two aspects of the same divine act, the one the process, and the other the result in life and power. Cf. Job xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4, xxxiv. 14 f.; Isa. xlii. 5; Ps. civ. 29 f. The tendency is

THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN JEWISH THOUGHT
for *ruach* to displace *neshamah*; cf. Gen. vi. 17,
vii. 15 (both P), and Gen. ii. 7 (J), and doubtless
this is due in part to development from the cruder
anthropomorphic descriptions.

On the basis of the *ruach* of God as the source of
life, representing the life-creating activity of God,
we explain Gen. i. 2 (P): 'The *ruach-elo-him* was
brooding upon the face of the waters.' In this
way the primeval chaos became capable of sup-
porting life. Similarly also for Ps. civ. 30: 'Thou
sendest forth Thy spirit, they are created; Thou
renewest the face of the earth.' Here the living
creatures which receive life are not men alone,
but also the beasts of the field, and even the
earth itself springs to new life. Ecclesiastes goes
further, holding that man and beast have the
same *ruach* (iii. 20 f.), but this is not the normal
attitude of the Old Testament, even though it is
found also in the first half of Ps. xlix., where,
however, it is carefully corrected in the second,
and later, half.

In Isa. xl. 13 - 'Who hath directed the Spirit
of the Lord?' - *ruach* is not equivalent to *nous*
(intelligence) (see *Encyc. Bibl.* 4752), as against
'essence'. The writer was a Hebrew poet, and
not a Greek philosopher. He meant that creative
power, native to Jehovah alone, by which,
without instruction from any puppet-god of
Babylon, He created all things, spanned the

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

heavens with His hand, and spread them out like the curtains of a Bedawy's tent.

3. THE SPIRIT IS POWER

Equally with 'life', the spirit is 'power'. Indeed, it is doubtful if the idea of power is ever far removed from the word *ruach*. In Ezekiel the two phrases 'the Spirit of the Lord' and 'the hand of the Lord' are, for the most part, interchangeable. Cf. Isa. viii. 11; 2 Kings iii. 15; Jer. xv. 17; Mic. iii. 8; Judges xiv. 6, xv. 14; Isa. xi. 2; and especially Zech. iv. 6.

We have seen that *ruach* involves abnormal, violent breathing in contrast to *neshamah*, ordinary, steady breathing; further, that one of the most primitive ideas associated with *ruach* is that a man so possessed is no longer in control of his faculties. In this way, *ruach* comes to be used of powerful emotions, those dominating emotions which can hurry a man headlong to disaster. Hosea (iv. 12, v. 4) believed Israel powerless to reform. He could therefore speak of a 'spirit [*ruach*] of adulteries' because of which Israel 'could not frame their doings to return to God'. In Num. v. 14 f. (P), that determination by which a man is driven to the final, deadly test of his wife's faithfulness is a '*ruach* of jealousy'. We would say his jealousy had got the better of him;

the Hebrew said he was possessed by a '*ruach* of jealousy'. Both they and we are semi-personalizing an emotion. (It is most curious to see how some writers continuously emphasize the Hebrew way of personalizing things, feelings, and corporate bodies, as though this were a remarkable and unique trait. There is, in this habit of thought, not such a tremendous difference between them and us.) These 'spirits' can come upon men just as strongly as that *ruach-adonai* which rushes on a man (Judges xv. 14), or which a primitive age believed lifted a man up and carried him none knew where (1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16; and the remarkable parallel in the New Testament story of Philip the Evangelist. Whoever is responsible for the basic details of those first chapters of Acts knew exactly what the Old Testament meant by *ruach-adonai*). The word is used of the dominating characteristic of character and disposition: Isa. xix. 3, xxix. 10, liv. 6, lxvi. 2; Job vii. 11; Gen. xxvi. 35; Ps. li. 17; 2 Kings xix. 7 (i.e. a *ruach* of uneasiness and fear). In Proverbs, *ruach* is used in a wider sense, though still of that trait which is the key to the character, xvi. 19, 18, xiv. 29, xvi. 2 (i.e. tests character). Similarly Exod. xxxv. 21; Ps. li. 12; Num. xiv. 24. When *nephesh* and *ruach* are used in such semi-psychological senses, *nephesh* is nice and quiet and gentle, but *ruach* is strong and overpowering, like

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

the rush and crash of the storm wind. A man can control his *nephesh*, but it is the *ruach* which controls him. And so *ruach* can be used of those profound emotions by which a man is stirred to the depths, or by which he is prostrated; Gen. xlv. 26 f.; Joshua v. 1; 1 Kings x. 5; Gen. xli. 8; 1 Kings xxi. 5; Judges xv. 19; 1 Sam. xxx. 12; Ps. cxliii. 7; Ps. li. 17. It is used of God – ‘grieving His Holy Spirit’ – though here (Isa. lxiii. 10) it may be merely a synonym for the Sacred Name (cf. Pss. cvi. 33 and cvii. 11). At the same time, certainly in all earlier Old Testament writings and generally throughout, where the writer finds himself involved in speaking of a man’s ‘spirit’ or ‘soul’, he avoids using *ruach*, and uses *leb* (heart; Jer. iv. 19, &c.), or *nephesh* (2 Kings iv. 27; Isa. liii. 11). The reason for this appears in the next paragraph.

4. SPIRIT IS NOT FLESH

The Hebrews made a firm and clear contrast between *ruach* (spirit) and *basar* (flesh). The first was from above, the second from below. An individual was something formed out of dust into flesh, and held together by *ruach*, so that for a while it was a *nephesh*. Without this *ruach*, which came from God, belonged to Him, and would one day return to Him, man, being *basar*, was

nothing but dust. *Ruach* is separate from dust, different from flesh, and in contrast is the source of life and power. The clearest example is Isa. xxxi. 3: 'The Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses flesh, and not spirit.' This passage is fundamental to the whole doctrine of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament, and everywhere else for that matter. *Ruach* belongs to God; flesh is definitely of man in contrast to God. That is the root difference. Flesh has no power, no strength, no life, no anything but dead dust. That is why it is folly to trust in Egypt, or in anything that Egypt stands for, either then or now. There is no strength and no quietness, nor confidence (the modern word is 'security'), apart from the *ruach-adonai*. The only strength is in the *ruach-adonai*. This is brought out clearly by the Septuagint translation here, where *ruach* is translated 'help'. It is because God has always known the utter helplessness of flesh that He has mercy upon us; cf. Ps. lxxviii. 39.

This distinction between spirit and flesh is found clearly in the primitive Gen. vi. 1-8. In spite of the two well-known cruces in this passage - the meaning of the word translated 'strive' and the reading 'for that he also is' - the meaning is fairly clear. The children born of these mixed marriages are half-human and half-divine. They are therefore half-*basar* and half-*ruach*. The one

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

means death, and the other life. The strife between death and deathlessness is summarily ended by God, who gives *ruach* the power for one hundred and twenty years, when *basar* triumphs with death, for where there is *basar* there must of necessity be death.

Whilst *ruach* is definitely not flesh, it is associated with it in that it vitalizes it. The idea of consubstantiation provides a partial analogy. This is the truth in all sacramental ideas, both in the Sacraments of the Church and in the loose way in which the phrase 'sacrament of Nature' is used. It is God who meets us there, and there is the same separation between God and the elements, and between God and Nature, as there is between *ruach* and *basar*.

And so we come to the phrase first found in Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16 (P), and frequent in later Jewish writings (cf. Book of Enoch), 'God of the spirits of all flesh' – that is, the God who gives to each man of flesh that *ruach* by which he lives. Here we approach the idea of a separate *ruach* in each man, for this is different from such phrases as 'a troubled spirit'. The steps are such passages as Ezek. iii. 14; Hag. i. 14; Dan. v. 20; Ezra i. 5; Prov. i. 23; Job xx. 3; and particularly Job xxxii. 8, 18, xvii. 1. Always the *ruach* of a man is from God, though in Zech. xii. 1 the idea of an individual *ruach* in each man has developed so

THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN JEWISH THOUGHT
that the prophet can say, 'And formeth the *ruach*
of man within him'.

There is one passage which is incapable of translation because in it the continued use of *ruach* involves almost every shade of its meanings, both original and derived. The passage is Ezek. xxxvii. 1-14, the story of the 'wind' (*ruach*) animating the dry bones of Israel. It is impossible to say when *ruach* here means wind, spirit, life, breath, or power, and for the most part all the meanings are involved.

This passage, Ezek. xxxvii. 1-14, brings us to the main reason why the word *ruach* is used at all. If it were simply that a man has breath and therefore lives, the word would be *neshamah*, not *ruach*. It is *ruach* because here, as everywhere else in religion, it is a case of God first and man afterwards. The association of *ruach* with God is through the wind of the desert; not gentle zephyrs and soft warm breezes, but storm and tempest and overwhelming might. For this reason *ruach* always involves the idea of power, the power that makes 'the cedars of Lebanon' 'skip like a calf', that 'shaketh the wilderness of Kadesh, and strippeth the forests bare' (Ps. xxix). From the association of Jehovah with the storm-wind comes the equation of the *ruach-adonai*, the 'blast of his nostrils', and his shattering wrath. Cf. Exod. xv.; Job iv. 9; Isa. xxviii. 6, iv. 4, xl. 7. In Ezek. xxxix. 29 the

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Hebrew text has *ruach*, and intends that *ruach-
adonai* by which the New Age will come to be. Septuagint, however, has *thumos*, 'wrath', referring to the wrath of past judgements.

There remain three passages to which special reference must be made.

(a) Ps. cxxxix. 7: 'Whither shall I go from Thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?' Here the parallel *panim* (presence, lit. face) shows that chiefly we have here a synonym for the Sacred Name. There is no question whatever of the idea of an all-pervading Spirit of God, some sort of divineness in all created things. 'His face' emphasizes His presence, and 'His Spirit' emphasizes His power.

(b) Isa. xxxiv. 16: 'For my mouth, it hath commanded [better, after LXX, 'his mouth'], and His Spirit it hath gathered them.' Again, there is a parallelism, and what personification there is applies to the Divine Word equally with the Divine Spirit. Cf. 2 Sam. xxiii. 2.

(c) Isa. xlvi. 16: 'The Lord God hath sent me and His Spirit.' The problem here is very ancient, and turns on whether 'His Spirit' is object or subject. If it is subject, then we have the Spirit of God acting separately from, though in conjunction with, God. This distinction is found nowhere else in the Old Testament. If it is the

object, then Rabbi Sa'adya was right when he translated, 'The Lord God hath sent me with His Holy Spirit', i.e. with that *ruach-adonai* which is the inspiration of the prophets.

In these passages there is undoubtedly some sort of personalization of the *ruach-adonai*, but it passes very little beyond that style of thought and speech which is necessarily common to all mankind. Indeed, it is impossible to speak of the *ruach-adonai* at all without personalizing the idea to some extent. The most the Hebrews did was to approach that half-dreamed, intangible representation which appears in Job iv. 15.

In the Old Testament, then, *ruach* is of God, and not of man. For this reason the term 'Holy Spirit' can rightly be used. This *ruach* is a condition of life, but most of all it stands for power, and the *ruach-adonai* is the power of God in and through the lives of men. This shows itself clearly in the Jewish ideas of Pentecost and in the story of Acts ii. Pentecost was the day of power. This is shown by the early Jewish readings and psalms for the day, Exod. xix.; Hab. iii.; Ezek. i.; Pss. xxix. and lxviii. All four involve a display of the overwhelming power of God. All the phenomena of His coming are found also in Acts ii., except only the earthquake, and that appears in Acts iv. 31. The descent of Holy Spirit at

Pentecost is not gentle as a dove, but tempestuous and all-powerful. (See, further, *Expository Times*, May 1932, p. 379 f.)

(b) *The Spirit of God in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

Limitations of time and space demand that we should deal only with such writings as are found in the Apocrypha, together with the Ezra-Apocalypse and the Book of Enoch. A detailed and comprehensive study of the Spirit of God in Jewish literature generally is to be found in an article by Professor R. B. Hoyle in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. xi., pp. 784-803, and, for those who read German, in Volz, *Der Geist Gottes*, 1910.

Generally speaking, Old Testament usage is followed throughout, except in the Wisdom of Solomon, though necessarily the Greek words *pneuma* and *psyche* are used. The general tendency of Septuagint is followed, whereby *psyche* (soul) tends to be used psychologically, and *pneuma* (spirit) represents the stricter uses of *ruach*.

(a) *Tobit* (pre-Maccabaeon, Egyptian). In iii. 6, it is the spirit of a man which ensures his living: 'Command my spirit to be taken from me that I may be released, and become earth.' We have here a development from Zech. xii. 1.

(b) *Ben Sirach* (pre-Maccabaeen, Palestinian). The Jewish tradition is followed, except that, after Proverbs, the creative function of the *ruach-adonai* is performed by Wisdom (i. 9, xxiv. 3). The spirit is the prophetic inspiration (xlvi. 12, xvi. 25), or ensures the continuation of life (xxxiv. 13). On the other hand, we find 'bitterness of soul' (vii. 11; cf. 2 Kings iv. 27). In the Revised Version, which is from the Greek, xvi. 17 reads, 'For what is my soul in a boundless creation?' but the original was (see Charles): 'What is my soul among the mass of the spirits of all the children of men?' Here 'my soul' is equivalent to 'I', as often in the Old Testament, and the use of 'spirits' compares with that in Tobit iii. 6.

(c) *Judith* (Maccabaeen, Palestinian). In xiv. 6, fainting under the stress of deep emotion is described as the failing of spirit (cf. Gen. xlv. 26 f., &c.). With 'Let all Thy creation serve Thee, for Thou spakest and they were made; Thou didst send forth Thy spirit, and it builded them. And there is none that can resist Thy voice' (xvi. 14), compare Ps. civ. 30 and the parallelism of Word and Spirit in Isa. xxxiv. 16, together with the general ideas of the irresistible power of the Spirit of God.

(d) *2 Maccabees* (c. 50 B.C., Alexandrian). No longer do we find 'uplifted in spirit', but 'in mind' (v. 17, *dianoia*), 'in heart' (v. 21, *kardia*), or

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

'soul' (vii. 12, *psyche*, here meaning courage). 'Spirit' and 'life' are closely allied, both of life on this earth (vii. 22) and of a resurrection life (vii. 22, xiv. 46). A new departure is the reference to Jehovah as 'Sovereign of Spirits'. This corresponds to the phrase 'Lord of Spirits', used 104 times in the Book of Enoch, many of them earlier in date than 2 Maccabees. The phrase belongs to the time of a developing belief in angels, elemental spirits, and spirits of the air, both good and bad. The reference is probably to these incorporeal spirits, and not to the spirits of men, either during this present life or after it. In the earlier, and Palestinian, 1 Maccabees there is no reference to 'spirit', but continuously all strength and power are regarded as coming from heaven (i.e. from God).

(e) *Baruch* (c. A.D. 78, Palestinian). In ii. 17, breath is regarded as essential to life, 'the dead . . . whose breath is taken from their bodies', and the two phrases 'the soul in anguish, the troubled spirit' (iii. 1), are both in accordance with Old Testament tradition (2 Kings iv. 27; Gen. xxvi. 35; &c.).

(f) *Ezra Apocalypse* (c. A.D. 100, Palestinian). There is nothing in the Apocalypse which is not in line with Old Testament tradition, any developments being those necessitated by the belief in a resurrection, and the growing belief in

elemental spirits. This is true also of the contemporary, and in some respects antagonistic, Apocalypse of Baruch. 'Spirit' is used of profound emotion (iii. 3, xii. 5; cf. 'soul' in v. 14); of being 'converted to a different spirit' (vi. 26; cf. Num. xiv. 24). There is the old association between life and breath (iii. 5, vi. 48, vii. 75). Even 'My Son the Messiah shall die, and all in whom there is human breath' (vii. 29). The word 'spirit' is used for that which has life after death (vii. 78), and in vi. 41 we find the account of the creation of the 'spirit of the firmament'. Here 'spirit' corresponds to the 'angel' in Enoch, and belongs to the class of elemental spirits.

(g) *Enoch* (pre-Christian and part probably pre-Maccabaeon, Palestinian). Here, for the most part, 'spirit' is used where we would use 'soul', i.e. for that in man which survives death, and is different from the body (lxvii. 8 f.; also x. 15, xxii. 3, &c.). In lx. we find references to the spirits of the elements, and in xv. 7 f. to the 'spiritual ones of heaven' and 'evil spirits upon the earth', 'who are produced from the spirits and flesh' (cf. Gen. vi. 1-8). We have already mentioned the frequently repeated title of God, 'the Lord of Spirits'.

(h) *Wisdom of Solomon* (50 B.C.—A.D. 10, Alexandrian). Here we find a considerable change. The writer's own belief is that Wisdom alone

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

was the Creator, and whilst, like Ben Sirach, he identifies Wisdom with the Spirit of God, his Wisdom is Greek rather than Hebrew. Indeed, he goes much further than a mere identification, for he equates the Spirit of God with the Stoic idea of a world-soul. He holds that the incorruptible Spirit of God is in all things (xii. 1), that it fills the world and holds all things together (i. 7), and that it is the source of knowledge in man of the ways of God (ix. 7). In this last he is orthodox enough, but not when he holds that the spirit which is in all things, pervades and penetrates all things by reason of her pureness, is that same power which passes into holy souls, and makes them friends of God and prophets (vii. 20-7, xi. 1).

It will be seen that, whereas in the Apocrypha generally Old Testament ideas of the *ruach-adonai* and the *ruach* of men are followed, yet in the Wisdom of Solomon we have something very different. In the Old Testament, except only for that first brooding over ('over', not 'in' or 'through') the primeval chaos, the *ruach-adonai* is essentially the power of God in and through men. In this attempt, due to Hellenistic influence, of the author of Wisdom to fit his religion into his philosophy, we have the beginning of a movement which has confused religion with philosophy. From it spring the errors of humanism,

THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN JEWISH THOUGHT
and the dangerous, we believe erroneous, identification of the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts and lives of men with the power that makes the grass grow green.