

of the baptized Christian soldier with the weapons of his warfare. In it the Spirit bestows an *augmentum ad gratiam*, and a strengthening for the fight. This became the standard teaching of the Middle Ages and was inherited by our Reformers.

For the Christian baptized in infancy, who, since he has been made a member of Christ, must *ipso facto* be in some sense a partaker of His Spirit, Confirmation is a completion of baptism by such a strengthening and arming; it is the occasion of a renewed apprehension of the Spirit corresponding to his affirmation of personal faith (an aspect of Confirmation rightly emphasized by the Reformers), and an equipping by special gifts of grace for the active Christian life. It may also, if our interpretation of Acts be correct, signify a share in the Church's apostolic mission. For the person baptized as a believer it is also an "equipping" and commissioning, but the strong element of ratification, both of divine promises and of personal faith, is scarcely present and the rite could be appropriately brought back as an integral part of the initiation itself.

What must be affirmed against the modern attempts to deny it, is the indissoluble connection of the reception of the indwelling Spirit of God with the sacrament which is the efficacious sign of the believer's incorporation into Christ in His Body, the Church.

The Holy Spirit in St. Paul's Writings*

BY THE REV. PROF. R. F. HETTLINGER, M.A.

ANY attempted exposition of St. Paul's teaching on the Holy Spirit is involved in two difficulties—quite apart from the inevitable limitations of the writer's knowledge and understanding. In the first place, it is more difficult in this than in any other area of Pauline thought to isolate one strand of doctrine from the others. The doctrine of the Spirit is integral to his doctrine of God, of man, of incarnation, of atonement, of the church and sacraments, and of eschatology. It is inevitable that this paper should assume much in these cognate areas which is open to discussion, and inevitable that the treatment of the subject should be somewhat amorphous. But in the second place, there is no subject on which the thought of the Apostle is less systematically expressed. His teaching, as Dr. Kirk¹ and Dr. Hodgson² have reminded us, was not the result of theological speculation but of empirical experience, and all his references to the Spirit are within the context of immediate religious needs or of ecclesiastical controversy. It is not difficult to find passages which are formally contradictory. All that we can do is to point out, as Canon Wilfred Knox³ suggested

* A paper read at the Annual Conference of the Evangelical Fellowship for Theological Literature, held at Cambridge, June, 1952.

¹ *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, pp. 168, 221.

² *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, pp. 50, 59.

³ *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, p. 117.

St. Paul might have done himself, that no religious or philosophical interpretation of spirit is entirely coherent, and make some attempt to elucidate the major themes in the Pauline writings.⁴

THE SPIRIT OF GOD

I have suggested that St. Paul's teaching about the Spirit sprang from empirical experience. He knew, and could assume that his readers knew God as indwelling Spirit (e.g. Gal. iii. 2). He writes to the Roman Church, which he himself has never instructed, and without explanation introduces the references in chapters v. (verse 5) and viii (verses 9-11, 26, etc.) to the work of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Dodd⁵ has shown that the activity of the Spirit formed the key to the primitive declaration of the realization, or at least inauguration, of the Eschaton. Dr. Barrett affirms that 'No more certain statement can be made about the Christians of the first generation than this: they believed themselves to be living under the immediate government of the Spirit of God'.⁶ Every New Testament book except 2 and 3 John and possibly James (e.g. ii. 26; iv. 5) includes a reference to the Spirit, for that which made the Church what it was was the transforming activity of God which took hold of human personalities and enabled them to enter into the mind and will of God revealed in Jesus Christ. Whatever question there may be as to the degree of 'hypostatization' implied in St. Paul's references to the Spirit, there can be no question as to the clarity of his belief that God was as wholly and yet also as distinctively operative in the life of the Church as He was in Creation and Incarnation. So much is implied indeed in the very phrase (used 15 times) 'Holy Spirit,' but St. Paul also speaks explicitly of 'the Spirit of God' (I Cor. iii. 16; vii. 40; xii. 3; Rom. viii. 9, 14; Phil. iii. 3 etc.), of 'the Spirit of the living God' (II Cor. iii. 3) and of 'the Spirit of our God' (I Cor. vi. 11). The love of God is both revealed and effected by the indwelling of the Spirit (Rom. v. 5), and to refuse sanctification is to reject not man but 'God who giveth His Holy Spirit unto you' (I Thess. iv. 8), for the Church is 'builded together for a habitation of God in (the) Spirit' (Eph. ii. 22).

St. Paul, as Dr. Kirk has expressed it, envisaged the Christian life as a threefold relationship to God of creation, communion, and possession,⁷ and his association of Father, Son, and Spirit as equals in the

⁴ The Pauline writings have been taken to include Ephesians but to exclude the Pastorals, although attention is drawn to significant parallels in the latter. Even if we conclude, with Dr. Mitton, that Ephesians is not strictly of Pauline authorship, it is in his words 'a faithful presentation of the Gospel according to Paul the Apostle' (*The Epistle to the Ephesians*, p. 270). Generally Eph. is somewhat more developed in its teaching on the Spirit than Colossians, but in two passages in which a definite reference to the Spirit might be expected it is surprisingly absent—Eph. i. 17; Eph. iv. 7 (cf. I Cor. xii. 4, 8).

⁵ *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, *passim*.

⁶ *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, p. 1.

⁷ Canon J. E. Fison quotes Professor A. B. Davidson as saying that the word holy, when combined with the word God, is 'a mere otiose epithet'. (*The Blessing of the Holy Spirit*, p. 43.)

⁸ *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, pp. 228-230. The word 'possession' is liable to misunderstanding, but as Dr. Hodgson has pointed out (op. cit. 38-41) some forms of possession do not destroy but heighten personality.

divine setting of the Christians' existence is the more striking for being informal and unelaborated. The Church enjoys fellowship with God in the Spirit, originating in the love of the Father and mediated through the grace of the Son (II Cor. xiii. 14). The Father is the architect of our redemption, Christ the agent, the Spirit its realization (Gal. iv. 4-7). The Father is the source of resurrection, Jesus the inclusive first-fruits, and the Spirit the assurance of our participation in the quickening power of God (Rom. viii. 9-11). We are anointed by the Father, established in Christ and sealed by the Spirit (II Cor. i. 21, 22). Christ is the way and the Spirit the context of our entrance to the Father (Eph. ii. 18). The Father is the object of prayer, Christ its inspiration and pattern, and the Spirit its effective answer (Eph. iii. 14-19). Yet there is no division of the Godhead in the Apostle's mind. Spirit, Lord and God are equally and at once the source of spiritual gifts (I Cor. xii. 4-6) for there is but one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all (Eph. iv. 4-6).

In thus stressing the unique soteriological experience of the Spirit, St. Paul is returning behind the immanentist identification of natural wisdom and Spirit which had come to characterize later Alexandrian Judaism* to the more characteristically Biblical emphasis upon supernatural, abnormal creativity as the mark of the RUACH of God. Without, as we shall notice later, qualifying the truth preserved in the later use of RUACH as a synonym for NEPHESH, he consistently recognizes that the Holy Spirit is the power of God far surpassing any immanent, natural or general human capacity. Dr. W. D. Davies has little difficulty in refuting the suggestions of Norden and Johannes Weiss, who would trace the origins of Pauline pneumatology to Stoic sources,¹⁰ and rightly criticizes the general modern tendency to interpret the Pauline doctrine of the Spirit in terms of divine immanence in creation.¹¹ Even the use of the term 'Spirit of God' to represent 'the illuminative presence of God operative in every soul which He has created'¹² attractive and, in part, justifiable as it is, cannot claim Pauline support. It is striking that in the relatively few references to God's immanent presence in creation in his writings (e.g., Col. i. 15-17; Rom. i. 19, 20; cf. Acts xvii. 22-8) the Spirit is not mentioned. Rather it is with 'active power or energy . . . superhuman, mysterious, elusive'¹³ that the Spirit is associated. Miraculous powers of healing (Gal. iii. 5; I Cor. xii. 10), supernatural knowledge of the future (I Cor. xii. 10; I Thess. v. 19, 20; cf. Acts xxi. 4, 11; xx. 23), signs and wonders (Rom. xv. 19) and the ability to speak with tongues (I Cor. xii. 10) are all indications of His presence.

But in recovering the pre-exilic sense of the mysterious and unexpected in the work of the Spirit, of what A. L. Humphries called 'the element of gracious surprise'¹⁴ St. Paul fused with the more

* Fison, op. cit. 73-8. cf. Norman Snaith, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 35-37.

¹⁰ *St. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 178-191.

¹¹ *ibid.* 190.

¹² Professor Pringle-Pattison in *The Spirit* (Ed. Streeter), p. 11.

¹³ H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, p. 8.

¹⁴ *The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience*, p. 231.

primitive emphasis the specifically Christian intellectual, ethical and religious insights. He did not question the divine origin of the more ecstatic and dramatic gifts (I Cor. xiv. 18), but unlike St. Luke¹⁵ he regarded them as of secondary importance, and effectively established the priority of the moral and intellectual work of the Spirit over the psychic and emotional. He taught, in the words of Monsignor Knox that 'The Church is one Body, expressing itself in a variety of organs, and it is not necessarily the most interesting of them that are the most significant'.¹⁶ Such an achievement must not be underestimated. While it is true that St. Paul was not the first to 'ethicize' the concept of Spirit,¹⁷ he was the first to identify the supernatural RUACH or PNEUMA unequivocally with the deepest religious and spiritual life, and to free it from undesirable associations with irrational and a-moral ecstatic phenomena.¹⁸ In the light of Calvary and Pentecost the truest evidence of divine activity is seen to consist intellectually in the gift of revelation, morally in the gift of love, and religiously in the freedom which delivers men from the bondage of their own sins.

In one of the most important passages of his epistles, St. Paul draws a radical distinction between the natural (*psychikos*) man, who is incapable of appreciating and recognizing the things of God, and the spiritual (*pneumatikos*) man, who is illumined and taught by the Spirit who knows 'the deep things of God' (I Cor. ii. 6-16). The Spirit is the source of revelation and truth, the inspirer and transformer of the human Nous, by whose agency the Christian is enabled to survey and enter into his situation with 'the mind of Christ' (I Cor. ii. 16). It is only because of the work of the Spirit that men are able to receive the Gospel as truth (I Thess. i. 5, 6; ii. 13) contrary as it is to the wisdom of the world, and lacking as it does the attractions of rhetorical and philosophic subtlety (I Cor. ii. 1-5). The experience of the Spirit anticipates the confession of Christ as Lord (I Cor. xii. 3) and it is only this supernatural power which can raise men above the human conflicts and divisions of race and nation (Eph. iii. 4-6; ii. 13-18).¹⁹ The association of Spirit and Word in Ephesians—'the sword of the Spirit is the Word of God' (vi. 17)—with the implication

¹⁵ 'The author of Acts loves to dwell on the outward, explosive, staccato phenomena; Paul prefers to base all the religious and ethical life of Christians on the quieter, constant, inward working of the Spirit' (Birch Hoyle, *The Holy Spirit in St. Paul*, p. 34; cf. Fison, op. cit. 113).

¹⁶ *Enthusiasm*, p. 22.

¹⁷ Davies, op. cit. pp. 218-220.

¹⁸ Dr. Barrett has suggested that the eighth century prophets avoided the term RUACH on account of its primitive associations with ecstatic possession (op. cit. 145-150). This may explain the infrequency with which the Old Testament books speak of the Messiah as Spirit-filled. Despite the fact that later authorities did make the connection explicit (Barrett, op. cit. 42-5; Davies, op. cit. 216-7) it seems likely that our Lord's own relative silence regarding the Spirit owes something to the need of a reinterpretation of life in the Spirit before the term could be used in the Church (Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, 51 ff).

¹⁹ It is possible that St. Paul has in mind the events of Pentecost and/or the conversion of Cornelius, when through a special outpouring of the Spirit God demonstrated the unity of all mankind. cf. also Eph. v. 18 with Acts ii. 13; Acts x. 44-8.

that not only the signs but also the content of man's knowledge of God are pneumatic is, at least in emphasis, a Pauline insight.²⁰ And it is in character that the Apostle exalts those works of the Spirit in which the human mind is enlightened and fulfilled rather than those in which it is overruled and ignored (I Cor. xii. 8, 10; xiv. 15, 28).

Yet supreme among all the evidences of the Spirit of God is neither the psychic nor the intellectual, but the ethical virtue of love. Beyond the satisfactions and excitements of ecstasy, beyond the fascination and mystery of prophecy, beyond the possession of truth and orthodoxy, beyond even the exhilaration of the martyr's faith—beyond all these is the humble self-giving love which has been revealed and exemplified in the incarnate Christ (I Cor. xii-xiv). Love is supreme because it alone really affects man's self and involves his recreation in the will of God; and love alone persists when the restrictions and perversions of human history are swallowed up in the life of God who is love. Popular piety, which finds comfort from the reading of I Corinthians xiii, has sometimes supposed that the Apostle is here comparing love as a natural virtue with glossalalia as supernatural gifts. But nothing surely could be further from the truth. 'St. Paul's great contribution is to give priority to the ethical without in the least abating one iota of the supernatural and eschatological character of His activity.'²¹ There is 'a way of life which surpasses even the best charismata'²² which is to be 'followed after' and sought from God but it is not within the capacity of man in himself, and the realization in experience of the love described by St. Paul is as much a supernatural phenomenon as the most dramatic outburst of the popularly miraculous tongues.

Finally, and, in the opinion of Dr. W. D. Davies, most distinctively,²³ the Apostle points to the new-found freedom of the Spirit as characteristic of true religion. The freedom of the Spirit lies in the gift by God of fresh, vital, untapped resources of life and grace. In Galatians (iii) and II Corinthians (iii) St. Paul argues from the evidential power of the Spirit in the Church to establish the claim which he makes for Apostolic authority. The freedom of the Spirit has overcome the weakness and frailty of the flesh (Gal. iii. 3; iv. 29-31; v. 16-24),²⁴ delivered humanity from sin and death (Rom. viii. 2), and replaced fear by joy (Rom. viii. 15; I Thess. i. 6; Gal. v. 22; Rom. xiv. 17). Above all, the religious life has ceased to be a burdensome attempt to satisfy the accusations and condemnations of the law (II Cor. iii. 17; Gal. iv. 4-7; v. 16-23) which, while providing a standard of righteousness, failed miserably to provide the motive power of obedience (II Cor. iii. 6; Rom. vii. 19; Rom. vii. 6). The Christian is 'strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inner man'

²⁰ Canon Fison points out that even in Ezekiel 'RUACH is not so much the source and criterion of the authenticity of the prophet's message as the explanation of his strange psychological condition and experience' (op. cit. p. 66).

²¹ Fison, op. cit. 121.

²² H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 187.

²³ op. cit. 225.

²⁴ "Flesh represents mere man, man in contrast with God—hence man in his weakness and mortality" J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, p. 19.

(Eph. iii. 16 ; cf. Rom. xv. 13) and is able to avail himself of the grace for moral growth which surpasses all possible natural resources. To St. Paul the "letter" was old, effete, outworn, devoid of power and life, of the earth earthy and subject to decay, but the "spirit" was ever new, perennially fresh, the creative breath of God, untouched by time, death or decay'.²⁵ The freedom of the Spirit stands over against every attempt to restrict the work of God too narrowly to the horizontal plane of history. It stands for the fact that where the Spirit of God is miracles always happen, and hope never dies. It means that the will of God will not always happen in the manner, or through the particular channels which seem obvious to us. It means that we can never assume that certain methods or Churches or traditions will not become the locus of the Spirit's activity. Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones revived and animated by the free Spirit of God provides the most fitting Biblical parable of the Pauline doctrine of the Spirit. "Can these bones live?" "Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will cause RUACH to enter into you, and ye shall live" (Ezekiel xxxvii. 3, 5).

THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST

The freedom of the Spirit does not mean, in St. Paul's thought, that the divine authority can be claimed for any and every religious experience. The Spirit of God is also the Spirit of Christ, and the name of Christ cannot be invoked for religious licence—whether it be moral (Gal. v. 13-15) or intellectual (II Cor. x. 5). Dr. Anderson Scott regarded this 'equating of the Spirit with Christ' as the most significant of all the Apostle's insights.²⁶ Dr. Dodd has written that 'his virtual identification of the experience of the Spirit with the experience of the indwelling Christ saved Christian thought from falling into a non-moral, half-magical conception of the supernatural in human experience, and it brought all "spiritual" experience to the test of the historical revelation of God in Jesus Christ'.²⁷ Such statements immediately raise the perplexing subject of St. Paul's trinitarian doctrine, and some attempt must be made to face this problem. It is not a question of the personal quality of the activity of God the Spirit, but of the personal distinctness of the Spirit from the Father and the Son. For any Jew there could be no real relation between God and man which was not personal,²⁸ and St. Paul's description of the work of the Spirit is primarily in terms of personal relationship²⁹ rather than of pantheistic absorption³⁰ or impersonal

²⁵ R. Birch Hoyle, *op. cit.*, 116.

²⁶ *Christianity According to St. Paul*, 144.

²⁷ *Romans*, p. 124.

²⁸ "Whatever else the Spirit of God may have been for the Jew, it was always at least the manifestation of the power of the God whose conscious purposive will was expressed in its activity" Hodgson, *op. cit.* 78.

²⁹ There are phrases which rest upon impersonal analogies (quench, I Thess. v. 19 ; drink, I Cor. xii. 13 ; cf. Eph. v. 18 ; supply, Phil. i. 19 ; Gal. iii. 5) ; but as Dr. Hodgson has suggested, these can better be explained in the light of the more personal categories than vice-versa (*op. cit.* 80-83). And we must remember that such analogies (cf. 'put on Christ' Rom. xiii. 14) were less 'impersonal' in an earlier age. See Davies, *op. cit.* 182-3.

³⁰ Dr. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of Christ*, pp. 155-8 effectively

force. God the Spirit does not operate upon human personality independently of their response, but by sensitive persuasion and illumination moulds and guides man according to His will. The Spirit leads the Christian (Rom. viii. 14; Gal. v. 18), witnesses with his spirit (Rom. viii. 16) and may be grieved by moral failure (Eph. iv. 30). St. Paul clearly believed in the personal nature of the Spirit's work. But it is far less easy to see that he had arrived at a conception of the relationship of the Father, Son and Spirit which would satisfy later theological definitions.³¹

The application of personal terms to the Spirit does not necessarily imply full 'hypostatization', for Old Testament writers do as much³² without anticipating Christian trinitarian dogma. St. Paul apparently distinguishes his spirit from his conscious self on two occasions (I Cor. v. 5; Col. ii. 5, cf. II Thess. ii. 8) where nothing more than effective sympathetic identification is implied. The very obscurity of many of the references which have been the subject for debate in this respect indicates that the Apostle had not concerned himself with the theoretical aspects of the question. Rawlinson's exegesis of the key passage II Corinthians iii. 17, 18³³ has received general approval, and it is improbable that St. Paul here formally identifies Christ and the Spirit, but the verse remains so equivocal as to be unintelligible if the writer shared the later dogmatic distinctions with which we are familiar. Any modern theologian who allowed himself to write a definition so patent of misinterpretation would at once earn the censure of the orthodox. Elsewhere St. Paul can say with equal facility that the believer is in Christ (Rom. viii. 1; ix. 1) or in the Spirit (Rom. viii. 9), that Christ is in him (Rom. viii. 10; II Cor. xiii. 5; Gal. ii. 20; Col. i. 27) or that the Spirit is in him (I Cor. vi. 19). No man can be Christ's unless he has the Spirit (Rom. viii. 9) and all who are in Christ know the 'law of the Spirit of life' (Rom. viii. 1, 2). Either Christ or the Spirit may be said to 'make intercession' for the Church (Rom. viii. 26, 34). Many scholars have concluded that St. Paul identifies the Spirit and the risen Christ,³⁴ but this also seems to assume a degree of theological systematization of which he is innocent. He thought of Christ as one who has 'passed by the Resurrection into a spiritual existence which has the power to communicate the higher life to the new humanity which He represents',

criticises the attempt to interpret Paul's 'Christ-mysticism' in stoic terms.

³¹ This is not to say that later orthodoxy is wrong, but that Pauline authority cannot be claimed directly for its conclusions, and that the widespread tendency to interpret St. Paul in the light of the Athanasian Creed leads to confusion.

³² The closest approximations are Ps. 51. 11; Ps. 142. 10 (LXX), Isa. xlvi. 16; and Isa. lxiii. 10-11, but it is extremely doubtful whether these are more than expressive parallelisms for the real personal presence of God. It is significant that the verse most frequently quoted as evidence for Pauline 'hypostatization' (Eph. iv. 30) has a striking parallel in Isa. lxiii. 10.

³³ In *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, p. 155, note 6.

³⁴ Birch Hoyle quotes Bousset, Harnack, Holtzmann, Feine, Peabody, E. F. Scott, Gunkel and Deissmann as examples (op. cit. pp. 19, 143).

to use Swete's paraphrase of 1 Corinthians xv. 45,³⁵ and of the Spirit as the fresh mode of divine operation. But he did not automatically or dogmatically associate the Spirit with the Father and the Son as a third entity or conscious personality. So much is clear from the remarkable fact that in every opening greeting of the Pauline epistles in each of which the Father and Son are invoked, reference to the Spirit is either absent or replaced by a reference to grace and peace.³⁶ This logical weakness, however, is in part the strength of the Pauline position. The personal activity of God the Spirit, creative and free as it is, follows the pattern of the Christ (I Cor. ii. 11, 16); Christ, on the other hand is no longer restricted in His presence and power to time and space (Rom. xv. 18, 19) but 'impresses His mind on the hearts of men in characters which all can read' (II Cor. iii. 3).³⁷ 'If the Lord gave personality to the Spirit,' writes Dr. Wheeler Robinson, 'the Spirit gave ubiquity to the Lord'.³⁸

What St. Paul is concerned to establish is that, although the experience of the Spirit involves the individual in a new dynamic and intimate relationship to God—and to this extent the Son and the Spirit are not identifiable—the character of this relationship and the criterion of its reality are already given in the person of Christ—and to this extent the Son and the Spirit are identical.³⁹ Those who share the Spirit are by grace established in and conformed to the same relationship to the Father as is Christ's by right and nature. By the birth after the Spirit (Gal. iv. 29) the believer has access to the Father (Eph. ii. 18) as a Son in Christ (Gal. iii. 26) and, encouraged (Rom. viii. 16) and led by the Spirit (Rom. viii. 14) is able confidently to address God as Father (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6) and to hope for a part in the eternal heritage of Christ the Son of God (Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iv. 7). In the words of L. S. Thornton, 'Christ is the indwelling content of the Christian life . . . the Spirit is the quickening cause'.⁴⁰ God was revealed and active for man's salvation in Christ, and according to this same revealed nature effectively consummates this work in the Spirit. The Spirit is thus the dynamic activity and presence of God, no longer isolated in the individual Christ Jesus, but powerful

³⁵ *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 191. If I Cor. xv. 45 is interpreted thus as a reference to the Resurrection it is worth considering whether Paul, apparently like St. John (xx. 22), regarded the gift of the Spirit as contemporaneous with the Resurrection, and whether Rom. i. 4 (cf. I Tim. iii. 16) means that *Pentecost* was the vindication of Christ as Son of God (cf. Acts ii. 33). Most commentators, however, regard *pneuma hagiosunes* as referring to 'a constituent part of the personality of Jesus, the higher aspect of His nature as man only' (Winstanley, *Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 60).

³⁶ cf. Kirk, op. cit., pp. 204-7.

³⁷ Swete's paraphrase, op. cit., p. 193.

³⁸ *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, p. 19.

³⁹ In this St. Paul is expressing the same truth as that of John xvi. 14 and anticipating the dogma of the "double procession".

⁴⁰ *The Incarnate Lord*, pp. 323-4. Dr. Oulton (*Holy Communion and Holy Spirit*, pp. 55-6) criticises Thornton (rightly in my opinion) for implying that Christ and the Spirit dwell in the believer. But I think Thornton is right in emphasizing (what Dr. Oulton seems to deny) that the Spirit does not reveal what is not revealed in Christ, nor produce ethical qualities other than those of Christ. I think we should say that Christ dwells in us as or by the Spirit.

in the many. His presence is no less characterized by the personal qualities and moral uniqueness of Jesus, but it has now become the inclusive source and centre of a new humanity. The Spirit conforms the Christian's everyday existence to the pattern of his sanctification in Christ, and anticipates his final participation in the resurrection of Christ.

The Christian is sanctified in Baptism (I Cor. vi. 11 ; i. 2) and his body is as truly separated for God's use as the Temple of Jerusalem (I Cor. vi. 14-20), for he has 'crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof' (Gal. v. 24). But there is a 'becoming what we are' and it is the work of the Spirit who is given in Baptism to conform the Church to the pattern of its initiation, to produce in the moral life of the fellowship and of the individual the same separation from the spirit of the world which was Christ's own. 'God chose you unto sanctification of the Spirit' (II Thess. ii. 13, Swete) who sanctifies in effect what is already sanctified in principle, conforming us to the *imago Christi* (II Cor. iii. 18 ; cf. Gal. iv. 19). To reject the challenge of purity, to claim a perfection which is not yet achieved, to be insensitive to the demands of Christian holiness, is to reject the will of God who 'giveth His Holy Spirit unto you' (I Thess. iv. 4-8 ; cf. Rom. vi. 19-22 ; Eph. v. 25). Especially is this true of the careless use of the Eucharist (I Cor. xi. 27-9) in which the Church is brought afresh under the sign of its essential nature.

The Spirit is also the assurance of the Church's participation in the Resurrection. In baptism the candidate rises symbolically from the grave (Rom. vi. 4) as partaker of Him who was the first-fruit of the dead (I Cor. xv. 23) and is assured 'in Christ' (I Thess. iv. 6 ; v. 10) of a like resurrection at the last day (I Cor. vi. 14). But by the Spirit he is already alive (Gal. v. 25) 'unto God in Christ Jesus' (Rom. vi. 11) and delivered from the threat of sin and death (Rom. viii. 2). The Christian already experiences the eschatological virtues of 'righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' (Rom. xiv. 17) and partakes of the first-fruit (Rom. viii. 2) or earnest (I Cor. i. 22 ; II Cor. v. 5) of the end. The Spirit inspires hope (Gal. v. 5 ; Rom. xv. 13) and joy in the face of tribulation (Rom. v. 2-5). Sanctification already achieved points to its completion in eternal life (Gal. vi. 8 ; Rom. vi. 19, 22) and sonship holds promise of inheritance (Gal. iv. 7 ; Rom. viii. 16, 17). The Spirit received in baptism is the eschatological seal (II Cor. i. 22 ; Eph. i. 13, 14 ; Eph. iv. 30) of acceptance at the consummation of all things, and of participation in the Resurrection Body of the Son.⁴¹

THE SPIRIT AND THE BODY

The Sonship which is the privilege of those who are born of the Spirit is never an individual experience. 'God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into *our* hearts, crying Abba, Father' (Gal. iv. 6)—'Ye received the Spirit of adoption whereby *we* cry Abba, Father' (Rom. viii. 15). Archbishop Carrington⁴² believes that St. Paul is here referring to the first admission of the baptized Christian to the liturgy, and his first participation in the common prayer, the 'Our Father'

⁴¹ See G. H. W. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, pp. 7-18.

⁴² See *Theology*, December, 1949, pp. 448-452.

of the Christian family. Professor C. F. D. Moule has also suggested to me that when the Apostle speaks of the Spirit "bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God" (Rom. viii. 16) he is thinking of the activity and work of the Spirit in the Christian community—of the powerful testimony of the fellowship. Certainly it is fundamental to the Apostle's thought that the Spirit is to be known only within the context of the *koinonia*⁴³ (Phil. ii. 1 ; II Cor. xiii. 14 ; cf. I Cor. i. 9 ; Heb. iii. 14 ; vi. 4), and that the Christian is inevitably bound in one with all those others who share 'a common life whose source is in God'.⁴⁴ When he speaks of the Spirit of Christ he is not thinking of the general pervasion of a Christ-like temperament, of the ability to get on with people socially, but of the spirit which animates the Church which is the Body of Christ (I Cor. xii. 12, 13) and the Temple of God (I Cor. iii. 16, 17). The Spirit is the transforming power operative within a quite clearly distinguished group of men and women who have submitted to the rite of Baptism, shared by them all and uniting them all despite the depths of their natural divisions of religion, society, and sex. 'In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free ; and were all made to drink of one Spirit' (I Cor. xii. 13 ; cf. Eph. iv. 4, 5). 'As many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female : for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus' (Gal. iii. 27-8). To St. Paul (whatever the good reasons for qualifying his assumptions in the light of history) it was unthinkable that the Spirit of God should be identified with the general action of God in nature or society. The Spirit is both the given and the creative reality which makes the Christian society different in kind from any human organization or association. Just as Christ, in the body of His flesh lived, died and was raised in perfect holiness, so He now indwells, sanctifies, and will raise up His Body the Church through the Holy Spirit. The Church is the Body of Christ conceived in terms of its given structure ; it is the fellowship of the Spirit conceived in terms of its dynamic life. The union of Christ with the Church, His flesh, in the Incarnation (Eph. v. 29-32) has its parallel in the union of spirit between Christ and the Christian, for 'he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit' (I Cor. vi. 17 ; cf. Rom. vii. 4, 6). It is the Spirit who makes the sacramental baptismal unity of the Body into an effective fellowship of love.

Baptism, which is the point of aggregation to the Body of Christ, and of entrance into the *koinonia* of the Spirit, prefigures the pattern of the Christian life. The very fact that men confess Christ is itself a mark of their common experience of the Spirit of truth (I Cor.

⁴³ Both Jewish thought (Davies, *op. cit.* 203-8) and earlier Christian tradition (Acts) as well as our Lord Himself (Flew, *op. cit.* p.52) had made this connection, but St. Paul gives theological expression to the fulfilment of the Old Testament hope of 'the democratization of the prophetic consciousness' (Wheeler Robinson, *op. cit.* p.14).

⁴⁴ Thornton, *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*, p. 6. Dr. Oulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 62ff. agrees with Thornton that the *koinonia* is primarily participation in or with the Spirit, and only secondarily the fellowship produced by the Spirit.

xii. 3) and all are endowed with some grace for the service of the body, flowing from the single source of power : ' There are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit . . . all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as he will ' (I Cor. xii. 4, 11). There is thus a given unity in the Spirit (Eph. iv. 3).⁴⁶ But the life of the Christian and of the Church consists in growth into the full experience of the privileges and opportunities bestowed in Baptism. ' If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us walk ' (Gal. v. 25). The *koinonia* in the Spirit must issue in a *koinonia* of the Spirit ; the sacramental union in the one bread must find its outworking in responsible fellowship (I Cor. xi. 17-34). Nothing is more striking than the priority given by St. Paul to love and unity as the supernatural marks of the Spirit. Love is the more excellent way (I Cor. xiii) and the most distinctive aspect of the Spirit's fruit (Gal. v. 22). Peace and longsuffering are equally His produce (Gal. v. 22). To claim spiritual maturity and to lack unity and love is entirely to misunderstand the nature of the Spirit, who is not an individual possession but the possessor of the corporate life. Disparity and division are the most distinctive marks of the unspiritual man (I Cor. iii. 3), who, making himself in the image of God, can brook no equals among his fellows. It is not the true freedom of the Spirit but the licence of the flesh which issues in conflict between believers (Gal. v. 13-15). Enmity, strife, jealousy, wrath, factions, divisions, heresies, envy, vain glory and arrogant criticism are all produced by the flesh (Gal. v. 20—vi. 5). Unkindness and unforgiveness are a grief to the Spirit (Eph. iv. 30-32).

Moreover, the various works of the Spirit are to be estimated according to their value for the community. The gift of tongues, desirable and comforting as it is to the individual (I Cor. xiv. 2, 4, 5, 18) is to be excluded from the common life unless it is intelligible to all or capable of interpretation (*ibid.* 27, 28). Prophecy, which ' edifieth the Church ' is much to be preferred (*ibid.* 4) and to speak five words for the good of the fellowship is better than to enjoy ten thousand for the good of one's own soul (xiv. 19). But St. Paul never underestimated the reality of sin. He recognized that the ability to appreciate and acknowledge the place of those who differ from us, the readiness to discipline even our religious powers and spiritual gifts for the good of the Church, to accept a place in the Body which is not altogether what we would choose, to forget our own interests and privileges in a wholehearted concern for others, is not man-made or man-given. He knew that there is no real hope of Christian unity on the basis of adjusted rights and legal claims. Apart from the transforming life of the Spirit, by which men actually become, like Christ Himself, unconcerned to preserve their particular rights at all costs and to maintain their precious traditions intact, there is no prospect of the given unity of baptism becoming an experiential reality. Yet in the Spirit there is hope, because the Spirit is the source of creative power. ' Ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another,' he writes to the Thessalonians (I Thess. iv. 9), and he appeals to the

⁴⁶ J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.* p. 60, note 2, points out that *terein* (*keep*) does not imply that the unity depends entirely upon the success of the Church.

Roman Church with confidence and hope for a more than human unity : " I beseech you by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit " (Rom. xv. 30 ; cf. Phil. ii. 1-3).

THE SPIRIT OF MAN

We have seen that in stressing the abnormal, supernatural character of the Spirit's activity, St. Paul was returning to the earlier theme of Hebraic thought, which conceived of the RUACH ADONAI as ' that special power by which God inspires the individual man, enabling him to do the will of God, and thus to do those things which in his own strength he is wholly unable to do '.⁴⁶ Yet he also gives full prominence to a later Old Testament usage, which must always to some extent have appeared to be in contradiction to the first. In using the word PNEUMA for the human spirit, the ' controlling, directive power in man ' (I Cor. ii. 11 ; II Cor. ii. 13 ; vii. 13 ; Gal. vi. 18 ; Rom. i. 9 ; ii. 29 ; Philem. 25, etc.) St. Paul is indebted to the post-exilic anthropology, which employed RUACH as a synonym for NEPHESH (soul) (Isa. xlii. 5 ; Job. xxxii. 8 ; xxxiii. 4), ' the vital principle in man, his whole psychical life, though usually regarded on its higher side '.⁴⁷ In this way, while preserving the truth that the Spirit is a supernatural reality, he preserves and deepens the truth that man's possession by God is not the contradiction but the fulfilment of his nature. The implication of the post-exilic use of RUACH is well expressed by Dr. Wheeler Robinson : ' Ruach as an element, or rather, as 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 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 '.⁴⁸

We have already noted that the greatest gifts of God for St. Paul are those which enlarge the human personality, of which love, the greatest, is determinative. For love must always be the full and conscious work of the self, in which the man is furthest from exterior or automatic possession. Glossalalia may be real and significant, but here the man speaks in spite of himself. Love is most real and significant, and here the man acts as himself made new in the Spirit. In the first the human spirit is superceded by the divine ; in the second it is transformed and fulfilled. It is not surprising that in many instances it is impossible to be certain whether St. Paul intends by PNEUMA the human or the divine spirit—or both.⁴⁹ There is no

⁴⁶ Norman Snaith, *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, p. 158.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 183.

⁴⁸ Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, p. 20, cf. also *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, p. 76 ; *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, pp. 109ff. It is now widely recognized that St. Paul did not distinguish *pneuma* from *psyche* as a distinctive faculty in man. I Thess. v. 23 is not a technical anthropological statement and is not typical. cf. I Cor. vii. 34 ; II Cor. vii. 1.

⁴⁹ *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, p. 13.

⁵⁰ e.g., II Thess. ii. 13 (cf. I Cor. vii. 34) ; Gal. v. 5 ; II Cor. iii. 6 ; II Cor. vi. 6 ; II Cor. xii. 18 ; Rom. vii. 6 ; Eph. v. 18. Dr. A. J. MacDonald's attempt (*The Interpreter Spirit and Human Life*) to distinguish on grammatical

suggestion that the two are to be equated—but the Apostle seems to regard the human spirit *when possessed and controlled by God* as taken up within the Holy Spirit, so as to be at many points indistinguishable in experience.

The Spirit is supernatural and personal, but not anti-natural and extra-personal. 'There is no simple addition of divine power and human power in the Christian life. The Spirit of God identifies itself with the human Me into which it enters and whose life it becomes. If we may so speak, it is individualized in the new moral personality which it creates.'⁶¹ The two are 'one spirit' (I Cor. vi. 17) just as man and wife are 'one flesh'. The witness of the Spirit is not *to* our spirit, but *with* our spirit (*summarturei*) in a union as intimate as that of the human conscience and the self (cf. Rom. viii. 16 with Rom. ix. 1). There is no prayer in the Pauline writings addressed to the Spirit, but the Spirit 'shares the groans of our imperfect nature, converting them into prayers without and beyond words . . . our inarticulate longings for a better life are the Spirit's intercessions on our behalf, audible to God who searches all hearts' (Rom. viii. 26, 27, Swete's paraphrase; cf. I Cor. ii. 10, 11). Although there are times when the Apostle knows himself to be 'in the Spirit', there are others when he can only say 'I think that I have the Spirit of God' (I Cor. vii. 40), implying that there existed in his experience no clear-cut I-thou relationship to the Spirit.

A recent writer in *Theology To-day*⁶² has called in question the common attempt to conceive of the Spirit as a third person of the Trinity over against the individual Christian. I believe that in this protest the writer is reminding us of a Pauline truth. Within this life our experience of God the Spirit is perforce always partial. Because we are still sinners in act we are always led by the Spirit (Gal. v. 16, 18) and the Spirit must always complete and interpret the inadequate and poverty stricken desires of our hearts God-wards (Rom. viii. 26). But as our experience of the Spirit deepens, so He becomes increasingly not someone outside us, but God in us. The mystery and complexity of the relationship is nowhere better expressed than in these words of St. Paul: 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith' (Gal. ii. 20). In his great book *Atonement and Personality* Moberly describes the Spirit as 'the subjective realization within and as ourselves of the Christ who was first manifested objectively and externally for our contemplation and love in Galilee and on the Cross. He is more and more, as the Christian consummation is approached, the Spirit within ourselves of righteousness and truth, of life and of love. He is more, indeed, than within us. He is the ultimate consummation of ourselves. He is the response,

grounds between the Spirit as transcendent and spirit as inward breaks down hopelessly in the Pauline writings, as he himself admits (op. cit. pp. 84, 85, 87). A comparison of ten of the uncertain verses with the translations of Swete and R.V. shows that (between them) they break MacDonald's rule in 11/17 cases and disagree between themselves in 3/7 cases.

⁶¹ Sabatier, quoted by Birch Hoyle, op. cit., p. 116.

⁶² *Theology To-day*, April, 1951, pp. 33-8.

from us, of goodness and love, to the goodness and love of God. He is, with quite unreserved truth, when all is consummated, our own personal response'.⁵³

This seems to me essentially a Pauline statement. Doubtless it raises difficulties in connection with the near-tritheism of contemporary Anglican trinitarian doctrine;⁵⁴ but if we can recover St. Paul's deep sense of the wonder of the Christian experience of the Holy Spirit, we shall be delivered from the far more dangerous, though more respectable, heresies of liberal humanism or ecclesiastical mechanicalism. We shall recognize the necessity of personal response and faith (e.g., Gal. iii. 2, 26ff; Rom. viii. 14), but we shall not limit the activity of God in man to the channels of conscious experience.⁵⁵ We shall value and prize the tradition of Infant Baptism, with its witness to the priority of the Spirit (e.g., I Cor. xii. 3), but we shall not suppose that the Spirit is fully received where there is no personal acceptance of Christ.⁵⁶ For St. Paul, while, as no other, insisting upon the responsibility of individual faith, did in his teaching about the Spirit bear witness to an activity of God in the Church which, once freely accepted, commits the believer to a fundamental transformation of the very roots of his being, the outcome of which he must leave to God. The Christian is not merely one who has chosen to follow Christ, but one in whom the Spirit is 'the source of an actual, though hidden, supernatural life, which is the inward principle of the new manhood'.⁵⁷

⁵³ *Atonement and Personality*, p. 204.

⁵⁴ cf. Donald Baillie *God was in Christ*, pp. 137-140.

⁵⁵ The idea of 'semi-physical essence' which some (e.g., E. F. Scott, *op. cit.* 156; Principal T. Rees, *The Holy Spirit*, p. 92) have found in St. Paul may perhaps represent this truth in pre-psychological language.

⁵⁶ cf. *The Theology of Christian Initiation*, p. 15.

⁵⁷ Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of Christ*, p. 154.