

THE
JOHANNINE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

A Thesis

Submitted to the Board of Theological Studies of
the University of Edinburgh, in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of

Philosophy

by

E. ARTHUR BETTS.



1932

Degree of Ph. D. conferred 20th July 1932.

FORWORD.

The chief aim of this thesis is to set forth the conception of the Holy Spirit found in the writings attributed by scholars to the Author of the Fourth Gospel.

This we have attempted to carry out, first by a close study of those passages in which the Spirit is mentioned, then by a review of possible sources and contemporary ideas, and finally by a systematic treatment of the various phases of the doctrine, with special emphasis on some of its more important corollaries. In this we have tried to follow out the spirit of the author, and to make clear the underlying principle rather than attempt to fit the doctrine to any one aspect of the changing panorama of life.

One omission that, in view of the recent interest in the subject as a whole, the writer would fain have supplied, is a treatment of any conception of the Spirit that may be found in the Mandaeen Writings. The attention that we have been able to give to these documents has convinced us, however, that a vast amount of preliminary work of a linguistic and historical character is necessary before any scientific conclusions on such a theme could be reached.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Foreword.....	ii.
A. INTRODUCTORY.	
I. Introduction.....	1.
II. The Johannine Writings and their Referen- ces to the Holy Spirit.....	5.
B. HISTORICAL.	
III. The Words Pneuma and Paraclete and their Use in Contemporary Literature.....	38.
IV. The Old Testament Doctrine of the Spirit....	45.
V. The Spirit in Palastinian Judaism.....	51.
VI. The Spirit in Alexandrian Judaism.....	55.
VII. The Spirit in Greek Thought and Experience..	68.
VIII. The Mystery Religions and the Holy Spirit...	72.
IX. The Spirit in the Hermetic Writings.....	76.
X. The Spirit in the Teaching of Jesus.....	78.
XI. The Spirit in the Early Church.....	82.
XII. The Pauline Doctrine of the Spirit.....	89.
XIII. The Spirit in the Odes of Solomon.....	100.
XIV. The Sources of the Johannine Conception of the Spirit.....	102.
C. THE JOHANNINE THEOLOGY.	
XV. Introductory.....	106.
XVI. The World of Light and the World of Dark ness.....	107.
XVII. The Johannine Doctrine of God.....	109.
XVIII. The Son of God.....	111.
XIX. Life, and the Communication of Life.....	116.

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

XX.	The Johannine Doctrine of the Last Things...	123.
	D. THE NATURE OF THE JOHANNINE SPIRIT.	
XXI.	Has John a Doctrine of the Spirit?.....	128.
XXII.	The Nature of the Spirit.....	130.
XXIII.	The Spirit and the Father.....	134.
XXIV.	The Spirit and the Son of God.....	136.
	E. THE WORK OF THE JOHANNINE SPIRIT.	
XXV.	The Spirit and the World.....	143.
XXVI.	The Spirit and Conversion.....	145.
XXVII.	The Spirit in the Believer.....	147.
XXVIII.	The Sign of a Christian.....	151.
XXIX.	The Spirit and the Church.....	153.
	F. DEDUCTIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.	
XXX.	The Spirit of Truth.....	156.
XXXI.	The Authority of the Spirit.....	165.
XXXII.	The Abiding Paraclete.....	170.
XXXIII.	The Doctrine of the Trinity.....	176.
XXXIV.	The Permanent Value of the Johannine Doctrine of the Spirit.....	184.

	List of Books and Articles used in the Preparation of this Thesis.....	187.

N.B. In the references in the text to the Johannine Writings, those such as 5:6 indicate the Gospel, and those such as I,3:24, the First Epistle.

INTRODUCTION.

In these days of turmoil and confusion, when the foundations of morality and even of religion itself seem to be fading away, the ears of many prophets are strained to catch the first notes of a new revelation of the majesty and power of the Living God. If only a modern Deutero-Isaiah could appear in our busy market-places and teeming amusement-centres, proclaiming the greatness of the Eternal above the roar of industry and the babble of human tongues. But even before this strong trumpet-blast could have much effect upon the hearts of men, another influence would have to be at work. The tender penetrating touch of the Spirit of God, easily discernable, yet mysterious as the source of the evening zephyr, must come upon the children of men and be felt by them, must open the blind eyes and unstop the ears that hear not. For who can make known the ways of God unless it be His Spirit?

Though primarily the Holy Spirit should be the object of experience, making itself felt in the heart rather than presenting itself for the mind to speculate upon, it is none the less needful that we should seek to understand it, and make ourselves conversant with its nature and work. As in the days of the infant Church

when the Apostle Paul had to point out that false ideas regarding the Spirit were hurting the Christian cause, so we must remind ourselves that the extravagant claims made by a few sects to-day along the same lines are equally harmful. But for us the greatest danger lies towards the other extreme. Our creeds, built upon thought forms of a past age are popularly interpreted in an almost tritheistic sense. We hear of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, and our minds dwell on their separateness. Again, as in popular religious teaching very little is said about the Holy Ghost we tend to forget about it altogether, and are left with a ditheism, which often points to a God far removed from earthly things and a Christ whose work was finished nearly twenty centuries ago. We might as well have been those found by the Apostle who had never heard that the Holy Spirit was given¹. As we look over the great body of the Church as it now is, we are constrained to say with Stanley Jones that it "is not living in Pentecost"². To a very great extent we have lost the Spirit which was the secret of the marvellous power of that little group.

In almost every period Christian thought has tended

1. Acts 19:2

2. cf. The Christ of Every Road, p.25.

to neglect the Holy Spirit, and with the exception of a mere handful of men, among whom may be mentioned the Cappadocian Fathers and St. Augustine, theologians have been almost one in declining to give the doctrine the attention it deserves. This defect has been pointed out in modern times by Ritschl,¹ and in spite of the many works which have appeared on different phases of the subject since his day, one cannot help feeling that a great deal still remains unsaid. Perhaps this may be due to the difficulty of treating it. To write adequately upon it, says Dr. Wheeler Robinson, "would require a strong grasp on every other doctrine and an expert knowledge of all the great theological problems". Again, "no theological doctrine is more definitely religious in its texture; the content of a particular human experience is always prominent in it, when it is alive, and no doctrine is more repellant when dead, through the loss of this personal warmth and energy"². Without assuming ourselves to possess the equipment indicated above, we are daring to invade the field, hoping that we may be able to shed some light on a few of its difficult problems.

The years of our Lord's earthly ministry, and of the

1. cf. The Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, 1900, p. 533.
2. The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit, pp. 1-2.

generation that remembered them are pre-eminently the age of the Holy Spirit. It is thus fitting for us to take as the basis of our study the thought of one of the great men of this period. Of these hardly any rank higher than the author of the Johannine writings, and in his work he has given a fair amount of space to our subject. In leading up to his doctrine of the Spirit we shall also have occasion to glance at some of the highest and noblest conceptions of this type set down by writers of the pre- and early Christian period.

THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS AND THEIR REFERENCES TO THE
HOLY SPIRIT.

Before turning to those passages with which we are to be specially concerned, it behoves us to devote a little space to a consideration of the composition, nature, and purpose of the Johannine Writings as a whole. Here, however, we may easily meet problems, the scientific study of which would fill volumes, and the most that we can do without making this section unduly long, is to indicate in the briefest manner possible the stand to be assumed throughout the essay. Those who desire to go further along these lines are referred to the many excellent works on the subject, some of which are mentioned below.

Under the term JOHANNINE WRITINGS are included the Gospel, the three Epistles, but not the Apocalypse, traditionally assigned to the Apostle John. As the two shorter letters contain no reference to the Spirit, we need only concern ourselves with the Gospel and First Epistle.

DATE: We may agree with the generally accepted position that the Gospel was written within the decade 90-100 A.D. The Epistle probably followed a few years later.

PLACE OF COMPOSITION: We may accept the traditional view so far as to affirm that Ephesus is the most like-

ly place at which the Gospel as we have it appeared.

The Epistle is probably also from the same centre.

UNITY: Few scholars hold to-day that the Gospel has come down to us in the exact form in which it was first written. Some think of it as the work of a single writer, somewhat rearranged by an editor, who possibly added the last chapter and a few other verses.¹ Others go further in this direction, and see in it the hand of one who had been a witness of many of the events referred to, that of a disciple of the "Witness" who was probably the actual writer of the Gospel, and the work of a later editor.² A few regard it as the union of two separate writings,³ and there are those who are of the opinion that behind certain sections (i.e., the Discourses) the presence of documents springing out of the same circle as the Odes of Solomon can be detected.⁴ For us it will be sufficient to point out that though we hold that Strauss' figure of the "seamless robe" may be applied to practically⁵ the whole of the Gospel to the extent that it comes from the pen of the one who in the next paragraph will be designated as the author, it is quite possible that he

1. e.g. the late Bishop Bernard.

2. e.g. Principal Garvie.

3. e.g. W.Soltau, E.S.Hoernle. For a good summary of the assignments of scholars to the various sources, see W.F.Howard: The Fourth Gospel, Appendix C.

4. e.g. Professor Bultmann.

5. Except 8:1-11, and a few other verses.

made use of written sources. For instance, the Nicodemus who in more than one way has a different name from the rest of the Gospel, may have

source. Again, such an expression may have possessed a distinct local origin and been used in a special way in some of the Gospels. The author, as a good master builder, has gathered stone from many quarries in giving shape to his ideas, and perhaps he may even have used stones that even yet show traces of their original structure. But these marks are of little importance; the main lines of the Gospel were conceived by a single mind to meet a variety of situations.

It is generally accepted, with one or two exceptions, as the work of a single writer. While certain of the most prominent writers are concentrating their efforts in the field of what might be termed the Urgeschichte of the New Testament, British writers are ranged on one side of the controversy as to whether it was written by the apostolic John, the Son of Zebedee, or by an unknown writer more or less remotely connected with the apostolic circle.¹ Into the details

of the epistle of John of Ephesus.

Borrower's
Surname: KIM

Date of
Consultation: 4/11/96

Author: BETTS

Shelfmark: Ph.D 1932

1. This item is for consultation in the library only and must be returned to the Service Desk after use.
2. Except with a thesis, ink must not be used in the vicinity of this item.
3. No photocopying is permitted without the express permission of library staff.
4. Please inform the Service Desk when you are completely finished with this item. Items will be reshelfed seven days after the last consultation date.

NEW COLLEGE
LIBRARY

made use of written sources. For instance, the Nicodemus incident, which in more than one way has a different theological flavor from the rest of the Gospel, may have come from a separate source. Again, such an expression as the Paraclete may have possessed a distinct local meaning, or have been used in a special way in some of the source material. The author, as a good master builder, has made use of stone from many quarries in giving expression to his ideas, and perhaps he may even have fitted in second-hand stones that even yet show traces of the pattern of the first structure. But these marks are of secondary importance; the main lines of the Gospel flow on as if conceived by a single mind to meet a single complex of situations.

The Epistle is generally accepted, with one or two minor interpolations, as the work of a single writer.

AUTHORSHIP: While certain of the most prominent German scholars are concentrating their efforts in seeking to trace what might be termed the Urgeschichte of the Gospel, British writers are ranged on one side or the other of a controversy as to whether it was written by the traditional John, the Son of Zebedee, or by some practically unknown writer more or less remotely connected with the apostolic circle.¹ Into the details

1. e.g. the Elder John of Ephesus.

of this controversy space will not permit us to enter. So inconclusive does much of the evidence appear, that instead of laying down a decision which must needs be more or less arbitrary, we prefer to submit a number of principles to be used in seeking a solution. To us the evidence, internal and external, seems to indicate that the Gospel was written by one who, -

1. Was brought up a Jew¹.
2. Knew Jerusalem quite well, being possibly brought up in that neighbourhood.
3. Was probably a Sadducee, belonging to a family represented in the Sanhedrin.
4. Had received at least a fair literary education.
5. Knew Jesus in the flesh, and some of the later events of His earthly life so well that he could presume to correct Synoptic tradition at a point where the Church would undoubtedly be most conservative²; or was very closely associated with one who could do so.
6. In later life was leader of the church at Ephesus or a similar centre, and who was called an elder³.

-
1. cf. Burney: The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.
 2. e.g. The setting of the Lord's Supper. cf. Holland: The Philosophy of Faith and the Fourth Gospel.
 3. cf. II,1:1.

NOTE: The reader who desires to investigate the problems referred to above may consult the following works, -

- Moffatt: An Introduction to the Literature of the N.T.
Bacon: The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate.
Stanton: The Gospels as Historical Documents. Pt.III.
Howard: The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation.
Introduction to the Commentaries by Bernard, Westcott, and others.

As to the Epistle, its peculiarities of style and doctrine for the most part proclaim it as coming from the same pen as the Gospel. We may safely say that the differences¹ are due to lapse of time and change of circumstance. If, as seems to be indicated, it was written later than the Gospel, and probably by a man now far beyond the allotted span of life, fierce heretical opposition could easily account for the stricter and more legalistic views found in the letter.

NATURE & PURPOSE: With the many problems arising out of the author's recording of events we are not directly concerned, and they may be passed by. But a question that often comes very aptly to the student of such themes as ours is, - How closely do the sayings attributed to our Lord in the Gospel, and especially in the so-called Last Discourse, mirror the actual words and thoughts of the Master when with the disciples in Galilee and Jerusalem? It is true that passages can be found in the Synoptics quoting sayings of Jesus which could serve as backgrounds for a considerable number of the Johannine statements². Again, the author,

-
1. We feel that Windisch has rather over-stated these divergencies (cf. Die katholischen Briefe, S.110) For a full discussion see Brooke: The Johannine Epistles, Law: Tests of Life, ch.17.
 2. For a thorough treatment of this phase of the subject see E.H.Woods: The Transition from the Synoptic to the Johannine Version of the Life and Teaching of Jesus.

or the apostle associated with him, may have been more intimately connected with the Master than the other disciples who had their own plans and ambitions, and may have heard sayings that they did not. Yet when all this is allowed for we not only have left unexplained a manner of speaking which we can hardly conceive the Master, as we think of Him, using; but certain forms of thought equally strange to that little group which we see in Galilee. Perhaps some light will be thrown on the subject if we try to realize that between the pre-resurrection and post-pentecostal conceptions of the Lord and Master in the minds of even the inner circle there stood a difference that was infinitely great. Before His death He appeared as a miracle-worker, a hero, a mighty leader, but hardly one who could not be compared with Moses and the great men of the past. After the resurrection He became by degrees in their minds the Divine Son of God, the Eternal Word made Flesh. Now the beauty of the Synoptic records is that they give us to a large extent the picture of Jesus as He was seen and thought of while on earth; the words and actions attributed to Him are on the human plane. But John looks back at the human Jesus through the eyes of one who has beheld the glory of His Divinity so long that the halo

is carried back to fit the head of the Man of Sorrows, and the picture of the human Jesus is painted to show Him as the omniscient and omnipotent Son of God, even amid human surroundings.¹ But to say that the Synoptic picture comes nearer to depicting the actual mind of Jesus as He sat with the disciples in the Upper Room is to disparage the possibility that there were thoughts in His mind quite incapable at the time of being comprehended by any of His human companions, but which were later caught up intuitively to be clothed in the author's own terms. As Garvie says, "this teaching ...so closely corresponds with what is most typical of the deepest Christian experience that, even if we have not before us a verbatim report, the conviction is irresistible that this is the record of an experience, in which the promises of the Master Himself were fulfilled, that the Jesus of history intended to be to His disciples what the Christ of his faith proved Himself to be to this disciple. ...We can accept this contribution... not as theological speculation, but as personal experience."²

Whether the author could have an account more in line with the Synoptics is a question difficult to an-

-
1. For the painting of such a picture^{considered} as one of the purposes of the Gospel, see Holland, op. cit.
 2. The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead, pp.112-13. cf. also Canon Raven: Jesus and the Gospel of Love, p.225.

swer, but "may not the unknown Evangelist have justly and without any sense of deception believed that the majestic utterances that came to him as he meditated upon Jesus were a more faithful 'Gospel' than anything that memory or research could supply?...The resulting testimony may not be history, if by history we mean only a transcript of words spoken on a precise day in the past, or a record of 'old forgotten far off things': but if we believe, as the Evangelist did, in the living Son of the living God, in a risen and present Saviour, we shall accept the gesta Christi wrought upon His unknown follower...as not less authentic than the events of His earthly ministry."¹

With regard to the so-called "I" style, we may rather consider it as an expression of the writer's devotion. He cannot conceive of the Jesus that he now knows and worships as speaking in any other way.²

Besides the author's expressed aim to write "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God",³ there are many subsidiary purposes that he has in view. Besides the growing tendency in the direction of legalism with regard to the remembered words of the Master,

1. Raven: op. cit. p.192.

2. For an elaboration of this point see Prof.B.W.Robinson: The Gospel of John.

3. 20:31

there appears to have been much uncertainty with regard to the real nature of the Person of Christ, and many were veering towards an incipient Gnosticism. Again, there are signs that false opinions were current in connection with the Lord's Supper. The polemic against the Jews was still being carried on, and any fresh evidence to prove further that the Church was the true Israel would indeed be welcome. Then there seems still to have been a sect who followed the tradition of the Baptist, and the subordinate place which the Forerunner really held needed to be emphasized. These and other purposes had their part in the selection of material and presentation of argument.¹

In the Epistle the polemic comes to a head and focusses itself on one terrible danger. What this really was has been the subject of dispute, but we may agree with Law² that it is a form of Gnosticism. This strange mixture of philosophy and religion sought to engulf Christianity by denying the true humanity of the Saviour, and pushing the love of God and the moral requirements of the Christian life into the background. Hence the insistence upon a true confession of Christ, and upon righteousness and love as necessary in the life of the believer.

1. cf. Prof. E.F.Scott: The Fourth Gospel, chs.III-IV.

2. cf. Law, op. cit. ch.2.

Our next task will be to review the passages found in the Gospel and Epistle in which reference is made to the Spirit of God. To facilitate this we have set them out in their order of appearance.¹

1:32 And John bare witness, saying, I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven; and it abode upon him. 33 And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize in (with) water, he said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, the same is he that baptizeth in (with) the Holy Spirit.

3:3 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except one be born anew (from above) he cannot see the kingdom of God....5...Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. 6 That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit....8. The wind bloweth (The Spirit breatheth) where it will, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knoweth not whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.

3:34 For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for he giveth not the Spirit by measure.

6:63 It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life.

7:37 Now on the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. 38 He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, from within him (out of his belly) shall flow rivers of living water. 39 But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the (Holy) Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified.

14:16 And I will pray (make request of) the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter (Advocate, Helper, Gr. Paraclete), that he may be with you for ever, 17 even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him: ye know him; for he abideth with

1. The text here and elsewhere is the American Revised Version. Words in the margin are enclosed in brackets. For a list of passages in the Greek see Swete: The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, 129f., 147f., 255..

you, and shall be in you.

14:26 But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.

15:26 But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth (goeth forth) from the Father, he shall bear witness of me:

16:7...It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. 8 And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: 9 of sin, because they believe not on me; 10 of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more; 11 of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged.

16:12 I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. 13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak; and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come. 14 He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you. 15 All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore saith I, that he taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you.

20:22 And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit:

I, 2:20 And ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things (ye all know)...27 And as for you, the anointing which ye received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any one teach you; but as his anointing teacheth you concerning all things, and is true (so it is true), and is no lie, and even as it taught you, ye abide (abide ye) in him.

I, 3:24 ...And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he gave us. 4:1 Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. 2 Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: 3 and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus (annulleth Jesus) is not of God: and this is the spirit of the anti-christ....6 By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error....13 Hereby we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.

1,5:6 This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with (in) the water only, but with (in) the water and with (in) the blood. 7 And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. 8 For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and the three agree in one.

Turning now to the exegesis of these passages, as far as may be necessary for our study, we shall consider them in ^{the} order given¹, with the exception that in dividing those of the Gospel into two groups, 20:22 will be included with those of chapters 1-12, leaving the so-called Paraclete-passages of 14-16 to form the second group.

The Fourth Evangelist omits any direct account of the baptism of Jesus, but in describing the descent of the Spirit, he enlarges upon the Synoptic story in saying that it "abode upon him". The idea may be a reminiscence of Is. 11:2, where the Spirit of God is to rest upon the Messiah.²

Whether the dove was actually seen by all present, or merely a vision appearing to one or more of the participants, as the verb in the perfect tense here suggests, is a question difficult to decide. Though the dove, with its peaceful ways and habit of fluttering or brooding is

1. We are not unaware of the fact that a large number of scholars favour a rearrangement of chs. 14-16. (For an example of such see Moffatt's New Translation) But for us, it is not hard to see, with MacGregor (see Commentary on John) that 14:16 forms a natural introduction for the Paraclete sayings, and for this reason we are keeping to the traditional order.

2. cf. Bernard (comm. in loc.); Abbott, Diatessarica 712ff

a fitting symbol for the Holy Spirit, true antecedents for such a vision are not easy to find.¹ With regard to Jewish writings, Strack and Billerbeck say, - "Jedenfalls gibt es in der älteren Literatur keine Stelle, in der die Taube klar und deutlich ein Symbol des heiligen Geistes wäre."² Perhaps the solution of the problem is to be found in some unrecorded words of the Master Himself describing His experience.

Summing up the results of a study of the passage, we have, - 1. The symbolical use of the dove for the Spirit, suggesting peace and trust. 2. The permanence of the gift, as signified by the verb; there is no need to refer to it later. 3. The possession of the Spirit by Jesus as necessary for Johannine doctrine. We shall come back to this again.

John's own baptism is only one with water (vs.26,31,33) merely, as MacGregor suggests,³ a negative cleansing from past sin. But that of Jesus, or rather that of the disciples in Jesus' name, for it is improbable that our Lord Himself ever baptized,⁴ was to go farther. Through Christ the positive gift of the Spirit was to come to the believer.

1. cf. W.Telfer: The Form of a Dove. Journal of Theological Studies, XXIX pp.238-42.

2. Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch, on Matt 3:16

3. Comm. in loc.

4. cf. 3:22,26; 4:1,2.

In the course of the Conversation with Nicodemus the work of the Spirit in connection with rebirth or conversion is dealt with. Bernard notes that here we have the counterpart of Mk.10:15, where the condition for entrance to the Kingdom is the possession of the child-like spirit.¹ Referring to Jesus' teaching of the Kingdom, Heitmüller writes, -"Neben dem klaren festen Grundton, ...hören wir in dem Wort einen Oberton, der uns aus der Predigt Jesu nicht bekannt ist und doch auch nicht fremd erscheint. Es ist ein Ton aus des Paulus Hymnus, 'Ist jemand in Christus, so ist er eine neue Kreatur. Das Alte ist vergangen, siehe es ist neu geworden'"²

The meaning of *ἀνωθεν* may be either anew or from above and probably MacGregor is right in suggesting that a double meaning is implied. The author may also have had in mind the practice of rebirth in the Mysteries.³

The mention of water does not directly concern us, though we may note that the usual way of interpreting it as standing for baptism is questioned by Dr. Odeberg, who has devoted much study to it.⁴ In any case, "there is a conscious stress on the spiritual change".⁵

1. Taking v.3 as parallel to v.5. It has been held that v.5 did not belong to the original, or it would have been quoted by Justin. cf. Swete, op.cit. p.132, Bernard, ad loc.

2. Des Schriften des N.T., S.741.

3. cf. Bauer: Das Johannesevangelium², ad loc. (p.209

4. cf. The Fourth Gospel I, ad loc. 5. Howard, op.cit.

Though the word πνεῦμα is used without the article in v.5, the presence of the latter in v.6 indicates that in both the Holy Spirit is signified.¹ There is no need to argue whether born or begotten is the right word; the meaning is clearly that believers are quickened (Westcott), or awakened by the power of God working within them. Through the Spirit they receive new life, and become citizens of the realm of spirit, the "Kingdom of God"

The following verse brings out well the distinction between the two Johannine worlds, that of the flesh and that of the Spirit, a separate birth into each being needful for those would come into the sphere of life and light. Bousset cites this as the only echo of Pauline metaphysics to be found in the Gospel,² but as we shall see later, the dualism of Paul is quite different from that of John. Note that the verbs are perfects; it is "that which hath been born, and at present comes before us in this light"³

1. Loisy thinks that πνεῦμα in this verse "éveille à la fois l'idée de souffle ou de vent et l'idée de réalité immatérielle et divine", indicating that both water and spirit (or wind) are sensible objects standing for the supersensible elements to which attention is mainly directed. But he practically gives his case away when he speaks of the terms being different, in that "la réalité sensible du premier se distingue tout à fait de l'objet figuré, à savoir la régénération de l'homme, tandis que la réalité sensible du second terme est déjà presque immatérielle, à moitié confondue, dans le langage religieux, avec l'action invisible de Dieu dans le monde et dans les âmes", the supernatural idea predominating in this instance. (cf. *Le Quatrième Évangile*², ad loc.)

2. Kurios Christos, S.197.

3. Westcott.

The first section of v.8 lends itself also to the translation, - "The Spirit breathes where He will" (Bernard)¹ This may be another case of intentional ambiguity. To the Hebrew mind the ways of the Spirit were always clothed with the mysterious power of the wind, and its manifestations were even in New Testament times frequently associated with this element.² "The point is that the Spirit, like the wind is self-creative, and accountable to itself alone".³ "You cannot restrict the action of the Divine Breath, or prescribe its course, any more than you can dictate to the winds of heaven."⁴ The ways of the Spirit "are not unnaturally puzzling to Nicodemus, for they are understandable only in the light of an experience of which as yet he knows nothing".⁵ They who have never possessed the Spirit are not in a position to theorize with regard to it.

In 3:34 there is some doubt as to whether God or Christ is the subject of *διδοσιν*. The reading of many manuscripts, supported by a study of the context, is that it is God "Who giveth not the Spirit by measure".⁵ The possession of the Spirit by Jesus is without limit; "in His case

1. cf. also Eccles. 11:5 LXX.

2. cf. 20:22, Acts 2:2

3. MacGregor. The same element of mystery is applied to Jesus. cf. 7:27; 8:14; 9:29.

4. Swete: op. cit. p.134.

5. With Bernard, Bauer, Swete, and MacGregor, but against Lightfoot. Loisy thinks that the word Son might be substituted later in order to safeguard the doctrine of the Incarnation.

the Divine current of light and power flows unchecked by human sin"¹. Jesus was thus a perfect Incarnation of the Spirit, as well as of the Word, of God.

In 6:63 we have the theme of 3:5 expressed even more clearly. The idea of the Spirit as the bestower of life is, as we shall see, a very old one, though the level of the life bestowed has risen so high as to be quite beyond the sphere of the flesh. "Flesh, without spirit, cannot quicken to eternal life" (Bernard). The last clause of the verse seems to claim life-giving power for the words of Jesus. Elsewhere we are told that they are the words of God,² "and as such belong to the sphere of spiritual realities" (Bernard). There is doubtless reference to the preceding discussion on the Flesh and Blood of our Lord. Loisy, referring the verse to the Redactor, says that the latter is toning down the realism of the author's statements, which are written for the initiate, and adapting them for a much larger public.³ As Swete puts it, "it is the Spirit in the humanity of our Lord which is life-giving, and it is the Spirit that mediates the process by which in the Eucharist or otherwise the life-giving humanity is conveyed to believers and becomes to them the food of eternal life".⁴

1. Swete: op. cit. p.136.

3. cf. also Heimüller in loc.

2. cf. 17:8

4. op. cit. p.142.

In the next chapter we have the story of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles. For the space of a week, offerings of water, drawn from the Pool of Siloam, had been brought up to the Temple courts, to the accompaniment of special psalms and chants, among these being Is. 12:3 - "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation". This forms a fitting background for v.38.

There is some confusion over the punctuation of vs. 37-8. Eastern authorities place the full stop after *πικετω*, as it is in our English versions. But some Western commentators carry it on to *εμε*, making the passage read, - "If anyone is athirst, let him come unto me; and let him drink who believes on me; as Scripture says, 'out of his body streams of living water will flow'" (MacGregor)¹ This rendering allows Ex. 17:6 and Ps.105:41 to be thought of as references, the association of Christ and the Rock being made by Paul,² and leads naturally to the following verse.

Though v.39 is assigned by many scholars to a secondary source, its purport is by no means out of harmony with the body of the work. Lightfoot quotes a passage from the Talmud showing that even the Jews took the libation of water as symbolizing the outpouring of the

1. With Loisy and others, as against Westcott and Bernard. For a full discussion of the subject see C.H. Turner's article in Jnl. Th. St. vol. XXIV, pp. 66-70, and that of F.J. Badcock, pp. 169-174.

2. I Cor. 10:4.

Spirit.¹ The distinction attempted by Westcott and others, making the omission of the article mark "an operation, or manifestation, or gift of the Spirit, and not the personal Spirit", seems to be pressing the words too far.

Referring to the last part of this verse, Loisy tries to show that the gifts of the Spirit to the prophets were not "de même ordre que le don fait aux chrétiens", and that the time was not yet ripe for the latter to be bestowed by Christ. This ^{point} may well be left until later.

Passing by the Paraclete-sayings, we come to 20:22. Immediately before His Ascension and Glorification the Risen Lord breathes forth the Spirit upon the waiting disciples. This is not, as Godet suggests, an earnest of Pentecost, but the Johannine Pentecost itself, the fulfilment of what has so often been promised. Here the author leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader that it was Jesus who gave, as well as who promised, the Spirit.

Breathing, meaning to convey life into, is used more than once in the Old Testament.² A second or third century papyrus speaks of breathing spirit into men.³ But the disciples must not be thought of as passive, for the command was to take (λάβετε) the Spirit, signifying that some effort on their part was required. As in 7:39, the

e/ 1. cf. Horae Hebraicae, comm., in loc. (gan.
2. cf. Gen. 2:7; Ezekiel 37:9. 3. Bernard, after Milli

omission of the article need not trouble us¹.

We now come to the second group of sayings, those introducing this rather mysterious or "rätselhaft" (Bauer) figure of the Paraclete. With regard to the word itself, the consideration of its use and meaning will form the subject of a later section, and may now be passed over.

The first saying opens with a promise of Jesus to pray for the Father to give the disciples "another paraclete". Here the distinction is made between Jesus, the Paraclete they now have upon earth, and will have in the future with the Father²; and the One who is to remain with them³ when the Master has left, in all respects the latter's "own alter ego" (MacGregor).

No sooner is the Paraclete mentioned than its affinity with Jesus comes to our notice. Christ is the Truth⁴; and the Paraclete is the Spirit of Truth.

The Spirit of Truth cannot find a place in the world "because sympathy is a natural condition for reception" (Westcott), and^{it} "neither has the spiritual vision nor the mystical experience which alone make the action of the Spirit intelligible" (MacGregor). Loisy links this

1. contra Westcott and others who speak of spirit here as merely the power of the new life from Christ, a "necessary condition for the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost"

2. cf. 14:13-14; I, 2:1.

3. For the true meaning of *eis tòr aiōna* and similar expressions, see any good lexicon.

4. cf. 14:6

this up with sacramental teaching: the world cannot know the Paraclete, partly because it does not know "l'expérience des communications intimes et personnelles qui ont leur source dans la régénération baptismale et leur aliment dans la communion eucharistique".

But the disciples have this experience, "for in Christ the Spirit was truly present already" (Westcott). As His Spirit it remains with them, and in the likeness of His Presence it will abide in their hearts in the days to come. In describing this relationship of the Paraclete to the believer, the three prepositions *μετά, παρά* and *ἐν* are used; the first is a mark of fellowship, applying more to the Church, the second suggests a friend sitting at one's side, the third indicates the indwelling Presence.

As Swete expresses it, "the Son of Man could not remain to the end of time; permanence was possible only for a spiritual Power"¹. Though such a Power was to be theirs, the Master knew that it would be hard to keep the disciples from longing for the sight of His own Person, so the promised Spirit is brought even closer to Jesus in the words that follow, "I will not leave you desolate: I will come unto you" (in the Spirit).

In the second Paraclete-passage (14:26), the fact

1. op. cit. p. 150.

that the Paraclete is the Holy Spirit is made unmistakable.¹ As Christ is come in His Father's name, to reveal Him, so the Spirit will come in Christ's name, to reveal the Divine Word, and "to make clear to the consciousness of the Church the full significance of the Incarnation" (Westcott). The Spirit is here set forth as the teacher, not literally of all truth, but of the Truth as embodied in Jesus, -of the divine Wisdom which should put to shame the wisdom of men. Memories of Jesus' teaching were to be stirred up, and things not at first understood were to be illumined in the light of later revelation.

The use of the masculine *ἐκείνος*² is significant here, and "shows that for John τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας meant more than a mere tendency or influence" (Bernard).

There are one or two ^{new} points in the next saying (15:26). The context indicates that we are to think of a world hostile to Jesus and His followers. Here the Paraclete will come as "the divine Advocate, defending the righteous One, and pleading His cause against false accusers" (Bernard).

Westcott reminds us that the word made so much of by the Councils, and rendered in our versions as proceedeth, may mean either coming "from a source", or

1. This is the only instance where John uses the full term τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

2. Repeated in 15:26; 16:8; 16:13-14.

"on a mission". The use of the preposition *παρά* rather than *ἐκ* shows that the latter is the intended meaning, and that the theologians who saw in the passage a reference to the Eternal Procession had, without noticing it, changed the prepositions.

In 14:26 it was the Father who sent, at Christ's behest, the Paraclete; now it is Christ who sends the same "from the Father". This witnesses to the unity of the Three in the mind of the writer.

The fourth saying (16:7-11), after referring to the necessity of Jesus' bodily withdrawal before the Paraclete can come, goes on to outline the effect of the Spirit's coming upon the world of unbelievers. Here his role changes from that of defending to that of persecuting attorney. The world that is to put Jesus to death and harass His followers is itself to be exposed and convicted.¹ This conviction will proceed along three lines,-

i. Unbelief in Christ as the Saviour of the world will be shown as sin in the one who does not believe.

ii. The glorification of Christ will prove that His righteousness has triumphed, and by this those who stood against Him are denounced.

iii. The showing up of evil by the coming of the Son of Man is a judgment upon all whose life and work is

1. The verb *ἐλέγχο* means to expose, reprove, convince, or convict.

is evil. As MacGregor puts it, "by Christ's death evil has been condemned utterly; the devil is fighting a losing battle".

In the fifth passage (16:13-16), several points touched on previously are made more explicit.

The Paraclete will reflect the Master's character even to the point of not speaking of Himself. Spiritual revelations which do not enlarge our knowledge of God are to be questioned. The Paraclete will reveal what He hears, just as Christ has done (8:26). Some question whether the author means this to extend beyond the time in which he wrote.¹

The verb in the final clauses of vs. 13-14-15 is the same, and the thought in the third is somewhat parallel to that of the others. Among the works of the Spirit, as we shall see, prophecy has always been prominent. The things to come: "that future which even now is prepared, and in the very process of fulfilment" (Westcott), the coming victory of Christ and the defeat of the powers of darkness, these are to be foreshadowed. We would hardly go so far as Bernard, who sees here a hint of apocalyptic prevision,² though if Jesus in the flesh saw such things, there is no reason why the Spirit should not suggest them.

1. cf. Bernard in loc.

2. as in Mk. 13:26.

The Paraclete will glorify Christ in that He will invoke fresh insight into the life and work of the Saviour, leading to "an enlargement of man's sense of His majesty" (Bernard). It will not be a visible glorification as Jude seems to expect¹, but will be the making of Christ divine in the hearts of His followers, through the appreciation of what He had been and done.

As MacGregor points out, "John allows ^{to} the Spirit little independent action or influence. His function is to represent Christ and to ensure that His influence shall continue, even as Christ's function is to represent God".

The great theme of the Epistle is "fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ".² This fellowship, if real, will find expression in abhorrence of evil and [^]love toward others. But a new sect had sprung up, who though called Christians, were no sons of God in the true sense and cared not for the Spirit of Truth. A series of tests was needed so that it might be clear to all which was the ~~real~~ faith, and in what direction the Spirit of Jesus actually lay.

The first reference to the Spirit (2:20) comes as a challenging note to those left after the departure of many to follow the Antichrist. The word *Χρισμα* probably

1. cf. 14:22

2. I, 1:3.

refers to what was received at the time of anointing, rather than the act itself. The old idea was that of consecrating a king, priest, or prophet to his office,¹ such a one being thought of as endued with the Spirit.² The word Christ itself means "the anointed one", thus pointing to the general belief that our Lord in a special sense received the unction of the Holy Spirit.³ Paul speaks of Christians as having been "anointed" by God, this being closely associated with the gift of the Spirit.⁴ Tertullian speaks of the practice of anointing as part of the ceremony of baptism,⁵ but we have no evidence that this was so in apostolic days. The reference here is rather to the gift, without doubt that of the Spirit, which seemed to have been regarded as a sort of unction conferred with the imposition of hands.⁶ The "Holy One" from whom the chrism comes may be the Father,⁷ but the term is more generally applied to Christ.⁸

The emphasis, however, is not so much upon the receiving of the chrism, as upon the fact of its reception and what it should mean to them. If we accept the last word of the verse as *πάρτες* ⁹ it signifies that they should

1. I Sam. 9:16; Ex.29:7; I Kings 19:16 (4:18.
 2. cf. I Sam. 16:13; Is.61:1. 3. Acts 10:38; cf. Luke
 4. II Cor. 1:21-22. 5. de Bapt. 7.
 6. cf. Acts 8:17. For a fuller treatment of the subject
 see Westcott, Brooke, Luthardt, comm. in loc.; Law,
 pp. 112, 127. (6:69; Acts 3:14.
 7. cf. I Cor 6:19; Jn. 16:16. 8. cf. Mk.1:24; Jn.
 9. With Westcott and Hort, followed by Findlay and Brooke.

all be aware of the things referred to; if, on the other hand it is πάντα¹, the sense is repeated and enlarged upon in v.27.

The writer, in v.27, reminds the readers that they "have received" the chrism, the verb denoting that it came to them as a single past event. We may follow Westcott and Brooke in treating the first clause of the verse as the protasis and the remainder as the apodosis, the pause being after the second "you". The last verb is probably indicative and the context favours Christ as the one in Whom they abide. Taken literally this verse almost claims papal infallibility for every Christian, and denies all need of human agency in Christian instruction. This can hardly be the meaning. Findlay points out that this chrism "did not guarantee a precise agreement in every point of doctrine and practice", but "covers essential truth, such as that of the Godhead of the Redeemer here in question"². But we would rather say that the knowledge mediated by the Spirit of Truth is apprehended by intuition rather than reason; even if they could not refute by logical process the heresy that reached their ears, they should feel it to be false. But we shall return to this later.

1. Textus Receptus, followed by Law and Windisch.
2. Fellowship in the Life Eternal, p.223.

We next hear of the possession of the Holy Spirit as a test of true fellowship with God (3:24). But how are we to know that the spirit within us is the Spirit of God? The answer follows quickly,—"Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God"(4:2). The essence of the argument is, as Law phrases it,—"God abides in all to whom He has given His Spirit; but only the spirit that confesses Jesus as the Christ come in the flesh is the Spirit of God; if, therefore, the spirit in us inspires this confession of Jesus, we know that God abideth in us"¹.

Whether the Spirit is the source, or its possession merely the proof of the Divine indwelling, is a point upon which commentators differ. Westcott says of 3:24b, "The love which the Christian feels and which is the spring of his obedience, assures him of God's fellowship with him. In other words, God has given him of His Spirit". On the other hand, Law claims that in the section 3:24b-4:6 the possession of the spirit "that confesses Jesus as the Christ is the objective and infallible sign that God is abiding in us"² It is not that the Spirit here assures us subjectively, but in its objective presence it is a sign to all who may observe it.

1. op. cit. pp. 263-4.

2. p. 263n.

With regard to the nature of this test to be applied to the spirits, Westcott shows that v.2b can be read in three ways,—"Every spirit who (i) confesseth Jesus as Christ, and a Christ come in the flesh"; (ii)"confesseth Jesus Christ, Him who is known by the full name, as come in the flesh"; (iii)"confesseth Him, Whose nature and work is described by the phrase 'Jesus Christ come in the flesh'"; and regards¹ the last as preferable. In such a confession one finds in a nutshell the substance of Christian allegiance. As Brooke says, it is not the confession "of the truth of certain propositions about a certain person, but the confession of a Person, of whom certain propositions are true,...not of the fact of the Incarnation, but of the Incarnate Christ. The repetition in v.3 emphasizes this².

The contrast between the attitude toward the Spirit in the Gospel, where the utmost freedom is given to it and its very mystery is pointed out, and in the Epistle, where if it declines to answer to a tribunal it may be stigmatized as belonging to the Antichrist, is made much of by Goguel,³ who thinks it indeed a backward step. But though forcing the Spirit to bow to a criterion may rob

1. With Huther and Brooke.

2. For the evidence for the Latin variant soluit (Every spirit that divideth Jesus), cf. Westcott, pp.156ff., Brooke, comm. in loc.

3. cf. La notion johannique de l'esprit.

its manifestations of originality and power, we need ever to keep in mind that our idea of the Spirit must always be linked closely to that of God as revealed in Christ Jesus. We cannot afford to have anything to do with a spirit that is not the Spirit of Jesus.

The passage also reminds us that every true believer is expected to be in possession of the Spirit, and that the gift remains with him, at least so long as he believes.

Though v.13 seems but a repetition of 3:24b, a new turn is given to its thought. The words "of his Spirit" remind us that none of us are capable of receiving the full measure of the Spirit. "To each according to his several ability". This does not mean, however, that the Spirit is in any way divided, but that certain phases of His Personality fail to find expression in us. The verb *δεδωκεν* supports this, suggesting as it does that there is continuity in the giving. As our personalities develop they may be able to receive more of the Spirit. Only to Jesus was it given "without measure".

Passing on to 5:7-8, we come to the last passage: the inclusion of the Spirit among the "three witnesses". The author has been trying to answer those who deny that Christ was truly incarnate. He may also have in mind those who knew only a baptism of purification, - Jews

and the followers of John the Baptist.¹ The references to water and blood are hardly of the sacraments as such,² but are rather of the events of baptism and crucifixion in the life of Jesus. He was not only consecrated to His public office by baptism, but truly poured out His blood upon the Cross. "The Death on the Cross was its consummation (of His work), not a mere incident in the life of an ordinary man, after the Higher Power had left Him, which had temporarily united itself with His human personality for the purposes of teaching" (Brooke).

That these things are so, the Spirit of Truth is a constant³ witness. There may also be a reference here to the heretical view that the Spirit left Jesus before the Passion.⁴ Then two witnesses are essential for legality and three desirable.⁵ Here we have, too, an echo of the Paraclete-passage (15:26), where the Spirit is to bear witness to the living Christ. And all three are in agreement, testifying jointly to the one truth. "This combination of the historical (the water, the Blood) and the ideal (the Spirit) is the strength of Christian apologetics. Without the one Christianity becomes a mere Ideal-

1. cf. Windisch in loc.

2. contra Law: op. cit. pp. 121ff. Brooke reminds us that *αἷμα* is never found of the Eucharist.

3. note the tense of *μαρτυροῦν*.

4. cf Brooke: comm. in loc. p. xlix.

5. cf. Deut. 19:15.

ism by which faith could no more conquer the world than the lungs could fill themselves in a vacuum. Without the other, the voice of truth awakens no inward response, lacks that self-evidencing power which alone makes it truth to the soul"¹.

Our review of the verbal references to the Spirit of God in the Johannine writings is now completed. But apart from these there are many passages where the idea is quite prominent in the author's mind. If we hold that for him the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the Risen Christ are one and the same, then discourses such as that of the Vine and the Branches fall into this class. But we have gone far enough to show the main lines of doctrine, and further details will come to the fore as we come to a systematic study of the author's thought.

The remainder of this essay will be devoted to the illumination and systematization of what has been gleaned from our exegesis of the Spirit-passages. We shall begin by examining rather closely the words Pneuma and Paraclete, and noting their use when John wrote. Then we shall pass on to a review of the different conceptions of the Spirit, ^{by} which our author may possibly

1. Law: op. cit., p.123.

have been influenced, or which may help us to understand his thought. After this we shall turn to the Johannine body of doctrine itself, first briefly glancing over the main ideas apart from that of the Spirit, then treating in detail the Nature of the Spirit, and following up with the Work of the Spirit. In conclusion we hope to consider one or two problems arising out of our study.

THE WORDS PNEUMA AND PARACLETE AND THEIR USE IN
CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

In seeking to penetrate into the mysteries of our subject we shall need to familiarize ourselves with the two words which our author employed in referring to the Spirit, and the various shades of meaning with which they might be used at that period.

The chief of these, and indeed the only term used by most writers, is the word *πνεῦμα*. This word has a long and interesting history, much of which will be touched on in the following sections of this essay, and here we shall content ourselves with taking a cross-section of the uses put to it alone, and in combination with such words as *ἀγιος*, in the days when the Gospels were written. These may be set down as follows,-

A. - Air in motion.

i. Wind. That this primitive use still persisted is shown in Stobaei *Hermetica Exerp.* XXIII: 36.

ii. Breath. cf. Josephus 3,12,6; 17,6,5.

B. - An incorporeal sentient intelligent willing human being, or the virtue by which it is sentient, etc.

i. With reference to life. "And her spirit returned" (Luke 8:55)

ii. With reference to the feelings, especially the religious life. "The spirit indeed is willing" (Mk.14:38) "His spirit was provoked within him as he beheld the city full of idols" (Acts 17:16)

iii. With reference to the intelligence¹ "Jesus, per-

1. *ψοῦς* is more often used here.

- ceiving in his spirit that they so reasoned"(Mk.2:8)
- iv. With reference to the volitional and emotional powers as these may be directed in space apart from the body. "Though I am absent in the flesh yet am I with you in the spirit"(Col. 2:5)
- v. With reference to the whole psychic life of a man. "Holy both in body and spirit"(I Cor. 7:34)
- C. - That in the human body which survives after death.¹ "The spirits in prison"(I Peter 3:19); "The spirits of just men"(Heb. 12:23)
- D. - Divine or angelic beings requiring no corporeal body. "Ministering spirits"(Heb. 1:14)
- E. - A divine Power, Influence, or Person,- the subject of this essay. The word is found,-
- i. Without the article, or other limiting words (I Cor. 2:4)
- ii. With the article. (Gal. 4:29)
- iii. With the adjective ἅγιος (II Cor. 13:14) This combination (besides πνεῦμα θεῶν) is found in the magical papyri.²
- iv. With the words "of God". (Rom. 8:14)
- v. With the words "of Christ", or "of Jesus". (Rom. 8:9; Acts 16:7)
- vi. Coupled with the word "holiness", or a similar term. (Rom. 1:4; Jn. 15:26)
- F. - Demons, or wandering evil beings, having no body of their own but seeking entrance into others. "A man with an unclean spirit"(Mk. 1:23)
- G. - Uses difficult to classify. "spirit of bondage"(Rom. 8:15).

1. The word ψυχή is the usual one here.

2. cf. Burton: Spirit, Soul, and Flesh, p.174.

For a more extended treatment of the subject see Shoemaker: The Use of πνεῦμα and of πνεῦμα ; Burton: Spirit, Soul, and Flesh; Galatians (International Critical Commentary) p.490f.

As the word *παράκλητος* was used much less often, and less study has been devoted to it, it is desirable that we should treat it far more exhaustively than we did the word pneuma.

Coming from the verb *παρακαλέω* which means to call, summon, invoke, entreat, admonish, or comfort, the word is rarely found in writings of the Classical period. In Demosthenes, the *παράκλητοι* are the friends of the accused.¹ From this time it appears as a judicial term, standing for one called to the aid of the one on trial, - an advocate, pleader, intercessor, a "friend of the accused person, called to speak to his character, or otherwise enlist sympathy to his favour"².

In Rabbinical circles, according to Strack-Billerbeck,³ the word⁴ was found to denote the following, -

- i. Angel- In the Targums are references to the defen-angel at the judgment, who shall appear if good works are laid up, and whose word shall prevail against 999 accusers.
- ii. Man.- Moses, in pleading for Israel before God, became her paraclete. A man's paraclete is referred to as his friend.
- iii. Offering - The two lambs, without blemish, offered up daily (Num. 28:3f) are spoken of as two paracletes. Israelites were warned to be careful about the offerings ordered in the Law, for no better paraclete exists

1. de falso legatione V 341.
 2. Field: Notes, 102.
 3. Kommentar, II, S.560-62.
 4. Transcribed into Hebrew.

- for bringing down the showers of rain than the daily offering.
- iv. Wood Offering at Feast of Tabernacles - Since the kind of wood used grows in water, the offerings become a paraclete for the rain.
 - v. A Kept Commandment - "Who keeps a commandment has gained for himself a paraclete!"
 - vi. Repentance and Good Works - Man when coming before the judgment needs a paraclete that he may be saved. Repentance and good works constitute such a paraclete.
 - vii. Almsgiving and Works of Charity - These form a great paraclete and peacemaker between the Israelite and his Father in heaven.
 - viii. Though never referred to by the rabbis as a paraclete, the Holy Spirit is on more than one occasion called a *גִּבּוֹר*, or defender.

The Septuagint does not contain the word, except in the edition of Aquila and Theodotion, where the friends of Job are spoken of as miserable or wearisome paracletes.¹ But in several passages functions assigned to the Johannine Paraclete are found attributed to the Spirit.²

In Philo we sometimes find the word used in the sense of advocate or chief advisor. Flaccus' place of banishment is changed by request of his paraclete, Lepidus.³ Joseph says to his brethren that he will forgive them without there being any paraclete to intercede for them.⁴

1. Job 16:2

2. cf. Is. 11:2; Hagg. 2:5; Ps. 143:10; Test. Judah 20:5.

3. In Flacc. 18.

4. De Jos. 40. cf. also De Opif. Mund. 6.

The word is also applied by Philo to virtues or attributes, when their presence may have a conciliatory influence. Those who have wandered away are said to have their separate paracletes with God, these being later referred to His compassionate Nature, the holiness and intercession of the founders of the nation, their own improvement, and so on.¹ Repentance and conviction of sin are said to form an impeachable paraclete.² Again, Persuasion is counted a paraclete, pleading that Reason should give way to Pleasure.³

As Prof. Kennedy suggests, paraclete is with Philo a picture-word for surety.⁴

In the New Testament the word is only found in the Johannine writings, once in the First Epistle, where Christ is spoken of as our Paraclete before God the Father,⁵ and several times in what are called the five Paraclete-passages of the Gospel,⁶ where it refers to the Holy Spirit. The idea of the Spirit as intercessor is found in Rom. 8:26, though the word paraclete is not used.

Prof. Bacon throws an interesting sidelight on the Johannine use of the term, when he speaks of the Risen

1. De Exsecrationibus 9. 2. De Spec. Leg. I, 11.
3. De Opif. Mund. 59. cf. also Vita Mos. III, 14.
4. cf. Philo's Contribution to Religion, p. 113f. 5. I, 2:1
6. cf. Windisch: Die fünf johannischen Parakletsprüche.

Christ as the Paraclete, the "Friend at court", interceding for us at the throne of God. He points out that the defender at court in those days was far more of a suppliant, and literally pleaded his case before the judge. But there is also the "friend from court", the "other Paraclete", who aids the disciples here upon earth.²

The suggestion of a break in the narrative as some of the Paraclete-passages are approached, and the difficulty of holding this figure apart from that of the Risen Christ, have led to different theories of interpolation.³ Some German scholars hold that the word has been applied to some historical or mythical individual such as the author of an earlier recension of the Gospel or Elijah redidivus,⁴ only to be linked up with the conception of the Spirit by the final author. It is true that the words of chs.14-16 suggest to our minds a type of angel rather than an omnipresent Spirit. But we cannot get away from the fact that though influenced by Hellenism our author is still unmistakably Hebrew in his ways of thinking, and like a Hebrew loved to make his word-pictures concrete and lifelike. How clearly he makes the main ideas of his Gospel stand out! There may have been

1. cf. Rom. 8:34

2. cf. The "Other" Comforter. (Expositor 8, XIV, pp.274-282)

3. cf. Sasse: Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium.

4. cf. Spitta: Das Johannesevangelium, S.314f.

connections in which the word was used of which we are ignorant, but as we have seen, it certainly had a considerable use and a definite meaning. The fact the author uses it in more than one connection suggests that it may have been a favourite word with him. Before his day it had not been, so far as we know, used for the Spirit, but there are many instances where it might have been. In the same way the term Logos might have been used by Paul in referring to Christ. As the Logos conception failed to express the full glory of the Divinity of Christ, so the Paraclete idea gave but a partial view of the riches of the Holy Spirit. But for that view we may indeed be thankful, since without it our doctrine would not be nearly as complete as it is.

THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT.

However much Christianity may be an advance upon the religion of the Old Testament, its doctrines are few indeed which are not illuminated by a study of these ancient records of the ways of God with His chosen people. Their influence upon the writers of the New Testament was beyond all measure of doubt, ^{much} greater than that of any other written source; and when we come to such a doctrine as the Spirit, we have not only to deal with the direct contribution of the writings, but also their indirect effect through moulding the thought of generation after generation of priests and prophets. But to deal adequately with the various phases and changes through which the doctrine passed even during the period covered by the Canon, would require a great deal of space; and as several excellent treatises have been written on the subject,¹ we shall confine ourselves to a hurried outline which must of necessity omit many important details.

Like the Greek pneuma, the Hebrew ruach (רוּחַ) was early connected with the idea of wind or air in motion.² Then it came to be used to designate breath, the movement of air in and out of the body.³ Only living beings

1. Among these may be mentioned Wood: *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature*; Humphries: *The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience*. Volz: *Der Geist Gottes...im A.T.*
2. cf. Ps. 1:4; II Sam. 22:11. 3. cf. Job 9:18; Ezek. 37:10.

breathe, so the "spirit" that passed in and out of the body, but returned no more after death, was thought to possess the power of physical life itself.¹ As the winds were controlled by God, so also was the life-force in man.²

But scholars might hasten to remind us that the phenomena to which we have just drawn attention, do not meet us in the early literature.³ What we do find, however, in the early days, is frequent mention of a power that seemed to take possession of men, a sort of intoxication, - and it is probable that intoxicating drugs were often used to induce it. Such a power would come upon men suddenly, and move them to do extraordinary things. As was the case with most unusual phenomena, it was thought to have a divine origin; and was thus early attributed to Jahweh Himself. It was the Spirit of Jahweh that came upon Othniel, "and he judged Israel" and "went out to war";⁴ upon Gideon and inspired him to gather the clans and deliver his country;⁵ and that moved Samson and strengthened him for his mighty feats of physical prowess.⁶

But ^{divine} spirit-possession did not confer physical power

-
1. cf. Job 12:10; Is.42:5. 2. cf. Num.16:22; Job 12:10
 3. cf. Burton: Spirit, Soul, and Flesh, p.54f.
 4. Jud.3:10 5. Jud. 6:34.
 6. Jud. 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14.
 7. There were also evil spirits. See below.

alone. The Spirit of God came mightily upon Saul when he met a band of prophets "and he prophesied among them."¹ The same thing is said of certain messengers of Saul². It was indeed at that time considered a mark of a prophet that he should at least occasionally find himself possessed in this way;³ though later, so careless and professionalized did these men become, that the great men of the eighth century and down to the exile preferred rather to attribute their inspiration direct to Jahweh or the Word of Jahweh(or God).⁴

The origin of the conception, Spirit of Yahweh, or of God, is not at all clear. Volz and others think that the spirits were first independent beings having nothing to do with Yahweh.⁵ But in the Old Testament records we find no trace of them apart from Him. Even the evil spirits are sent out by Him,⁶ though we do not find the Spirit of Yahweh sent out on evil errands. Indeed, from the earliest days its operations were doubtless conceived as having religious value. Though the Spirit worked through picked individuals, its work was for the community rather than for the individual through whom it worked. Its manifestations were generally sudden and

1. I Sam. 10:10.

2. I Sam. 19:20

3. cf. I Kings 22:24; II Kings 2:15, etc.

4. cf. Amos 1:3; Micah 1:1; Is. 1:2; Hosea 1:1; Jer. 1:2, etc.

5. op. cit. S.22f.

6. cf. Jud. 9:23; I Sam. 16:14-15; 18:10; 19:9; I Kings 22:22f.

spasmodic; only in a very few individuals, as David and Elijah, does there seem to be anything like an abiding Spirit.

After the Exile we find the Spirit coming into its own again. The conception is made much of by Ezekiel, and is taken up by later writers. As God grew in the thoughts of men from the tribal Deity of Israel to the Creator of the universe and Judge of the nation, becoming more and more separated from the ordinary affairs of life, so the Spirit ~~in~~ as His active agent on the earth and among its creatures. Not only does it inspire prophecy,¹ skill and wisdom,² strength and power,³ but it is considered the basis of rational and even, as we have seen, of physical life.⁴ Apart altogether from man, it is found at the Divine work of fashioning the universe.⁵ Through the Children of Israel it is working to build up the chosen nation.⁶ But at this time the nation was in distress, and its great hope lay in future deliverance and prosperity. As its leader in this coming age, we see thrown upon the screen of prophecy the figure of the Messiah. Upon him the Spi-

1. Ezek. 2:2; 3:12, etc.; Neh. 9:30; Is. 61:1, etc.

2. Ex. 28:3; 31:3; 35:31; Num. 27:18.

3. Zech. 4:6

4. Job 27:3; 33:4; 34:14; Is. 44:3-4; Num. 16:22; 27:16.

5. Job 23:16; Gen. 1:2; Ps. 33:6.

6. Is. 63:10, 11, 14; Neh. 9:20; Ps. 106:33.

rit of Jahweh would rest,¹ and the day of his coming was to be marked by a special outpouring of the Spirit of God upon mankind.² The Spirit was upon the mythical figure of the Suffering Servant.³ Even in ^{the} private religious life of that period itself, we seem once or twice to be almost on the verge of finding the Spirit conceived as the indwelling Presence of the Divine in the heart.⁴

Between the doctrine of this later period and that of the time of the Judges a very decided development may be noted. The cruder and more physical ideas have dropped back, and a long stride towards its becoming the source of the moral and spiritual life of the individual has been taken. But its work is still mainly national in character, and only in two or three late passages do we find its possession so personal that the nation is left quite out of account. Connected always with God in earlier times, it sometimes comes to be almost as a divine Hypostasis, independent of God.⁵ It should be noted, however, that there were always other Divine agents apart from the Spirit; the earlier writers have many allusions to the Voice of God, the Word of God, the Hand of God, and so forth, while following upon the

1. Is. 11:2
 etc.; Is. 32:15; 34:16; 59:21; Zech. 12:10; Joel 2:28-9.
 2. Ezek. 11:19; 36:26-7; 39:29
 3. Is. 42:1
 4. Ps. 51:10-11; 139:7; 143:10.
 5. as in Ezek. 2:2.

Exile came the development of angelology.

Seen in the light of Christian theology, the Old Testament conception at its best has at least three limitations, - (i) It always appears as quite subordinate to God, and with hardly a trace of personality.¹ (ii) It is bestowed on leaders alone, though a more general participation is looked forward to in the future. (iii) Its work is almost entirely confined to enlivening and inspiring the one upon whom it comes, making him fit for office, but remaining unconcerned about his need for moral regeneration.¹ But we have only to compare it with some of the ideas prevailing in contemporary religious systems to see what a vast stride forward had been made, and how well the way had been paved for the greater revelation to come through Christ.

1. An apparent exception to both (i) and (iii) above, is the "Holy Spirit" of Ps. 51:11 and Is. 63:10-11. The Psalmist, in asking for a clean heart, requests that God's Holy Spirit be not taken from him, and the prophet speaks of the people having grieved the Holy Spirit. In his book, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature*, Abelson, after examining the opinion of several exegetes, contends that these are passages expressing "that deeper sense of the abiding nearness of God to Israel, that mystical perception" of God "filling" an individual or nation, later spoken of as the Shekinah. (cf. pp.193-97)

With reference to the moral nature of the Holy Spirit, it should be kept in mind that there was comparatively little moral content in the Hebrew idea of holiness. Speaking of Ps.51:11, Volz points out that the Holy Spirit had not prevented sin, or been removed because of it. "Die Ruh ist nicht die Kausalität die die Frömmigkeit wirkt, sondern das göttliche Wesen, das dem Frommen geschenkt wird, und das Gemeinschaftsband, das ihn mit der Gottheit wesenhaft verknüpft". (op. cit. S.111)

THE SPIRIT IN PALESTINIAN JUDAISM.

Jewish thought from about the third century B.C. easily divides itself into two schools,- that which remained in Palestine with Jerusalem as its centre, and which offered a more or less rigid resistance to Hellenistic encroachment; and that which flourished in Alexandria, and held the door open for an alliance with Greek thought. Each of these movements, running parallel with the founding of the Christian Church, was important in its own way, and must be given separate treatment.

Our first sight of Pal^astinian Jewish thought is one that suggests a dull and uninspiring legalism. Silent is the prophetic voice, even amid great tribulation.¹ The general opinion is that revelation has ceased, and the priests busy themselves in codifying and interpreting the Law of Moses, and adapting it to the minutiae of everyday life. No writer no^w considers himself inspired; for the most part he dare not even publish his work under his own name, since it is through the great men of the past that the Spirit has spoken, and only in so far as the patronage of Solomon or Moses can be invoked, are his writings likely to be read.

This theory of past inspiration, however, is broadened out so as to hold that all the canonical books

1. cf. Ps. 74:9; I Macc. 4:46; 9:29; 14:41; Josephus: Cont. Apion, 1:8.



are composed under the direct guidance of the Spirit, though the manifestation of the Spirit in the Pentateuch is regarded as higher than that in the Prophets and the Writings¹. This theory of inspiration leads to the custom of quoting words of Scripture as though directly spoken by the Holy Spirit. With reference to this, Volz says, - "Statt der lebendigen Offenbarungsträger hat der Geist Gottes nun ein ständiges Organ, das heilige Buch; in diesem Buch hat er einmal in vergangenen Zeiten gesprochen, aber er spricht heute noch durch dasselbe; deswegen kann man von einem Bibelwort sagen: 'der heilige Geist spricht'"². Traces of this are found in the New Testament³.

One source of direct inspiration, though not associated with the Holy Spirit, is found from this period on. Short incisive messages and warnings were often received through the Bath Kôl, or Voice from heaven. In this way Nebuchadnezzar hears the words of judgment;⁴ Baruch is informed of coming events;⁵ and Enoch speaks concerning his vision⁶. This same phenomena is found in the New Testament, in connection with the Baptism,⁷ and

1. cf. Abelson: op. cit. pp. 209-210

2. op. cit. S.168.

3. cf. Heb. 3:7; Acts 1:16.

4. Dan. 4:31f. (65:4;96:3

5. Ap. Baruch 8:1;13:1;22:1.

6. Enoch 83:5; cf also

7. cf. Mk. 1:11; and parallels.

Transfiguration of Jesus,¹ the conversion of Paul,² and Peter's vision.³ It appears once in the Fourth Gospel.⁴

But even an age such as this could not entirely quench the prophetic spirit. Against the background of a sordid present was painted more than one picture of a bright and glorious future, ushered in perhaps by struggles of unusual magnitude. An in earlier prophecies, a rich outpouring of the Spirit was to be upon the Messiah, the promised leader in the golden age.⁵ In this connection we find such terms as "spirit of wisdom", "spirit of understanding", "spirit of righteousness", "spirit of holiness", and "spirit of grace".

As God grew more and more remote and majestic in the minds of His followers, men became loathe even to utter His name, and different circumlocutions were used. Among these were "Spirit of the Lord", and "Holy Spirit".⁶ This makes it difficult to determine whether God, or the Spirit of God is referred to in a passage.

As the holiness of God was conceived more and more as ethical, so in the course of time His Holy Spirit became more and more connected with morality. This may be seen in the Book of Jubilees,⁷ while elsewhere the Spirit is the bearer of different moral virtues.⁸

1. Mk. 9:7, and parallels.

2. Acts 9:4

3. Acts 10:13; 11:7

4. 12:28ff.

5. cf. Enoch 62:2; 49:3. Ps. Sol. 17:42; Test. Levi, 18, Jud. (24.

6. cf. Enoch 67:10; Abelson: op. cit. ch. XVII.

7. 1:21. 8. Test. Sim. 4, Judah 20:5; Benj. 4, 8; Enoch 61:11

Among the rabbis there came a time when the possession of the ^{Holy} Spirit became the "supreme religious ideal which every Jew must strive to realize"¹. Here the Spirit was to be imparted almost to anyone provided the necessary standard of physical and moral purity were achieved. To reach this, however, was by no means easy. Beginning with the study of the Law, a second century (A.D.) rabbi states that this "leads to carefulness, carefulness to diligence, diligence to cleanliness, cleanliness to abstemiousness, abstemiousness to purity", and so on through piety, humility, fear of sin, ^{and} holiness, to the Holy Spirit and the Resurrection of the dead². Here the Holy Spirit is looked upon as the reward of righteousness, rather than its source and support.

We have thus seen that even this period of legalism knew something of the Spirit. As Volz says, -"Trotz alledem kann die nachexilische Zeit und das spätere Judentum nicht arm an Pneumatikern gewesen sein....Vergleichen wir das Judentum etwa mit der heutigen Zeit oder sonst irgend einer Zeit der Menschheitsgeschichte, so bekommt man den Eindruck, dass ein verhältnismässig reiches Leben des Geistes in der jüdischen Gemeinde der letzten vorchristlichen Jahrhunderte sich kundgab und dass sich die Juden auch hierhin als das Volk der Religion erwiesen."³

1. Abelson: op. cit. p.268.

2. R.Phinehas b.Jair. Quoted from Abelson, p.271.

3. Op. cit. §.144.

THE SPIRIT IN ALEXANDRIAN JUDAISM.

A century or so before the birth of Christ the city of Alexandria began to be famous for its learning. Here gathered students and teachers from all parts of the Mediterranean world, among whom Jews were by no means the least prominent. But besides these followers of the Law of Moses, there were disciples of Plato and of Aristotle, of Epicurus and of the Stoics. In different ways these would meet, become acquainted, and exchange views; and since all were systems that had been transplanted to this new soil, it was natural that there should be many attempts at eclecticism. Men trained in one school of thought would come to understand and believe in the principles of another, and wishing to give up neither, would try to harmonize the two. Thus it was that Jewish teachers came to know Greek learning and tried to make Moses and the prophets expound the mysteries of Plato and the Schools. Of these men we are mainly concerned with two,- the author (or authors) of the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, and the greatest of them all, Philo Judaeus.

The most important section of the Wisdom of Solomon, a writing dated about 50 B.C.¹, is a hymn of praise to the Divine $\tau\acute{o}\phi\iota\alpha$ or Wisdom of God. This conception

1. See commentary by Oesterley, pp. xv-xix.

meets us first in the Book of Proverbs¹. Here Wisdom or Understanding is almost personified, being referred to as existing "from the beginning, before the earth was,"² by wisdom the earth was founded and the heavens established.³ She is to be a guide unto men, and those who lay hold of her and are led by her, find honour and riches. Here is a conception developed parallel to that of the Spirit. We meet it again in the so-called Wisdom Literature, ^{of the Apocrypha} of which the Wisdom of Ben Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) and the Wisdom of Solomon are the most important works.

The author of the latter work is not only familiar with this Hebrew concept, but he also knows the universal Logos-Spirit of the Stoics; the immanent Divine Reason, which penetrates every substance, of which the human soul is a spark or emanation.⁴ At every turn his idea of Wisdom shows the impress of this philosophy. As Rees puts it, here "the idea attains to its most complete unity and its most universal significance...It is the medium of creation, revelation and providence. It is immanent in the world as the order of nature, the law of history, and the moral and religious teacher of man. In all essential points it is the same as Philo's Logos.

1. cf. chs. 5, and 8. 2. 8:23. 3. 3:9

4. cf. Bois: Essai sur les Origines de la Philosophie Judéo-Alexandrine, pp.248ff.

Although the term retains the practical and moral emphasis of its Hebrew associations, it is predominantly a Greek synthesis of divine essence, cosmic principle and moral law."¹

The significance for us of this concept becomes apparent when we notice a step in another direction that is taken by our author. Although in more than one passage the point is obscured by textual confusion,² little doubt remains but that the identification of the divine Wisdom and the Holy Spirit was in his mind. This is clearly shown in the following couplets,-

(evil,

Because wisdom will not enter into a soul that deviseth
Nor dwell in a body that is held in pledge by sin.
For a holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit,³

(dom,

And who can know Thy counsel unless Thou give him wis-
And send Thy holy spirit from on high?⁴

While it may be true, as Drummond suggests, "that the words denote different aspects of the same being, Wisdom indicating its moral and rational essence, while Spirit represents rather its capacity for external action and distribution"⁵, it is not hard to see that this identification does much to broaden and enlarge the doc-

1. cf. The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience, p.46f.

2. i.e. 1:6 and 7:22, where, as Leisegang shows (Der Heilige Geist I, S.69) we have to choose between what is essentially "Wisdom has a spirit", and "Wisdom is a spirit". He follows Heinze in concluding that the ideas are indented, while Goodrick (The Book of Wisdom) takes an opposite stand, arguing that the variant in 7:22 "was due to some supporters of this identification.

3. 1:4-5 (R.V.)

4. 9:17 (Oesterley)

5. Philo Judaeus, I p.217.

trine. It now becomes unmistakably associated with morality, for Wisdom teaches the four virtues,¹ guides into the ways of soberness,² instructs in the things pleasing unto God,³ fleeth deceit and unrighteousness,⁴ correcteth the ways of those on earth,⁵ and bringeth men to judgment.⁶ Again, its possession becomes to a large extent permanent, for as earthly wisdom is usually held once it is acquired, so the divine Wisdom could be taken "to live with one".⁷ "From generation to generation passing into holy souls, she maketh men friends of God and prophets", and God loves those that dwell with her.⁸ She comes in answer to prayer,⁹ and is a comfort "in cares and griefs".¹⁰

That we are not far astray^a in interpreting our author as we have, is proved by his giving Wisdom-attributes to the Spirit. "For thine incorruptible spirit is in all things",¹¹ and "the spirit of the Lord hath filled the world".¹²

To what extent the Wisdom-Spirit is conceived as personal is not easy to estimate. We cannot take the writer too literally as his phrasing is manifestly poetic. According to Drummond, Wisdom is personal, but not a per-

1.8:7	2. 9:11	3. 9:18
4.1:5	5. 9:18	6. 1:8
7.8:9	8: 7:27-8	9: 7:7
10.8:9	11: 12:1	12: 1:7

son¹ "If the distinction is valid," says Gregg, "it expresses well the nature of a Being which is allowed to possess all the moral qualities of God without His self-determination. She is holy, and possesses intelligence; God loves her; and yet she does not exist out of Him. She is rather the result of God's being and the reflection of His volitional movements, than a Being standing over against Him....And yet the writer regards her as far more than a merely literary personification: in view of 8:16-18 it must be granted that he conceded to her a refined supersensuous personality. But psychological analysis had not reached its present development, and the differentia of personality would be stated now in very different terms...No modern psychologist would allow personality to Wisdom, on the data advanced in the book....She emanates from Him, but emanation has not terminated. No birth-severance has taken place, giving her independent life."² We have quoted at length because we consider this a good treatment of a rather important point.

Though many of the possibilities inherent in this union were never developed, it will be seen that there is some justification for the statement of Rendel Harris that the Holy Ghost as well as the Logos of Christian

1. cf. Philo Judaeus, I p.226.

2. Comm. pp. xxxv-xxxvi.

theology sprang from the doctrine of the divine Wisdom.¹ Though many writers have endeavoured to trace the influence of this work in the Christology of Paul and John, few have given it the value it deserves as a source for their thought on the Holy Spirit.²

We now turn to Philo Judaeus, a man who lived in the time of our Lord. Born a Jew, he remained to the end of his days a follower of the Law of Moses. But having drunk deep at the springs of Greek thought, and concluding that such wisdom could not have been hid from Moses, he sought to re-express the teachings of the Pentateuch so as to bring to light this fact, using allegory as his method. He is best known by his doctrine of the Logos or divine Word, which partakes of the nature of the Stoic universal Reason, and of the Hebrew Word of God, and appears as an intermediary between God and the world.

So broadly did Philo develop his conception of the Logos, that he really has little use for a separate doctrine of the Spirit, and as we shall see, it is extremely difficult to draw a line between the two. But we may well leave this for a little space and commence with Philo's record of his own experience.

1.cf. Origin of the Prologue to St.John's Gospel, p.38.
2.cf. R.Birch Hoyle: The Holy Spirit in St.Paul, p.213ff.

In drawing back the curtains of his soul and using what he saw as data upon which to base in part his conclusions, Philo goes beyond most of his contemporaries who were concerned altogether with what they found in the past. In one very illuminating passage he speaks of having come often to the task of writing with his mind full of his subject, and been unable to accomplish anything; at other times, though coming "empty", he writes, "I suddenly became full, ideas being invisibly showered upon me, and planted from above; so that by a divine possession I was filled with enthusiasm, and was absolutely ignorant of the place, of those present, of myself, of what was said, of what was written: for I had a stream of interpretation, an enjoyment of light, a most keensighted vision, a most distinct view of the subjects treated, such as would be given through the eyes from the clearest exhibition"¹. Such revelation he seems to attribute to "the invisible spirit which is accustomed to converse with me in an unseen manner"². Speaking of prophecy, he tells us that "the mind that is in us is removed from its place at the arrival of the divine Spirit, for it is not lawful for the mortal to dwell with

1. Migrat. Abr., 7 (Drummond's Translation)

2. De Somn., II, 39

N.B. In referring to the works of Philo, the notation of Richter, used in the English translation by Yonge, is employed. Most of the quotations are after Yonge.

the immortal.¹ The real prophet is even unconscious of the fact that he is inspired, his own reasoning powers leaving the citadel of his soul, and the divine Spirit coming in quite unknown to him.² Nor is the prophet able to comprehend all that he utters.³ Here we have the impress of the author's metaphysical^{and moral} dualism. The human being is for the most part earthy and evil, and Philo prefers to interpret his experience so as to have the human spirit vacate while the divine Spirit is in possession. Few traces of this idea are found in the New Testament, and certainly none in the Johannine Writings. It is far more like the more modern theory of verbal inspiration,⁴ in fact, "to Philo perhaps should be traced the theory of passive and literal inspiration which came into vogue in the Christian Church".⁵

But there is another side to Philo's doctrine of the Spirit, and we even find him speaking in quite a different strain with regard to prophecy. "Through prophecy is made manifest the things which cannot be comprehended by a process of reasoning."⁶ The divine Spirit assists the reason, helping it to make correct conjectures, and "leading it into the way of truth".⁷ Again, there is a

1. Quis. Rer. Div., 53.

3. Monarch. I, 9.

of the legend that the translators of the Septuagint had separately written the same words. (Vita Mos. II, 7)

5. Rees: op. cit. p. 51.

7. Vita Mos. III, 36.

2. De Spec. Leg. IV, 8.

4. cf. Philo's acceptance

6. Vita Mos. III, 23.

definitely moral aspect to the prophetic Spirit. When it enters the soul, divination and cunning are unable to stay and are driven out.¹

We may now pass on to what may be called our author's general teaching of the Spirit, a doctrine which comes nearer to his Logos theory, and which is more in line with the principles of Greek psychology than the one we have been considering. Man as first created was made "according to the image of God...perceptible only by the intellect...imperishable by nature."² But in the Fall man "made himself over wholly to the earth."³ This theory, however, gives little room for Philo's prophetic Spirit; and how explain Genesis 2:7, which he seems to take as applying to the general run of humanity, in distinction to 1:27, which refers to the ideal man mentioned above?⁴ This question he approaches in a good many passages. In one account he states that each "is two persons, the animal and the man". "To the one portion is assigned the vivifying faculty," to the other the "rational faculty,"⁵ into which God has breathed the "spirit of genuine life"⁶. This "rational part is the substance of the divine Spirit,"⁷ "sent to take up its habitation here on earth"⁸. The divine Spirit in the

1. Vita Mos. I, 50.

2. Opif. Mund. 46.

3. Fragm. in Jn. Damasc., p. 748 A. 4. cf. Volz, S. 105.

5. Quod det. pot. 22.

6. Leg. alleg. I, 12.

7. Quaest. in Gen. II, 59.

8. Opif. Mund., 46.

soul has no direct control over the sensations, powers of speech and generation, and so on; but as they are controlled by the mind, which the Spirit inspires, there is a sort of indirect rule¹ of the whole body.

But the Spirit "does not remain for ever and ever among the greater part of us". It does not stay with those who "live in defiance of law and justice" to whom it often comes only to convict.² It only remains among those "who, having put off all the things of creation, and the inmost veil and covering of false opinion, come to God in their unconcealed and naked minds".³ For example, the Divine Spirit was always beside Moses.⁴ Here Philo differs with the Christian in making the Spirit come presumably very early in life, and be driven away by sin. But he evidently regards it as the basis of morality,⁵ and even as synonymous with virtue, for still referring to Gen.2:7 he says that God "created no soul barren of virtue", and had there existed "one into whom real life had not been breathed (*ἐμπνευσθεῖς*) but who^{was} without experience of virtue, when punished for his transgressions, would have said that he is unjustly punished for that it was through inexperience of good that he failed in respect of it", and would lay the blame on his

1. Leg. alleg. I, 13.

3. Gigant. 12.

5. Opif. Mund. 50.

2. Gigant, 5.

4. Gigant. 12.

Maker¹. Here Philo practically makes the reception of the Spirit the sign of individual moral responsibility. We have already seen that the Spirit is said to visit some in order to convict them, and in another passage we are told how its coming leads to repentance and godliness.²

Thus we have in Philo a development of the conception found in the Wisdom of Solomon, where the Spirit is associated with the moral life of the individual. With regard to the author's sources for this, Leisegang says, -"Philon legt in diese Stelle (Gen 2:7) die platonisch-aristotelische Auffassung vom Nous hinein, die hier gar nichts zu suchen hat, und zwar will er unter dem Nous nur den Geist in engerem Sinne als sittliche Kraft verstanden wissen"³, but there is little doubt that he is also influenced by such Jewish ideas as we have noted.

But again referring to Gen.2:7 and speaking of the soul, Philo tells us that the Creator "employed for its making no pattern taken from among created things, but solely...His own Logos", and that "man was made a likeness and imitation of the Logos when the divine Breath was breathed into his face"⁴. Again we read of the soul being "a genuine coinage of that dread Spirit, the di-

1. Leg. alleg. I,13
3. op. cit. S.90.

2. Quod Deus immut. 29.
4. Opif. Mund. 48.

vine and invisible One, signed and impressed by the seal of God, the stamp of which is the eternal Logos.¹ Here, and in other passages,² we have the Holy Spirit and the Logos brought so closely together that they are almost identified. Sometimes we find the Logos carrying out functions usually given to the Spirit, such as communicating prophecy, speaking through Moses and in the Scriptures, occasioning piety and wisdom, and bringing knowledge of God and conviction of sin.³ It may also be a consort, friend or leader of the soul.⁴ On the other hand the Spirit is sometimes given a creative and cosmic significance usually a mark of the Logos. Volz says that "Philo hat die beiden Factoren nirgends in klarer begrifflicher Scheidung auseinandergehalten"⁵. But Spirit "in its higher sense is used of the Logos only in connection with mankind"⁶.

Philo is also one with the author of the Wisdom of Solomon in attempting to combine the Spirit and the divine Wisdom. In seeking to define the Spirit he uses as an illustration the reference to Bezaleel, whom God filled with "His Holy Spirit, and with wisdom (*σοφία*) and understanding and knowledge"⁷. Later we have the wish expressed that the "divine Spirit of Wisdom may not

1. Plant. Noe, 5.

3. Volz, op. cit. S.187

5. S.187.

7. Gigant. 5. After Ex.31:2f.

2. cf. Quod det.pot. 22-3, etc.

4. Leisegang: op. cit. S.140

6. Drummond: op.cit., II, 217.

lightly shift His dwelling and be gone, but long, long, abide with us" as with Moses.¹ Speaking of this Wisdom, Leisegang writes,—"Die Weisheit die Philon hier als kosmisches Prinzip im Auge hat, ist keine menschlich vernünftige Erkenntnis, ist kein Wissen und keine Wissenschaft, sie ist vielmehr eine übernatürliche Kraft, die in der Menschengestalt einströmt und diesen zu einer Erkenntnis befähigt, die mit irdischen Erkenntnissen nichts gemein hat....Vermittler der Gnosis aber ist das *πνεῦμα* als von Gott ausgehende kosmische Kraft."² We shall see the truth of this when we come to the Johannine Spirit.

The eclectic mind of this Alexandrine has, as we have seen, attempted to fit together many things that were never made to be associated, and in doing so has produced strange and wierd figures. Of some of them we hear no more; but others persist through the centuries. Some were very useful; others were as shutters keeping back light. Of the bringing together of the Stoic *πνεῦμα* and the Hebrew Spirit of God, Rees says,—"It brought the Hebrew idea into a rational system of philosophy, but at the same time deprived it of much of its vividness, individuality and independence....Where the philosophy of Alexandria predominated, the Spirit always remained an attendant shadow, or a corollary of the Logos"³

1. Gigant. 11. 2. op. cit. S.67-68. 3. op. cit.p.56.

THE SPIRIT IN GREEK THOUGHT AND EXPERIENCE.

We have already had occasion to refer to the influence of Greek thought in shaping the theology of the Alexandrians. Let us now step over to this land and see what elements of a doctrine of the Spirit of God we can find there.

But first we must carefully mark out our field, lest we be carried away into the tangles of irrelevant speculation. We need to remember that we are not seeking the doctrine of the soul, the positing of a divine spark as inherent in every human being; but rather the coming of the Divine from without into the human heart, the taking possession of a man in whole or in part by a Power that is greater and nobler than he could ever be.

For this reason we may pass the different pantheistic systems by as having little to offer us. Neither the Logos of Heracleitus ^{the Logos-Pneuma} or ~~of the Stoics~~ come near enough to be included in our study, though they may have influenced genuine Spirit-conceptions. The *διὰ μὲν* of Posidonius is a soul rather than a divine Spirit.¹ The same applies to the "rational" soul of Plato; the godlike element is there before birth.

But we also find in Plato's thought a strain which

1. cf. Bevan: Stoics and Sceptics, ch.3. Later Greek Religion, pp.79-89.

might well stand as the basis for a doctrine of the Spirit. When dealing with madness and frenzy he speaks of a kind of madness (*μανία*) produced "by a divine release from the ordinary ways of men". Of this there are four kinds, - prophetic, brought about by Apollo; mystic, by Dionysus; poetic, by the Muses; and the best, the madness of love, by Aphrodite and Eros.¹ On poetic inspiration he holds that "God takes away the minds of poets and uses them as His ministers, as He also uses diviners and holy prophets in order that we who hear them may know that they speak not of themselves, who utter these priceless words in a state of unconsciousness, but that God is the speaker and that through them He is conversing with us".² This that enters into man is a divine power (*θεῖα δύναμις*) Sometimes the word *ἐπίπνοια* is used,³ of which Leisegang says, - "das auf die zugrunde liegende Vorstellung von der Mitwirkung eines *πνεύμα* oder einer *πνοή* hindeutet"⁴ Here we see the source of some of Philo's thought. We may almost think of the above as demanding expression in spite of Plato, for it ^{is} certainly beside much of his philosophy. Here were facts which he could not let pass unnoticed. But the time for their development was not yet ripe.

1. cf. Phaedrus 265, 244ff. 2. Ion, 533Dff.
3. Crat. 399A; Phaedrus 265B. 4. op. cit. S. 129.

Perhaps the best suggestion of the Christian Holy Spirit to be found in the Greek world is the *διαμῦρ* of Socrates. This was to the philosopher as a divine Presence accompanying him and through its "signs" guiding him. According to Plato these signs were of a prohibitory nature, warning him not to follow certain lines of action, and thus keeping him in the right way. It would even stop him in the middle of a speech; and the absence of warning he counted as a signal that his course of action was favourable.¹ Xenophon, however, represents the *διαμῦρ* as giving positive advice, not only for Socrates himself, but also for any who cared to consult him. "He would", he relates, "constantly advise his associates to do this, or beware of doing that, upon the authority of some divine voice; and as a matter of fact, those who listened to his warnings prospered, whilst he who turned a deaf ear to them repented afterwards."² The most significant phase of this interesting experience is that to Socrates the "signs" were definitely moral in character; what they warned against was to him quite wrong. Whatever explanation psychologists may give to this "there can be no question that Socrates himself regarded it as a special and all but unique re-

1. cf. Phaed. 242Bf.; Ap. 31D;40; Theat. 151A.

2. Memorabilia, 1:1. Dalkyn's translation.

velation from the Gods"¹. Here is a conception of the Spirit which, unadorned as it may seem, is in some respects higher than any to be found before the days of Christ.

Another interesting Greek phenomenon was the theory of inspiration connected with the oracle at Delphi. Here a priestess, sitting amid the vapours on a tripod, was expected to be possessed by the god and used by him as a mouthpiece. Referring to this, Leisegang writes,—"Ob der in den Leib der Pythia eindringende Dampf tatsächlich den Enthusiasmus bewirkete, mag hier dahingestellt bleiben. Tatsache bleibt, dass er in Altertum als erregende Ursache des die Prophetie bewirkenden Enthusiasmus aufgefasst und gerade mit dem Worte *πνεῦμα* oder spezieller *πν. ἐρθουσιαστικόν (μαρτικόν)* bezeichnet wurde."²

The mention of these examples of divine possession suggests that many others remain unchronicled. A type not far removed we shall meet when touching on the Mystery Religions. But on the whole the Greek spirit was too rational, too scientific, to develop such conceptions. Its genius lay in the direction of metaphysics rather than theology; and it preferred a cold rationalism to a warm religious fervour.³

1. Adam: The Religious Teachers of Greece, p.324.

2. op. cit. S.129. References are given in a footnote.

3. cf. Büchsel: Der Geist Gottes im N.T., S.53-4 for a fine comparison of Greek and Jewish spirit-conceptions.

THE MYSTERY RELIGIONS AND THE HOLY SPIRIT.

We are now to tread upon ground that is miry and treacherous, and there are many pitfalls to trap the unwary. We must first make clear what is to be dealt with under this heading. Many who set out to discuss the so-called Mystery Religions include not only the varied forms of religion centering about a "cult" in the Graeco-Roman world, but such forms of mysticism as are found in Philo, whom we have considered above. Here we shall confine ourselves to those religions in which oriental ideas and practices were combined with Greek forms, and which took root and flourished in Greek soil.

A common feature of these sects was that they took the form of secret societies, with carefully guarded rituals, and articles of religious knowledge supposed to be known only to the initiate. The very nature of such knowledge, coupled with the reverence shown by all toward the secrets of the Mysteries, precluded its being published abroad. Hence, beyond a few prayers and hymns¹, we are dependent for our knowledge upon references in contemporary writings, and while these are in many cases quite numerous, they usually stop short of telling us what we really want to know. The outward

1. cf. Dietrich: Eine Mithrasliturgie. Orphic Hymns.

rites and practices we can often reconstruct, but the doctrine behind remains obscure.¹

One of the great purposes of the Mysteries was the attainment of salvation. The candidate was put through a series of ceremonies in which he believed himself to come into living contact with the god. Such ceremonies were often very realistic, drinking or bathing in the blood of bulls, intoxication, and sexual orgies being not uncommon. No wonder Christian writers were vehement in their denunciation of such.

But referring to the Dionysus and Orphic cults, Leisegang writes, -"Hier liegt der Grundstock der Lehre vom Heiligen Geiste vor uns. Alles, was später hinzutritt, sind Ausbildungen und Umbildungen oder auch Nebenstimmungen die hier ihre Quelle oder doch ihre Parallele haben."² Let us then focus our attention upon these two sects, to find if we can the undeveloped germs of our complex doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

One of the chief features of the cult of Dionysus was the sacred nocturnal feast, where the raw quivering flesh of a newly killed bull was hastily torn apart and eaten before the divine element could escape. Believing himself now possessed, the participant with the aid of

1. cf. Willoughby: op. cit. p.24ff., Harrison: Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.

2. op. cit. S.254.

wine worked himself up into a sort of frenzy or temporary insanity (Euripides); and while in this state was capable of many strange things. We even read of Theban mothers leaving their homes and babes and wandering in the mountains clasping fawns and wolf cubs in their arms and suckling them at their breasts.¹

Speaking of this worship, Miss Harrison tells us that though its essence was intoxication, "by the very nature of primitive thought this essence was almost instantly transformed into something more, something deeper and higher than mere physical intoxication. It was intoxication thought of as a possession". The savage was "possessed by a god (*ἔρως*), not figuratively, but literally and actually; there is a divine thing within him that is more than himself, he is mad but with a divine madness".² Farnell points out that the zenith of such enthusiasm was a state of silence. He also claims that such frenzies were at least at first induced, not as an end in themselves, but because of the miracle-working power that followed them.³

Turning now to Orphism, we come to a cult also connected with the god Dionysus, but whose rites and ceremonies were more austere. Its theology is also better known, our sources being hymns, liturgical remains,

1. cf. Euripides: Bacchae 699ff.

2. op. cit. p.426.

3. cf. The Cults of the Greek States, vol.V, p.161ff.

and references in the writings of Pindar, Aristophanes, Euripides, Plato, and the Christian Clement of Alexandria. Though he would hardly admit it, there is no doubt that Plato owed much in his thought to its influence.

One of the chief Orphic myths tells us that man was created from the ashes of the blasted Titans, who had already consumed the god Dionysus, and thus the divine vitality entered into the human race. But this spark was imprisoned in the flesh. "The body is the tomb of the soul."¹ Within man, however, was the divine; he "is by origin half-divine and is of the kindred of God".² As Adam shows, this Orphic doctrine of the celestial origin^{and nature} of the soul is a very significant one.³ But we beg to point out that it has little affinity with the Christian doctrine of the Spirit, which treats of a Power that comes into man from without.

In all the ground we have covered we have garnered but a small handful of ears, and in them is very little grain. The matter is well summed up by Büchsel when he says, -"Dass die urchristlichen Geisterlebnisse und Geistvorstellungen in den hellenistischen Mysterienkulten beruhten, ist aus dem Besund der Quellen nicht beweisbar".⁴

1. Plato: Crat. 400B.

(40.

2. Farnell: The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion, pp.139-

3. cf. The Religious Teachers of Greece, Lec.V, especi-

4. op. cit. S.113-14.

(ally p.112ff.

N.B. For a fuller treatment of many points see Reitzenstein: Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen.

THE SPIRIT IN THE HERMETIC WRITINGS.

From one of the pagan philosophico-religious schools of Alexandria has come a body of writings ascribed to the god Hermes, to which has been given the name Corpus Hermeticum. Concerning the date and religious background of these writings there is much uncertainty. The third century A.D. is favoured by W.Scott¹, as the time of composition, though most authorities claim that the thought goes back several centuries. He detects the influence of Platonism, Stoic physics, Egyptian mysticism, and possibly a slight Jewish or Christian borrowing. Oriental religion and astrology brought its share, though perhaps not so much as to some cults of the period. Whether there existed a definite mystery cult as the source of these writings is not certain.

Here, as in many contemporary religions, the emphasis was upon the attainment of salvation. The general theme is the attainment of rebirth, but the gross materialism of the Mysteries gives place to the way of repentance, asceticism, meditation, and spiritual vision. This gave power to lead a moral life, and assured immortality for the future.

We find no reference in the Hermetic writings to a divine πνεῦμα, but we do come across a ροῶς that has some

1. cf. Hermetica, vol.I, p.8.

likeness to the Holy Spirit. This Nous is not given to all men, but is more of a prize put out for human souls to win.¹ It is "of the very substance of God". As the light of the sun is spread or diffused over the earth, so is this divine Nous diffused in men.² "But of what that substance consists, or whence it flows in, God only knows".³

Again, we read of a great basin being sent down to earth filled with Nous; into this men were invited to dip if they could (or would - Scott); and they dipped themselves in, or were baptized with, Nous, and so became complete or perfect⁴ men.⁵ Whether there is here a reference to the Christian rite of baptism⁶ with an accompanying conferring of the Spirit, is not altogether certain.⁷

The doctrine, of which we have but stray glimpses, is evidently that of an indwelling Spirit of God which is only conferred upon those who can attain unto it, though without it man is not complete. It comes as the mystical Substance of God Himself, and possibly its coming was associated with a rite such as baptism.

-
1. cf. Corpus Hermetica IV, 3. 2. C.H. XII, 1.
 3. C.H. XVI, 6 4. cf. Reitzenstein: Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen³, S. 165, where *τελειος* is given the meaning of consecrated.
 5. C.H. IV, 4. 6. cf. Scott: Corpus Hermetica, II, p. 140ff.
 7. For further reference see Reitzenstein: Poimandres; Willoughby: Pagan Regeneration, ch. 8.

THE SPIRIT IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

When we turn to the words of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptics, we are at once struck with the meagreness of reference to the Holy Spirit. So eager does He seem to be to reveal the Father, that the other Person of the Trinity almost passes unnoticed. Of the few sayings that are recorded, the majority are rejected by many critics and all by some¹. Even if all were genuine we have little enough to work on.

Taking the sayings in the Marcan order, the first is that relating to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.² Here Jesus is reported to have said that though words spoken against Himself might be forgiven, those against the Holy Spirit could not, the immediate cause of the speech being the charge that His own conduct was due to the work of an evil spirit. Assuming that these words represent a genuine saying of the Master, and setting aside the puzzling question of the unpardonable sin, we have here our Lord's own declaration that His work is by the power of the Spirit. But this is no more than a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy that the Messiah should have this as His special endowment.

The introduction to the quotation from the Psalter,-

1. cf. Windisch: Jesus und der Geist nach synoptischer
Überlieferung.

2. Mk. 3:28-30 - Matt. 12:31-2 - Luke 12:10.

"David himself said in the Spirit"¹, is merely a restatement of the later Jewish idea that all writers of Scripture were directly inspired.

The next passage is that in which Divine help is held out to the disciples in need.² When they are brought to trial the "Holy Spirit"(Mk.) or "Spirit"of their Father(Matt.) will show them what to say. In one parallel passage Luke says that they will be given a "mouth and wisdom"³. Abbott notes that Luke is here trying to supply a defect in the others, where the divine speaker is to be "in" them (Matt.) but distinct from them.⁴ The full concept of the indwelling Paraclete is John's solution to the riddle. Though the verses occur in a doubtful chapter of Mark, and though conditions are contemplated which did not rise until later, as Scott points out,⁵ it is probable that a piece of genuine tradition is behind the saying. But it points to the future, and we obtain little light on the Spirit in Jesus' own day.

The reference in Luke to the gift of the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer is supported neither by the Western text, nor by Matthew⁶, and we may take the latter's

-
1. Mk. 12:36 - Matt 22:43, cf Luke 20:42 where *ἐν βίβλῳ*
 2. Mk. 13:11 - Matt.10:20 - Luke 12:12. (is found.)
 3. Luke 21:15
 4. The Message of the Son of Man, pp.109-110.
 5. The Spirit in the New Testament, p.73.
 6. Luke 11:13 - Matt. 7:11.

rendering, "good gifts" as the more correct one.

In another passage¹ we have Matthew supporting the reading "Spirit of God", where Luke has "finger of God", the reference being the means by which Jesus "cast out demons". Even if Jesus did use the Lukan phrase, it is merely a figurative way of saying that His miraculous work is due to the power of God working in and through Him.

Is this all that Jesus said regarding the Spirit? In view of the large place given to the Spirit and its work in the early Church, we can hardly believe that the Synoptists would miss anything important in this direction. Windisch, after rejecting all the passages mentioned above as spurious, goes on to prove that Jesus was a man of the Spirit, a fact which the Synoptists preferred to leave in the background, since guidance by the Spirit would hardly fit in with their conception of the Son of God. This led to confusion, even in the records of His teaching.² Though there may be some slight truth in this we need to remind ourselves that there is a considerable body of material in Matthew and Luke which treats of our Lord's possession of the Spirit; and that John who above all emphasizes His Divinity, refers to the Spirit's com-

1. Matt. 7:11 - Luke 11:13.

2. Jesus und der Geist. (In Case: Studies in Early Christianity)

ing at the Baptism, and devotes more space to the consideration of its nature and work.

Abbott suggests that Jesus may ~~have~~ used other phrases, such as "Son" or "Son of Man" in expressing His thought in this direction.¹ Again, many of His references to the Father and the Father's work need for their full understanding the embracing of a doctrine of the Spirit. But we should bear in mind that He came not to assist us in building up theological systems, but to reveal God in His redemptive love for mankind. In this revelation His teaching, His work, His whole life, ^{even} and His death, all centre. Yet in this, as we hope to see later, is to be found a very real conception of the Spirit of God.

1. op. cit. ch.VII.

THE SPIRIT IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

No event was ever more startling in its presentation or more overwhelming in its consequences than the resurrection of Jesus Christ. He may Himself have foreseen that the grave would not hold Him, and attempted to convey the tidings to the little band of men and women who knew Him so intimately; but how could they in those hurried days take seriously a saying which ran contrary to what they believed had always taken place. But when they saw with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears the Risen Master, they simply had to believe. Little by little the implications of this sublime fact began to come home to them. Then all at once as the company were together in the upper room, there flashed into their minds the truth that His work was to be carried on, and that they were to do it. What a responsibility and what a privilege! God had raised up this Jesus, and made Him Lord and Christ,- the great day of the Messiah had dawned, and they were to go forth and proclaim it. No wonder they felt themselves seized by a new and mighty force. No wonder it seemed that fire rested upon the heads of those in the room, for the brightness of that morn was never equalled. No wonder they gave expression to their feelings in exclamations

that were intelligible to those in sympathy with them, but which brought upon them the charge of drunkenness from the mob that came from the street outside.¹ Then Peter, the spokesman of the group stood up and spoke, and "fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done through the apostles".²

When we look more closely at the power which had taken hold of the little group, we see that it was not unlike that which had stirred many a Hebrew prophet in times of old. It even more closely resembled the Spirit that was to be poured out in the days of the Messiah. This was indeed none other than the Spirit of God, working in the disciples that the good news of the resurrection of Jesus Christ might be proclaimed and the day of the Lord ushered in.

Following upon this experience, it does not surprise us that as the group went on with its task these phenomena should reappear, and other incidents, equally strange and wonderful, should take place. The gift of tongues comes up again and again in connection with

1. We are accepting the position that this was an ordinary case of so-called Glossolalia, and that Luke is a little confused in his reference to foreign languages. The phenomenon of glossolalia has often been treated in recent times, and as it is not mentioned in the Johannine writings, we do not think it necessary to deal with it. See Scott, op. cit. pp.93-108; C.A.A.Scott:What happened at Pentecost. (in Streeter: 2. Acts 2:43. The Spirit)

Christian meetings,¹ and does not diminish as Christianity is embraced by the Gentiles.² The apostles receive power to perform miracles;³ and are able to defend themselves and their work on many extremely difficult occasions.⁴ There seems to be a Presence within them leading them on, directing their activities,⁵ holding them back from entering upon certain courses of action,⁶ giving specific hints where procedure is not clear,⁷ warning them of dangers ahead,⁸ and, in general, taking the place of the Leader Whom many of them had known so well in Galilee and Judea.

That this was as an energy or power working within them and in no sense a vision, is shown by the fact that it is nowhere confused with appearances of the Risen Christ.⁹ These were quite another thing, as were also the imaginative pictures in the mind of the Seer.¹⁰ Here the Spirit linked itself with the Messiah in that its activity was always directed toward the furtherance of His Kingdom. It was as they went on with this work that the new Power came into them, and it was not until long

1. cf. Acts 10:44ff; 19:6; etc. 2. I Cor. 12.
 3. Acts 2:43; 3:1-10; 5:12-16; 8:13; 13:9; etc.
 4. Acts 4:8, 31; 7:22; 23; 26; etc.
 5. Acts 10:19; 13:2; etc. 6. Acts 16:6, 7. (11.
 7. Acts 8:29, 39. 8. Acts 11:28; 20:23; 21:4,
 9. cf. I Cor. 15:5-8, etc. 10. Rev. 5:6ff. The conception of the indwelling Christ, abiding in the heart of the believer does not meet us before the days of Paul.

afterward that it was reckoned as having part in anything else. How closely bound up it was with the life of the group is shown in the story of Ananias and Sapphira, whose crime was spoken of as primarily against the Spirit.¹

In this age when the study of other forms of religion contemporary with Christianity is being carried on so minutely, the predominance of spirit phenomena of a kind in the practices of many cults has led to the claim that the New Testament Spirit came in from the Gentile world through Paul and John.² But even allowing that later ideas could so influence Luke's story, we have to bear in mind that Paul and later writers take it for granted that the Church has always possessed the Spirit. The fact lies deeply imbedded in early Christianity, and even before the last words of the New Testament were written, the supply of its quickening force had begun to be impeded. That a great and sudden influx of spiritual energy came to that little waiting group, is the only reasonable explanation of the events of those early days; that they at once saw a connection between this and the Spirit of God referred to so often in the Law and the Prophets is quite understandable in view of the fact that they were Jews, and especially in the

1. cf. Acts 5:1-11.

2. cf. Scott: op. cit. pp.81-93

light of Messianic prophecy. Further proof of the reliability of Luke's account is established when we see that the association of the Spirit and Christ is not nearly as frequent in the early days¹.

Though usually conceived as a sort of impersonal power, there are occasions even in this early period when the Spirit is made almost personal; Ananias deceived the Holy Spirit,² and it bids Peter in his dream to go with the men.³ It comes suddenly and its action is intermittent though when once bestowed it may remain latently with the individual.⁴ Though this may be due to Pauline influence, there is also an ethical note in such a phrase as "full of the Holy Spirit", and it is this same Spirit against which evildoing is directed.⁵ When the Christian first received the Spirit appears to vary: it came upon some before baptism,⁶ upon others at baptism,⁷ while others again were given it in connection with a special laying-on of hands.⁸ Its presence in the individual was shown by gifts of tongues, eloquence, discernment of the unseen, prophetic insight, guidance in^{the} service of the Church, and many other signs, though we need not suppose that any or all of these were necessarily present

1. "Spirit of the Lord" appears twice in Acts(5:9;8:39);
 "Spirit of Jesus", once(16:7). (24.)
 2. Acts 5:3 3. Acts 11:12. 4. Acts 6:3,5;11:
 5. Acts 5:3,9. 6. Acts 10:44 7. Acts 2:38;9:17
 8. Acts 8:15f.;19:6.

in any one recipient. They were doubtless based on natural gifts, but as is usually the case in times of deep religious feeling, the whole gift was attributed to Divine influence. Throughout the community there was the most intense realization of the Presence of God, and though there have been many attempts to revive the atmosphere of those halcyon days, it is unlikely that it has ever since been approached. But they were most critical days, and had the Divine support not been as strong, ^{as it was} the history of the Christian Church might have remained a blank.

As those who had known the Master in the flesh looked back upon His earthly life, they saw it full of words and deeds which betokened an overwhelming possession of the Spirit. There was the tradition of the descent of the Holy Spirit at His baptism, and from the time that He was driven by it into the wilderness the fact is so patent that it is hardly mentioned again.¹ But should not the childhood and even the birth of One so favoured have been marked by manifestations of this same Spirit of God? Hence we have the Birth stories in which the very Power which was of old the bearer of physical life, now quickens the flesh which is to bring forth the Christ. Though other influences may have made them-

1. cf. Luke 4:14; 10:21.

selves felt,¹ the predominant source for these narratives is clearly the Old Testament doctrine. The Lukan stories of Mary and Elisabeth, Zacharias and Simeon,² as well as those of the Baptist related in part by the other evangelists, all breathe the atmosphere of Palastinian Judaism, to which a few Christian touches such as the granting of the Spirit to women and the making of the gift somewhat more permanent,³ are added. It should be noted that only ^{upon} those who have something to do with the Messiah's coming is the Spirit bestowed.

Having completed our survey of the Spirit as felt and known by the Early Church, let us summarize a few of the results,-

- i. Behind all doctrine lies experience. What Christians saw and felt they sought to express.
- ii. In giving expression to this experience, Hebrew ideas codified in the Scriptures, especially those dealing with a Messianic Kingdom, were employed.
- iii. The Spirit is still conceived as a power taking temporary possession of a man, and conferring upon him extraordinary gifts, though there are signs that men were coming to view it as a more permanent possession, and its gifts rather as pertaining to the moral life.
- iv. It is still conferred by God, though Christ may have something to do with the bestowal.
- v. Its work is centred in the extension of the Messianic Kingdom, and the protection of those that belong thereto.

1. cf. Leisegang: Pneuma Hagion.

2. cf. Luke 1-2.

3. cf. Luke 1:15.

THE PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT.

Paul came into the Church when it was beginning to need a thinker of the first order. New and startling events had taken place; strange and vital forces had been experienced, but so far only the old thought-forms had been used to give expression to them. A mind was required that would lift Christianity out of its Judaic mould, and fashion for it one that would both liberate it from national and racial restraint, and protect it [^]harmful syncretism. Such a mind needed to be linked to a heart of deep feeling, that the thinker might remain fully alive to the fact that Christianity was a religion of experience, and should remain so. A man of this calibre was found in Paul. Though he did have a few ways that have been a worry to expositors since his day, he deserves our highest admiration for the way in which he stepped into the breach and became the first great Christian theologian.

If we are to know any part of Paul's teaching we must first seek to understand the one great experience of his life: his ineffectual struggle under the Law, followed by his miraculous conversion and subsequent peace and joy in Christianity. He had seen the need for righteousness, but though he earnestly strove to fulfil the Law, the downward pull of the flesh was al-

ways too strong¹. But after the vision on the Damascus road all was changed; what had hitherto been so impossible was now realized; the Law was now fulfilled.²

This miraculous change came about, not because of anything that he had done, or could do; but through a new power that had come into his life, a power that brought with it an already obtained victory over the forces of evil. And to his great wonder and joy this power remained with him, carrying him through great difficulties, past great temptations, and ever unfolding itself in new glories before his eyes.

We have seen the chief features of the doctrine of the Spirit as Paul would come to know it. He found himself in possession of its various gifts, such as prophecy, tongues, power to work miracles, and so on; and he devotes a couple of illuminating chapters to showing how they should be exercised, and which were to be desired more than others.³ It is interesting to notice that of these he ranks prophecy highest, and makes the hitherto coveted "speaking with tongues" take a low place.

A gift of the Spirit that we hear little about in Christian circles before the days of Paul is that of wisdom. There is, according to him, a Divine wisdom,

1. Rom. 7:19ff.
3. I Cor. 12-14.

2. Rom. 8:1-4.

a wisdom of a type so different from that of this world that men would count it foolishness, a wisdom hidden in God, that is taught by the Spirit¹. This same conception meets us again in the form of John's "Spirit of Truth".

But far more important than any outward gift that the apostle had was this new power that he found living in his heart. Visions and revelations might come,² but they also passed away, while this Presence remained with him. He found himself gaining in kindness, faithfulness, and many other virtues,- even in love itself, and to what could he attribute such if not to this abiding power? What was this that he possessed? The Risen Christ had appeared to him; had He wrought any change in his inner nature that might have such far-reaching effects? At times Paul thought so, and speaks of himself as crucified with Christ, as dead; and it is Christ that is living within him.³ But even this explanation does not satisfy him; perhaps it is too materialistic. Nay, it is rather the Spirit of Jesus Christ,⁴ the Spirit of God's Son,⁵ that is in his heart. And as he sees Jesus Christ as equal with God Himself,⁶ he realizes that this Spirit of Jesus is none other

1. I Cor. 2.
3. Gal. 2:20
5. Gal. 4:6

2. II Cor. 12:1ff.
4. Phil. 1:19
6. Phil. 2:6

than the ^{Holy} Spirit of God, that came upon men of old, and was now so active in the Christian Church. Here indeed was a discovery of far-reaching importance. That Paul made it by following out the same premises in the way we did just now, cannot be put down as certain, but we do know that he reached that conclusion. Though others before his day had made tentative advances in this direction, it was left to Paul to take this great step forward in the progress of religious thought.

There are three sides to this development of Paul's, each of which we must consider by itself,-

i. The Spirit is now beyond the shadow of doubt set down a permanent possession of the believer. Every believer as such receives it,¹ and though it may be grieved² or quenched,³ there is not the least hint that it does not remain to the end with all who continue in the faith. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God"⁴.

ii. The Spirit is the source of the Christian's moral and spiritual growth. Those who "walk by the Spirit" do not "fulfil the lust of the flesh"⁵. "By the Spirit", man's sinful habits are destroyed,⁶ Moral virtues, on the other hand, are fostered. "The fruit of the Spirit

1. Gal. 4:6

2. Eph. 4:30

3. I Thess. 5:19

4. Rom. 8:4; cf. vs. 9-11

5. Gal. 5:16

6. Rom. 8:13.

is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control"¹, - even the love of God itself, which "hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit"². Not only does this Power nourish the spiritual life within us, but it also stands as its Advocate, bearing "witness with our spirit that we are children of God"³.

"For Paul, then, the Spirit is a higher principle which lays hold of our nature and inwardly changes it"⁴. And the miracle is that in this process the believer's own personality is not damaged or weakened, but rather strengthened and enhanced. Several times Paul mentions the Spirit in such a way as to show that it is quite distinct from the human spirit. The passage quoted above in which the Spirit bears witness with our spirit, and that referring to the intercession of the Spirit⁵ may be cited as examples. Then, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty"⁶. Hitherto the human spirit has been fettered by the bonds of sin, but now it is free. The manner in which the diversity of gifts is dealt with suggests that natural gifts are to be directed and expanded. Even the talents with less comeliness are to be developed and brought into service.

1. Gal. 5:22-3

2. Rom. 5:5

3. Rom.8:16

4. Scott;op.cit.,pl38.

5. Rom. 8:26-7

6. II Cor.3:17.

It is needful to take I Cor. 6:17 in the light of the marriage tie.

The conception of the Spirit as expanded by Paul was something that men had been looking for throughout the ages, and even now many grope for it without knowing that it has been proclaimed. But had it not then been formulated, we cannot tell what Christianity might have suffered from "die dem urchristl. Geistbegriff nahe liegende Gefahr der Erzeugung eines in uferlose Schwärmerei ausmündenden Stroms von Enthusiasmus".¹

iii. The Holy Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ are now one and the same. Before the days of Paul the Spirit of God had not really been Christianized. True, it had been with Him while in the flesh, and its work was now in the last resort the extension of His Kingdom, but it had not yet been thought of as coming from Him as it came from the Father, of being also His Spirit. The early disciples must have felt that their Master was invisibly present with them, though they were probably for the most part far less conscious of it than Paul. In any case they did not ^{connect} this Spirit of Jesus² with the Spirit of God which was empowering them. What would have happened had they not been seen as one, we can only surmise, though the effects of their separation

1. H.J.Holtzmann: Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie², II, S. 158.

2. The one use of "Spirit of Jesus" in Acts (16:7) is probably due to Pauline influence.

in times less remote leads us to agree with Cave when he writes,—"Without the association with Christ the belief in the Spirit would have led some to fanaticism and others to a vague religiosity without moral meaning or power," and "the preaching of Christ without the experience of the Spirit would have made Christianity traditional and legal, concerned with the past, and not with the present".¹

But some think that Paul has gone too far here, and many claim that he has practically dropped the Spirit in favor of Christ. Glover says that "the indwelling Christ seems to leave nothing ^{distinctive} for the Spirit to do or to be".² Gunkel concludes that the two were parallel in the mind of the apostle, and that though his own formula, "in Christ" stood nearer his heart, the Spirit doctrine was the preferable one to use in his ordinary intercourse with the Church.³ Wernle states that "the logical consequence of his reasoning would have been to abandon the conception of Spirit altogether in favour of the personal influence of the historical Christ", and adds, "it would have been better so for all future time, for under the title 'Spirit of God' all that was alien to the Spirit of Jesus crept into the

1. The Gospel of St. Paul, p.83.

2. Paul of Tarsus, p.219.

3. Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, S.100.

new religion"¹. Now if these scholars intend to say, as we have tried to above, that Paul has combined the old idea of the Spirit of God with the quite new conception of the Spirit of Christ, we can only say that their phrasing is not very apt; but if they mean a real identification in person and work of Christ and the Spirit, if, as Rees suggests, Paul represents "the Godhead as two hypostases, God and the Logos-Spirit",² then we heartily disagree with them. But let us ^{first} look with some care at one or two passages in which some think that Paul does identify Christ and the Spirit.

The two passages which might at first appear to suggest this, are the one in which Paul speaks of the "last Adam" becoming "a life-giving Spirit",³ and the one where he cries out, "Now the Lord is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty".⁴ In the first of these it is quite clear that the apostle is referring not to the Spirit of God, but to a Being which is celestial and not earthly, which use of the word is quite legitimate. The second is rather more difficult,⁵ though the last half of the verse makes it plain that complete identity cannot be meant. If we take the verse

1. Beginnings of Christianity, Eng. transl, I, p.266.
2. op. cit. p.56. 3. I Cor.15:45. 4. II Cor. 3:17.
5. Holtzmann says that here "die ganze paulin. Christologie in nuce beschlossen liegt.(op. cit. II,S.90)

along with the preceding ones, it is not hard to see with Lebreton that "le Seigneur est l'esprit dont il a été parlé plus haut, c'est-à-dire, l'esprit opposé à la lettre"¹. This is the view taken by the majority of commentators. As Scott says, -"it cannot be made out, then that Paul anywhere identifies the Spirit and Christ. His aim, on the contrary, is to keep them distinct, and his very phrase 'the Spirit of Christ' which brings them so closely together implies an effort to distinguish"². Cave remarks very aptly that at times the terms Lord and God are often used by the apostle so as to be nearly interchangeable.³

Paul keeps Christian theology from submerging the personality of Jesus beneath an impersonal Spirit that would be incapable of love. "Spirit, therefore, does not interpret the nature of Christ, but the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, is Christ Himself, and He gives it His own character"⁴.

It may be of value for us to inquire just what Paul means by the Spirit, and how he relates it to God. Taking the latter point first, we notice that he speaks of the relation of the Spirit to God as analogous to

1. Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité,⁷ I, pp.614-15.

2. op. cit. p.182.

3. The Doctrines of the Christian Faith, p.83.

4. Porter: The Mind of Christ in Paul, p.275.

that of the spirit of man to man.¹ Here there seems to be a close approach to identification, especially if we can take it for granted that Paul thinks of God as immaterial. But the fact that there are a large number of passages in which they are held distinct shows that this would be misinterpreting the general thought of the apostle.²

Perhaps the most typically Pauline view is that the Spirit is a power or energy coming from God or Christ, and dwelling in the heart of man,- a doctrine not very different from many that we have already reviewed. But there is practically no evidence to show that it was, as Scott suggests, "in some sense a substance...to be communicated by a material rite"³ Here a measure of borrowing from the Mystery cults or Stoicism is assumed. We have already seen, however, that the materialistic ideas of the one, and the pantheistic background of the other could support no doctrine of the Spirit of God that could bear the name Christian. Certainly nothing in this line could have appealed to Paul. It may be that he used such words as ἐπιτίθημι⁴ but this does not mean a literal drenching any more than being "crucified

1. cf. I Cor. 2:11ff.

2. cf. I Cor. 2:10; 6:19; Gal. 4:6; Rom. 8:11, etc.

3. The Spirit in the New Testament, p.156.

4. I Cor. 12:13.

with Christ" is to be interpreted literally.¹ In any case the decision ultimately rests on the question of what Paul really thought God to be.

At times the Spirit is referred to as if quite impersonal and even capable of quantitative division;² while on the other hand, it "maketh intercession for us with groanings",³ confers gifts,⁴ and has a place in the three-fold benediction.⁵ Probably Burton is not far wrong in speaking of the Spirit as occupying a place in Paul's midway between identity with God and personality distinct from God, being "the personalized power of God operative in the spirits of men".⁶

We may say without fear of contradiction that no writer has done more to advance the doctrine of the Holy Spirit of God than Paul of Tarsus.

1. For a more adequate treatment of this phase of the subject see Hoyle: *The Holy Spirit in St. Paul*, p. 265ff.

2. cf. I Thess. 1:5; Rom. 5:5; 8:23; II Cor. 1:22; Gal. 3:5.

3. Rom. 8:26.

4. I Cor. 12:4-11.

5. II Cor. 13:14.

6. *Spirit Soul and Flesh*, p. 190.

own spirit.¹ But,-

(speak;

As (the hand) moves over the harp, and the strings
So speaks in my members the Spirit of the Lord.²

and,- I will open my mouth
And His Spirit will utter in me
The glory of the Lord and His beauty.³

There are times when the writer hardly seems to distinguish Christ and the Spirit. We have the Spirit of the Lord brought in almost abruptly after continued references to Christ.⁴ In a grotesque and rather difficult passage the Holy Spirit secures from the Father the gift of redemption which was mediated through the Son.⁵ Later we read of the Spirit as the Mother of Christ.⁶ Then, there is the rather difficult couplet which refers to the presence of the Spirit with the Messiah, probably at the Baptism, and goes on to make the Messiah head over the Spirit.⁷

Though the doctrine of these lyrics is not entirely orthodox, and is sometimes expressed rather crudely, its main tenets are not very different from those of the Johannine writings.

1. cf. 6:7

3. 16:5

5. 19:2,4

2. 6:1; cf. also 14:8

4. 3:10

6. 36:3

7. 24:1

THE SOURCES OF THE JOHANNINE CONCEPTION
OF THE SPIRIT.

Having looked over the above antecedent and contemporary ideas of the Spirit, it now behoves us to point out which of these were most weighty in their influence upon our author.

Behind the thought of John, as indeed behind all New Testament thought regarding this subject, lies the old Hebrew doctrine of the Spirit of God, which came upon men and abided in them. Though there have been many changes both of emphasis and content, the Spirit which the prophets knew and felt is in the last analysis the same as the one that the Baptist saw descending upon Jesus; and that, charged with new significance from the Incarnation and the Cross, comes to those who follow their Risen Lord. It is significant that the characteristics of the Hebrew Spirit not found in the Christian doctrine, such as its connection with physical life, are to a large extent adventitious, and that the coming of the nobler and more general idea was looked forward to by the prophets.

Palestinian Judaism seems to have had little to offer apart from its preservation of the Messianic expectancy of a general bestowal of the Spirit, and its emphasis on holiness which helped along the moral develop-

ment of Christian times.

The contribution of Alexandrian Judaism is somewhat more problematic. The bringing together of the Spirit and the Wisdom of God may have been responsible for John's Spirit of Truth. The deeper moral note struck might have been an encouragement to Christian thinkers to advance in this direction. But lest we be tempted to search here for positive antecedents for the doctrine of Paul and John, let us note that with regard to morality the ideas of Paul and Philo are poles apart. While Philo regards the Spirit's remaining with the individual as dependent upon the latter's moral life, Paul makes the moral life transformable under the action of the Spirit. Philo's Spirit comes to men in general, but is driven out by evil; Paul's comes to individual men, and renders them less and less prone to evil. Though these Christian thinkers were probably more under the influence of the Wisdom of Solomon, the teaching of that document ^{in this connection} is too indefinite to be taken seriously as a source. Wood points out that the Alexandrian Spirit is conceived wholly in the sphere of the unusual and extraordinary; that as a charismatic Spirit it is wholly a temporary possession; and that it is ultimately equivalent to the Logos; and concludes that the Johannine

form of the doctrine is not Alexandrian.¹

We have seen that neither the philosophy of Greece nor the Mysteries of the Hellenistic world had anything worth mentioning that could have been made part of the structure of this Christian doctrine. Such ideas as are found in the Hermetic writings are far more likely to have felt Christian influence, than given of their own.

The contribution of our Lord and His early disciples and followers, including Paul, is indeed great; though to determine just how much is from the Master Himself, and how much from Paul and the others, is by no means easy, since an apparent borrowing from John's great fellow-thinker may really be a parallel development of what is implicit in Jesus' teaching. It is, however, to the Pauline doctrine that the Johannine conception lies nearest, and it is significant that all the great Pauline developments are presupposed by him. The permanence of the Spirit's abiding, the fostering of the moral life, and the new relation to Jesus Christ, are almost taken for granted.

One departure that our author seems to make from all earlier Christian thought is that he never speaks of it as conferring charismatic gifts upon the individual. But

1. cf. *The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature*, pp. 247ff.

as Wood points out, such an omission is quite in line with his thought as a whole, and there are no instances recorded where such an explanation is demanded.¹ The outward manifestations of the new life do not concern him so long as the life itself is begun and sustained.

As we shall see below, John has advanced upon the thought of Paul to the extent that he makes the Spirit the agent in the rebirth of the individual. The peculiar form of the Paraclete conception is also his own. Though he has made use of material from many sources, he has given it all the stamp of his keen and devoted mind.

1. op. cit. p.235.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS.

The peculiar nature of the thought of John is seen most easily when we show it in contrast with that of the other great theologian of apostolic times. Paul has an argumentative mind; he analyzes his matter carefully and builds up his position point by point, each being an essential link in his chain of reasoning. He starts from his own convulsive experience, and he rarely gets away from the facts of life. He burns with fervid passion against those who oppose him, and sometimes in the heat of controversy advances arguments that are not easy to co-ordinate with other phases of his thought. John, on the other hand, is a steadier thinker, less heated in argument, more contemplative and intuitive. His ideas are synthetic rather than analytic; he sees truth as a few well co-ordinated principles gathered about a great central fact,- the nature of God. He brings in little detail for it would obstruct the vision of the eternal Truth which he aims to proclaim. His theme is developed by a series of parallels, returning again and again to the same point, rather than by a closely knit line of advance. Whether his knowledge is definitely mystical in character must be left for others to say,¹ but it cannot be gainsaid that few mortal men have been granted such a vision of the eternal Verities as he presents.

1. cf. Hazzard: The Mysticism of the Fourth Gospel.
(Edinburgh University Thesis)

THE WORLD OF LIGHT AND THE WORLD OF DARKNESS.

Upon nearly every page of the writings of John stand contrasts sharply outlined and grimly opposed. Light and darkness, life and death, truth and error, love and hate, the things of the Spirit and the things of the world,- here is a cleavage which points to an underlying dualism. On the one side is life, love, and all that is true and good; on the other is sin, death, and all that is false and evil. A man can belong to one or the other, but he cannot belong to both at once.¹ His deeds must be definitely good or definitely evil, for there is no middle way.²

Our first task must be to plumb the depths of this chasm. It is not hard to see that we have here a dualism that is unmistakably moral, but does it go deeper? Have we here an echo of the Greek opposition of matter and form, a dualism of substance such as we get in Gnostic systems? To this, scholars are inclined to give a negative answer. The Gnostic Logos cannot really enter into flesh, for flesh belongs to the realm of matter, but the Johannine Logos "became flesh and dwelt among us"³. Sons of men while here upon earth can become children of light, and can even here enjoy the benefits of eternal life. "The conflict of light and darkness is the conflict of morally good actions and dispositions, on

1. 3:19-21.

2. I, 2:10-11.

3. 1:14.

the one hand, with morally evil, on the other", and the "sphere of the conflict...is here the sphere of free moral action".¹

Dean Inge calls John an idealist in the Platonic sense, since "to him what is most real is certain divine 'ideas' - Light, Truth, Life, Love, etc. These are eternal and essential attributes of God, who may therefore be identified with them. God is Spirit; God is Light; God is Love; He has Life in Himself; His Logos is the Truth. Reality is the sphere where dwell these fountain-heads, or creative principles, of all the good that we know....What happens is only important in its relation to the eternal verities which constitute the real world. Christ is represented as constantly speaking of these ideas, bringing all experience to the touchstone of them."² With this very fine passage we can agree, so long as we do not read into it anything in the nature of the metaphysical dualism of Plato and many who have followed in his footsteps.

1. Stevens: op. cit. pp.131-2. cf. 8:12;12:35;12:36,46.
 2. The Theology of the Fourth Gospel, p.259. (In Swete: Cambridge Biblical Essays)

THE JOHANNINE DOCTRINE OF GOD.

The place of John as a moral and religious teacher rather than as a philosopher, is again seen when we come to his doctrine of God. The Greek metaphysical deity tended to be cold and impersonal, having no real contact with the material world. Even Philo's God only touches matter through the Logos and other created intermediaries. But while holding that God is spirit,¹ our author conceives Him in the highest moral terms, and amplifies Jesus' picture of Him as a loving Father.

By departing altogether from the God of the Hebrew theophanies, and denying that He has ever been seen by mortal eyes,² or even limits His presence to any particular place,³ John goes as far as possible in suggesting a universal God, Again, though His prerogative may be temporarily lessened by the "prince of this world,"⁴ idols,⁵ and those who walk in darkness, there is no suggestion that in the eternal dispensation these count for anything. Nowhere is God's omnipotence brought into question, nor is there any relapsing from the pure monotheism of later Hebrew days.

Like Philo John ascribes to God unbroken activity.⁶ But while Philo thinks more of physical activity, the Elder of Ephesus puts it on a moral plane. This mora-

1. 4:24.

2. 1:18; I,4:12

3. cf.4:21

4. 12:31;14:30;16:11.5. I,5:21.

6. Leg.alleg.I

3. 5:17

lity is conceived in terms of personality, the highest known expression of human relationship, that of Fatherhood, being used. God is Father, not only in a special way of Jesus, and of all believers, but at least potentially of the whole world. Implicit in the idea of fatherhood are the attributes of love and righteousness, this being forcibly shown in the Epistle where we read: "God is love",¹ "God is righteous".² Whether these are basically one is fully discussed by Law, who concludes that one attribute is involved in the exercise of the other in such a way that there is no incompatibility between them. God may be said to be righteous love.³ Here is a definition which satisfies not only the metaphysician, but the moralist and even the saint.

God is made known unto men through Jesus Christ Who came to reveal Him.⁴ But knowledge in the Johannine Writings connotes far more than intellectual discernment. To know God aright one must at least have begun to grow like Him. "He that loveth not knoweth not God".⁵ As Stevens says,—"The knowledge of God is pre-eminently an ethical affair, and implies in the possessor of it a kinship of life with God".⁶

1. I, 4:8

2. I, 2:29

3. op. cit. ch.5. 4. cf. 14:8; 7:16ff.

5. I, 4:8

6. The Johannine Theology, p.66. See also Ely: Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought.

THE SON OF GOD.

Though John is almost alone among New Testament writers¹ in referring to Christ as the Logos, the term that follows most readily from his pen is "Son", or "Son of God". Scholars may be quite correct in holding that the "Logos" idea influences the whole Gospel, but this ^{somewhat} meta-physical conception is far subordinate to the moral and spiritual notes of the more inclusive term.

Students of a generation ago were referred at once to Philo and his writings as the source of the Johannine Logos. But as more attention has been paid to certain Jewish writings, its affinities with the divine Wisdom have been made clearer.² A recent writer sees in it "simply a Christian rendering of the Hebraic creative Word of God, incarnate in Jesus the Messiah."³ In this way the tendency is growing to make less of the Greek element, and more of the Hebrew. "It is rooted in the soil of the Old Testament"⁴ But, on the other hand, there is certainly a Hellenistic reference in the term, which is best understood in the light of Alexandrian teaching.

It is not the Logos of philosophical speculation that our author is most interested in, but the Logos made Flesh. It is but one of the many ways that he has

1. cf. Rev. 19:13.

2. cf. Harris: op. cit.

3. R.H.Strachan: The Historical Jesus in the N.T., p.158.

4. Stevens: op. cit. p.85.

of depicting the Christ that he knows and worships. If not a household word the term was at least understood by a large number of Ephesian Christians, and it may have been used in different circles for the Christ. In any case it is now given shades of meaning that it did not formerly possess.

The term "Son of God" is derived from Hebrew sources,¹ its meaning being enriched by the unique filial consciousness of Jesus. It is used to some extent by both Paul² and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.³ In a few passages it is accompanied by the adjective only-begotten,⁴ while elsewhere it is understood before it.⁵

This term, as we have already hinted, expresses most aptly what the author has in mind when he thinks of the Christ. As a Son, Jesus is subordinate to the Father, being sent by Him to carry out His will.⁶ He came forth from the Father and returns to Him.⁷ "Before the world was", He was with the Father and shared in His glory.⁸ While Jesus was on earth the Father was referred to as being "in" Him;⁹ and knowing Jesus was equal to knowing the Father.¹⁰ Once we read that He and the Father are one.¹¹

-
1. cf. Enoch 105:2; IV Esdras 7:28ff.; 13:37ff.; 14:9.
 2. cf. Rom. 1:4; II Cor. 1:19; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 4:13.
 3. cf. 4:14; 6:6; 7:3; 10:29.
 4. cf. 3:16, 18; I, 4:9.
 5. cf. 1:14, 18.
 6. 5:30; 5:36-7; 6:57; 12:50; 14:28; I, 4:14, etc.
 7. 16:28. 8. 17:5 9. 10:38; 14:11
 10. 14:9 11. 10:30.

Whether this unity of the Son and the Father extends into the realm of metaphysics is a question that probably never troubled the writer.¹ It is the religious bond between the two that is in his mind. Father and Son are One in fellowship, One in will and purpose, One in moral being. The Father sends His Son out to die for the salvation of the world,² and the Son is ready to lay down His life for the sheep.³ At times it is almost suggested that Jesus' own filial love and obedience is holding Him in such unity with the Father, while again He seems to claim the right of eternal Sonship from the beginning of time. In the great Prayer of Intercession (ch.17) we have this latter conception at its highest level. Here again unity is mentioned, but that it is ethical is shown by the fact that the same unity is enjoined among the disciples.⁴

The epithet only-begotten, as Scott puts it, "serves to remove all doubt as to the unique character of the Sonship of Jesus"⁵. Men might become sons of God,⁶ but here was One who had always enjoyed that privilege, and enjoyed it in a sense that no other had. Many have questioned why John did not give his support to the doc-

1. cf. Stevens: op. cit. p.103f.

2. 3:16. 3. 10:15.

4. 17:22ff.

5. cf. Scott: The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology, p.187.

6. 1:12.

trine of the Virgin Birth, since it would have placed more emphasis upon this point. But even this might have spoilt the picture, by impeding the majesty of the **entry** into the world of the divine Son of God.

Though John probably had very little idea of the implications of his thought, ^{and} did not even dream that controversies would arise over statements that he ^{might} make, there is no doubt that he conceived Christ as pre-existent. How could One Whom he so worshipped have begun life in the ordinary way? Here it is that the Logos idea helps him out. If the Christ could be shown to have been all that the Logos stood for in the minds of thinking men, then there could be no question about His eternal Divinity. Throughout the Gospel we see the marks of this emphasis ^{the glory of} on His pre-existent divine Nature. The miracles recorded are arranged as "signs" of His power. His knowledge of man is perfect.¹ There is something about Him which makes His Person inviolate except as He permits.² He goes about as one who has a fixed programme, and nothing enters into His life except as He wills it.³ Even His words have a power all their own.⁴ The accounts of the Temptation and the Agony are omitted; there is no hint of any moral struggle. Though certain

1. 2:25 2. 7:46;18:6,11. 3. 7:30;8:20;2:4.
4. 15:3; 6:68.

signs of human weakness such as thirst, weariness, and grief,¹ are mentioned, it is ^{often} with a sense of unreality, as if they were only inserted for the sake of the story.²

Has John then gone so far as to rob our Lord of His humanity while on earth, and so to make it impossible for us to try to follow Him? This is a question that we cannot linger upon, and it may suffice to accept for the present the words of Mackintosh that "the Christ of the Fourth Gospel...is truly man, one with us in all points except sin. The secret of His uniqueness lies in an unparalleled relation to the Father. Men can be children of God only by the new birth; Jesus is the Son of God by eternal nature."³

The work of the Son of God may, according to John, be summed up in the statement that He came to bring new life to the children of men.⁴ The many different figures and allegorical pictures all have this as their central theme. Light is needed for life to develop; bread and water to sustain it; a shepherd to guard it from danger; the branches need to preserve contact with the vine that it may not leave them; and the laying down of life is sometimes necessary in bringing it forth.. But this is to be the theme of our next study.

1. cf. 4:6, 31ff; 11:35; etc. 2. cf. Scott:Fourth Gospel, (pp.163ff.
3. The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ, p.101.
4. cf. 3:16; 10:10; 20:31; 1,5:12; etc.

LIFE, AND THE COMMUNICATION OF LIFE.

We have just seen that the supreme function of the Johannine Christ is to impart new life. What this life is, and how it is communicated, must now be our concern. We shall, however, need to be as brief as possible, for an adequate treatment would provide material for a whole thesis.

A large part of the Old Testament reflects a conception of life that little more than physical in character. The follower of Moses hoped for "length of days", with continued happiness and prosperity here upon earth. Jehovah was thought of as the source of life, and fellowship with Him which included the keeping of His Law, was necessary for its realization. In this way, while restricted to the earthly span, life was linked up with the Divine Being.

Many Greek thinkers, on the other hand, considered the body as a hindrance to real life. Only the philosopher who for a few brief moments seemed to rise above the limitations of the flesh into the realm of pure thought, was entitled to say anything about life. Hence the Wise Man's aim so to live that the desires of the flesh had little hold upon him. But such an ideal was intellectual, rather than moral or spiritual. Meanwhile

to both Jew and Greek was appearing the vision of a life beyond the grave.

The Synoptic writers show in the thought of Jesus a development of the Jewish conception. Life begins at the physical level but includes a great deal more. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness"¹. Here the moral side becomes of paramount importance. Outside material things are only subsidiary: "for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth"². Real life does not come without sacrifice. "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it"³. In certain of the Synoptic pictures, a definite future change is indicated, when a life here unattainable though achieved through present conduct will be realized.⁴ Whether this is an apocalyptic overlay cemented to Jesus' real teaching we cannot stop to determine. It is enough to note that the idea of life upon earth as being a sort of probationary period, at the end of which one is either doomed to "eternal" punishment, or rewarded with the gift of "eternal" life, is one that is deeply imbedded in the minds of these writers.

Turning to Paul, we find that for him the flesh was

1. Matt. 6:33.

2. Luke 12:15.

3. Matt. 10:39.

4. cf. Matt. 7:14; 25:46; Mk. 9:43, 45; 10:30; etc.

far too much the seat of evil to be taken as the basis for anything like genuine life. Deliverance from this "body of death" must first be obtained. But through union with Christ Who has entered upon life, the believer may here get a foretaste of what is waiting for him. Referring to Gal.2:20, Scott says,—"The believer cannot yet say 'I live', but he is conscious of an inward communion with the living Saviour, which is the earnest and security of his own life hereafter. In that sense life may be spoken of as an actual and present possession."¹

In John we leave once more the Greek dualism of matter and spirit, and rise to an opposition of life and death, taking these terms in a new and deeper sense. Death is not merely the cessation of physical activity, but absolute, timeless darkness, the antithesis of love, light, and truth.² Life may best be regarded as the very possession of the Divine, rising above all limitation.³ "The Father hath life in Himself";⁴ in the Logos "was life"⁵ and with the Spirit is life associated.⁶ Life and death are states that are quite exclusive, and a moral individual must belong to one or to the other.⁷ Transition from one to the other may take place now,

1. Fourth Gospel, p.242.

2. Not to be confused with the metaphysical darkness of Zoroastrian thought.

3. With respect to time, Westcott says that eternal life "is not an endless duration of being in time, but being of which time is not a measure".

4. 5:26. 5. 1:4. 6. cf.7:38-9. 7. I,2:8-11.

and thus here in the flesh actual life may be experienced. Seen in the light of eternal death, physical death dwindles to nothing; and for him who has passed from death unto life in the higher sense, the cessation of physical life has no real import.

The infinite love of God could not suffer the world to go without the opportunity of sharing in this life, and the Son was sent to mediate it, ^{through His life and death.} The first step in this communication of life to the individual is that he should see Jesus and believe on Him.¹ Belief leads to knowledge, and through Jesus the Christian comes to know God.² This knowledge of God is, as we have seen, far more than intellectual recognition. It is in the last analysis experiential; there must be an acknowledgement on our part of the Truth, and an attitude of obedience toward Him Whom we would know. "If any man will le^th to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God"³. Knowledge of God is necessarily progressive, advancing as the believer increases in obedience; but it ever has a moral and religious basis. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God"⁴. Here the author takes a firm stand against Gnosticism.

1. cf. 6:40;9:35; etc. The Spirit's part in this will claim our attention later.

2. 14:7f.;17:25-6.

3. 7:17

4. I, 4:8.

One of the more spiritual adjuncts to knowledge is belief¹. So closely are the two linked at times that they seem almost to merge into one². "Faith and knowledge" to quote Stevens, "are seen to be in John's mind essentially one. Either may be called the condition of salvation. The true knowledge of divine things is an ethical and spiritual knowledge; it is the certitude which faith begets."³ But of the two belief is the more comprehensive term. Its connotation ranges from hardly more than intellectual acceptance,⁴ to the coming of the believer into mystical fellowship with his Lord.⁵

This mystical union with Christ represents the channel of life opened to the fullest extent. In giving expression to it the author uses a wide variety of figures. The Christian is referred to as having Christ,⁶ coming to Christ⁷, receiving Christ,⁸ and abiding in Christ.⁹ In the Eucharistic passages we have the yet more striking words, -"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life....He that eateth me, even he shall live by me"¹⁰. In the Epistle the figure of begetting is much used: "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not"¹¹, the term God appearing where in the Gospel we

(is very frequent.)
 1. Though the noun hardly appears at all, the verb πιστεύω
 2. cf. 17:8; 10:38. 3. op. cit. p.239. cf. also
 Bauer² S.99-101; Holtzmann² II, 531-40. (31ff.
 4. 5:46-7; 10:37-8. An inadequate type is indicated in 8:
 5. cf. 14:1; etc. also Stevens, pp.228-35.
 6. I, 5:17; 7. 6:35. 8. 1:12. 9. 15:5. 10: 6:54,57.
 11. I, 3:9; I, 5:18.

find a reference to Christ¹. Such diversity of expression bears witness to the importance of the doctrine in the mind of the author.

The reader may now be ready for the question, - What is involved in this giving of new life? Is it ^{solely} a moral and spiritual transforming, - a purging of the affections, a redirecting of the will; or does it also imply a change in the physical substance of human nature? Scott tries to prove that both these ideas are found in the Gospel; the first arising out of the author's own religious experience, in that Jesus "by the might of His faith and love, by the revelation of God imparted through their knowledge of Himself...had lifted His disciples into a new life"; the second coming from Greek sources and conceiving life as "an ethereal essence...a higher energy, analogous to the physical life-principle in man," and its communication as a "transmutation of ^{human} nature" in which "not so much his mind and will, as the very substance out of which his being is formed, must become different"². In criticizing this Law shows that while the Johannine teaching does imply a renewal of the moral nature "due to a change in the sub-conscious region

1. The Epistle is theocentric, rather than Christocentric. cf. Law: op. cit. 196ff.
2. Fourth Gospel, pp. 260-1, 281.

of personal being, which is wrought directly by Divine influence and can only be conceived as the communication of a new life-principle", there is certainly no "organic change in the constitution of human natureThe life communicated is a new moral life; a life which is manifested in a new view of sin and righteousness, in new desire and power to do the will of God, to love one another and to conquer the world."¹

Another problem arising here is, - who is eligible to receive this new life? Jesus is quoted as saying, - "No man can come unto me except the Father...draw him"². Again, there are references to those "not of my sheep"³; those who cannot hear His word,⁴ and whose eyes are blinded that they should not see.⁵ There is also the fulfilling of the Scriptures in Judas,⁶ and other passages which seem to indicate a definite doctrine of predestination. Yet on the whole the writings tend to place the responsibility in the hands of the individual himself.⁷ Without going into the details of the matter we may say that the latter was probably John's general belief, the former being modifications due to the believer's consciousness that no credit ^{can go} ~~is~~ to himself, and the need for explaining why man could refuse so generous an offer.⁸

1. op. cit. p.205f. 2. 6:44 3. 10:26
 4. 8:43 5. 12:38f;9:39. 6. 13:18;17:12.
 7. cf. 1:11-12;3:16,19;7:37;8:51;10:9;12:26,32,46;I,5:1.
 8. cf. Law: op. cit. p.272f.,Holtzmann, II,S.544-45.

THE JOHANNINE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS.

Under this heading we shall deal with the Parousia or coming again of Christ, and the idea of future judgment.

Jewish apocalyptic thought pictured a Messiah triumphantly overthrowing all who opposed him. This idea came into Christianity as an expected second coming of Christ¹. What Jesus Himself actually said with regard to this is at present ground of a highly controversial nature. It is certain, however, that shortly after the Resurrection Christians began to look forward to the immediate reappearance of their Master. In a time of great trial and persecution He was to appear suddenly in the clouds, and having conquered the forces of evil in a most terrific struggle, was to reign during a millenium of peace and security². Mark indicates that these things were to be looked for before the passing away of the first Christian generation³, and a further saying with apparant reference to the "beloved disciple" outliving the Parousia was evidently treasured by the Church⁴. But the years came and went, and no Parousia took place; those who had "seen the Lord" were becoming fewer and fewer, and still the looked-for event did not take place. Many

1. The Christianizing of this thought is best seen in the book of Revelation.

2. cf. I Thess.4-5; Rev.4-20. 3. 13:30. 4.cf.21:20ff.

hold that one of the major purposes of at least the concluding chapter of the Gospel, was the silencing of the doubts that arose as the last of these were being laid away¹.

The Johannine Christ certainly leaves no doubt in the minds of His disciples that death is not to keep Him away from them. "A little while and ye behold me no more; and again a little while and ye shall see me"². "I will not leave you desolate: I will come unto you. Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me."³ But these clearly refer to Jesus' spiritual Presence after the Resurrection. "The real Parousia has taken place already. It followed immediately on the departure of Christ, when through His death He re-assumed His glory. Set free from the limitations of earthly, bodily existence, He was able to reveal Himself, as an unseen presence, to each individual believer."⁴ Here John spiritualizes this great hope of the Church, making it a present timeless event, instead of a single future happening.

But this explanation hardly satisfies all the references to Jesus' coming again. For instance the allusions to the "last day"⁵, the "last hour"⁶, and the sense

1. cf. Streeter: The Four Gospels, ch. XV.

3. 14:18-19. 4. Fourth Gospel, p. 302.

6. I, 2:18.

2. 16:10

5. 6:39ff. 11:

24.

of expectancy in I,2:28, are only relevant if they are taken as ^{unco-ordinated} relics of the old position, or as signs that the new doctrine does not altogether cover the author's thought in the matter. We prefer the latter, agreeing with Law that "St. John by no means discards the primitive New Testament belief in the Parousia as a historical fact of the future. With him it scarcely predominates over the whole scene as with St. Paul; but it is still the great mountain-peak at the end of the valley....But... this future crisis will only be the inevitable manifestation of the existing reality....not the arrival of One Who is absent, but the self-revealing of One Who is present."¹

In Hebrew thought are to be found two radically different conceptions of judgment. In earlier days when little or no thought was given to a future life, judgment had to take place in this one, if at all. It was usually the nation that was at the bar of judgment, the sentence of evildoing being the withdrawal of divine support, and the reward of righteousness being the divine favour, coupled with peace and prosperity. Later this was brought home to the individual.² But it was evident that such a crude conception could not stand; the facts of life,

1. op. cit. pp.327-8. cf. also Stevens, ch.14; Holtzmann² II, S.572-5.

2. cf. Ezek. ch.18.

though not always as extreme as in the case of Job, would bring it daily into question. Speculation now began to be directed toward a future judgment, either before or after the expected reign of the Messiah, or both¹. First the living, then^{later} the dead, were included.

This latter conception forms the background of early Christian teaching on the subject. But in contrast to it are certain aspects of the Synoptic Kingdom of God, into which men were to enter who could fulfil certain requirements². But by far the best exposition of present judgment is that found in the Johannine writings, though here the old Hebrew idea is so changed as to be almost unrecognizable. This judgment follows and depends upon the coming of the Son of God as the Light of the world³. As Holtzmann puts it, -"Der menschengewordene Logos ist hier gleichsam als ein scharfkantiger Fels mitten in die Flut des geschichtlichen Werdens gestellt, so dass die Wasser sobald sie an ihn gestossen sind, sich auch sofort teilen und nach rechts oder links abströmen"⁴. Though Christ is more than once spoken of as not coming to judge the world⁵, it is made quite plain that one of the results of His coming is that certain individuals

1. cf. Charles: Eschatology, pp.159f, 242f.

2. cf. Matt. 6:33;11:11;21:31;23:13; Mk.1:15; Luke 9:62.

3. 3:19.

4. op. cit. II, S.576.

5. 3:17;5:45;12:47.

will choose to remain in darkness, and be hastened towards death. As Scott puts it, -"the judgement is on His part involuntary, for His whole desire is to draw men unto Him and save them"¹. Judgment begins when the Light makes its way to the heart of a man; if he believes and accepts the offer of life he is free from it, but if he believes not he must take the consequences². If the invitation of Jesus falls on deaf ears, what hope is there that he will ever appreciate anything but evil?

Just as the author has not brought the Parousia altogether into the present, so he still looks forward to a future "day of judgment"³. This is the "last day"⁴ of the Gospel; the day when "the consciousness of those who now reject Christ will...contain a very awful testimony of God's reprobation"⁵.

1. Fourth Gospel, p.215.

2. 3:17-20.

3. I, 4:17.

4. 12:48.

5. Law: op. cit. p.331. For an opposite view see Scott: Fourth Gospel, pp.213ff.

HAS JOHN A DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT?

Before we begin to discuss the various phases of the Johannine doctrine of the Spirit, it might be well to make sure that such a conception is to be found. Superfluous as this task may seem, its need is shown by the fact that more than one scholar of recent times has tried to point out that there is no real place for the Spirit in Johannine thought.

As a good example of this school we may take the writings of E.F.Scott. In his treatise on the New Testament Doctrine of the Spirit, he claims that there is "no place for it" in the Johannine theology. The evangelist "finds it impossible to keep Christ and the Spirit separate....It is clear that the two conceptions mingled with each other in the writer's mind. The Spirit who would keep the world mindful of Christ and continue his work in each succeeding age, would be no other than Christ himself, abiding with his people."¹ Again, in his book on the Fourth Gospel we read, -"Indeed, the more closely we examine the Johannine doctrine of the Spirit, the more we are compelled to acknowledge that there is no real place for it in the theology as a whole. All that is vital in it is contained already in the grand conception of the return of Christ as an

1. p.206.

invisible and abiding presence....The doctrine of the Spirit may therefore be regarded as the supreme instance of that tendency, everywhere prevalent in the Gospel, to conserve the traditional belief alongside of the new and deeper interpretation"¹.

In our endeavour to answer this it will expedite matters if we first indicate more precisely what we mean by the Holy Spirit. We may say provisionally that the Spirit may be likened unto a power or energy that comes from the Father or the Son, ^{or both} partaking of the divine Nature; and ^{which} enters into the hearts of men, transforming them and giving them new moral life, and making itself ^{even} felt as "an invisible and abiding presence." If in the pages of the Johannine Writings we can find such a Power, we ought certainly to hesitate before saying that the author has no place for it; and if we find it to be at all prominent we can hardly think of it as an unnecessary piece of "traditional belief".

The point where such men as Scott have gone astray is in their clinging to a pre-Christian definition of the Spirit. The presence of the Risen Christ in the heart as differentiated from the Jesus of history or the glorified Messiah, is the Spirit, and all honour is due to Paul and John for setting it forth.

1. pp. 347-48.

THE NATURE OF THE SPIRIT.

In the introduction to his work on the Pauline Spirit, Birch Hoyle gives a summary of the current views regarding the nature of the Spirit. These we have summarized still further,-

i. The Spirit is a semi-material substance: "a super-sensuous matter which can only be called immaterial relatively, so far as it is not earthly or sensuous materiality" (O. Pfleiderer), closely related "to glory as it appeared like fire on earth" (Weinel), "impersonal and semi-material, as a kind of influence or power that came from God upon man" (Rees)

ii. The Spirit is a power or energy: "a name for the totality of those supernatural operations of power in which God reveals himself" (Wendt) "the supernatural power which has been sent forth from God through Christ and works, in the same power, miracle" (Gunkel)

iii. "Spirit" is an abstract principle; "the immaterial, supersensuous principle of existence" (Beyschlag)

iv. The Spirit is an instinct, influence, or inspiration: "the superior instinct which directed the Church in all its acts" (Renan) "the influence of God in the human soul" (Pringle-Pattison) "the continuous inspiration of the Christian Church" (Gardner).

v. The Spirit is the Hegelian Spirit of Logic, the élan vital of Bergson, or some such philosophical principle.

vi. The Spirit is a personal Being: "an independent centre (Centrum) proceeding from God and the Exalted Christ" (Titius). This is practically the orthodox view of the Creeds.

vii. The Spirit is "the collective spirit which animates the communal life of believers" (Schleiermacher)¹

1. op. cit. pp.16-21.

It should be noted that these do not all refer to New Testament thought. But they give us an idea how differently conceived the doctrine may be, and indicate possible limits for our search for the Johannine form.

Seen in the light of the passages from the Gospel and Epistle which we studied in an earlier chapter, it is soon evident that the abstract or philosophical principle (iii,v) is quite another thing, and the collective spirit (vii), and instinct, influence, or inspiration (iv), while they may reflect certain phases of the Spirit's work, are all too incomplete as definitions. Leaving the question of personality in abeyance, we have still on our hands the substantial Spirit (i), and the Spirit as power or energy (ii). As regards the former, it is true that certain passages appear to support it,¹ and if we allow a good measure of Greek influence it is quite probable that the writer at least combined this with the other.² But so far we have failed to discover any definite stratum of Greek metaphysical thought in the writings. At least the greater part of his doctrine would be perfectly at home among the Judean hills, while the metaphysical Spirit belongs to the Stoa. The

1. cf. 7:38,39; I,4:13; etc.

2. Heitmüller, referring to the Pauline Spirit says that it was "in the first instance, supernatural power and this power was represented as substantial, material".(Quoted by Hoyle in op.cit, p.17)

main idea behind the promise of the Spirit is the bestowal upon the believer of moral and spiritual power and energy. No inflow of new substance is needed since with John flesh is not inherently evil. With this power comes inspiration, and in it all true Christians are made as one. In short, it may be spoken of as a Divine influence working in man.

The precise degree to which John attributes personality to the Spirit is not easy to determine. Certain passages become almost obscure if we have a person in mind.¹ With regard to the Paraclete, there is evidently an intended personification, as the use of the masculine pronoun indicates,² though this may have been in part brought about by a former denotation of the word itself. In any case we must bear in mind that our own conceptions of personality were quite foreign to ancient thought, as they are now to the Indian mind.^{3@}

1. 3:8,34; 20,22, etc.

2. It may be noted that Goguel, who remains neutral on the question of the personality of the Johannine Spirit, regards \wedge as of slight evidential value since it is used for the word of Jesus in 12:48 (cf *La Notion Johannique de l'esprit*, Pt.II, ch.4)

3. See the writings of Rabindranath Tagore.

4. Denney writes that the Spirit of God "cannot be truly thought of as impersonal, and yet it is far more frequently spoken of in a way which is satisfied by the conception of a Divine impulsion to or stimulation of human thought, feeling, or action, than as a distinct personality. This is so even in writers who, like St.Paul and St.John, distinctly have the latter mode of representing the Spirit". (D.C.G., art. Holy Spirit).

In the preface to his collective work on the Spirit, Professor Streeter says that the "conception of the Spirit as the active indwelling of the transcendent Divine ...which dazzled the minds of a St. Paul or a St. John" is essentially the same as the "more vitalistic conception of the nature of the Power behind phenomena - a conception of which, perhaps, the happiest expression is Boutroux's vague but impressive formula 'The Beyond that is Within'".¹ This idea of the Spirit as God immanent in the world, ^{in a certain sense} working in matter, to some extent in all mankind, and to a greater extent in Christians, is quite popular to-day in many circles; but it is not the Spirit of Paul and John. Though the Johannine Spirit is to reprove and convict the world, it "cannot receive" it, and must in this case work from outside. The only resting place of the Spirit of God in the human world is in the heart of believers. It is even a test of their faith that they possess it.² Here we may leave the matter until we come to the doctrine of the Trinity.

1. The Spirit, p.ix.

2. cf. I, 3:24ff.

THE SPIRIT AND THE FATHER.

The relation between the Spirit and the Father is a subject to which John does not give much attention. There are, however, one or two rather important points which we should not fail to notice.

God ^{the Father} is the final **Source** of the Spirit, and by Him it is sent out among mankind¹. It is thus in a sense subordinate to Him, and under His will. The idea of its being on a mission is heightened by the use of the word proceedeth², - the Spirit acts for the Father.

We may agree with Goguel that the evidence is not sufficient to prove unity of substance³. It is a point which would have no particular interest for our author. But there is a unity of will and purpose. As in the case of the Father and the Son, they are One in righteousness and One in undying sacrificial love for mankind. As God is love, so is the Spirit also love⁴. But the Spirit is also holy; sin and evil are quite foreign to its nature. As it is the Father's purpose to save mankind from sin and death, so it is the will of the Spirit to do its part in the salvation and sanctification of the individual.

1. cf. 14:26; 15:26; I,3:24, etc.

2. 15:26.

3. op. cit. II,4.

4. cf. Walker: The Spirit and the Incarnation.

In an indirect sense the work of the Spirit concerns the Father, for the Spirit is the Representative and Revealer of Christ in the human heart¹, and it was Christ Who made the Father known². The Spirit is the Father's Ambassador at the court of the human spirit; the God in us.

1. cf. the Paraclete-passages. 2. 17:26, etc.

THE SPIRIT AND THE SON OF GOD.

We have seen fit to hold that even if John does assign to the Spirit the same functions as he does to the Risen Christ in the heart of the believer, it does not mean that he has no place for the so-called Third Person of the Trinity. It now falls to us to prove this by showing that there is a distinction in the author's mind between the two doctrines.

Many commentators have wondered at the insistence with which John clings to the tradition of the reception of the Spirit by Jesus at the time of His baptism. Surely this incident of questionable value in the polemic against the Baptizer could have been given the same treatment as the institution of the Eucharist, especially as the holding of Jesus as the Incarnate Logos would seem to make any bestowal of the Spirit superfluous. As Holtzmann puts it,—"sein von Anfang an übermenschliches Bewusstsein kann keine Steigerung durch Geistesbegabung erfahren"¹. But the author must have had some strong reason for bringing it in, and the most probably explanation is that he wanted to show Jesus as having within Him, not only the eternal Word, but also the Holy Spirit of God. Though Scott may be right in saying that in the

1. op. cit. II, S.509.

early Christology we find no trace of Jesus as the incarnate Spirit,¹ - in the exact sense that He is the incarnate Logos, we do find John thinking of Him as one who in an extraordinary sense embodies the Spirit,² and who is also a source from which the Spirit is to come forth as "rivers of living water".³ There is no evidence to show that the Elder regarded the Holy Spirit as altogether taking the place of the human spirit in Jesus;⁴ but, on the other hand, every page in the Gospel portrays the Master^{as} directly influenced by a power which can be none other than the Spirit of God. When Jesus, referring to the Paraclete says, - "ye know him; for he abideth with you",⁵ He was clearly directing their attention to the divine Spirit which He Himself embodied.[@]

If we interpret the author as holding that Jesus is in the above sense an incarnation of the Spirit, many of the apparent inconsistencies of the Gospel are swept away. When Jesus promises the little group that He will return shortly, it is to be fulfilled in the Spirit, which is both His and that of the Father; and therefore it is but repetition to follow^{up} a promise of the Paraclete with the words, - "I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you"⁶. It is in this sense that the

1. Spirit in the N.T., p.182. 2. cf. 3:34;7:38.
 3. 7:38 4. cf. 19:30 5. 14:16-18. 6. 14:16-18.
 @. Streeter refers to Christ as the portrait of the Spirit. (cf. The Spirit, p.350)

Father and the Son "will come unto" the one who keeps Jesus' words, and make Their "abode with him"¹. At His final departure the Master can "breathe" the Holy Spirit upon the waiting group,² and thus it remains to dwell with His followers from age to age.

But is this interpretation not open to serious objections? We are reminded that it is "another" paraclete that is promised.³ It may well be asked whether we do not make too much of this one word.⁴ The coming of the Spirit of Jesus will certainly be "other" than His arrival in the flesh after a temporary absence. The point that the Paraclete is to "bear witness of" Jesus⁵ need not trouble us if we can think of a dying father telling his sons that his spirit will keep his teaching fresh in their minds. Though the Paraclete is often given or sent from the Father, the Son has also a part to play.

It will be seen that here our author is but putting into his own terms, and amplifying the thought of Paul. There is no identification of the Spirit and Christ, but the Spirit of Jesus is seen as the Holy Spirit of God. Walker phrases it thus, -"The truth is...not that the Spirit is identical with Christ, but that it was from the first so entirely the principle of His personality,

1. 14:23
5. 15:26.

2. 20:22

3. 14:16

4.

and He was so completely one with it in His Divine Humanity that He became its perfect organ and expression... The Holy Spirit therefore includes the personal presence of Christ"¹.

A more pertinent question demands a reason why the Spirit was not available for the followers of Jesus until after His death and resurrection. It has been suggested that while they had the Master with them in the flesh nothing further was needed. But He was not always at their side, and there are occasions on record where help was needed. If we may turn for a moment to the Synoptic picture, why was the Spirit not conferred upon the Seventy,² or sent to the help of those who were unsuccessful in casting out the devil?³ Yet, as Hare puts it, these men were then as helpless children;⁴ they were living by sight and would not have had faith enough to look for the Spirit. It was needful for Jesus to leave them and let them become mature enough to receive it.

But there is another and deeper reason than that. In saying that "the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified"⁵, John indicates that the sacrifice of the Cross needed to take place before the

1. The Spirit and the Incarnation, p.83.

2. cf. Luke 10.

3. cf. Mark 9:18ff.

4. The Mission of the Comforter, p.6ff.

5. 7:39.

Spirit could be really available. The atoning work of Christ included a releasing of hitherto pent-up spiritual force. This is seen more clearly when we remember that though the Spirit of God had been working in men through the ages, it was only after the supreme revelation of the Divine in the life and sacrificial death of the Son of God that the "other Paraclete" could make Himself felt as the abiding Presence, and take the place of the absent Lord in the hearts of His followers while continuing His work among the sons of men. Though the teaching of Jesus may not seem to have revealed so much concerning the Spirit, His life and work paved the way for its coming, and it is as the Spirit of Jesus that it has most power in the world to-day¹.

Can the work of Christ be differentiated from that of the Spirit? Holtzmann finds "ein etwas gezwungenes Verhältniss zwischen zwei Grössen, die im Grund nur eine und dieselbe Rolle spielen, nämlich die eines Mittelwesens zwischen Gott und Welt, aber im johann. Drama auseinandertreten und verschiedene Aufgaben zugeteilt erhalten"². This statement is true in so far

1. Justin Martyr speaks of the powers of the Spirit of the prophets coming to rest (ceasing) in Christ. These now became gifts, given to those worthy of them. But the old Spirit of the Prophets came no more. (Dial. 87)

2. op. cit. II, S. 510.

as the work of Christ and the Spirit are both mediatory between God and man, and the Fourth Evangelist does at times seem to attribute to both the same function. But if we look a little closer we see that there is a distinction. It was the Son Whom the Father sent into the world to bring Light and Life unto men, and though the Spirit may work in the conversion of men¹, and may even be referred to as a source of life², this is only a making available of what has been already procured by the Saviour. It was the Son Who declared the Father to the world;³ Who showed to man the glory of the Divine love. It is Christ Who is the Light of the World, the Way, the Truth and the Life, in Whom men are to put their faith. Nowhere is it suggested that men are saved through the Spirit. But, on the other hand, it is the Spirit of the Risen Christ, or the Paraclete that is to remain in the world, convict the world of sin, comfort and sustain the believer, and conduct him into the mysteries of God as revealed in the Son. Except for the slight confusion with regard to the reported promises of the Master as He took leave of the group, a place in which a wrong impression might come about most easily, the thought of the author appears quite clear on these points.

1. 3:5

2. 6:63

3. 1:18;17:26.

Even when we think of Christ as we see Him in the Prologue,- the eternal Word of God, we can still keep Him distinct from the ever-present divine Spirit. The Logos [might] might lighten "every man as he cometh into the world"¹, but the Spirit must first prepare the heart, and keep bright the light that has there been made to shine. Commenting upon 15:26 Bauer sees there "die Selbständigkeit des Geistes neben dem Sohn gewahrt. Das Verhältnis beiden Grössen scheint dem des Logos zu Gott analog gedacht zu sein"².

In the relations between the Spirit and the Son we find the same note of subordination as between the Son and the Father. The Spirit is sent either by Christ,³ or at His behest,⁴ and continues the revelation begun by Jesus.⁵

It is a tribute to the greatness of our author's work that he is able to develop these two conceptions as he has done. Following upon his day we find a great deal of confusion. For instance in the Shepherd of Her- mas it is the Holy Spirit that becomes the Son of God, and is thus identified with the pre-existent Christ.⁶

1. 1:9(R.V.margin)
3. 15:26;16:7; 20:22;7:38
5. 16:13,14. I,5:7,8.

2. Commentary on John²
4. 14:16,26.
6. cf. Sim. V, IX,1-2.

THE SPIRIT AND THE WORLD.

In the last few chapters we have been mainly concerned with the nature or being of the Spirit. Now we turn to notice its function or work, as that is treated by the Johannine author.

We come first to its effect upon the world. By the latter term we mean "the sinful world, mankind as alienated from God"¹. This is the meaning most prevalent in John, where the circle of believers is sharply distinguished against the world of those who still love the darkness.

The Paraclete has no home in the world. It "cannot receive" Him; "for it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him."² To be known the Spirit must be felt; before it can be felt it must be received; and the world cannot receive it because it has no room for it. Its desires and aims run in other directions, and it is impatient of anything of this sort.

But though it may have to work from outside it has a definite task to carry out with reference to individuals in this category. This is the work of self-exposure and self-conviction, a process which must take place in their hearts before they can turn to the light. Up to this point they themselves have been the judges, and have

1. Stevens, op. cit., p.133. 2. 14:17.

measured by their own standards; now they must submit to judgment and be declared guilty according to a standard that belongs to another realm. No human agency could bring this about; only a divine Power can effect this stupendous displacement of values in the heart of man. "Whatever the final issue may be, he who 'convicts' another places the truth of the case in dispute in a clear light before him, so that it must be seen and acknowledged as truth"¹; here is a work which the Spirit of Truth alone can do.[@]

In this new vision of Truth which the Spirit puts before the eyes of the man of the world, are three great Facts,- the vileness of sin as shown by the life and death of the Son of God, and the moral helplessness of those who live apart from Him; the inherent righteousness of Christ and His way of life; and the lack of hope for those who are following the way of the world.² These facts, if truly seen, could hardly lead to anything other than belief in the Saviour of the world.

1. Westcott. cf. comm. on 16:8. 2. cf. 16:9-11.

@. The emphasis of the passage is apologetic rather than missionary. The picture is plainly that of the followers of Christ being accused at the bar of judgment, and the Paraclete turning the tables and the trial ends with the accusers themselves sentenced. See Bernard in loc.

THE SPIRIT AND CONVERSION.

We have seen how sharply John distinguishes between ordinary physical life, and spiritual life mediated through Christ and available to those who believe in Him. Just as he conceived earthly life to be ushered in by a birth process, so this new type of vitality was to have its genesis in a rebirth whose only connection with the physical birth was that one could stand as analogous to the other. Whether this new act of birth could be a slow development extending through the years of childhood is a question that may not have occurred to the author. ~~When~~ he would have agreed with such an authority as William James who speaks of conversion as "the process, gradual or sudden, by which a self hitherto divided, and consciously wrong, inferior and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right, superior and happy, in consequence of its firmer hold upon religious realities"¹, we cannot pause to determine, except to remark that in the Johanne conversion the part played by the Divine would be overwhelmingly great, and the human share merely that of acceptance and faith, if even so much, and that the "unification of the self", and the "firmer hold upon religious realities" would amount to a thoroughgoing moral and spiritual re-orientation, that would remain the

1. The Varieties of Religious Experience, p.189

outstanding event in the history of the individual.

Though this new life is made available by Christ, the actual conversion of the individual is the work of the Spirit.¹ Only a divine Power could be the author of such a miraculous transformation, and only God the Holy Spirit comes into sufficiently close contact with the human spirit to effect it. The occurrence of the phrase "born" or "begotten of God"² might indicate that there was in the mind of the writer a parallel theory of regeneration. But such an expression does not tell us how the new birth takes place. We have seen that conviction of sin is the Spirit's work, and we shall soon have occasion to observe its action in the heart of the believer. It would therefore be strange if the intermediate process were not also part of its work.

We need hardly add that the new life ^{itself} is to be kept quite distinct from the Holy Spirit. The one is a state, the other a power; the one is a transformation of the personality, the other is kept, as we shall see later, from actually merging with the personality.

1. cf. 3:5ff.

2. 1:13; I,3:9; I,4:7; I,5:1.

THE SPIRIT IN THE BELIEVER.

In his work on the Holy Spirit and the Church, Bishop Gore makes the statement that in the New Testament the Spirit is only given to those who are "in the Church"¹. Without accepting the implications of the concluding phrase we may again point out that it is quite true that only to the believer does the Spirit come.

The time of the Spirit's coming in the history of the believer is not very clear. There are indications that the early Church made it contemporaneous with the ceremony of baptism,² and a slight degree of support is given to the position that this was John's theory by the association of water and the Spirit in 3:5 and by the mention of a definite chrism in I, 2:20,27. But on the other hand, equally valid evidence could be brought forward to support the more spiritual view that the coming of the Spirit is in no wise subject to material laws or circumstances.

Was the Spirit thought of as being bestowed as a single gift, or is the believer to receive it more and more as his Christian life develops? The idea of most passages seems to be that of a single "anointing", But the mention of our Lord's having the Spirit "not by measure"³, and the words, "-he hath given us of his Spirit"⁴,

1. p.14ff. 2. See above. 3. 3:34. 4. I,4:13.

warn us not to be too dogmatic on this point. Again, the verb in I,4:13 is best translated "has given and continues to give". This is in line with a few passages in Paul¹ and in the Epistle to the Hebrews². Perhaps the author's real opinion would be that while the Spirit in all its grace and power abides with an individual, the ability on the part of each to respond, and the measure of "gifts" bestowed, differs according to the person. In a sense each Christian is a partial incarnation of the Spirit, or rather of certain aspects of the Spirit's life and nature[@].

The nearness of the Paraclete to the believer is expressed with all possible fulness. Terms of fellowship, friendship, and indwelling are used;³ yet there is no suggestion that the Spirit of God is to replace the human spirit. The picture is not one of the trance-like ecstasy seen in many who thought themselves god-possessed, or even of a mind taken hold of and used as we saw in Philo, but of an unseen Presence directing and helping the group of men who were following in the footsteps of the Master. This concept of an abiding Presence within and yet distinct from the [^]spirit is not easy for the philosopher to deal with, but it represents Christian expe-

-
1. Where he speaks of the "earnest" of the Spirit as given to his readers. (II Cor. 1:22; 5:5)
 2. Where the author refers to distributions (*μερισμοῖς*) of Holy Spirit (2:4), or those who "were made partakers" of Holy Spirit (6:4) (Spirit.
 3. cf. 14:16,17. @. cf. Robinson: The Kenosis of the

rience, and this was our author's chief concern.

The work of the Spirit in those who receive Christ is, as Stevens suggests, "to foster the Christian life"¹. It is the Advocate of the absent Lord, bearing witness of Him,² instructing in His teaching,³ and guiding them into the Truth⁴ of which His revelation is the keystone. Here we miss the Pauline mention of the "fruit of the Spirit", or its work of sanctification in the believer. But all this is implied in the Johannine doctrine. The important thing is to know God, and knowledge of God is mediated through Christ and apprehended through the Spirit. This is sufficient amid all conditions and under all circumstances. While Paul and others look from below and see effects, John is trying to catch the view from above, and to see the channel through^{which} the Divine influence comes; on the side of God he sees the ever-present Paraclete, and on the side of man that knowledge which, as we have seen, includes discernment and belief. It is not mere details of the Master's earthly life that is meant here so much as that quality of heart and mind which were in Him; if we can, in the Johannine sense know these, no power in earth or heaven can trouble us.

The doctrine of the indwelling Spirit is one of the

1. op. cit. p.207.

2. 15:26; I, 5:7.

3. 14:26, I,2:27

4. 16:13-14.

greatest of Divine revelations. Man is indeed a change-creature; he may be under the influence of good intentions at one moment, and before the next has passed, the entreaties of a friend or the urge of some inner want may have completely carried him away. Unless he has a Presence even closer than that of a companion, guiding his actions and keeping the form of his Master ever before his eyes, he is liable to forget even the One Who gave His life to save him. But, as John reminds us, this indwelling Spirit must ever point to the Cross, and the Figure upon it, or the doctrine loses its vitality and power.

THE SIGN OF A CHRISTIAN.

Within even a few decades of the time of Christ, groups of men were to be found who ^{were} publishing interpretations of His teaching and Person quite different from those of the Apostles. Among them were men of learning who tried to prove that their doctrine was supported by the great systems of truth handed down through the ages. No wonder the ranks of the faithful were broken as one after another was persuaded to accept the new teaching and the moral system supported by it. In trying to combat this, John looks around for a sign that will indicate true Christianity. Among others he sees the Spirit. Surely only a true follower of the Way would be thus endowed. But this leads to a welter of confusion, for as in the Corinthian Church a good many claimed to know and possess it whose ^{life and} conduct were most questionable. Things were said and done in the name of the Spirit of God,- as in many quarters we see to-day, that should have made a disciple of the Master hang his head in shame. Hence the spirits themselves must be tested. Those forces within a man which inspired him and prompted his activities must be examined and their source laid bare. Perhaps, as Law suggests, there was a tendency to be carried away by a false en-

thusiasm, to pay homage to violent emotional disturbance, or to regard the extraordinary and sensational rather than the calm and normal "as possessing in itself the credentials of truth"¹. Whatever the practice may have been, there stood a test that would separate at once anything that was truly Christian from all else. The spirits must all come before, not a passionless Gnostic being, but the Christ Who came in the flesh, Who suffered on the Cross, and in doing so revealed the eternal Divine love; and their confession must be noted. For the Spirit of Jesus Himself this will be nothing, but all the others will tremble and flee. To quote Law again, - "to deny the truth of the personal Incarnation" is "to annul the possibility of that communication of the Divine Life to man on which salvation essentially consists"². No spirit that was really of God could do this, and no one that knowingly and deliberately refuses to acknowledge the one great Fact of history can call himself a Christian.

1. op. cit. p. 265.

2. p. 107.

THE SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH.

In the last few chapters we have been considering various aspects of the Spirit's action upon the individual. But we hasten to add that, at least as far as the New Testament is concerned, this is a theoretical position. For these writers there is no such thing as a solitary Christian. Though Nicodemus may have come to Jesus by night, there is no record of any Christian remaining unknown to the Church, and failing to obtain strength from the Church and to advance its cause as he^{or she} was able. It was through the Church that the blessings of Christianity came to men; and it was through her, organized or unorganized as she may have been, that they put forth their efforts to serve their Master and to advance His Kingdom. More than that, the impression is often created that such gifts as that of the Spirit were only bestowed that they might use them in His service.

Though ostensibly the Paraclete was promised to the Eleven in the Upper Room, there is no doubt that John has the Ephesian Church or Churches in mind as he writes.¹ The Spirit is to be their Comforter and Helper, their Guide into the way of truth. As a group they will come to know this Advocate of their Risen Lord, this Presence of Him Whom they had heard so much from the

1. Swete considers that the references of chs. 3-7 concern the individual, and those of 14-20 the future Church. See *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p.148.

lips of His followers in Galilee and Jerusalem. As a church they will come to know Him more and more, and to understand the great mysteries of His life and teaching. As they came together to worship Him and to commemorate that sacred meal as He had bidden them, things that they had not seen before in His Person would appear, and far greater glories than they had yet beheld shine before their bewildered eyes. It was ^{through} the Church, too, that the Paraclete would have most power in convicting the world; and as the Incarnation of the true Spirit of its Lord, this group which confessed Him would show its Divine origin and power.

To say that the author held this view does not necessarily make him a rigid ecclesiastic. There are in fact many sayings in the Gospel that suggest a marked liberalism in this direction.¹ But in these days when so many church members hardly ever attend its services, or meet their fellow-members, it is hard to realize the great place ~~the~~ corporate life and fellowship can take in the realization of the Spirit. Again, the coldness and formality with which so many of our services of worship are conducted blind our eyes to the fact that here most of all the Spirit of Jesus may be expected to be present and to make itself felt.² The mighty things accomplished

1. cf. 4:7ff.; 10:16; 12:20. 2. cf. Matt. 18:20.

by secular organizations who take advantage of the social instincts to unite their members and to focus their efforts, afford us a hint of what the Spirit might be able to do were the Johannine promises to be fulfilled in us.

THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH.

There now remain for our consideration a number of topics arising out of what has been already dealt with. These will not only take us somewhat farther afield than we have yet been led, but will serve to present new views of the doctrines themselves, and will in this way form a conclusion for our essay.

We must now put to our author the question that he places in the mouth of Pilate, -"What is truth?"¹ It will help us to understand him if we turn for a moment to the thought of Plato.² This prince of thinkers regarded the real abiding world as one of supersensuous Ideas, earthly things being true in so far as they are faithful copies of these Ideas. John's main position is not far removed from this; though he gives more emphasis to the moral and spiritual and does not concern himself with the metaphysical. Truth is not to be found in this world or in the things of this world, but is wrapped up in the hitherto hidden mysteries of God. There is a Light whose rays would put to shame the most precious gems of human wisdom. The most learned of philosophers would

1. 18:38

2. This does not mean that we agree with Scott when he suggests that there is a line of thought behind the Fourth Gospel that is derived from Plato through Philo. Paul's views on the Wisdom of God form a much more likely source. (cf. Scott:Fourth Gospel,p.253f.)

appear as a babe if confronted with the Divine wisdom, which is part of the Nature of God.

But though through the ages this Truth has been hidden, now is come the time for its revelation. In the incarnate Son of God we behold the eternal Truth¹. He is the Standard by which all is to be measured; the Rule that is to determine the truth or falsity of every theory and precept formulated by students and sages in all time. In Christ the great Realities, the existence of which may have been dimly sensed, but whose disclosure awaited His appearing, have been made manifest, "and we beheld his glory"². In Him we are able to see the one perfect Exemplar of Reality.

Yet this Jesus in the flesh only lived for a few brief years, and to few was it given to catch more than a stray word from His lips, or a fleeting glimpse of His form. By being born a few years too late, even these were denied to the Christians of Ephesus. But this need be no loss to them, for the Spirit of this Incarnate Truth was to be in their midst, to guide them into "all the truth"³. They had the anointing from the Holy One which "teacheth...concerning all things"⁴. The Truth was even more available to them

1. 1:14,17; 14:6; etc.

3. 16:13.

2. 1:14.

4. I, 2:27.

than it was to those who lived closest to the Master when He trod the paths of Galilee. The Paraclete stood ready to lead them "into the complete understanding of and sympathy with that absolute Truth, which is Christ Himself"¹.

All this time we can feel the scientist getting impatient, and asking what [what] rating John would have for the systems which ^{by mounting fact upon fact} he has laboured through the years to build up. The answer would be that seen in the light of this revelation in Christ, they would be rated low indeed. Knowledge of any kind, unless it be linked up with this Divine wisdom, is of little real value. It may serve to improve the lot of man upon earth, it may even be instrumental in increasing his joy and lessening his suffering, but unless it even dimly points the way to the Incarnate Christ, it is nothing. But here the scientist cries out ^{perchance} that he cares not what ultimate value his hypotheses may have so long as they can be proved to be consistent with the so-called laws of his own particular science and the facts as he claims to see them. With regard to such a one the Evangelist could say little else than that he could not see because his eyes were blinded,² or if he were so bold as to claim that

1. Westcott on 16:13.

2. cf. 12:40.

he could bring moral and spiritual benefits to men, the demand would be made that his spirit should confess Jesus Christ if it is not to be counted as a spirit of error. The author would be far from denying that speculation in general is without value; but he would point out that it can only realize its value by linking itself up with the Truth as manifested in Christ, and revealed through His Spirit.

How does the Spirit declare unto us the things of Christ?¹ Are such facts to be put before our eyes as^{if} on a sheet let down from heaven? The answer is that the writer is not interested in^{mere} facts as such; he only considers them as a foundation for a super-factual knowledge. The rational is only an element in the complete body of knowledge, and not perhaps the most important one at that. It may represent the dominant note, but in true knowledge ~~the~~ overtones of feeling and will are essential for strength and harmony. In seeking to eliminate these the scientist robs his conclusions of the general bearing upon life, and the inclusive unity with Truth as a whole, that they might otherwise possess. It is by the addition of the right overtones that the Paraclete adds to our knowledge;² He brings in elements of feeling and will that make the bare seeds of fact

1. cf. 16:13-14.

2. This includes a type of rational insight, which clears the way for certain lines of reasoning.

blossom forth and bear the rich fruit of true discernment. The way in which these irrational elements can enhance a fact may be noted if we compare our mental states when we hear that an unknown Mrs. X has been run over and killed, and when we learn that this same Mrs. X is our mother; or when quite unexpectedly the vague report of a scholarship won by someone in the school is turned into the certain knowledge that we ourselves have been so honoured. Even more powerful overtones than these can be added by the Spirit to scraps of fact already in the mind. Truly "what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak"¹. Just as the Spirit has enabled the author to weave such a rich Gospel around a few of the facts of Jesus' life, so in us a body of knowledge can be formed "concerning all things"² that matter.

But the Paraclete is also to "declare unto you the things that are to come"³. Here again we must not think of a disclosure of the facts of to-morrow's history, but of a discernment of to-day's events that will guide us in our expectation of what is to come. As Gardner reminds us, - "through all history the prophets who have tried to detail future history have failed; but the great ones among them, who have seen into the heart of things and declared in what direction they were moving,

1. 16:13

2. I, 2:27.

3. 16:13.

have succeeded. The truth of prophecy is not truth to fact but truth to idea"¹. In the last analysis it is because of a happy correlation of facts, plus a liberal surcharge of overtones, that we are able to peer into the future at all; and then it is the combinations of will and feeling, the "ideas" as Gardner expresses it, rather than the events, that we can distinguish most clearly.

John's theory is one of progressive revelation. He sees that facts when once codified into laws become dead, and lose their real content. To the facts of Jesus' life and teaching new meaning must ever be added by the Spirit of Truth. In his Gospel the author has shown in a very striking manner how this is possible. As far as actual incidents of the Master's earthly life go his Gospel does not give a great deal that is new; but it does clothe such facts with fresh meanings and values. It is in this light that we are to regard the saying that the Paraclete will take the things of Christ and declare them². The prospect of ^{further} unrecorded events of that history ^{being} brought to light was dark indeed, but there is no reason why the interpretation of those already known should not be added to until the

1. The Ephesian Gospel, p.263.

2. cf. 16:14

end of time. Though the author may have found such an idea of value in providing an apology for his own Gospel, there seems to be no indication that he did not think that this work of the Spirit might not go on after his day.

A question that often arises is how far can a group of Christian people who in meeting together have invoked the Spirit's help, be led to see the truth of a subject upon which they may be deliberating. Here enter in a number of factors, all of which must be taken into consideration.

To begin with, the group must be made up of individuals who have actually come to know God through Christ, and who have received the gift of the Spirit in their hearts. It is open to question whether this can be said of many that invoke the Spirit's aid in our day.

It is also needful that the group should be genuinely seeking the Spirit's guidance in forming their opinion, and not merely expecting it to put a stamp of approval on conclusions already arrived at.

We have to bear in mind, too, that the Johannine Paraclete is only directly concerned with matters that are truly spiritual, and that pertain to the welfare of the Kingdom of God. It may be said that there is nothing

in the whole universe that does not in some slight way or other connect itself with the Kingdom, but that was not, as we have seen, the point of view of our author, and if we are going to pin our faith to the promises found in his works we must accept such limitations as are attached to them.

There is no guarantee that the group will arrive at the truth in one sitting, or for that matter in any number of sittings. The picture outlined by the writer is not that of a sudden revealing flash, but of an individual or group of individuals following the advancing Paraclete, plodding on through many a difficult slough, and up many a steep incline before reaching the goal.

Though the Spirit may have little to do with the actual gathering of facts by the mind, this is not to say that facts already gathered may not be made use of. The author did not let his knowledge of the Master hinder him from storing his mind with the learning of many schools of philosophy, and we can hardly conceive of such a work as his Gospel being possible had not the Paraclete been at work in his own mind adding fresh values to some of these facts, and revealing their abiding and eternal significance in the light of the Truth

brought before human eyes in Christ Jesus. A man does not have to be a scientist or a philosopher to have fellowship with God, or to receive the gift of the Spirit, but if he can be versed in such knowledge while at the same time realizing that the true Reality lies in a sphere far higher, then, as we have seen in the case of John, who can say how far this same Spirit of Truth may lead him? And if this be so with an individual, could it not be far more so where a number of such persons are working together, always provided of course, that there is sufficient agreement among them, for the Spirit cannot work in disorder.

Though it may be given to certain individuals from time to time to plumb vast depths of truth, there is no doubt that the most harmonious and the purest conceptions are arrived at when the Spirit of Truth is able to work through^a a number who are patiently striving together to see common spiritual values in facts and experiences which are in many ways unconnected and disparate.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE SPIRIT.

Broadly speaking, there are three centres of Christian authority,- the Church, the Bible, and the direct testimony of the Holy Spirit through the Christian conscience. As Sabatier shows, the first characterizes the Roman Church, the second is found in Protestantism through the greater part of its history, while the third shows itself most of all in certain movements which, though they may not at certain periods have been at all prominent in Protestant thought, are really more akin to its inner spirit¹. In the last resort all these depend more or less upon the Spirit of God, since the Roman Church considers herself divinely commissioned by the words of Jesus, ratified by the Spirit; and the Bible has been regarded as dictated by the Spirit by those who have made it most authoritative. In these days, however, the tendency is to depend more and more upon the direct testimonium Spiritus Sancti itself.

"For our authority is the Spirit", cries Dean Inge, "and we look for His last word, not in the remote past, but in the unknown future"². It will now be our task to determine the stand of our author on this subject.

The supreme Authority, according to John, is the

1. cf. The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit.

2. The Modern Churchman, vol.XIX, p.299.

Father, Who has commissioned the Son and delegated to Him certain powers¹. In some passages a certain amount of authority seems to be inherent in the words of Christ,² but we cannot think that the Evangelist held the actual sayings that fell from the lips of the Master as possessing a warrant in themselves or he would not have made free use of them as he did. The Paraclete is sent forth in the name of the Son, and with a certain measure of the Son's authority³. It is significant that the reference to Jesus breathing the Spirit upon the disciples is followed by one which clothes them with authority over the spiritual condition of others.⁴ But this may be taken as holding good for all believers, and apart from the vague statements of the last chapter, there is no indication that a greater measure of authority has been delegated to any one Christian or group of Christians, more than to others. There is also the customary use of quotations from the Old Testament Scriptures, which, as by other writers, were doubtless regarded as inspired by the Spirit, though interpreted quite freely.⁵ @

Reviewed in the light of modern conditions and needs,

1. cf. 3:35; 5:27; 8:42; 12:49, etc.

2. e.g. 3:34; 6:63,68. 3. cf. 14:26; 16:15.

4. 20:23. MacGregor suggests that this may be taken in the sense of the world being judged by its attitude toward the Christian community and its message. But the parallels (Matt. 16:19; 18:18) go to show that the greater moral discernment of the Christian carries with it a measure of authority.

5. cf. 7:38; 10:34-5; 19:36-7, etc.

@. There is also the indefinite measure of authority assumed by the author in writing as freely as he has.

this leaves before us one problem,- what authority does our possession of the Holy Spirit confer upon us, to what phase of life does it pertain, and to what degree is it infallible?

We may approach the subject by noting one or two ways in which our author may easily be misinterpreted. Chief among these is the error into which Montanus and his followers seemed to fall when they thought that the Paraclete had come into them, and having actually taken possession of their minds, was using them as mouthpieces¹. We have seen [that] signs of this in the Old Testament, and it comes very close to the idea of Philo, but it is not the thought of the Fourth Gospel. As we shall presently see, the abiding Paraclete leads the human spirit into truth, rather than entering in and displacing it, and using the physical organism as its own organ of expression. The Divine authority is thus always indirect, since it is mediated through the human spirit.

Again, just as the Spirit of Truth is not directly concerned with knowledge that is not spiritual in character, so we need not look for it to clothe us with authority in any realm but the spiritual. Because a

1. cf. Swete: *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p.67f.
Rees: *op. cit.* p.76ff.
Harnack: *History of Dogma*. Eng. tr. vol.II,p.

man feels that the Spirit is with him ^{in itself} is no reason why he should be heard in any of the special departments of learning. Another mistake made by the Montanists was that they began to feel that the Spirit speaking within them was even greater than Christ Himself.¹ The authority of the Spirit cannot be greater than that of the ^{of} Son, Whom it bears witness,² and Whom it confesses;³ and no one thinking himself to have a revelation above that of Jesus Christ can in any sense say that he has John behind him.

Having in this way cleared the field, we may attack our problem from two angles, - first dealing with the authority of the Spirit in the believer's own life, and then passing on to authority delegated to him to wield over others.

If the Spirit that is with us is truly the Spirit of Christ, we can think of nothing that should have more weight ^{the testimony of} than ~~this~~ witness. The abiding Paraclete is both Divine and personal; He speaks the things of God, and His word is ^{as} the message of a friend. The ~~de-~~ **cre** of the Church is of prime importance, but He reserves the right to interpret it and to declare the things of Christ that it may point to. The words of Scripture

1. cf. Swete: The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church, p. 71.
 2. cf. 15:26; 16:13, etc. 3. I, 4:2.

are living indeed, but the Paraclete still has the right to pick out what is truly of the Master, and make it real to us. Here is indeed a charter of the Christian liberty of conscience, but at the same time it is a bond which brings him all the closer to his Lord and Master.

When it comes to the question of the believer's authority over his neighbour we find ourselves on ground that is much less certain. But we can at least say that the possession of the Spirit invests the believer with an ability to discern spiritual matters, thus giving him a kind of authority over those who do not have it. It is this that is referred to in the saying on the forgiveness and retention of sins,¹- not that a sort of Divine stamp is automatically placed on any judgment that we might make in this connection, but that the Spirit will help us to see and declare the mind of Christ. Such authority is quite secondary, however; we never know how little the Spirit as yet has been able to make known to us. We cannot claim the example of the Evangelist in setting forth our interpretation of the Word of God as "true"² until we know exactly what his "witness" was, and are sure that we have one of equal value.

1. cf. 20:23.

2. cf. 19:35; 21:24.

THE ABIDING PARACLETE.

We have already noted that while John speaks of the Paraclete as being with, beside, and in, the believer, there is no suggestion that this Spirit enters into an actual union with, or drives out, the human spirit that is there already. It may be profitable to see just what this mean in the light of modern knowledge of the self.

Seen from a psychological point of view, an individual is a bundle of emotions and instincts connected with a kind of control centre, called the will, with which are associated feelings and memories, some of the latter being beyond conscious recollection. Attached to the will, but in close touch with the conscious mind as a whole is a unifying centre which may here be termed the soul¹. Rough as this sketch may be, it will be sufficient for our purpose. What we are here concerned with is whether the Spirit of God, when it comes upon a man, displaces any essential part of the psychological equipment, and if it does not, where it establishes contact with it.

Many have sought to find in a "religious" instinct the basis for this side of man's nature, forgetting that religion can dominate the life of a normal healthy individual in a way that none of the true instincts

1. In spite of the protests of many psychologists, we cannot help feeling that the presence of something of this nature has to be reckoned with. See MacDougall: Body and Mind.

or emotions can. Others try to find it in the "subconscious", which would again be cramping it far too much. Nor can we locate it in the will, for the will often behaves in a very unreligious manner. Even what we have termed the soul cannot for the same reason be called the actual source of the religious influences which operate in man. Again, there is no indication that the Spirit takes over any one of these in which to dwell, for in the believer each can still play a non-religious part. Truly we must look elsewhere for the seat of spiritual power.

Here it is that John can teach even the psychologist. According to him the religious influence comes from outside. Though he might describe the Paraclete as being "in" the group of believers, he clearly keeps it from becoming part of the actual self. Like the dove it hovers over the one with whom it abides, nearer to him than any other person or thing, and yet not becoming part of him. It is as something which enters into his very heart and yet respects the privacy of his inner self.

The point in the self where the Spirit of God establishes contact might by different thinkers be variously placed. Some would say that it is in certain

feelings that they experience the Divine in the most intimate manner; others that they approach Him in pure thought. The normal spiritual life demands, however, that the Divine influence should permeate the whole self; that it should not only seize hold of the will and through it reach the control of the desires and impulses, but even touch the soul and magnetize it so that it has but a single life-purpose. Such an influence over the soul tends to unify the whole personality, - one of the great aims of the psychologist of religion. While a man before the advent of the Spirit might be divided and distressed by a number of conflicting aims and passions, there now comes into his life something that sets these in order, and makes them serve a single master-purpose. It is with the soul of a man that the Spirit is able to do its mightiest work. In fact, it is in this organizing centre, rather than at any other point, that the real contact is made, and the streams of power sent in to make their way to every part of the organism. So long as this contact is kept alive the growth and vigour of the new spiritual life is assured.

In analyzing as we have done above we are apt, however, to destroy the beauty of the figure which our au-

thor uses. He has in mind the Master as that little group knew Him in Galilee. Day and night He was at their side, comforting, warning, directing. As little children depend on a parent, so they depended upon Him to take the lead in all that was said and done. A thousand times in the course of a day He would hear from their lips the common word παρακατέω,¹. In a very real sense He was their Paraclete; of all that might have been used, no word could have expressed more. We all know the value of a loyal and noble friend, one who perhaps has seen more of life than we have, and whom we can respect and admire. No earthly influence is more powerful and uplifting than the friendship of a personality stronger and more virtuous than our own. How inexpressibly rich must have been the influence of Jesus over those who were privileged to share His friendship. His very presence would stimulate and strengthen all that was true and noble in them. One look from Him would work in broken wills and neurasthenics all the powers of healing and releasing of energy described by Captain Hadfield² in his article. The impact of His Personality would be able to do far than the work of all the psychoanalysts and psychothera-

1. In this sense the word could be rendered "I beg", "I intreat", or merely "if you please". It is thus used to the present day. I am indebted to Professor Curtis for this explanation.

2. cf. The Psychology of Power, in Streeter: The Spirit.

pists in the world.

It is this Presence, free from the limitations of space and time, that the author has before his eyes as he writes. This unifying, strengthening, ennobling influence is to be available for the disciples, for the Christians at Ephesus, for all through the ages who shall believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.

But is there not another side to the picture? Is it not possible for the human spirit to retard and even divert altogether the influence of the Paraclete? Though the question does not come up in the Spirit-passages, we are frequently reminded elsewhere that love on the Christian's part is needful to sustain the Divine indwelling.¹ This love shows itself in the keeping of Jesus' commandments,² the chief of which is that we should "love one another".³ In the Epistle we are shown that we cannot expect ^{the love of} God to abide in us if we love the things of the world,⁴ or hate our brethren.⁵ "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked".⁶ "Whatsoever is begotten of God overcometh the world".⁷ But the writer never seems to entertain the idea that the Spirit of God could finally depart from a man.⁸

1. 14:21;15:9; I, 4:12,16.

3. 15:12

5. I, 3:14-15

7. I, 5:4

2. 14:15,21;15:10.

4. I, 2:15ff.

6. I, 2:6.

8. cf. 6:37.

Not only, however, were they to have the Presence of the One they loved so much, in their own individual lives, but He was to be with them as they worked and worshipped together in the Church. The disciples knew well the persuasive majesty of His words as He spoke to His Father in prayer. If only they could invoke this Spirit in their gatherings. Again, they remembered His as He moved among them as a leader, reproofing in a firm and gentle manner those who were wrong, encouraging the weak and timid, and passing on a word of help just where it was needed. How it must have made their hearts glad when they realized that this Spirit was still in their midst though His visible Presence was there no longer. Could we, too, realize it as we ought, how much more Christian our ecclesiastical life might be.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

During the last few years a good deal of uneasiness has been expressed regarding what may be called the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Writers have pointed out that the conception of the Godhead as three Persons is neither practical for purposes of instruction and belief, nor is it in accordance with New Testament teaching. "Popular Christianity," says Canon Streeter, "is Tritheism with reservations"¹. "It can hardly be doubted" writes R.C.Moberley, "that, among those who wish to make a point of being orthodox, there is a great deal of practical Di- or Tri-theism"². Denney claims that "such an expression as 'I believe in the Holy Ghost' is entirely foreign to the New Testament;...to present the Spirit as an object of faith co-ordinate with Christ is both to desert the New Testament and to beguile ourselves with an illusion of knowledge about the divine Nature which has no Christian value"³. "To speak of the Spirit as a third Person co-ordinate with the Father and the Son", writes Professor Jackson, "is to go further than our New Testament goes"⁴. And to return to the Fourth Gospel, "there is no trace in John", says E.F.Scott, "of the doc-

-
1. Quoted by Jackson in Hibbert Journal, XX, p.629.
 2. Atonement and Personality, p.156.
 3. Jesus and the Gospel, pp. 400-401.
 4. What do we mean by the Holy Spirit?, in Hibbert Journal, XXIV, p.503.

trine of a Trinity"¹. We might go on to quote many others, but what we have shown will suffice to indicate that the subject is one that needs to be dealt with.

As Moberley suggests, there should ever be "a certain note of reverent agnosticism"² in our attitude toward the mysteries of the Godhead. In the last resort we are dependent upon the Revelation given to us in Christ, and none of our elaborately worked doctrines or finely spun analogies bring us nearer the truth unless they start in Him, and are worked out in His Spirit. Even if we follow the modern call to go back to experience, what experience will avail unless it be of the Divine, and what closer and deeper experience of this nature did ever a group of men have than those who were around the Saviour in the days of His flesh and immediately after? In the writings of John we have a record of one of the most profound of such experiences, expressed with striking clarity and breadth of thought. If in his thought we find no basis for our doctrine of the Trinity, we may well discard it; and if we find that it is there, but in a radically different form, it may well signify that there is need for making a special study of the subject, with a view to^a revision of our forms of belief.

1. Fourth Gospel, p.341.

2. op. cit. p.163.

First we can see behind the words of John an experience of God as Creator and Sustainer of the world, and potential Ruler of all mankind. In the beginning He made all things, and though in the meantime a few powers and spirits may exercise a slight measure of dominion, their strength is not real, and of the final triumph of the Almighty there is no doubt. This God is a God of righteousness, in Whose sight evil is condemned. He is also a God of infinite love, and the figure of the father giving up the one dearest to his heart, - his only son, is hardly strong enough to express His love for the wayward sons of men.

In the second place he knows God as He made Himself known to men, as He brought light into the darkness, and the vision of truth into the maze of error. Without this revealing Word the Divine love would not have been felt by the sons of men. It is because of this Divinity that God can be called Father. It is He Who made the new eternal life available for those who believe on Him. It is He Who supplies the Water of life, from which if one drinks he need never thirst again, and the Bread of life, which is more than sufficient for the hunger of the world. It is He Who has opened up the Way for man.

There is yet ^{another} sense in which John has experienced God. He knows Him as an indwelling Presence, abiding with him, inspiring him and leading him to do great things, and opening up new vistas of truth to his eyes. It is through this Presence that life has come to him, and by it he is able to distinguish between the transient and the permanent, the vanity of the world and the great eternal Realities. He feels that in this way God is ever at his side, constraining and yet not forcing him, and as he puts himself into the Divine hands and beholds the way he is led, he can but marvel and exclaim that "it is not yet made manifest what we shall be"¹.

That the author has not always clearly distinguished between these experiences, or given a separate name in every case to the Divinity that is the Source of each, is but another sign that his work is genuinely human. The important thing is that behind all three he sees the same God. Whether it be the old Hebrew monotheism, or a still more ancient Spirit, or the one through which the other worked, no trace of tritheism is to be found in our author's thought. God the Father and God the Son are one in will and purpose, and the same unity binds together God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. Though in his doctrine there is plenty of room for mutual

1. I, 3:2.

relations between Father, Son, and Spirit, there is no excuse for attributing to one moral properties not attributable in equal measure to the others.¹ As Augustine points out, the Father and the Spirit are just as much Wisdom as the Son.² If John had in his vocabulary our word person in its various shades of meaning, there is room for doubt as to whether he would have used it, valuable as it has been, to designate the separate members of his Trinity.

The Trinity of the Johannine writer is more than a theoretic unity; it is a practical one, centering in Christ Jesus. Through Him the Divine revealed itself to man, and man in his approach to the Divine must ever come through Christ. The Father is the Father of Jesus; the Spirit is sent out by Jesus or at His behest; and it is through the Incarnation of the Logos that men are able to receive life. He is ever the one portal, through which the divine Radiance shines forth.

We have thus seen that there is a doctrine of the Trinity in the writings of John, and it is evident that it differs somewhat from the form in which we usually teach it. Since this is hardly the place for an extended treatment of this important subject, we can do lit-

1. cf. Moberley: op. cit., p.172.

2. cf. Moberley, p.206f.

tle more than indicate a few ways in which our teaching may be brought more into line with that found in John.

i. We need to be sparing in our use of the word person when designating a member of the Trinity. Though the term has undoubtably been, and still is, of great value in furthering our understanding of the Divine nature;¹ when we apply it to the separate divisions of the Godhead, it tends to dissolve the unity which should bind them together in our minds. In the case of the Holy Spirit this danger is a very real one; and for a time at least it would be of material help if Moberley's suggestion regarding the use of neuter pronouns were carried out.² This would be even more in keeping with the ^{spirit of the} Johannine usage than with the letter. It is not that we are loathe to attribute full personality to God the Holy Spirit, but that we desire to repair the strained bonds of unity in our conception of God the Three in One.

ii. We must beware of clothing one member of the Trinity with moral attributes to the neglect of showing the same to belong equally to all three. God is most righteous, but no more so than are Christ and the Holy Spirit. The compassion of our Lord is matched by that

1. Moberley, *op. cit.* ch. 8.

2. p. 180f. The practice followed in this essay was conceived independently of the writer referred to.

of His Father and His Spirit.

iii. We need to keep ever before our eyes the unity of the Godhead. All teaching which concerns a single member of the Trinity should include a connecting reference to God as One. Special emphasis should not be given to the nature and work of one more than to that of the others. In particular Christians should be brought to know the Holy Spirit as they have the Father and the Son, that they may come to see God in all His fulness and glory.

iv. All teaching that concerns the Divine should have its reference to Christ Jesus. "In Christ", as Professor Manson says, "the whole content of Divine revelation is...given"¹, and no mention of any part of this revelation is complete until it leads up to the Revealer. This is even more important when dealing with the Holy Spirit, and its work in the heart of the Christian. So many are apt to say that the sense of Jesus' Presence is sufficient, and that they want nothing to come between them and Him. But as Moberley points out, "to have the Spirit is to have the Son...this is the only mode of presence which could be quite absolutely direct, and primary, and real"². For all Christians,

1. The Incarnate Glory, p.208.

2. op. cit. p.169.

even for those to whom we have just referred, is reserved a great store of comfort and power, to be made available through a greater knowledge of Him Who is its Source. And if this same Spirit of God, and of His Son, Jesus Christ, could only have its way in the hearts and lives of all who call themselves Christian, through them it would soon "convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment".¹

1. 16:8

THE PERMANENT VALUE OF THE JOHANNINE
DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT.

To the student of New Testament thought, the Johannine Spirit-conception appears as a peak, high and massive, standing out against the sky. But in front of it is another, whose top, instead of being smooth and rounded off, is crowned with a number of pinnacles that reach even higher than the peak behind, and thus mar our view of it. In this manner may the Pauline doctrine be thought of as tending to belittle the work of John.

If we would see the true grandeur of any part of our author's thought, we must let him lead us away from the hum and bustle of ^{the} everyday world, and the details of ordinary life and experience, to a place where we can see the great eternal realities that underlie all this. It is these that John has used to build his structure, and the omission of the particular shows them up in all their simple majesty. Leaving it to others to show their ramifications in the world of affairs, he deals with them as they span earth and heaven, and stretch from the dawn of creation to the end of time.

Of the limited number of doctrinal principles which constitute the Johannine system, few are of more intrinsic value than that of the abiding Paraclete. It is true that it is not finished off as we would like to see it.

Many of its parts are to be found attached to other conceptions, and we are never sure when we have it quite complete. Some of its casing has crumbled with age, and we are not certain just how to restore it. One or two sides have been adorned with a false embellishment not easily removed. But in spite of all this, we have no record of a doctrine formulated before this that matches it in tenderness and strength. In some ways the Pauline conception approaches it; it may even go farther in certain directions; but it is less free from the personality that formed it, and in several respects is weak and defective. The Paraclete is more personal, yet not so much as to blur its Divinity; it is an idea more suited to group life, though it still appeals strongly to the individual. It completes the doctrine of the Fatherhood^{of} God.

Another important Johannine thought is that of the Spirit as the source of the new life. We could have wished that our author had developed this a little more. The same might be said of the Spirit's work in the conviction of sin.

The Johannine Spirit-conception goes beyond even the doctrine of Paul as a charter of Christian liberty. It sounds the note of progressive development in things spiritual, and yet makes this remain within the bounds

of the Truth as it is revealed in Christ. There is ever a tendency for religious life to settle down and lose its spontaneity in the ^{close} observance of the letter. But John tries to keep before our minds the fact that the Paraclete will take the things of Christ and declare them unto us. It is a doctrine that must be carefully handled, for it can be easily misused. In the author's own day it was necessary to add the provisions that we find in the Epistle, and even these did not prevent the Montanists and others from claiming that it supported their excesses. But this is frequently the fate of a noble idea.

Few periods in the history of Christianity have needed the message of John more than our own. If only Christian people could share this experience of the abiding Paraclete, making them truly certain of the nearness of God to their lives, and if ⁱⁿ our meetings and services of worship we were more sure of this Presence, who could measure the torrents of new life which the Church would receive? And to-day we need not only the releasing of the Spirit from the letter, but also the testing of the spirits by their confession of the one supreme truth: Jesus Christ manifested in the flesh.

LIST OF BOOKS AND ARTICLES USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS THESIS.

- Abbott, E.A. The Message of the Son of Man. London, 1909.
- Abelson, J. The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature. London, 1912.
- Adam, James The Religious Teachers of Greece. Edinburgh, 1908.
- Asting, R. Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum. Göttingen, 1930.
- Bacon, B.W. The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate. London, 1910.
The "Other" Comforter. (Expositor, 8, XIV, 274-282)
The Mythical "Elder John" of Ephesus. (Hibbert Jnl. XXX, - October 1931)
- Badcock, F.J. The Feast of Tabernacles. (Jnl. Th. St. XXIV, 169-174)
- Bauer, W. Das Johannesevangelium? Tübingen, 1925.
- Baur, F.C. Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie. Leipzig, 1864.
- Bevan, E. Stoics and Sceptics. Oxford, 1913.
- Bois, H. Essai sur les Origines de la Philosophie Judéo-Alexandrine. Paris, 1890.
- Bousset, D.W. Kurios Christos. Göttingen, 1913.
- Bréhier, E. Les Idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon d'Alexandria. Paris, 1908.
- Briggs, C.A. The Use of α in the Old Testament. (Jnl. Biblical Literature, XIX pt.2)
- Brooke, A.E. Johannine Epistles. Edinburgh, 1912.
- Büchsel, D.F. Der Geist Gottes im neuen Testament. Gütersloh, 1926.
Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus. Gütersloh, 1928.
- Bulcock, H. Religion and its New Testament Expression. London, 1928.
- Bultmann, R. Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangelium. (Z.N.W. XXIV, S.100-146)
- Burch, V. The Structure and Message of St. John's Gospel. London, 1928.
- Burkitt, F.C. The Mandaeans. (Jnl. Th. St., XXIX, 225-235)
- Burney, C.F. The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel. Oxford, 1922.
- Burton, E.DeW. Spirit, Soul, and Flesh. Chicago, 1918.
Galatians. Edinburgh, 1921.

- Carpenter, J.E. The Johannine Writings. London, 1927.
 Cave, S. The Gospel of St. Paul. London, 1928.
 The Doctrines of the Christian Faith.
 London, 1931.
- Charles, R.H. A Critical History of the Doctrine
 of a Future Life...or Hebrew, Jewish
 and Christian Eschatology.² Lond., 1913.
- Clark, Wm. The Paraclete. Edinburgh, 1900.
- Conford, F.M.(ed) Greek Religious Thought from Homer to
 the Age of Alexander. London, 1923.
- Davison, W.T. The Indwelling Spirit. London, 1911.
- Denney, Jas. Jesus and the Gospel. London, 1908.
- Dewar, L. Magic and Grace. London, 1929.
- Downer, A.C. The Mission and Ministration of the
 Holy Spirit. Edinburgh, 1909.
- Drummond, J. Philo Judaeus. London, 1888.
 An Inquiry into the Character and
 Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.
 London, 1903.
- Easton, B.S. Christ in the Gospels. New York, 1930.
- Ely, M.R. Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought.
 New York, 1925.
- Farnell, L.R. The Cults of the Greek States. Vol.5.
 Oxford, 1909.
 The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion,
 London, 1912.
- Feine, P. Theologie des Neuen Testament.³
 Leipzig, 1919.
- Findlay, G.G. Fellowship in the Life Eternal.
 London, 1909.
- Gardner, P. The Ephesian Gospel. London, 1915.
- Garvie, A.E. The Beloved Disciple. London, 1922.
 The Christian Doctrine of the God-
 head, London, (1925).
- Glover, T.R. Paul of Tarsus. London, 1925.
- Godet, F. Commentary on the Gospel of John.
 Eng. Tr., Edinburgh, 1876-9.
- Goguel, M. La Notion Johannique de l'Esprit.
 Paris, 1902.
- Goodrick, A.T.S. The Book of Wisdom. London, 1913.
- Gore, C. The Holy Spirit and Inspiration.
 (In Lux Mundi¹² London, 1891)
 The Holy Spirit and the Church.
 London, 1924.
- Gregg, J.A.F. The Wisdom of Solomon. London, 1913.
- Grill, J. Untersuchungen über die Entstehung
 des Vierten Evangeliums.
 Tübingen, 1902-23.
- Gunkel, H. Die Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes.
 Göttingen, 1888.

- Hare, J.C. The Mission of the Comforter.
London, 1846.
- Harris, J.R. The Origin of the Prologue to St.
John's Gospel. Cambridge, 1917.
The Origin of the Doctrine of the
Trinity. Manchester, 1919.
- Harris & Mingana, A. The Odes and Psalms of Solomon.
Manchester, 1920.
- Harrison, Jane Prolegomena to the Study of Greek
Religion. Cambridge, 1913.
- Heitmüller, W. Das Johannes-Evangelium. (In Weiss:
Die Schriften des N.T.² 1908)
- Hoernle, E.S. The Record of the Loved Disciple.
Oxford, 1931.
- Holland, H.S. The Philosophy of Faith and the
Fourth Gospel. London, 1920.
- Holtzmann, H.J. Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen
Theologie.² Tübingen, 1911.
- Hort, F.J.A. The Way, the Truth, the Life.
Cambridge, 1894.
- Howard, W.F. The Fourth Gospel and Mandaeen Gnos-
ticism. (London Quarterly Review, Jan.
1927. pp.72-85)
The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism
and Interpretation. London, 1931.
- Hoyle, R.B. The Holy Spirit in St. Paul. Lond., 1927.
- Huck, A. Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien.⁶
Tübingen, 1922.
- Humphries, A.L. The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experi-
ence.³ London, 1911.
- Illingworth, J.R. The Doctrine of the Trinity. London,
1907.
- Inge, W.R. The Theology of the Fourth Gospel.
(In Swete: Essays on Some Biblical
Questions of the Day. London, 1909)
Authority and the Life of the Spirit.
(Modern Churchman, XIX, 285-299)
- Jackson, G. What do we mean by the Holy Spirit?
(Hibbert Jnl. XX, 622-31; XXIV, 499-512)
- Jackson, L. The Fourth Gospel and Some Recent Ger-
man Criticism. Cambridge, 1906.
The Problem of the Fourth Gospel.
Cambridge, 1918.
- Jones, E.S. The Christ of Every Road. Toronto, 1930.
- Kennedy, H.A.A. St. Paul and the Mystery Religions.
London, 1913.
The Theology of the Epistles, London.
1919.

- Kirk, K.E. The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity. (In Rawlinson: Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, Lond., 1928)
- Law, R. The Tests of Life: A Study of the First Epistle of St. John. Edinburgh, 1909.
- Lebreton, J. Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité.⁷ Paris, 1927.
- Leckie, J.H. Authority in Religion. Edinburgh, 1909.
- Leisegang, H. Der heilige Geist. Leipzig, 1919.
Pneuma Hagion. Leipzig, 1922.
- Lidzbarski, M. Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer. Giessen, 1915.
- Lightley, J.W. Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Christ. London, 1925.
- Loisy, A. Les Mystères Pafens et le Mystère Chrétien. Paris, 1914.
Le Quatrième Evangile.² Paris, 1921.
- MacGregor, G.H.C. The Gospel of John. London, 1928.
- Mackintosh, H.R. The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ. Edinburgh, 1913.
- Manson, W. The Incarnate Glory. London, (1923)
- Marmorstein, A. Der heilige Geist in der rabbinischen Legende. (Archiv für Religionswissenschaft. Bd. 28, 286-303)
- Matthews, W.R. God in Christian Thought and Experience. London, 1930.
- Mears, E. The Gospel of John. London, 1930.
- Moberley, R.C. Atonement and Personality. London, 1901.
- Moffatt, J. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. Edinburgh, 1911.
The Theology of the Gospels. London, 1912
- Moore, G.F. Judaism. Cambridge, 1927.
- Morgan, W. The Religion and Theology of Paul. Edinburgh, 1917.
- Nairne, A. The Alexandrine Gospel. London, 1917.
- Nylloth, C.F. The Fourth Evangelist. London, 1925.
- Nunn, H.P.V. The Son of Zebedee. London, 1927.
- Odeberg, H. The Fourth Gospel. Stockholm, 1929.
- Pallis, S.A. Mandaean Studies. London, 1926.
- Philo Judaeus Works. Editions of Cohn & Wendland, Colson & Whitaker, and Yonge.
- Plato Works. Jowett's translation.
- Porter, F.C. The Mind of Christ in Paul. New York, 1930.
- Raven, C.E. The Creator Spirit. London, 1927.
Jesus and the Gospel of Love. Lond. 1931.
- Rees, T. The Holy Spirit as Wisdom. (In Mansfield College Essays. London, 1909)
The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience. London, 1915.

- Reid, H.M.B. The Holy Spirit and the Mystics. London, 1925.
- Reitzenstein, R. Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen.³ Leipzig, 1927.
- Robinson, B.W. The Gospel of John. New York, 1925.
- Robinson, H.W. The Kenosis of the Spirit. (Expository Times, XXXV, 488-493)
- Hebrew Psychology. (In The People and the Book. Oxford, 1925)
- The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit. London, 1928.
- Robinson, J.A. The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel.² London, 1929.
- Robson, J. The Holy Spirit, the Paraclete. Edinburgh, 1894.
- Rohde, E. Psyche. Eng. trans. London, 1925.
- Sabatier, A. The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit. Eng. Trans. London, 1904.
- Sasse, H. Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium. (Z.N.W. XXIV, 260-279)
- Saunders, K. The Gospel for Asia. London, 1928.
- Scott, C.A.A. The Fellowship of the Spirit. Lond. 1921
- Scott, E.F. The Hellenistic Mysticism of the Fourth Gospel. (Am. Jnl. Th. XX, 345-59)
- The Fourth Gospel: Its purpose and theology. Edinburgh, 1906.
- The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. London, (1923).
- Shoemaker, W.R. The Use of $\eta\gamma\gamma$ and of $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$. (Jnl. Biblical Literature, XXIII, Pt.1)
- Smeaton, G. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.² Edinburgh, 1889.
- Stange, K. Wort und Geist. (Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie,
- Stanton, V.H. The Gospels as Historical Documents. Pt. III, The Fourth Gospel. Cambridge, 1920.
- Stevens, G.B. The Johannine Theology. New York, 1894.
- Strachan, R.H. The Fourth Gospel. London, 1917.
- The Fourth Evangelist: Dramatist or Historian. London, 1925.
- The Historical Jesus in the New Testament. London, 1931.
- @
Streeter, B.H. The Spirit: God and His relation to man considered from the standpoint of philosophy, psychology and art. by Streeter and others. London, 1919.
- The Four Gospels. London, 1924.

@. Strack, H.L. u. Billerbeck, P. - Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch. München, 1924.

- Swete, H.B. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. London, 1909.
The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church. London, 1912.
The Last Discourse and Prayer of our Lord. London, 1913.
- Taylor, V. The Psychology of the Johannine Christ-Testimonies. (Jnl. Th. St. XXVII, 123-37)
- Telfer, W. The Form of a Dove. (Jnl. Th. St. XXIX 238-242)
- Torrey, C.C. The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John. (Harvard Theological Review, October 1923, pp.305-344)
- Turner, C.H. On the Punctuation of St. John 7:37,38. (Jnl. Th. St., XXIV, 169-174)
- Volz, P. Der Geist Gottes. Tübingen, 1910.
- Wade, G.H. New Testament History. London, 1922.
- Walker, W.L. The Spirit and the Incarnation. Edinburgh, 1899.
- Wearing, T. The World View of the Fourth Gospel. Chicago, 1918.
- Wernle, P. The Beginnings of Christianity. Eng. trans. New York, 1903-4.
- Weinle, H. Biblische Theologie des N.T.³ Tübingen, 1921.
- Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Johannes. Berlin, 1908.
- Westcott, B.F. The Gospel according to St. John. London, 1887.
The Epistles of St. John. London, 1883.
- Willoughby, H.R. Pagan Regeneration. Chicago, 1929.
- Windisch, H. Die fünf johannischen Parakletsprüche. (Festgabe für A. Jülicher. Tübingen, 1927. S.110-137)
Jesus und der Geist nach synoptischer Überlieferung. (In Case: Studies in Early Christianity, New York, 1928)
- Winstanley, E.W. Die Katholischen Briefe.² Tübingen, 1930.
Spirit in the New Testament. Cambridge, 1908.
- Wood, I.F. The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature. London, 1904.
- Woods, E.H. The Transition from the Synoptic to the Johannine Version of the Life and Teaching of Jesus. (Edin. Univ. Thesis. 1924)

Articles in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, and Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, etc.