

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

the idea of the Holy in the Old Testament. It may be doubtful whether the moral Holy ever appears there quite free from any material embodiment, yet such a passage as Ps 15 suggests a need for greater caution in language than Dr. SCOTT has shown.

On worship itself Dr. SCOTT is good. He finds its basal principle to be sacrifice—our whole personality made over—in affection—as an offering to God. A word of regret may be permitted that his language on p. 51 does less than justice to the great prophets of Israel. To say that under their teaching it was discovered that sacrifices were only symbols is an understatement. There can be little doubt that the prophets rejected material sacrifices as a non-essential and misleading part of religion.

Viewed from a Christian standpoint, then, 'Public Worship, rightly ordered, will do three things: It will provide a sacrifice, which is nothing less than the Body of Christ. It will secure the cleansing and the sanctifying of the sacrifice. And it will culminate in the offering of the sacrifice.' The worshippers are made sensible of their unity in the properly ordered opening of the service; God, by Word and Love and Spirit, cleanses 'the Body of Christ' during the progress of Worship; there but remains the final act, the offering of the sacrifice.

The natural thing is to synchronize it with the 'Collection.' 'Is there any reason why the Minister and people should not, after the Collection, bring the whole service to its natural climax and fitting conclusion by repeating together the great sentence of the English Communion Service: "Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and our bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee"?'

Many will find much fresh exegesis in the author's treatment of the Lord's Supper. The direction of his teaching may be roughly summarized in his own words: 'The "Body of Christ" was there' (he is speaking of the Early Church view), 'not because through the speaking of certain words by the proper person the Bread and the Wine had been changed into the Body and Blood, but because by the power of the Holy Spirit living men and women had been knit together into a living Body of Christ; because by the same Spirit they had been "consecrated" in public worship; and because they, conscious of themselves as the Body of Christ, had then made corporate offering and sacrifice of themselves to God.' It is a view which will be unfamiliar to many, but which is, as he says, gaining ground; and it is here expounded with great learning and persuasiveness.

---

## The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

BY PRINCIPAL THE REVEREND ALFRED E. GARVIE, D.D., LONDON.

EXCEPT in a few devout circles, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has in the history of the Christian Church been very generally neglected. And this neglect has even found theological advocates. Dr. Denney in his book, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, and Dr. Rees in his book on *The Holy Spirit* indicate that they would be content to have it merged in the doctrine of the Living Christ; and Dr. Jackson has recently been contending for that course of treatment. Briefly to state the argument: as the communion with the living Christ and the operation of the Holy Spirit

cannot be separated in religious experience, so the doctrine of the one and the other should not be distinguished. There has, however, quite recently been a revival of interest. It is significant that a few years ago, mainly owing to the influence of Dr. Wheeler Robinson, who is understood to be writing a book on the subject, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the Godhead has been added in the syllabus for the B.D. degree of London University. Significant, too, is the choice of this theme as the guiding idea of the Church Congress recently held in Southport. In the book in which I have tried

to develop my theological system—*The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*—I have accepted the trinitarian basis, as my study and meditation on the articles of the Christian faith has increasingly convinced me of the loss the neglect of the doctrine involves for Christian life and thought, and the gain of the consideration of it. I welcome the decision of the editors of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to deal with the subject in a series of articles, and am glad that I have been asked to introduce the series; for as the experience of the Holy Spirit is valuable for Christian religion, so the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is significant for Christian theology.

1. The neglect of the doctrine in the Christian Church is not a proof that it is meaningless and worthless for Christian life and thought, but can be explained by the history. Even in the Apostolic Church, as Paul's writings on the subject show, there was a tendency to lay emphasis on those aspects of the Spirit's presence in the Christian community to which less universal and permanent interest and importance must be assigned, namely, the 'holy enthusiasm' of Pentecost, and the *charismata*, spiritual gifts, which accompanied this consciousness of being 'filled with the Holy Spirit.' Paul, with the moral and religious insight of his saintly genius, laid the greater stress on the inward work of the Spirit in sanctification with its fruit in Christian character. The organization of the Church, a necessary expression of its inspiration, under the stress of heresy and schism on the one hand, and of persecution on the other, tended to supersede that inspiration. Reliance on Church authority displaced dependence on the Spirit's illumination. The neglect of the doctrine was due to the waning of the experience. The crude attempt of Montanism to revive the ecstatic mood further discredited the doctrine. On the other hand, the influence of Greek philosophy made the doctrine of the Logos as a solution of the Christological problem central. The objective and cosmic interest superseded the subjective and psychic. The Macedonian heresy was not due to an independent interest, but a movement in the Christological controversy. Only, when so challenged by heresy, did the Church formulate the dogma of the Holy Spirit, employing the same categories as in the dogma of the Son; it was not because the doctrine of the Holy Spirit had the same crucial importance that the doctrine of the Trinity assumed the form that it did. It was the product not of spiritual harmony, but rather of speculative symmetry. One cannot affirm that later theological

formulations were due to any fresh discernments. The later religious movements, in which the doctrine of the Spirit recovered prominence, did not contribute anything of special value to the interpretation of the reality.

2. The grounds on which an independent development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit has been depreciated by recent theological writers seem to be at least two. (i) In the first place, the doctrine of the Living Christ and fellowship with Him for the more inward religious life holds the place which the doctrine of the Logos held in the early Christian centuries; and it seems to afford a more adequate alternative to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It may at once be admitted that the historical reality of Jesus gives to the content of the consciousness of the living Christ, in which that historical reality is, as it were, spiritually diffused and continued, a definiteness which any consciousness of the Spirit's presence and activity lacks. Further, few Christians have the assurance to maintain, as I have heard one Christian minister at least maintain, that they can by reflection in their inner life clearly distinguish and separate the fellowship with the living Christ and the working of His Spirit. Paul did not separate the one from the other, as for him the Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ. But he did not for that reason identify Christ and the Spirit, as is sometimes contended by a too rash inference from one passage, where he seems to do so (2 Co 3<sup>17, 18</sup>). In dealing with the sublime mystery of the Godhead we may in theology interpret religious experience as that does not, and need not, interpret itself; for the whole subject can then be placed in a wider context of reality and thought. The theologian may distinguish Christ and the Spirit, as the believer does not, and need not. In so doing he does not substitute another doctrine, but only renders explicit what is implicit. His finer discrimination may in turn enrich the experience which he is interpreting, for by this discrimination he is putting greater fullness into his conception of God. In distinguishing, however, if he knows his business, he does not separate; for it is the one God with whom as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit he is concerned. To use the language of the creeds, he can distinguish the persons without dividing the substance; the recognition of diversity in God is not a denial of His unity. Further reasons for such discrimination will afterwards be shown.

(ii) Secondly, many Christian theologians even have an aversion to the doctrine of the Trinity because they regard it as a useless and even

bewildering speculation. There is a tendency to make the unreasonable demand that 'the man in the street' shall be the arbiter in all questions. What cannot be plain to him must be set aside as an unnecessary and even illegitimate subtlety. Certainly the gospel should be preached in all simplicity, so that even 'the wayfaring man' may understand. But the popular incapacity for thinking should not be the measure of the theologian's right to think, and express his thoughts. The arithmetical puzzle which the Athanasian Creed appears to be does not justify the too common attitude of aversion to the doctrine. That the philosophical categories in which the dogma has been expressed, three persons in one substance, because of the change of meaning of the first term, and the unintelligibility of the second, mislead and perplex must be admitted. The construction of the doctrine in speculative philosophy, as in the Hegelian, does make it appear very remote from any practical interest. But against these objections it may be urged, that although the terminology and the philosophy which this implies, since words involve thoughts, are not found in the New Testament, yet the New Testament is distinctly and on the whole consistently trinitarian, for God is historically revealed as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that we are by no means bound to the categories in which the dogma has been formulated, but have not only the right, but even the duty, of giving to the doctrine the most adequate expression for our own thought to-day which our intellectual resources will allow; that even the speculative constructions bear witness that, when profound thinkers have been seeking reality, they have been led to a trinitarian conception of God; and that, as the history of human thought shows, even practical experience, without being aware of it, is in course of time affected by the conclusions which thinkers reach. It may be that theologians who have no speculative interest in the coherence of thought, but only a practical interest in its utility for life, are justified in stopping short at an *economic* trinity, the trinity of revelation, and not pushing on to an *ontological* trinity, the trinity of ultimate reality; but it does seem unreasonable that they should make a virtue out of this their infirmity, and attempt to prohibit those who welcome as also a good gift of God man's capacity to grapple with the last questions the mind can ask, from essaying even though it be the perilous quest of philosophical speculation in interpretation of religious experience.

3. The reasons why, despite these attempts to

arrest human thinking, there has been the revived interest in the doctrine already noted are the following: (i) If the early Christian centuries were influenced, even dominated by Greek metaphysics, the modern world has been potently influenced by science; and at different periods by different sciences. In the eighteenth century, physics and mathematics were the main interests, and Newton's was the greatest name; in the nineteenth century biology came to the forefront, and Darwin's was the name to bless or curse. In this century psychology is the fashion of the hour, but has not yet yielded the master mind. This psychological interest directs thought towards the subjectivity of religious experience rather than the objectivity of creeds, codes, rituals, and politics.

(ii) Closely related to this scientific interest is the practical tendency in religion to mysticism. Just as the piety of the Middle Ages was affected by Neo-Platonism, so is the piety of to-day influenced not only by the mystical inheritance of the Christian Church, but also by the wider environment into which it has been brought by our enlarging knowledge of similar tendencies in other religions, especially the religions of India.

(iii) It is the common element in all mysticism, if not always, as in extreme developments, to identify God and man, yet to bring man and God into immediate contact as well as intimate communion. The attribute of God which dominates a good deal of religious thought is that of the Divine immanence. Roman Catholic Modernism attempted an immanental theology: the New Theology in England tried to restate all Christian doctrines on the basis of the Divine immanence. The conception of evolution, which has a much wider range, and rests on a more solid foundation than the Darwinian theory, when theistically interpreted replaces, if not corrected in its one-sidedness, the transcendent by the immanent God. The Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit in my judgment meets the legitimate demand in each of these tendencies, and corrects the errors which some of these developments disclose. We need not retain the doctrine, therefore, merely as an ancient relic which respect of the New Testament and the Early Church forbids us to discard; but we should seek rather to restate its significance and recover its value for the Christian faith of to-day.

4. Even the theologian who does not hold any rigid doctrine of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures must give due regard to the witness of the New Testament to the doctrine based on experience, of what we must, in historical justice, still reverence

as the creative epoch of the Christian Church. Although I am not one of those scholars who regard with suspicion the influence of Hellenic thought on the Christology and Soteriology of the New Testament, as a foreign infusion sullyng its pristine purity, yet it gives me some satisfaction to call attention to the fact that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament is more closely attached to the Hebraic inheritance and the earliest experience of the primitive community than is the doctrine of Christ's person and work. It cannot be depreciated as a foreign element. It is not necessary in this introductory article to deal with the New Testament teaching in detail. Only a few considerations of crucial importance must be urged.

(i) The Old Testament does not anticipate the New Testament doctrine of the Trinity, unless in so far as it places the historical figure of the Messiah in the forefront of the hope for the future, and lays stress on the activity of the Spirit of God, which is distinguished from God, but not separated from Him, in human gifts and achievements, and notably in the prophetic consciousness. This distinction of the Spirit of God from God as of the spirit of man from man may be dismissed by the critic of the doctrine as a survival of the primitive animism, but it is more reasonable to conclude that the survival of this element in the highly developed doctrine of God morally and religiously is an evidence that it has an inherent value, making it worthy of survival.

(ii) Even if the teaching of the Fourth Gospel about the Spirit cannot be taken as a *verbatim* report, although I myself believe that these last discourses contain early reminiscences as well as later reflections, the Synoptic evidence is sufficient to prove that Jesus did promise the coming of the Spirit after His own withdrawal. The earliest records of the primitive community record the fulfilment of the promise. Believers in Jesus the Christ as Lord were consciously possessors of the Spirit as zeal and power; 'filled with the Holy Spirit'—that phrase describes the distinctive Christian experience. There was the consciousness of the Risen Lord, the expectation of His visible return in power and glory, and the assurance of the Spirit's presence. Was the distinction which was so real for the Apostolic Age merely an illusion, and may we now set it aside as insignificant and valueless?

(iii) Paul did not depreciate the ecstatic mood and the *charismata* which accompanied it when he subordinated both to the activity of the Spirit in sanctification, just as little as did the

prophets abolish the institution of sacrifice when they exalt social righteousness above it. He claimed the possession, and did not abstain from the exercise, of these gifts. The fine gold of this experience did not always remain unalloyed, as in the Corinthian Church. Some of the manifestations were abnormal; and the like have recurred in religious revivals since those early days. That any were entirely supernatural may be doubted, if not on the evidence denied. What was real was the enthusiasm and the energy of the new life, with its religious and moral gains, which this consciousness of the possession of the Spirit of God produced. The sanctification was real, an indubitable evidence of Divine activity.

(iv) However intimately Paul relates Christ and the Spirit, so that whenever Christ is believed as Saviour and Lord, the Spirit is possessed, I am convinced that he nowhere identifies Christ and the Spirit, still less does he confuse them. An utterance of inspired eloquence, impassioned feeling, such as the passage in 2 Co 3<sup>17, 18</sup>, must not be interpreted with prosaic literalness, or as modifying his consistent trinitarian teaching as in the apostolic benediction in 2 Co 13<sup>14</sup>, or the discussion about spiritual gifts in 1 Co 12<sup>4-6</sup>. His monotheistic confession of one God and one Lord in ch. 8<sup>6</sup> does not require for the immediate purpose any mention of the Spirit.

5. Such in outline is the teaching of the New Testament; it commends itself to my reason and conscience as intelligible and credible. But I do not hold the doctrine of the Holy Spirit solely on the authority of the New Testament; but because it meets needs and corrects errors of to-day in the thought and life of the Christian Church. (i) Do we not need to lay stress on the Divine activity in human illumination, inspiration, and sanctification, the development of human personality in religious experience and moral character? Is there not an added promise and potency in that development when it is realized as not man's achievement merely, but as also God's endowment? That God comes into immediate contact and intimate relation to man in enlightening his mind, quickening his heart, and strengthening his will, enriching his whole life, is a truth too precious to be neglected. A Divine immanence, personal in character and operation, is by this doctrine asserted, which avoids the pantheistic error of identifying God and man. Man does not become God, but God dwells and works in man to make man more like unto Himself. It is God's personal perfection as truth, holiness, love, which is emphasized, and His personal relation to

man ; and thus the error is avoided of regarding all reality as in the same degree a manifestation of God, and so confusing the distinction of values which the moral conscience no less than the religious consciousness must maintain. Accordingly the tendency of mysticism towards pantheism is also arrested, and yet its demand for the most intimate satisfying relation to God is met. This immediate activity of God in man in bringing man into intimate communion with Himself is morally and religiously of higher value than would be absorption in God. The inwardness of religious life is safeguarded by this doctrine.

(ii) While the application of the science of psychology to the description of the psychical processes of this religious life is not only interesting, but valuable, since we enrich consciousness as we raise it to the level of self-consciousness ; yet psychology carries the danger of reducing the whole process to a subjectivity, unrelated to any objectivity. The description of the mode may be regarded as an explanation of the cause. This peril can be averted only as we can make intelligible and credible the Christian conviction that it is God who worketh in us by His Spirit in what appears most really our own thinking, feeling, willing. There is a moral quality and a spiritual power in the Christian experience which gives assurance to the believer that he is not confined to his own reserves in his higher life, but can draw on the resources of God by His Spirit. The sense of dependence and the capacity to receive from God are so marked features of the Christian life that, unless an extreme scepticism declares that what man values most in his experience is illusive, the witness of the Spirit must be accepted.

(iii) All this may be conceded, and yet it may be contended that there is but one Divine influence, and that it is a theological subtlety to distinguish between what the Risen Christ does and what the Spirit. Of course, there is only one God, and the whole God is in every activity ; but nevertheless we may apprehend that activity under different aspects. We do distinguish the Divine transcendence and the Divine immanence, but do not separate them from one another ; it is the transcendent God who is immanent. In this immanence the Divine revelation itself, as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, has taught us to distinguish the more objective and the more subjective aspect—God objectively manifest in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord, and God subjectively experienced as the Holy Spirit enlightening, hallowing, renewing. It is a safeguard against an unsound subjectivism

to distinguish what is thus objectively manifested, the historical reality of Jesus diffused and continued in the Living Christ, and what is subjectively experienced, and to be always testing the subjective by the objective, so that we shall not ascribe to the Spirit anything in ourselves which is not Christlike. The activity of the Spirit is to realize in human experience the Divine revelation and human redemption in Christ. He is not visibly, audibly, or tangibly present ; but His presence is made real to faith by the Spirit's inward activity. The Spirit so stimulates human receptivity that His truth can be ever more fully apprehended and His grace ever more fully appreciated. It is the Spirit who within the soul brings about the inward conditions for the universal and permanent presence and influence of the Living Christ. When as in the religious experience of Paul the Living Christ becomes as real as, nay, more real than, the things of sense, the Spirit's activity fulfils its end, and is merged in that consciousness. This experience is not equally attained by all ; and many do not rise above a vague sense of Divine presence and power in their own religious experience. It is by the Spirit in all cases that God is present and active in men, and makes Himself manifest to them as man in Jesus the Christ.

(iv) On the ground of religious experience, theologically interpreted, making the implicit explicit, we are, it seems to me, necessarily led to the economic trinity. The orthodox formulation, three persons in one substance, tends to make the difference a division, and the unity unreal, and so easily passes over into tritheism. When we speak of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as *persons*, we must never think of *individuals*, as John and Paul were ; when we speak of God as *one substance*, we must never think of a *class*, such as man, or beast, or bird. To speak of God as one *person* in three *modes* may not adequately recognize the difference in unity ; theology has not yet discovered categories that will accurately express what we can think on this glorious and blessed mystery, disclosed but unfathomed. As psychology on the one hand and sociology on the other launch out into the deep of the essential relation between personality and society, we may discover conceptions of personality as essentially social and society as essentially personal which may enable us to say something which will be more and better than, as Augustine himself felt what he had said to be, a mere breaking of the silence. This is not the occasion for a speculative construction of the doctrine, an attempt at formulating an ontological Trinity ;

but I would add that, for myself, I cannot think of God as personal, as truth, holiness, blessedness, and love without thinking of Him, not as a duality, for that leaves us with differences unresolved, but as a Trinity, for in that unity is restored. The

Hegelian formula for the movement of thought, thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, is not 'a mare's nest' for thought; but a help to human thinking, even on the Divine reality of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one God.

---

## Literature.

### AN INTRODUCTION TO NEW TESTAMENT STUDY.

PROFESSOR A. H. MCNEILE of Trinity College, Dublin, already well known for his scholarly work on the New Testament, has issued a new book which will enhance his reputation and at the same time earn for him the gratitude of students of theology. The book is entitled *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (Milford; 18s. net), and is a most serviceable manual, fresh, scholarly, and—for an Introduction—unusually comprehensive. It aims at showing in outline 'how the New Testament as a whole, and each book in it, reached its present form, when and where each acquired canonical authority, the chief problems which the study of them raises, historical, literary, and textual, and broadly what each is about and what it contains.' Thus it includes, besides the usual matter contained in an Introduction to the New Testament literature, an account of the growth of the New Testament Canon. There is also an account of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, and a discussion of the Inspiration and Value of the New Testament writings. The work is clearly arranged and clearly written, the standpoint is at once modern and conservative, and helpful guidance is given towards more extended studies. A valuable feature of the work, when considered as a students' text-book, is that on disputed points it records the chief representative opinions, with an indication of where the author's own sympathies lie. (For example, on the synoptic problem he is in sympathy with the 'four-document theory' urged by Canon Streeter.) Two quotations will serve to throw light upon Dr. McNeile's standpoint. The first is from his estimate of the Book of Acts: 'The historical value of the book as a whole lies, not in the verbal authenticity of its speeches, or the accuracy of the words or actions of the persons in the drama, or the exhaustiveness of its contents, but in the general picture which the author gives

of the Christianity of the time, with its endowment of spiritual enthusiasm, the conditions under which it struggled, and its rapid advance from Jerusalem through a large part of the empire to Rome.' The second quotation is from his estimate of the Gospels: 'In no single sentence can we be entirely certain that we possess the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, even if it could be assumed that the Greek translations which have come down to us were always adequate. The variations in the reports of the same sayings in the different Gospels would alone be enough to render that certain. And yet we may feel confident that we possess to a considerable extent the real substance of them, because the substance of His words forms a large and indispensable factor in the production of the total Portrait which is required to account for the coming into existence of Christianity.'

---

### DR. H. R. MACKINTOSH ON FORGIVENESS.

A new series of works, named 'The Library of Constructive Theology,' is being issued under the general editorship of Sir James Marchant, with Dr. W. R. Matthews and Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson as Theological Editors. Its aim is to re-state the great doctrines of the Christian faith from the standpoint of religious and Christian experience, as distinguished from a merely traditional acceptance of the authority of the Church or the Bible. It is a praiseworthy aim, and the Editors have done well in inviting Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D., of New College, Edinburgh, to introduce the series with a volume on the central doctrine of forgiveness.

Dr. Mackintosh's volume, *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net), might readily have been a complete outline of theology, such as many of us are awaiting from his pen. One recalls that Albrecht Ritschl's famous monograph on the cognate doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation was virtually a system of Christian theology. But Dr. Mackintosh touches but lightly on such