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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

saved them,' and Moffatt has 'the Eternal raised up a champion for the Israelites, who rescued them,' and 2 K 13^5, where R.V. has 'the Lord gave Israel a saviour,' and Moffatt has 'the Eternal gave Israel a hero.'

There is another Hebrew verb which is translated 'save,' but it means properly 'to live.' In several passages, for example, we have 'God save the King,' or 'God save King Adonijah.' This really means 'Long life to the King,' or 'Long live Adonijah,' like the French 'vive le roi,' or 'vive l'entente.' In the causative form the word is used of reviving or bringing to life again, and often occurs in this sense in the Old Testament, where God is spoken of as One who causes men to live on, or One who gives life. It will be seen that, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, the words translated in our versions, both A.V. and R.V., as 'save,' 'saviour,' and 'salvation' have nothing at all in them of the traditional theological idea of salvation from sin by an atonement. They mean 'help' or 'deliverance' in a sense indicated by the context, or, more generally, they mean that gift which a sufficient God can offer to His people in any time of need so as to add to their fullness of life.

But what of the New Testament? Professor CANNEY suggests that throughout the New Testament the dominant idea is life or new life. The woman who touched Christ's garments, for example, said, 'If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole.' The R.V., obsessed with the word 'save,' puts in the margin 'I shall be saved.' An old version, the Syriac Peshitta, has 'I shall live.' So in a passage in which Jesus says, 'Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole,' R.V. margin has 'thy faith hath saved thee.' Professor CANNEY points out that the Syriac versions invariably render the word translated 'save' in our versions by verbs meaning to give life. In the words at the Cross, for example, 'He saved others, himself he cannot save,' they translate 'He gave life to others, but he cannot preserve his own life!'

The significant conclusion of this study is to give support to the suggestion made by Burkitt, that Jesus described Himself, and was described, according to Aramaic usage, as Life-giver rather than as Saviour. If this were so, the Fourth Gospel, in the general impression of the teaching of Jesus which it gives, may be felt to reflect that teaching better than the Synoptists. And, further, it is interesting to note that this is being regarded in our time as the whole meaning of religion, and particularly of Christianity—life, access to life, fullness of life. The idea of being 'saved' by the blood of Jesus from the wrath of God here or hereafter has little meaning for men and women to-day. We are 'saved' when we gain true life. We are 'saved' when we learn to pierce the dead husk of life and penetrate to the living kernel. We are 'saved' when we succeed in recognizing or apprehending the spiritual realities hidden behind material phenomena. Salvation means a new birth, a new consciousness, a new life.

The Holy Spirit in the Bible.

BY PRINCIPAL THE REVEREND H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., REGENT'S PARK COLLEGE, LONDON.

AMONGST the toys of childhood is—or was—the kaleidoscope, that transparent box of fragments of coloured glass, yielding the symmetry of an ever-changing pattern when viewed through the triangular tube of mirrors which multiplied and co-ordinated their 'broken lights.' No doctrine of the Bible is more kaleidoscopic than that of the Holy Spirit, whether we choose to think of the fragmentary elements which exhibit the πολυποίκιλος σοφία of God, or of the elusive transformations which the doctrine undergoes within the thousand years of its revolving history, or of its fascination

as we see it reflected backwards and forwards between God and man and human society.

The primitive and fundamental idea of 'spirit' (*ruach*) is that of active power or energy (ἐνέργεια not δύναμις), power superhuman, mysterious, elusive, of which the *ruach* or wind of the desert was not so much the symbol as the most familiar example.[1] When we read books of travel in Arabia, such as Doughty's *Arabia Deserta* or Lawrence's *Revolt in the Desert*, we are often made to feel the overwhelming power of the wind across the desert, scorching heat by day and piercing cold by night. This elemental force, incalculable and irresistible and invisible, was surely akin to that which could shape a man's behaviour as strangely as the desert sand was shaped before the blast. There was a demonic power which sometimes took possession of men, for good or for evil, enabling them to do for a season what was normally impossible. Such energy 'rushed upon' Samson, when he tore a lion limb from limb (Jg 14^6; cf. 13^{25}), slew thirty men (14^{19}), burst the ropes that bound him (15^{14}), or upon Saul, when he cut in pieces a yoke of oxen in prophetic symbolism (1 S 11^6); it would explain the heroic valour with which Othniel (Jg 3^{10}) or Jephthah (11^{29}) led Israel to war, and Gideon sounded the war-horn (6^{34}). The abnormality might lie in qualities rather than in deeds, and therefore be less dramatic and more permanent, such as those displayed by David, after his anointing by Samuel (1 S 16^{13}), or by the Messianic prince (Is $11^{2ff.}$), or by the prophet charged with a Divine message ($61^{1ff.}$), or by the wise Joseph (Gn 41^{38}), the efficient Joshua (Nu 27^{18}), the artistic Bezalel (Ex 31^3), the faithful Caleb (Nu 14^{24}). But originally the *ruach* is a non-moral energy, which may issue in evil as well as in good, like the evil *ruach* that divided Abimelech and the Shechemites (Jg 9^{23}), or made a husband doubt his wife's fidelity (Nu $5^{14.\ 30}$) or a people unfaithful to its God (Hos 4^{12} 5^4). In one instance only is this *ruach* clearly personalized, namely, in the vision of Micaiah (1 K 22^{21}); and here it is a lying *ruach* employed by Yahweh to 'inspire' the optimistic prophets. This passage shows us how objective the prophetic inspiration was conceived to be—as objective in its origin as in its earlier phenomena—as when Saul stripped off his clothes and 'prophesied' before Samuel (1 S 19^{18-24}). The energy is so materialistically conceived that it can be transferred from one to another (Nu $11^{17.\ 25}$, 2 K $2^{9ff.}$). Amongst the greater prophets, the physical phenomena were incidental rather than essential to their message, though probably none would have reckoned himself, or have been recognized by others, as a prophet without some such abnormal experience. Indeed, Ezekiel is the only one of these to connect *ruach* directly and explicitly with his prophetic inspiration, though others (*e.g.* Hosea) seem to imply it.

So far we have been concerned simply with the psychical and physical results of a superhuman energy, similar to the phenomena encountered elsewhere by the student of primitive animism. The only difference (but it is a great one) is that in the Old Testament these phenomena are brought under the control of Yahweh, instead of irresponsible demons and 'spirits.' This centralization meant, of course, ultimately a complete moralization of the idea of Spirit, in proportion as the idea of Yahweh Himself was moralized, through the teaching of the great prophets. But it meant more than this. We must always beware of making the Hebrew mind more 'metaphysical' than it ever was; but so far as Israel did advance to a philosophy of the Divine nature, it was in terms of *ruach*. The Egyptian empire with its powerful cavalry was reckoned irresistible in Isaiah's day, but he bids his compatriots remember that the Egyptians are men and not God, and their horses flesh and not *ruach* (Is 31^3). This is the true Hebrew dualism—not the contrast between the human body and the soul (or spirit), but that between terrestrial nature as being of one order and the celestial as being of another (cf. 1 Co 15^{40}). The contrast, as Duhm acutely remarks, 'forms the driving force of the subsequent religious development up to the fifteenth of First Corinthians.' A similar contrast underlies the obscure legend of the mingling of the 'sons of God' with the daughters of men (Gn $6^{1ff.}$). The Hebrews thought of God as being in human form, yet of a different substance from man; His body was of fiery brilliance (Ezk $1^{26.\ 27}$), so dazzling that even the most favoured of mortals could not bear a frontal view of Him (Ex $33^{17ff.}$). It is never said that this substance was *ruach*, yet it belongs to the realm of *ruach*; and it is significant that when that Hebrew of Hebrews, the Apostle Paul, was faced by a similar problem in the Christological realm, he says explicitly, 'The Lord is the Spirit' (2 Co 3^{17}), whilst the Fourth Gospel takes the further step and says, 'God is Spirit' (4^{24}). We must not read back the full content of these words into the Old Testament conception of Yahweh, with all its naïve realism. But at least we may see some preparation for them in the way in which His activity is described as His presence (*i.e.* 'face'), and this paralleled

[1] Cf. Shelley's 'Ode to the West Wind.'

with His *ruach*. We must note the full significance of Hebrew parallelism when we read :

> Cast me not away from thy face,
> And take not thy holy *ruach* from me
> (Ps 51^{11}).

Where God is present He is always active, and no word gathers up His activity more completely than this word *ruach*. Yahweh's presence among His people means that His *ruach* is in their midst (Hag $2^{4.5}$, LXX); indeed, the Divine *ruach* is virtually hypostatized in Is $63^{10.11}$, where rebellion grieves the *ruach* of His holiness in the midst of Israel (LXX omits the reference to Moses). Yet here again we must remember that the hypostatization, such as it is, is Hebrew and not Greek. So with the assertion of the Divine omnipresence in Ps 139^{7} :

> Whither shall I go from thy *ruach* ?
> Or whither shall I flee from thy face ?

As Volz rightly says : 'the omnipresence of Yahweh does not depend on the *ruach* of Yahweh, but on Yahweh Himself ; Yahweh is in heaven and in Sheol (v.^{8}), at the uttermost end of the world His hand holds man (v.$^{9ff.}$). It goes without saying that His *ruach* and His Face (*panim*) are also omnipresent' (*Der Geist Gottes*, p. 147, n. 1).

Parallel with this highly important development of the idea of *ruach* within the theological realm, there was another, intimately connected with it, yet much less obvious, within the anthropological. The original idea of *ruach* as an invasive energy, used to explain the abnormal in man's conduct, was so far naturalized as to allow the use of the term for the more marked energies of life, even when there was no suggestion of an invasion from the supernatural realm. Thus when the weary and thirsty Samson finds water and drinks, 'his *ruach* returned and he lived,' *i.e.* his life-energy was renewed (Jg 15^{19}), and when the queen of Sheba saw Solomon's wisdom and splendour 'there was no more *ruach* in her,' *i.e.* she was utterly overwhelmed (1 K 10^{5}). In such passages, we must forget all we have been told about a Hebrew trichotomy or even dichotomy, and take the word simply as meaning 'energy,' for this is all that it does mean, as applied to man, *before the Exile*. But when the creation of the world and of man had been ascribed to Yahweh, the breath (*neshamah*) and the breath-soul (*nephesh*), which were the principle of human life, came to be conceived as due to the inbreathing of Yahweh. He had moulded the physical organism—the 'flesh'—but it was inanimate until He blew into its nostrils living breath. The wind itself, however, was Yahweh's breath, and so, in course of time (but not before the Exile), the breath of man came to be called by the same term as the wind, namely, *ruach*. This was naturally extended to cover the psychical phenomena of the breath-soul, though never to the point of displacing the original term for this (*nephesh*), or the terms for certain physical organs (such as the heart) to which psychical functions were ascribed. *The term* ruach *was thus naturalized in man's life as it had been supernaturalized in God's*. The importance of this anthropological development (hardly yet realized by theologians, because only a critical study of the terms will reveal it) will be obvious to any one who knows the Pauline pneumatology. *Ruach* as an element, or rather, an aspect of human nature, would always tend to suggest its origin in God's creative activity ; its very use linked man to God, bridging the gulf of the Isaianic contrast of flesh and spirit by the assertion of an implicit kinship. Here, in man's *ruach*, was a potential contact for the inflow of new accessions of the Divine *ruach* ; to use the term was to keep the door open for God. It gave to the Biblical idea of man a certain δύναμις which is one of its most characteristic features—the potentiality for the yet greater things, and the suggestion that their possibility lay in the ἐνέργεια of God. If it seems an exaggeration to base this conception on the mere identity of terms, the answer must be to point to the enormous influence of terminology on theological and philosophical thought—think of the dominance of Christian thought by the term *Logos*, largely because it expressed at once the inner thought and the outer word. But we are here dealing with much more than a mere identity of terms. The careful study of the Old Testament in its true chronological order will reveal that as 'wind' became 'Spirit' in relation to God, so 'Spirit' became 'spirit' in man. If we reverse this order, as we do when we take *ruach* to be a constituent of the idea of man from the beginning, ignoring all the evidence of literary criticism, then we shall not only create a 'trichotomy' which never existed in Hebrew thought, but we shall blur the line of development and confuse the true Biblical conception of the relation of man to God.

It is in the pages of the New Testament that we first see the full significance of this long development. The Christian consciousness might be not unfairly described as the democratization of the prophetic consciousness through the gift of the Holy Spirit. This is true whether we think of the cruder side of prophecy in its psycho-physical

phenomena, or of its moral and spiritual side realized by the greater prophets. This consciousness includes a new experience of God (through Jesus Christ), a new emphasis on the supernatural, a new sense of power, notably in the conflict with those many 'spiritual' powers which thronged the air of the ancient world. The conflict can be traced through the Synoptics, in the war waged by Jesus in the power of the Spirit against the demons of disease and insanity; or in the Spirit-world of the Apostle Paul, filled with principalities and powers; or, again, in more etherealized form, in the Johannine conception of the world, the flesh, and the devil. The new sense of power, always the characteristic creation of the Spirit, breaks into consciousness at Pentecost, where it is seen in the creation of a new fellowship. On the individual side, though never divorced from the communal, we have the Pauline experience of deliverance by the Holy Spirit, which is exhibited most fully in the seventh and eighth of Romans. On the communal side, again in closest relation to the individual, we have the development of the doctrine in the Fourth Gospel.

The increasing recognition that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is central in the Christian thought of the Apostle Paul (rather than the Rabbinical doctrine of 'justification') marks a great advance in the interpretation of his gospel. Every other conception of his is baptized into this, and most of all the concrete fact of history—the Cross of Christ. The whole life of the Christian, normal and abnormal, is brought within the sphere of the Holy Spirit. This comprehensive view, with its new evaluation of the phenomena, forms Paul's greatest contribution to the doctrine. He had learnt from the Old Testament to regard πνεῦμα (with the content of *ruach*) as a normal constituent of human nature, its highest aspect (*e.g.* Ro 8^{16}). From the same source came the long tradition to explain all supernatural influences by the same term. But apart from his new conviction about Jesus, that after all He was the Christ, the contact between supernatural power and the potentialities of human nature would never have been made for him. When it had been made, on the road to Damascus, there came not only a new ability to fulfil the old moral ideals of Pharisaism, but a new conception of life. As he came to realize that the human personality of Jesus, dominated by the ethics of the Cross, really belonged to the 'heavenlies,' and was therefore the most essential link in the chain of the Spirit, the doctrine of the Spirit was transformed for him—personalized, ethicized, as never before. It claimed the whole of human life, and claimed it to new ends and in new ways of working. He could not be content with the conventional views which specialized the activities of the Spirit in such *charismata* as 'Tongues' and 'Prophecy.' He saw those activities in the more valuable *charismata* of service to the community, the gifts of healing and helpfulness, of administration and government, and, above all, that gift of the Christian ἀγάπη, upon which the proper exercise of every other gift and grace depended. He traced back to the Holy Spirit of God (or Christ) the whole of the inner life also—the mediation of Christian experience, the union with Christ, the assurance of sonship, the consecration of life, the specific virtues, and the extension of this life into the life beyond death, of which we have already the beginning in the 'earnest' of the Spirit, and of which the final feature will be a 'spiritual' body, commensurate to the needs of the redeemed spirit. The ethical realism of this Pauline mysticism owes its form, doubtless, to his Jewish nature and nurture, but its content is drawn from the Person and Work of Jesus Christ, through whom the Spirit of God flows.

The communal aspect of the Holy Spirit has been already implied in the reference to the *charismata*; these gifts of the Spirit are bestowed on the community, in the community, and for the community. and the spirit of selfish display or ostentatious individualism comes from another quarter. It is as much out of date for historical exegesis to discuss whether the spirit-filled individual or the spirit-filled Church comes first, as it is to discuss whether individual or social life in general is primary. As in the natural order, so in the spiritual—the individual and the group grow together into a new consciousness of their inherent nature, and the individual life is inherently social, whilst the social life does not exist at all save through its individual representatives. The authority of the Church by which it declares that 'it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us' (Ac $15^{25.\ 28}$), is the authority of Spirit-led individuals in their group relation; it is the collective consciousness of the Church which speaks through the mouths of its prophets (13^{2}). The unity of the Church through this indwelling Spirit is the particular theme of the Epistle to the Ephesians—'one Body and one Spirit . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all' ($4^{3ff.}$). But the doctrine becomes most explicit in the Fourth Gospel.

The farewell address to the Apostles in the Upper Room declares that another Paraclete, or 'Helper,' will take the place of their present

Helper. This 'Spirit of truth' will be unseen and therefore unknown to the world, but will be known to, and remain with, the disciples of Christ ($14^{16.17}$). He will come in Christ's name to teach and to recall all the teaching of Christ (v.^{26}), and to bear witness of Him (15^{26}). He will be given and sent by the Father ($14^{16.26}$), or sent by Christ from the Father, from whom He proceeds (15^{26} 16^{7}). Christ's withdrawal from the world is the condition of His coming, and the apparent loss is real gain (16^{7}). His presence (with the disciples) will conclusively convince the world that their unbelief in Christ is sin, that Christ's cause has been vindicated by His ascent to the Father, and that the sentence of Divine judgment has already been pronounced on the arch-enemy of Christ, the Satanic ruler of the world (16^{8-11}). It has been necessary for Christ to leave much unsaid, but His successor will guide the disciples into all the truth, being Himself the Spirit of truth. His teaching is not, however, independent of Christ's, but its complement, deriving from Christ Himself, and opening the future; His work will glorify Christ (16^{12-14}). The significant feature in all this teaching is that the activity of the Spirit is confined in its direct operation to the Church, enabling it to win its victory over the world; there is no thought of the Spirit working directly on the hearts of sinful men to bring them to Christ; if the unbeliever is convinced it will be after the fashion of the Corinthian meeting, where the testimony of a Christian 'prophet' will bring him to faith by revealing the secrets of his heart (so E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 337). The Spirit is conceived as the projected presence and activity of Christ Himself with His Church, and this explains the personalization of the conception. The communal activity of the Holy Spirit here begins to be ecclesiasticized, though such a word really does violence to the fluidity of Johannine mysticism. How far, then, has the Bible brought us towards the Trinitarian doctrine of the fourth century? The answer to this will be given by our exegesis of the Pauline benediction in 2 Co 13^{14} (for by this we shall construe the more enigmatic, and probably later, baptismal formula of Mt 28^{19}). 'The fellowship of the Holy Spirit' is most naturally taken as an activity of the Spirit comparable with and resulting from the active grace of Christ and the active love of God which is expressed in and through that grace (cf. Ro 15^{30}, 'the love of, *i.e.* produced by, the Spirit'). The fellowship is a fellowship with God through Christ mediated by or in the Holy Spirit, so agreeing exactly with the teaching of Eph 2^{18}: 'through him (Christ) we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.' There is certainly no warrant for the interpretation 'fellowship *with* the Holy Spirit,' as distinguished from the Father and the Son; nor does it satisfy the parallel members of the Benediction (always important for Hebrew or Hebraized thought) to make κοινωνία mean simply the fellowship with men created by the Spirit, *i.e.* the Church. Thus the triple Benediction is simply a more explicit form of that which Paul uses elsewhere, 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.' When that is said, all is said, for the grace of Christ implies the love of God behind it, and the fellowship (of the whole group) with God created by the Spirit through that grace.

Inevitably, we are left asking further questions about the Holy Spirit which the Bible will not answer for us, questions which have emerged in subsequent discussion, questions which do not belong to historical exegesis at all. We must always recognize that the thought-world of an ancient document cannot possibly be ours, and that the writers were content to leave many problems unsolved, because those problems had not risen upon their horizon. Just as the Apostle Paul seems to have had no difficulty in postulating the pre-existence and the post-existence of Christ, alongside the Father and sharing His nature, though subordinate to Him, so he comes to intellectual equilibrium in the thought of the real presence of that Christ in the believer's heart and life by the indwelling Spirit. To treat this presence as the 'influence' of a vague and semi-physical *something* is altogether to miss the truth; for Paul life is so identified with Christ that to live is Christ, and the fellowship of the Spirit is intensely personal, with nothing between the believer and his Lord. Yet, on the other hand, to think that we can therefore leave out the Spirit, as some tacitly do, is to forget that cardinal utterance of Paul's—'the Lord the Spirit.' No mere historical figure of the past could ever have entered into the Apostle's thought and experience as did the living Christ. If the Lord gave personality to the Spirit, the Spirit gave ubiquity to the Lord. If the Divine Fatherhood and Sonship gave to the Spirit a new content of truth, the Spirit (by the very use and meaning of the term) opened up new avenues of inquiry, new fields of speculation about personality in man and in God which are very far from being yet exhausted. The glory of the Bible doctrine of the Holy Spirit is that it compels us to seek its meaning in the larger book of human history and human thought, to which all the nations of the earth contribute.