



McMASTER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
231.7 .P
The spiritual gifts. C.1



3 9005 0476 3111 8

A white rectangular library label with black text and a barcode. The text includes the library name, call number, title, and volume information. The barcode is a standard 1D barcode with the number 3 9005 0476 3111 8 printed below it.

STORAGE

A bright green rounded rectangular label with the word "STORAGE" in bold black capital letters, centered on the bottom of the cover.

THE SPIRITUAL GIFTS

THE SPIRITUAL GIFTS

(τὰ χαρίσματα)

BY THE REV.

J. R. PRIDIE, M.A.

VICAR OF HAM, SURREY.

Sometime Chaplain of Clare College, Cambridge

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT
ROXBURGHE HOUSE
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

MCMXXI

PREFATORY NOTE

THE Charismatic Gifts have usually been considered as extraordinary activities of the Holy Spirit, connected exclusively with the first age of the Church's life. Their purpose has been thought to be simply evidential of her mission and character. They were her credentials, and having established her claims, were not to be looked for in the later developments of her history.

The present essay takes a different point of view, namely, that the Charismatic Gifts were part of the Church's essential endowment by her Divine Lord, and intended to be part of her timeless equipment for carrying on His work in the world. They may still be regarded as evidential, but in the sense that as her commission is of perpetual validity, so her endowments for the fulfilment of that commission may be expected to share the same quality of permanence. She was designed to be the instrument through which her Ascended Master might still continue among men that redemptive activity which was His purpose in the days of His Flesh, and which has not ceased to be a fundamental fact. That work was entrusted not to individuals as such, but to a Body which enshrined His Spirit and in relation to which the individual Christian might find his true avocation.

In twenty centuries of experience the need for Divine help in overcoming on the one hand the evils which beset human nature, and in perfecting on the other hand those powers with which it is endowed, has not grown less or less obvious. It was always part of the Church's mission to bring men to the knowledge of God. That does not need emphasis, for

it has been her main impulse for many generations. But the other side of her mission has not been so prominent, at least in modern thought, namely, that she was designed to be the instrument through which the Divine power reaches men. This can only be in virtue of her call to be the Body of Christ in which He, through the power of His Holy Spirit, lives and works to-day. It is necessary to keep this in mind as the true corrective both to a mechanical theory of the Church and to that vague idealism which denies to the Church any real function or even any real existence—ideas which are equally destructive of her actual place and office.

A study of the Charismata leaves on the mind a deep impression of the central vitality of that Body, expressing itself through those spiritual gifts which belong to the Church's corporate life.

In tracing the history of her organization we sometimes become aware of differences which have broadened and deepened with the passage of time. In a study of the living organism we become aware of an innate vitality of power which finds its proper channel of expression through the corporate faith of that Body of which the Lord Christ is the living Head.

This inquiry into the meaning and scope of the Charismata as the earliest self-expression of that organism may not be out of place to-day when men are seeking to understand afresh the meaning and message of the corporate Christian life.

J. R. P.

I	INTRODUCTION	II
II	PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS	21
III	THE GIFT OF THE SPIRIT	37
IV	GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT (I)	52
V	GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT (II)	68
VI	DIVERSITIES OF GIFTS (I)	83
VII	DIVERSITIES OF GIFTS (II)	106
VIII	DIVERSITIES OF GIFTS (III)	
	The Charismata of Power and Sympathy	124
IX	DIVERSITIES OF GIFTS (IV)	
	The Charismata of Power and Sympathy (<i>continued</i>)	140
	INDEX	157

Part I
SPIRITUAL GIFTS

SPIRITUAL GIFTS

I

INTRODUCTION

THE fundamental idea of the Church in the New Testament is that of a corporate life lived in definite conscious relation to God and in definite conscious relations of mutual brotherhood among its members. It is from the first an organism rather than an organization, and as an organism the law of its being is the expression of that Divine life with which it is endowed and by which it lives. Organization comes later as a necessary development for permanent activity in that mission for which it was first fully equipped with vital power at the Pentecost. It was "power" (*δύναμις*) not "authority" (*ἐξουσία*) for which the eleven were bidden to wait in Jerusalem. Secure in the possession of dynamic power, authority would ere long become its natural expression in certain circumstances and under certain conditions.

And to each member of the Body was secured his due share of the "power" by Baptism. That Sacrament of initiation at once defined the convert's relation to God and to his fellow-members in the Body. It was a relation of corporate vitality, and it is within the sphere of this vital relationship that the scope and purpose of the spiritual gifts is to be sought. They have a corporate significance, not merely an individual measure. The whole spiritual life is to be "in Christ," and is therefore to be identified with His life at least in such aspects as come within the scope of human activity. The expression *ἐν Χριστῷ* is

peculiarly Pauline, but the fact which it expresses is not a discovery of the apostle's. It is part of the consciousness of the whole Church and finds its root in the Lord's own definition of the relationship, "Ye in Me and I in you." And as in the first days the Church tries to measure the scope of her work and of her opportunities she sees that there is still work of teaching, of healing, etc., to be done, and that it will still be done by Him through her as His Body.

It is from this standpoint that we propose to inquire into the meaning and scope of some of the spiritual gifts, but in selecting those which have to do less with the organization than with the organism of the Church we are not to be understood to imply that the one class of gifts is more or less "spiritual" than the other. They all spring from the relation of the Church to the living Christ. They are all implicit in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, though they do not all become immediately explicit. But as soon as circumstances call for their exercise they are found not to be wanting. The gift of Pentecost is the gift of spiritual vitality which will be constant and active through all the ages of the Church's history, though the occasions of its activity may vary from time to time. And it will be imparted normally to individuals in the Sacrament of Baptism and its complement Confirmation.

The relation which we describe as one of corporate vitality will serve to explain what may seem to be a challenge to the statement that the charismata find their root and spring for individuals normally in Baptism. The seventy who were sent out to proclaim the Lord's coming in the Judean villages were clearly endowed with a charisma of healing (St. Luke x.). The company of Cornelius, the Centurion of Cæsarea, received obvious charismata before Baptism, for it was on the evidence of charismata already bestowed that St. Peter was convinced of their fitness for Baptism (Acts x.).

Neither, however, of these exceptional cases will affect the main argument. In both there were special conditions. In one the charisma was the direct gift of the Lord Himself in order to the fulfilment of the special ministry on which the seventy were sent.

In the other, the gift served to declare to the apostle and to the Jews that the inclusion of the Gentiles in the Christian Church was according to the will of God. Both were alike in marking a new departure, and St. Luke, the careful historian of origins, records both alike as evidence of the new power at work among men. And both alike were movements towards that new unity which was to find its expression and its symbol in the one Baptism.

But such occurrences do suggest a question. Had these gifts which, under the Christian dispensation we are accustomed to call charismata, any place among the natural gifts of humanity, and if so, what is the meaning and measure of the supernatural character so consistently ascribed to them in the Christian writings? Ancient records of peoples differing widely in race and culture bear witness over long periods of history to what has been called the theory of disease demons.¹ The term was usually applied, at least among the more advanced peoples, to forms of illness which had some mental effects. It is only among primitive peoples that the idea extends also to other forms of sickness. Some terms in common use to-day—e.g. epilepsy—bear witness to this familiar idea. And as a consequence of the theory of disease demons healers and exorcists abounded. Ancient Babylonian-Assyrian texts no less than Greek or Roman have copious references to them. Exorcist formulæ are frequent and precise.² This fact would itself suggest that there are certain powers inherent in human nature of dealing with disease, etc., and some modern cults endorse that conclusion.

But Christian teaching as to the source and purpose

¹ Cf. Tyler, *Primitive Culture*, *passim*.

² *Ibid.*

of the Church's charismatic gifts is quite clear always. They come from God and are for God's service. That would be true for the early Christians whether the gifts were regarded as something quite new, a definite new departure dating from the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, or whether they were thought of as a revelation from God through Christ of powers which were inherent in human nature but were not clearly manifested nor adequately understood until they were revealed in perfect operation in the Person of the Redeemer—"perfect man" as well as "perfect God." Did He adumbrate some such revelation of the powers of human nature when He declared His mission to be—according to St. John: "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly"? Did He mean that the redemption wrought by His life and death should extend to these hidden spiritual powers in man, nay, should set free new tides of power unsuspected as yet? And when we think of it from this point of view, and we remember that the charismata are always definitely associated with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, we remember also that the Holy Spirit was not given until Jesus had been glorified—i.e. until His work of redemption had been completed.

Wherein then lies the difference between the class of gifts which we call charismata and those gifts or powers which had manifested themselves among both primitive and civilized peoples from the earliest times?

A fundamental difference is indicated by the method pursued in the use or cultivation of the gift. In the Christian Church it starts always from the spiritual relation existing between God and man, and it proceeds as unquestionably fulfilling the will of God for man's good. In the demon cults there appears to be no belief in any *vital* relationship, and certainly no inkling of an idea that disease or sickness is contrary to the will of man's tutelary

deities. In all ancient demon cults the healers were a special and privileged class. The gift was not universal, was not even widespread. It was exercised by a very small class. It tended to become simply an individual "accomplishment" and tended towards concentrating power (authority) in the hands of those so specially favoured by the gods. There was no trace of a corporate sense in it, and mercenary motives seem largely to prompt its exercise.¹

In the Christian Church, on the contrary, it was originally shared by the whole community, and it was balanced by other gifts. It is not without significance that the power among ancient peoples was chiefly confined to healing and exorcism. When they go beyond this to the exercise of prophecy or divination recourse is almost always had to artificial stimuli.² But in the Christian community the very spontaneity of these other gifts calls for certain regulations and restraint (1 Cor. xiv. 26, etc.). And it is equally significant that certainly for more than two centuries³ the Church, though she constantly used exorcism, did so by her Bishops and Presbyters and had no distinct order of exorcists. She believed, and acted on her belief, that all her members possessed the gift and therefore it was not necessary for any special class of healers to be set apart. This only came later⁴ and was thought to coincide with the passing away of the special miraculous gift to the Body as a whole. It is at least open to question whether the cessation of power in this direction was not due to that submergence of faith through which the Church passed at the close of the sub-apostolic period, when first the Church and the world-power came to terms of mutual toleration. Be that as it may, it is clear that in the earliest years the Church was convinced that this power was a common gift to the whole Body, and that if it was manifested in a special

¹ Cf. Tyler, *Primitive Culture*, *passim*.

² *Ibid.*

³ Cf. Bingham, Bk. iii.

⁴ Cf. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*.

degree in any particular member it was always to be used under the control and direction of the whole Body—expressed through the local Church—and for the good of the corporate life of that Body. It was through her charismata that the Church most fully realized and expressed that corporate vitality with which she was entrusted on behalf of the Kingdom of God. There were varieties of spiritual gifts, but the same Spirit gives them all. There were diversities of administration, but all to serve the same Lord.

The importance of this teaching is clear when we reflect that the Church of the first century was peculiarly open to criticism not merely by new converts entering the fold, but by men without the fold, whose whole training and predilections suggested hostility. The Church herself accepted the phenomena of the charismata as part of her authentic experience, and this general acceptance may, in some measure, account for the paucity of reference in the New Testament to the spiritual gifts. It is only when it is a question of their regulation, or as a reminder of the Church's equipment to meet particular dangers or difficulties that they are mentioned at all. St. Paul is the only New Testament writer who treats the subject in any formal way, and then only at any length in 1 Corinthians xii. His allusions to it in the Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians are but brief. Each of these passages has its own significance and will be examined at a later stage. At this point they are mentioned, rather, for the purpose of emphasizing the rarity of reference rather than the comprehensiveness of their teaching. And even this scanty reference seems to be determined as much by external as by internal pressure. On the one hand the Jews, with their pride in the ancient prophets of their Church and race, would be inclined to challenge the claim of the Christians to a charismatic gift of prophecy. On the other, the Greeks, with their own elaborate system of oracles and soothsayers, would

be apt to deride a claim to special Divine inbreathing. The Jews did not see any incongruity in ascribing to Beelzebub the power of the Lord Christ in dealing with "spirits," and the taunt would not be less vehemently urged in regard to the followers of the despised and crucified Nazarene when they began to exercise the same power. The Greeks no less than the Asiatics, fearing that both their commerce and their religion might suffer by any disloyalty to ancient beliefs, would not hesitate to ascribe the spiritual gifts of the Christians to an evil source.

It is the necessity for a clear statement in order to reassure Christians surrounded by hostile opinion that calls for the exposition given by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xii., and in Ephesians iv. The spiritual gifts follow Baptism, and might therefore be presumed without further argument to be a gift from Him to whom the Christians were united by that Sacrament. They were indeed part of the evidence of the reality of that life "in Christ" which was for St. Paul the fundamental truth of Christian existence. And if the Church in Corinth or in Ephesus had existed in a Christian atmosphere it is probable that no question of this kind would ever have arisen. It is, however, a moot point what influence a Christian atmosphere would have had in reducing the manifestations of the charismata as the contrast between the Church and her surroundings grew less keen and acute. It is not unlikely that it has had considerable effect in reducing or curtailing the "miraculous" manifestations of her inner vitality. But at the time when St. Paul gives to the Church his exposition of the place and meaning of the charismata the pressure of outside opinion had made itself felt, and the question seems to have reached an acute stage when 1 Corinthians was written. It had evidently been submitted to the apostle along with other questions of a fundamental character, the answer to which he gives in his first letter.

But besides this outside pressure, and much more danger-

ous, a tendency to schism had manifested itself within the Corinthian Church—a tendency which was entirely destructive to that corporate vitality which was the essential truth of existence for the whole Church. The Apostle therefore deals at length with the matter of the spiritual gifts, for unless the whole question raised by the Corinthian Christians were placed in the right light and the true perspective, the schismatic spirit would tend to accentuate itself by exalting or else decrying gifts which so obviously, for Christians, belonged to a region beyond the dictates or control of man.

To ascribe the gifts to an evil source was the easiest method of disparaging a rival party more fully endowed than its critics, and of instilling the poison of doubt in those who possessed them. To ascribe them to the Source of all good was the readiest retort and the obvious remedy for a damaged self-esteem. It was necessary then that the matter should be thrashed out, and the apostle not only places beyond doubt the source and origin of the gifts, but he is equally clear as to their meaning and purpose. The real recognition of the truth would, he knew, tend to soften and heal the schismatic spirit as the parties in the Church realized the greatness of that Power with Whom they were in touch, and His purpose of using them as His instruments in the upbuilding of the Kingdom of God.

The immediate occasion of the apostle's exposition in 1 Corinthians is in connection with public worship, where certain kinds of charismata would have special prominence. It was in public worship that the most striking evidence of the unity of the Church might be offered to hostile critics within her fold, and it was here that those factions to which the earlier chapters of the Epistle bear witness would be most sensitive of their differences. It was in public worship, therefore, that it was most necessary to demonstrate the unifying quality and force of those gifts of the Spirit.

There are, however, two other Pauline expositions of the

spiritual gifts—in Romans xii. and Ephesians iv. The list in Romans xii. has some likeness to that in 1 Corinthians xii., in that all the gifts mentioned might be conceived of as operative in some local Church, though the list in 1 Corinthians xii. is longer and more comprehensive. But the list in Ephesians iv. is of a different character and has entirely to do with ministers rather than with ministrations. A possible reason for the difference may be found in the purpose which inspired the apostle in writing each of these Epistles. In Romans and 1 Corinthians he is concerned with the special circumstances of a local Church. In Ephesians, on the contrary, he is writing—as its circular superscription indicates—to a much wider circle, and he is dealing all through with broad principles broadly applied rather than with a consideration of any particular application. The lines of the Epistle to the Ephesians are Catholic, not local—nay, the apostle's vision penetrates to a region so far beyond "things seen" that it is scarcely an exaggeration to describe the Epistle as cosmic in its sweep and significance. But the Epistle to the Ephesians contains not only a formal enumeration of the spiritual gifts of the Christian Church, it has also, in vi. 12, an exposition of the spiritual powers against which the Church is called to fight. May not this supply the reason for the endowment of the Church with those gifts which—especially in the Corinthian list—seem to pass beyond the needs of ordinary Christians in their ordinary progress in the spiritual life?

Her warfare in this view is not simply against evil inclinations of fallen human nature, it is a warfare against spiritual personalities, and she must needs be equipped with spiritual powers to meet them.¹

It is important to note two points in regard to the spiritual

¹ Cf. St. Thom. Aquinas, *Summa Theolog.*, pars 3: "Hac apud Ephesios spiritualia opponuntur spiritualibus gratiæ (1 Cor. xii. 1), adversanturque fidei, spei, amori, donis, vel per vim contrariam, vel per falsam imitationem."

gifts in the New Testament—(i) they cover what may be called ordinary talents as well as extraordinary powers—e.g. in 1 Corinthians xii. the gifts of healing or of tongues fall in the same category as talent for administrative usefulness and the faculty of government ; (ii) they are regarded, especially in Acts, as ordinary gifts for the ordinary purpose of the Church's life, and, as in Galatians iii. 5, were exercised by ordinary members of the Church. When it is remembered that this attitude of mind is in complete contrast to that of the surrounding people, it is obvious that a corporate consciousness formed at this stage the absolute condition of Christian life and work.

These two points are of great importance in view of the history, so far as we can trace it, of the use of the charismatic gifts. It may serve to account for the distinction between ordinary and extraordinary gifts which subsequently becomes apparent in the history of the Church to observe that the ordinary gifts are those which would be emphasized in the organization of local Churches, while it would become increasingly difficult as organization became more precise and tended to become more rigid to find place for the extraordinary gifts. Some attempt would be made to bring the extraordinary gifts within the circle of organization by the creation of special "orders" such as exorcists who alone would have official sanction for the exercise of those gifts, with the result that the gifts would first cease to be regarded as part of the corporate possession of the whole Church, shared in by every member of the Body, and would ere long pass out of use as part of the ordinary equipment of the Church in dealing with the spiritual problems with which she was faced.

The reawakening in the Christian Church to-day of a sense of the need for unity may then justify a fresh examination of the meaning of those spiritual gifts which were so specially characteristic of her in the days when her unity was unbroken.

II PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS

(I)

IN St. Paul's writings the references to beings of the spiritual world are so frequent, and the subject is so clearly part of his whole religious conception of the universe, that no examination of the meaning of the spiritual gifts would be adequate without some attempt to estimate their mutual relation. In the form in which St. Paul held it the belief in the world of spirits was the special possession of the Jewish race. Other nations, especially the Greeks and Persians, had developed systems of demonology and even of angelology, and these nations had had their influence on Jewish modes of thought. But to the Jews the question was primarily a religious one, not a philosophical one. They had held it for ages, coming slowly to regard it as part of the revelation with which they were entrusted. They had developed it in the sad years of exile, and it was so widespread and general among them in our Lord's time that the Sadducees are remarked in the New Testament, not for their intellectual attainments or for their political power, but for their disbelief in angels and spirits.¹

If the letters of the New Testament were addressed exclusively to Jews it would not therefore be remarkable that St. Paul, so learned a Pharisee that he was regarded by his contemporaries as the favourite disciple and possible successor of the great Rabbi Gamaliel,² should dwell much

¹ Acts xxiii. 8.

² Cf. Mishna Sota ix. 15. "With the death of Gamaliel reverence for the law ceased." Quoted by Milligan, *H.D.B.* II. 1063.

on this subject. Mr. St. J. Thackeray in his learned essay¹ has shown the deep influence of Jewish culture on St. Paul's thought and language. But we have to remember that he was not writing to Jews, but to Christians who before their conversion owed their culture in the vast majority of cases to heathen and not to Jewish influences. It is true that in some cases this had its own peculiar dangers when such people were taught by the apostle the truths of the spiritual world. But those dangers came largely from Greek and Gnostic sources, scarcely at all from Jewish sources. It would then clearly be inadequate merely to observe that St. Paul in speaking of the spiritual world uses idioms of thought and language which are familiar to him as a Jew. That is the natural channel of his message, but the value of the message is to be gauged by its relation to that body of Christian teaching which it is the apostle's purpose to inculcate in his letters to the Churches, and in order to get to a position from which we may be able to gather the meaning of his teaching and its place in the permanent thought of the Church it will first be necessary to trace as briefly as possible the growth of the belief in "spirits" which lies behind that teaching.

The characteristic of practically all primitive religions is *fear*. That was true, so far as we can discover, of all ancient primitive forms of belief,² it is certainly true of all primitive forms to-day. Man is at the mercy of unseen personalities of unknown power. He first becomes conscious of these personalities as he begins to seek for causes to explain the happenings of his life or the conditions by which he is surrounded. In the earliest stages of belief these personalities are almost always malignant and must be propitiated—that is to say that at first it is the evil happenings which most impress him. His first impulse is to give his gods something—to bribe them by sacrifice into at least benevolent

¹ *St. Paul and Jewish Thought*. Macmillan, 1900.

² Tyler, *Primitive Culture*.

neutrality if not into active co-operation on his behalf. It is not till a much later stage in his development that any ethical conception begins to appear.

On the other hand, the record of revelation and of development contained in the Old Testament is full of the idea of conflict. Man is no longer merely the sport of unknown powers. He is conscious of himself and slowly becomes conscious that he can and must fight against evil. All the fervour and wrath of the prophets is stirred when men turn back to the old ideas and begin again to try to propitiate their strange gods. It is treachery against Jehovah, but it is treachery too of man against himself.

And Christian consciousness is quite clear about the fact of conflict. It is part of the education or growth of the spirit to become more sensitive to the fact. But in that growth or education what place are we to assign to this ancient consciousness of hostile spiritual forces actively at work, actively engaged in an attempt to injure or even to destroy that inner spiritual life by which man is conscious of God and of his own high destiny? Two factors must be noted in passing which do not tend to make our task easier. One is the deep-seated idea that in the process of mental and moral evolution we have reached a stage which warrants us (if indeed it does not insist) in discarding primitive beliefs as definitely belonging only to the earlier stages of man's development and definitely to be discarded by more enlightened folk. At one end of the scale are the affirmations of animism, at the other the negations of such systems of belief as Christian Science. But the persistence in one form or another of the belief in spirits would seem to challenge the validity of this idea as a sound canon of progress.

The other factor to be borne in mind is the theological colour which Western Christianity has given to Omnipotence as an attribute of Deity, a colour which makes it difficult for us to realize any kind of limitation to Divine

power or to make room in our thought for any other personalities besides the Deity and ourselves. It is due to this attitude that any discussion of our subject has for long been ruled out of court. Science has been called in to supplement by her doctrine of natural laws the defects of theological discussion. But the newer philosophy of vitalism¹ has shown that natural laws are not the whole account of the matter—that there is a *causa causans* which has still to be taken into account, and this has directed our thought towards new ideas of personal and spiritual elements in the development of human nature. And, theologically, there has been a welcome movement towards re-examining our conceptions of the attributes of Deity in the light of the broader *παντοκράτωρ* of the Nicene Creed rather than of the narrower and less adequate Omnipotens of the Western Creeds.

(II)

So far as the ancient Hebrews are concerned, their thoughts about the world of spirits were largely moulded by the early Semitic ideas which surrounded them in the dawn of their history. They come perhaps through the stream of polytheism, but they have deeper roots than that in primitive animism. And even at that earlier stage in his development man was seeking for causes of the phenomena of nature or of personal experience. He lived in a world peopled with superhuman agencies, some beneficent, others (and more of them) malignant. The strongest influences from outside on Hebrew thought came from Babylon. There are three strange passages in the Old Testament where this influence can clearly be seen²: Isaiah xxxiv. 17 (? not later than the Exile), “the hairy satyr shall cry to his fellow, the screech-owl (= night monster) shall rest there.” Leviticus xvii. 7, “no more offer sacri-

¹ Cf. Henri Bergson, *Creative Evolution*, *passim*.

² Rev. O. C. Whitehouse, *H.D.B.* I. 593, art. “Demon.”

fices unto devils" (סַעֲרִיִּם, Satyrs ; post-exilic). Best known of all is the "scapegoat" of Leviticus xvi. 8, 10, 26 = Azazel (marg.). Azazel is not elsewhere mentioned in the Old Testament, but the Book of Enoch (second century B.C.) speaks of Azazel as leader of the evil spirits.

We note also the common Hebrew conception of the heavenly host as represented by stars—1 Kings xxii. 19 ; Judges v.

Isaiah xxiv. 21, "the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones on high" is a development of the same idea. The "host" here represents the heathen (evil) deities identified with fallen angels.¹ The doctrine of angels appears, on the other hand, to be far less ancient than the opposite doctrine. The obscure phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα (τοῦ κόσμου) in Galatians iv. 3 ; iv. 8, 9 ; Colossians ii. 8 ; ii. 20 ff. (Hebrews ii. 5 is perhaps a parallel development of the same idea) must be considered in the light of the specifically Jewish doctrine of angels, but it is possible that στοιχεῖα provides a middle term between the two doctrines of angelology and demonology. While such authorities as Lightfoot, followed by the majority of English commentators regard στοιχ. as referring to the elementary stages in the religious training of the world,² Continental commentators, following the view maintained by many of the early Fathers,³ adopt, the position that the expression refers to personal forces presiding over the physical elements of the universe.

It is to be noted that the creation of the angels is not mentioned in [the Old Testament. Like the existence of God, their existence is presupposed.⁴ In Hebrews i. 14 they

¹ Rev. O. C. Whitehouse, *H.D.B.* I. 593, art. "Demon."

² *St. Paul and Jewish Thought*, p. 163.

³ Just. Mart., Dialogue 23. Epiph. adv. Har. I. Just. M. Apol. II. 5, etc., etc.

⁴ There does not appear to be any account of the creation of the angels before the "Book of Jubilees" of the century just preceding the Christian era.

are called "spirits," but not in the Old Testament, where not even God is yet called Spirit.¹ They belong to Jehovah's retinue, they are an element of His majesty, but it is not till later ages that their relation to man gains real definiteness. Generally in the Old Testament "angel of the Lord" is a theophany, though sometimes, as in Genesis xvi. 11; xxxii. 34; xxxiii. 2 (but interpreted in xxxiii. 14, 15) a distinction appears. It is when Greek influence makes itself felt that angels become intermediate agencies between the absolute transcendent God and the world of men.

The great factor in the development of Jewish religious thought was the revelation of the one God, and this revelation was specially committed to them in contrast with the surrounding nations. The old gods were emptied of power; they were in this sense declared to be "no gods," and we are familiar with the attitude of the Jewish religious leaders in the New Testament in regard to any further revelation about the Supreme Being. But we note that the Sadducees are singled out for their denial of angels or spirits—the Pharisees and the "common people" believed both. One effect of the growing clearness of belief in the one God was that this belief involved a new loyalty, and so grew up a sharpened conception of the human will, whether in union with or opposition to the Supreme Will. From this there gradually grew up the "moral" idea which has had so great an influence on modern discussions with regard to the sources of evil in human experience. Until recently those sources were generally regarded as having root either in the inscrutable will of God or in the intractable will of man.

(III)

The Old Testament is as much a record of the education of man's spiritual faculties and perceptions as of the actual content of revelation. In the New Testament we enter

¹ A. B. Davidson, art. "Angels," *H.D.B.* I. 94, etc.

a new atmosphere. It is specifically the record of *redemptive* history, the final emancipation from the religion of fear. We see at last in clear light not only what God's purpose for man is, and what His work ; we are taught not only to realize and explore the relation in which man actually stands to God—" God so loved the world," but, too, we are taught something of the character of that conflict which God wages on man's behalf. We leave the atmosphere of primitive ideas, the influence of animism, Semitism, of Babylon, Persia, Greece. They have had their place in the education of the religious sense, they have helped to mould man's conception of the spiritual world. They have contributed much towards his understanding of the universe and of his relation to it. But their chief work has been educative, formative, preparatory. In the New Testament we are in presence of the great central Fact of human history, and in the light of that Fact we gain new understanding. The Incarnation shows God interpreting Himself in terms of human life—but it also shews God interpreting human life and all that touches it in terms of Divine knowledge and Divine purpose. And apart from the last and most terrible conflict with evil on the Cross, we can see coming athwart that Life of serene strength and clear vision a growing knowledge that that serenity and clearness involves issues with a hostile and malignant power which is something vastly more and vastly stronger than moral depravity in man. There are some instances in the Gospels where our Lord's consciousness of contact with an evil personality or power seems to be clear and outstanding.

(i.) The Temptation. (a) The form of the story is, for our present purpose, immaterial ; we are more concerned with the fact that " the ultimate source of information must have been our Lord Himself, as the most vigorous criticism admits." ¹ We may then believe that the account was given as part of the whole revelation of spiritual fact which

¹ Plummer, *St. Matt.*, p. 36.

it was our Lord's mission to give to men. And the outstanding fact of the Temptation was that of conflict. While "the meaning and essence of the Temptation is wholly spiritual; it is the problem of what is to be done with supernatural powers: shall the possessor of them use them for his own sustenance or for his own aggrandisement?"¹ the *source* of the Temptation must be recognized as lying outside our Lord's personality. It is unthinkable to ascribe the Temptation to anything approaching "moral turpitude" in the Incarnate God. It is equally unthinkable that the Father should be the source of any such testing for the Son. There remains only this: that the source of the Temptation lay in that evil personality whose hold on human nature it was the Son's purpose to subdue, and both the Father and the Son refused to evade contact with that evil personality which was the common lot of that humanity with which the Son had clothed Himself.

(b) If this is the right point of view from which to regard the Temptation, it will fall into place not merely as a preliminary to our Lord's teaching with regard to the evil that is in man, but also with His attitude towards the evil which is "outside" of man and of which he is the victim not only in his moral, but in his physical being.

(ii.) When for the first time He has called His followers to His help in liberating their fellows from bondage and they report that even the devils (*τὰ δαιμόνια*) (St. Luke x. 17) are subject unto them in His Name, there comes that strange comment; "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven howbeit, rejoice not that the spirits (*τὰ πνεύματα*) are subject unto you . . ." Is there not a sense of personal conflict between God at work in men and through men and an evil power holding men in thrall? Nor can we fail to notice that in the commission given to these seventy men there is given unmistakable evidence of the presence of

¹ Sanday, *Life of Christ in Recent Research*. Quoted by Plummer, p. 36.

this hostile power in the "serpents and scorpions" on which they had been given authority to tread. It would seem that these poisonous creatures, hostile to man, were in some mysterious way a manifestation of the "power of the enemy," and that the coming of the Incarnate Power ultimately involved their subjugation or even their destruction. St. Mark has already hinted that they were powerless in His Presence.

(iii.) Or in that scene where the Lord reveals so much of the spiritual conflict of His life (St. Luke xxii. 28 ff.): "Ye are they that have been with Me in my temptations," and He adds, addressing that disciple so fervent in emotional love, so lacking in perception of spiritual danger, "Simon, Simon, Satan asked to have you (pl.) . . . but I made supplication for thee that thy faith fail not; and do thou when once thou hast turned again establish thy brethren."

(iv.) Or, once more, in Gethsemane: "This is your hour and the power of darkness."

All of it speaks of the personal contact of the Lord of Life with a supernatural power of evil from whose grip He has come to deliver His brethren. In St. John this note is specially strong and clear. Thus, (xii. 31) "Now shall the prince of this world be cast out"; (xiv. 30) "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me" ("nothing that falls under his power." Wescott. *in loc.*); (xvi. 11) "The prince of this world is judged." We note the likeness between these passages in St. John and Ephesians ii. 2; vi. 12. The whole tone of them is in complete contrast to the received ideas of our Lord's time. There the devil is represented as the enemy of man rather than of God. Here it is a direct conflict waged by God to conquer the enemy of good, to recover the Kingdom, and therefore to set men free from thralldom.

Does it mean that those ancient intuitions, those dim fears of bygone ages, have been groundless, imaginary, false, or does it mean that, like law the schoolmaster, they

were meant to lead to the great Healer and Conqueror, the Christ of God? For it is to be remarked with special care that while our Lord completely contradicts the primitive false notions of God as a tyrant who rules in blood, He as distinctly seems to emphasize and reaffirm the truth of those primitive convictions which personified evil and gave that personified power a large share in the happenings of human life. St. Luke xii. 5 is His most impressive warning: "Fear him who after he hath killed hath power (*ἐξουσίαν*) to cast into Gehenna." And it is in absolute contrast to His teaching about the Father's thought of men which comes in the immediate context, "Fear not, ye are of more value than many sparrows."

(IV)

An examination of the records of the Lord's ministry will show that this attitude towards evil is concurrent with His teaching about God and about the Kingdom which He came to found. To Him they are both positive facts, though not yet perceived in their fullness by those among whom He lived. His first call to men is to repent—but not of their sins: "Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand." It is an announcement of His Mission, the revelation of a power strong enough to deal with the evils of which men were the victims. Sin—moral evil—did not hold nearly so large a place in their consciousness as did the obvious evils of physical suffering and disability. To Him both physical and moral evil appeared to have the same root, to spring from the same source: a power hostile to God, and therefore to man. It was part of His Mission to lead men to higher ideals of life and therefore to clearer conceptions of the meaning of sin, and He does this through those miracles of healing which show the power of evil to hurt and the power of God to heal. But first men must be taught about that kingdom of power which for the first time is clearly manifest among them. This in itself involved

a *μετάνοια*—a change of attitude—in regard to their way of thinking about the spiritual world. It was not a far-off sphere, remote from the human world, but so near and close that men were always subject to its laws and influence. And often men could only see the way when it was opened to their sight by some miracle of help. Then they could begin to understand that they were touched, not by some impalpable force, but by the pulsing vitality of Eternal Love.

But such teaching and such work does not pass without challenge. The act of casting out a dumb demon (St. Matt. xii. 22) calls forth the full virulence of enmity. And again the Lord asserts that in such acts as this, in such dealing with the spiritual foes of men manifesting their power over men's physical nature is to be found real proof of the coming of the kingdom of God. That was certainly not the view of His contemporaries. And similarly His claim on behalf of the "daughter of Abraham" (St. Luke xiii. 16) was entirely new teaching about the spiritual world and its meaning. The novelty of it lay in this, not that Satan and the evil host were enemies of man, for this had been a long-established belief, but that physical ill could be attributed to the devil, and, above all, that God would interest Himself on the sufferer's behalf. The same attitude towards the ills of humanity can be observed in the case of the man born blind (St. John ix. 1), with an equally strong repudiation of the popular belief as to the cause of the blind man's misfortune.

We are familiar with the words of command with which the Lord addresses the demons. *Φιμώθητι* (St. Mark i. 25) to the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum is characteristic of His attitude. It is one of unchallenged supremacy, of complete command. It is perhaps what we should expect. But do we equally expect to hear the same word used in healing Simon's wife's mother (St. Luke iv. 39), and in the stilling of the storm (St. Mark iv. 39)?

No theory that the Lord is accommodating Himself to the mental attitude or the intellectual level of those who surround Him will form a satisfactory explanation in these cases. They indeed serve to show the wide gulf that exists between the new Teacher and His contemporaries. And when He sends His messengers out on the errand of healing (St. Luke x.) it could scarcely be that He could offer the Father thanksgiving for successful accommodation to popular prejudice, yet He *did* offer thanks for the success of the disciples' first mission of healing, both of the sick and of the possessed.

It is in this mission that we get the first glimpse of the method the Lord will follow in bringing this power within reach of those who heed. He commissions men to act in His Name. Not only the twelve upon whom afterwards the Church shall be built up, but the seventy also. They had the same commission (so far as healing and exorcism were concerned) and the commission carried the same power with them as with the Apostles.

(v)

The time between the Resurrection and the Ascension is marked by instructions which are clearly intended to ensure the continuance of the Lord's work of conflict with the evil power which had usurped dominion over men. So strongly is this present to the mind of St. Luke, the historian of the first days, that he does not hesitate to speak (Acts i. 1) of the deeds of Jesus during His ministry as only a beginning of His work on earth. To him as to all the first disciples the Lord is still present and still working and teaching though His bodily Presence is withdrawn. And the commission to the Apostles before the Ascension emphasizes the fact that it is part of our Lord's plan that help in physical disabilities should still be given to men as well as help in spiritual necessity. It is part of the Gospel that in His Name His followers shall cast out devils (and we must

interpret this by His own acts) and lay hands on the sick that they may recover.¹

And with the coming of the promised power, *δύναμις* (Acts i. 4), we find the infant Church carrying out her commission with completely serene consciousness that she is not only obeying her Lord's command, but is indeed the living instrument through which He is Himself acting. Nothing is more clear or remarkable in the Epistles than the consciousness of the "supernatural," which is continually making itself felt. On the one hand, the Christ fulfilling Himself through the Church: "As the body is one and hath many members, so also is Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 12); on the other, part of that "fulfilling" is the making known *through the Church* "to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places" (i.e. making known to the spiritual sphere in which there are evil powers as well as good) "the manifold wisdom and the eternal purpose of God in Christ Jesus" (Eph. iii. 10, 11). So the living Church of the living Christ has a double function to perform. She has to carry on Christ's work of setting free the souls and bodies of men on earth, and by so doing she has to act as the organ of revelation to supra-mundane beings.

The sense of the power against which the Church has to wage Christ's war is not vague: it is rather cleared and sharpened as opportunity grows. It lies first in the spiritual sphere, not of men's thoughts, but of actual malignant activities: "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places." That is not an appeal to fear, it is a call to confident, purposeful action on the part of the Church as a whole, and to limit the idea of

¹ St. Mark xvi. 14 ff. It is to be noted that although this form of the Apostolic Commission is only recorded in these "doubtful" verses of St. Mark's Gospel, yet the practice of the Apostles shows that they regarded it as real.

“ the Christian warrior ” to that inner conflict by which the believer gains in patience the possession of his own soul is to rob it of its deepest significance.

(VI)

For such a work as this it is obvious that the Church will need a consciousness of corporate life through which the indwelling *δύναμις* may express itself. No single individual could hope to face alone these spiritual powers which stand in hostile array against him. He must have a sense of corporate vitality which will quicken both his sense of strength and of responsibility. Already that principle had been foreshadowed in the methods of the Lord's miracles. It is noticeable how very rarely He performs a miracle as it were single-handed and alone. Almost always He is surrounded by or He gathers together people who are animated by some common desire, some common bond of sympathy, some common hope or fear, and especially when He is about to perform a “ nature ” miracle. These men and women by their mental attitude seem to create an atmosphere in which He can work: it is only when the atmosphere is hostile or merely curious that He seeks to isolate the object of His pity.¹ And if we link together the Gospel story with the development of the Church's consciousness of herself and of her mission, we may see how the Lord was teaching her in the Gospels not only the principles which should by and by underlie her actions, but, too, the methods by which those actions could become fruitful. Read in this light there is a real purpose in that insistence on the corporate life shared by all the members of the brotherhood which is so marked a feature in the Apostolic teaching.

But while the Church grows in this consciousness of her corporate life (by which we mean not merely concerted action, but common possession of a common gift), she learns that this corporate vitality expresses itself through varying

¹ Cf. *Christus Futurus*, p. 274, etc.

gifts with which individual members of the Body are endowed. Those gifts are not for individual profit or renown. They are particular expressions of that "power" which is the common possession of the whole Body. "The diversity of function is necessary to corporate unity." And in 1 Corinthians xii. there is a whole group of charismata which refer to the aspect of the Church's work which we are considering: "Faith," "gifts of healings," "working of miracles," "discerning of spirits."

But they were not gifts to privileged persons only: there was no hierarchy of healing (to take one example) in those early days. The power was the common possession of ordinary Christians (Galatians iii. 5): "He that worketh miracles in you, doeth he it by the works of the Law or by the hearing of faith?"¹ And so it remained for the first age. The ordinary baptized member of the Church claimed and exercised this mysterious spiritual power. It was controlled and disciplined by submission to the local body²: it was to be exercised as part of the ministry of the whole Church. And here was the great contrast between the "miracles" of heathendom and the miracles of the Christian Church. The one were *τέρατα*, the others *δυνάμεις*. The one wrought by individuals with weird and terrible incantations for their own profit or renown, the other so expressive of an innate and abundant vitality that the Church had to devise rules; not for the calling out of that power, but for the regulation of its use.

While at first the power was recognized as a gift to the whole Church, it gradually came to be regarded as restricted to particular officers, ministers in the Church. It went with the ordained ministry, but it created a class of its own within the ministry. Cornelius of Rome in his letter

¹ Cf. Lightfoot's note on Gal. iii. 5.

² Even the "prophets," as they moved about among the local Churches, had to submit their credentials to the severest criticism. The Church's canon in this respect was, "Try the spirits, whether they be of God."

to Fabius of Antioch notes that among the Church officers in Rome at that time (A.D. 251) are fifty-two Exorcists and Readers as compared with thirty-six Presbyters.

And step by step the Church's perception of this common gift of power has become more and more feeble. Partly perhaps through our notion that, for instance, "possession" is an out-of-date way of accounting for certain phenomena, partly because we have displaced the early idea of the Church as a living organism by the modern notion of the Church as an organization. And partly also because the use of that power had become perverted. Exorcism had, e.g., become almost exclusively connected with baptismal rites, Unction had ceased to be used as a means of restoration, and had been restricted, at least in the West, to that form known as Extreme Unction, while in England the Sovereign alone, by virtue of his anointing at his Coronation, was supposed to retain the power of the healing touch, though even this, till its final disappearance in Queen Anne's time, was strictly confined to one class of illness.

The solitary instance in which the English branch of the Church retains some expression of the ancient faith is in the commission to "heal the sick" still given to each Bishop at his consecration. The world still needs a Gospel of Power, an evidence of that corporate vitality with which the Church was entrusted by her Lord. She is sent indeed to follow her Master's footsteps, not only "to bind up the broken-hearted," to piece together the fragments of a shattered humanity, but also to "set at liberty them that are bound." Is there any limit of time in the great commission to the Apostles, or is the limit to the power then given to them to be found in that attitude of mind which acquiesces too completely in the world's estimate of the meaning and value of spiritual force? Do we not need in humility and courage to look and see whether in this way the Lord Christ is not still waiting on the faith and knowledge of the Church in order that He may fulfil Himself?

III

THE GIFT OF THE SPIRIT

IN its present form the Nicene Creed embodies the belief of the whole Church, both Eastern and Western, in regard to the Person and work of the Holy Ghost. The elaboration of the clause in which this belief is now expressed is in marked contrast to the earlier forms of the Creed. The more elaborate form which finally became established was due (as were almost all the composite expressions in the Creeds) to an effort to set forth clearly and without ambiguity the intellectual form of a belief which had slowly been brought into shape through the fires of controversy. That long and often dangerous process served at least this purpose, that the Church gradually grew to see more clearly what the implications of her fundamental beliefs involved. Even the great controversy on the Filioque clause, which doctrinally severed the East from the West, did not confuse the final issue of belief in the Godhead of the Holy Spirit. While the immediate occasion of that controversy, fraught with consequences which have no parallel in the history of the Church until the sixteenth century, was a dispute as to the right of a local Council to alter an œcumenical document, we cannot forget that in the background there was an ancient jealousy, now, by force of recent events, growing more acute between the political centres of power in Rome and Constantinople. But two hundred years before Toledo, Constantinople had itself been the scene of the Council which had accepted a form of the Nicene Creed in which the clauses relating to belief in the Holy Ghost had

been greatly expanded. And it was that form of the Creed which, with the exception of the Filioque clause, henceforth became the accepted symbol of the Faith both in East and West. And in it the Godhead of the "Holy Spirit, the Lord and the Life giver, who proceedeth from the Father" (*Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον, καὶ τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον*) is unequivocally set forth, and even the "subordinationism" of the Eastern Church gives way before the phrase which follows the clause regarding the procession of the Holy Ghost "Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified" (*τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον*).

The subordinate clauses which gradually attached themselves to the central belief in the Holy Ghost were suggested by the observed effects of His work, and this led back to a more ample statement in regard to His Person. It is not a little remarkable that the first movement towards expanding this clause came from the Church of Jerusalem, the scene of His first activities under the new dispensation,¹ nor is it less remarkable that these new clauses have to do with His function as the "Life giver." They give us an insight into the first thoughts of the Church about that "Comforter" promised by the Lord before He suffered. She felt herself to be in touch with a new vital Power, and her history is a history of the growing conviction that she is herself the instrument and channel through which that vital Power operates.

The Acts of the Apostles—the Gospel of the Holy Ghost, as it has been called—comes also from Jerusalem, and it is the first volume of the history of that "vital activity" by which His presence is made known to men. The field of that vital activity is the application among men of that redemptive power which had been brought into operation

¹ Cf. Curtis, *History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith*, p. 73 (T. & T. Clark, 1911).

by the Life and Death of God the Son. The Christian Church affirms her belief in the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, and therefore in His eternal Nature; she traces His operations in natural law of which science is the great teacher. She sees His inspiration in the realms of art or poetry which both the ancient and the modern world has stored in the treasure-house of time. She perceives His impulses in that uplift of the moral sense which has guided mankind along the path of progress. But in the Acts of the Apostles we have the record of the beginning of a new activity of the "Giver of Life" on behalf of men. It is an activity in a world in which the gate of redemption stands open and the road to spiritual development clear. The redemptive power of God has been proclaimed and is now at work as a living force in human life and experience, and however far the circles of activity may extend, whatever varied forms the Church's energy may take, to whatever point it may ultimately reach, the centre will always be the great event of the Pentecost. And at that point those energies and that activity are indissolubly linked with the redemptive work of God the Son. That must be always not merely their background, but the measure of their purpose. The point from which they start is a vital unity, a unity of man with the eternal power of God, expressed in the living union of that little band of believers with their ascended Lord and therefore with each other. The point towards which they move is that revealed by the life and work of the Redeemer: a humanity which in Him has become a royal Priesthood. The full service of God demands at least potential perfection in His servants, and the first steps towards the completion of that perfection which lie next beyond and complementary to the personal work of the Saviour, wrought out in His life and death, are noted in the records of the Acts and the Epistles. They together form the first histories of the new ways in which God was revealing Himself as at work among men,

But it must not be supposed that the infant Church at once formulated a plan of action or a policy of expansion. The command of the Master, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," was of necessity to be the main impulse in the Apostles' life. But the full significance of that command had slowly to be learned. Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, were the first and obvious points of contact with the world, and even this limited experience served chiefly to point and sharpen the contrast between the magnitude of their task and their personal insufficiency. "There is nothing religious, nothing even deliberate about the first stages of the Church's expansion. The issue is brought about simply as the result of a divinely ordered series of events."¹ It was "the persecution that arose about Stephen" which was the occasion of the first great expansive movement, and which by and by led to the necessity of calling a council at Jerusalem to formulate a policy, although before that the Apostles had evidence that the Gentiles were also heirs of the Kingdom. It was the genius of St. Paul which really formulated a definite plan of action and developed a scheme of missionary enterprise.

The matter of supreme importance in the earliest stage of the Church's career was not to formulate a policy, but to realize and explore the meaning and range of that power which had been poured out upon her at Pentecost.

Evidence may then be looked for in the Acts of the presence and operation of that Divine power which in later years could be noted and classified according to the different directions or the various methods by which it worked. But, as yet, only in an elementary, almost undefined stage of manifestation. The mind of the Church had scarcely yet passed beyond the sense of wonder at the fact. It is only by small, even trivial, movements that she begins to perceive the operation of this new power or the laws of its working. The necessity for organizing her own charity

¹ Bishop Chase, *Credibility of the Acts*, p. 61.

is the first occasion, for instance, when she begins to see the need of an orderly development in her own constitution.¹ But until that external stimulus quickened her insight and her outlook, the indwelling vitality did not begin to clothe itself with external organization. The Apostles to whom the sacred charge had been committed, and who alone of all the Christian company had been trained under the Master's hand, were the sole depositories of all that the Church at this stage of her growth needed for authority or guidance.

But the Divine energy was there and was not quiescent. It was teaching the Church to understand and rightly to appraise her gift and her function.

As the Son Himself was the Eternal Logos (St. John i. 1), the Word, the Wisdom of God, and it was by that Word or Wisdom that the ordered creation grew to perfection, so now in the new creation (*καινή κτίσις*, 2 Corinthians v. 17) His Spirit "moves upon" the mind of the Church, gradually forming those ordered activities which later mark her as distinct, not only in form, but in being from the other organizations of human life among which she moved.

It is not unimportant to mark that little note of "objectivity" in Acts ii. 6, "and when this sound was heard (*γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης*) the multitude came together . . ." It might otherwise be possible to think of the gift of power as a mere subjective quickening of the natural qualities of that little company, stirred to its depths as it had been by the emotions of the past few weeks. It might be possible to think of that cloud of fire parting itself among them in separate tongues of flame as the vision of men in a condition of mystic exaltation; nay, the "rushing wind" might even be just the dawn-breeze as it swept across the hills and fanned the fire on the sacrificial altar near by. The varied throng of people now beginning to crowd the Temple courts for the observance of the great feast had, however, seen nothing of this, known nothing

¹ Acts vi., cf. Chase, p. 62.

of that little band of men and women gathered together in prayer, uplifted with the spirit of expectation. But they *had* heard the sound of the rushing wind, so unusual, so unexpected, that the crowd is moved by a common impulse of inquiry into the meaning of so strange a portent. The incident has its place in the narrative, and it serves to strengthen the whole impression that something quite outside the ordinary experience of men had occurred within the circle of the followers of the crucified Nazarene.

And the importance of the objective view of this occurrence has not lessened with time. At first the hardest task of the infant Church was to meet the criticism of those who despised her premises and disputed her conclusions.

But as time went on, while her difficulties changed in character, they did not grow less formidable. She had always to commend herself and her message to a world where she did not stand alone in her claim to spiritual leadership.

To-day the problems of human personality, of the scarcely yet discovered power of the subliminal self, of the laws of suggestion and kindred psychological realities, raise questions of which in her infancy the Church never dreamed.¹ And it is in view of these questions of to-day that it is specially worth while remembering how that the account in the Acts of the outpouring of the Spirit is couched in terms which support a real, objective view of that event.

Just as a Christian view of the scientific doctrine of evolution refuses to ignore the thrice-repeated בָּרָא (created) of Genesis i. 1; i. 21; i. 27; marking the introduction of some new order of creation, something not evolved from previous stages,² and testifying to the work and purpose of

¹ For examples of these problems consult, e.g., Myers, *Human Personality*; James, *Varieties of Religious Experiences*; Streeter (ed.), *The Spirit, God and His Relation to Man*.

² Although it cannot be argued that there is an absolute distinction between בָּרָא and עָשָׂה to the extent that "ב" refers only to a creation *ex nihilo*," while "ע" refers to operations on material already available," yet "ב" is certainly used exclusively by God

a transcendent God, so in the account of the beginning of the new creation we cannot overlook the fact that it is not ascribed to some power of development, of adaptation, of progress inherent in man, but to a fresh movement of the Holy Spirit of God acting on the spirit of man, but acting first as transcendent rather than as immanent God. Are we not here in presence of the largest movement in God's purpose for the redemption, the freedom of man, body, soul and spirit ?

The Gospel of the good news proclaimed by the Lord Christ was attested by the miracles He wrought, which thus became as important in regard to His message as in regard to His Person. The words used in the New Testament to describe them are as far removed as possible from the idea of prodigy or portent which underlay the word in common use among non-Christian writers to describe anything which might be considered of miraculous nature: the word *τέρας*. That term is never used alone in the New Testament, though indeed there was much in the Lord's miracles to rouse thought and wonder in the minds of the beholders. But, on the contrary, the New Testament terms always serve to suggest higher thoughts¹ about the miracles than that of mere magic or occult power. Chief among those terms, and most descriptive of their place in the Divine teaching, is *σημεῖα*, "signs," manifestations of God's power exercised on man's behalf against a common foe. The whole nature of man was in bondage, body as well as soul and spirit, and Christ had come to free it as a whole. It is not difficult to understand why His Gospel of freedom had its expression in terms of physical healing and refreshment, as well as in terms of spiritual restoration, when we reflect that our Lord's treatment of sickness and disease shows

to denote, viz., the production of something fundamentally new by the exercise of sovereign originative power, altogether transcending that possessed by man," cf. Driver, *Genesis*, p. 3 (ed. 1906).

¹ Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, p. 343.

them to be in His mind the counterpart in the physical sphere of evil and sin in the moral sphere, and that both alike are contrary to the good will of God. Moralists before Him had taught men something of the nature of spiritual evil, or had sought to explain the presence of physical ill, but no one had linked the two together as He did and treated them as having a common source, claiming lordship over man's whole nature.

To adapt an ancient phrase describing the Church, the Gospel miracles were "extensions of the Incarnation," inasmuch as they were an "embodiment" in action of Divine grace working in a physical direction as afterwards the Sacraments became an "embodiment" of Divine grace working in a spiritual direction. They both take their rise from the same source: God bringing redemptive power to bear on individual needs.

The Holy Spirit came in order to carry on His work and in order that this redemptive power consummated on the Cross might still be assured to men in all its fullness. And one of the signs that this freedom was still operative in bringing man and all his needs into direct contact with that Divine power is the working of miracles by the Apostles, which forms so large a part of their first activities. They were reckoned, indeed, by St. Paul (2 Corinthians xii. 12) as signs of an Apostle in the same way that they had been claimed by the Lord Himself as evidence of His Divine mission (St. John x. 25).

The miracles wrought by the Lord Himself and those wrought by His Spirit through the Apostles are described by the same terms (*σημεῖα, δυνάμεις*), words which seem expressly used to emphasize the note of living power, and to lead our thoughts at once from the miracles themselves to the Source from which they come and to which they must be traced. It is the same power now working in the Church as that which worked in the Great Founder of the Church: the gift of the Spirit assured the permanence of

that relation between God and man which had been established in the person of the Saviour and in which the Son would be found to be "all in all fulfilling Himself" (Ephesians i. 20).

We proceed then to inquire into the method by which this power (*δύναμις*), coming to man from a source external to himself, manifested itself.

The following classification of the spiritual gifts, agreeing in the main with that given by Tertullian, is suggested:—

- (i.) Charismata of Power (Tert., *Sermo intelligentiæ et consilii*).
- (ii.) Charismata of Sympathy (Tert., *Spiritus religionis et timoris Dei*).
- (iii.) Charismata of Administration (Tert., *Valentiæ Spiritus*).
- (iv.) Charismata of Utterance (Tert., *Genera Linguarum: interpretatio sermonorum*).

An examination of the Acts of the Apostles will show, we believe, these spiritual gifts manifesting themselves in the earliest days of the Church's life, even though that life is not yet organized. Nor need it be organized in order that the presence of the Charismata may be discovered, for they are signs of the Church as an organism, part of her very vitality, before they take their place in her system of organized activity.

It is sufficient for the Apostles at the outset of their ministry that they could work in the Name of Jesus the Nazarene and that work done in His Name was effective. It carries on for them an experience already begun in the Gospels (e.g. St. Luke ix. 49; x. 17). And the value of their personal training in discipleship by the Master was put to the test almost at once, for both the Jews and the Samaritans appear to have shared with other Oriental peoples at this time a belief that certain quasi-personal powers (*δυνάμεις*) or emanations of the Godhead were

revealed or became incarnate in the person of men.¹ The first question of the Sanhedrin to St. Peter and St. John, on examining them with regard to the miracle performed at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, was (Acts iv. 7), "In what Name or by what Power have ye done this?" and, contemptuous though the question be in form, it yet gives expression to a fear of something supernatural lurking behind such events as those which were disturbing the serenity of the Holy City. Still more marked, and perhaps still more credulous, is the readiness with which the Samaritans gave a hearing to Simon Magus, calling him the Great Power of God (Acts viii. 10). But unlike Simon, the Apostles set before themselves as their chief aim, not the working of miracles, wonders and signs, but the vindication of the claim of Jesus Christ to be the long-foretold Messiah. As in the work of the Master, the miracles were still incidental to the main object of their efforts. And the Apostles (in contrast to the false teachers of their time) consistently refused to allow themselves to be regarded as anything more than the instruments and servants of their invisible Head. They could appeal to ancient prophecy and point to Jesus the Nazarene as fulfilling it, and their appeal was so convincing that their critics and judges could not but acknowledge the cogency of their arguments even while they refused consent to them. The miracles were in this sense "accidental," not part of the main purpose of the Apostles' work and teaching. But they were so clearly a consequence of "faith in His Name" that the disciples began to perceive in them evidence that the power which they had seen to be at work in the days when they were learning the first lessons of the Gospel message had not been withdrawn, but was still operative for the help of man. Before long this is recognized in the Acts, not as an abstract possibility, but as a fact of actual experience. The power (*δύναμις*) promised by the

¹ Cf. Page, *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 132 (quoting Milman, *Hist. Ch.* ii. 5).

Lord (Acts i. 8) has indeed been given and is capable of proof.

In St. Luke's account of the Lord's ministry, the outpouring of the Spirit upon Him is regarded as covering the whole of His ministerial life¹; so in St. Luke's account of the first beginnings of the Church the same outpouring upon the Christian body is regarded as having the same purpose and consequence. The *δύναμις* is ere long manifested in *δυνάμεις*—miracles, which are the clearest and most obvious signs of the presence of the Holy Spirit.² They are not yet recognized and classed as a definite charisma of the whole Body, for the special agents through whom alone at first they are wrought are the leaders of the little band of Christians, the men who from the beginning had "compared with the Lord Jesus," and the significant note is added, "beginning from the Baptism of John," i.e. from the first outpouring of the Spirit in which they are now consciously sharing.³

But it is not long before it becomes clear that the operation of this power is not to be confined simply to the leaders themselves, for St. Stephen is described as one who "wrought great wonders and signs among the people" (Acts vi. 8), and though his acts are not formally named as *δυνάμεις*, yet they are referred to the operation of the central *δύναμις*. He has been called to share by the laying on of hands in the endowment which was indeed common to the whole Church, but which was specially manifested in the first days as a charisma of the Apostles.

The two instances in the Acts where this power was brought to bear on moral and not on physical ills (Acts v.; Acts xiii.) serve to emphasize the fact that it was given to furnish the Church with weapons of warfare against evil in all its forms. The tremendous denunciation of the sin of Ananias and Sapphira, and the scathing rebuke of Elymas

¹ Cf. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 56.

² Acts i. 8 (ii. 22), (iii. 12), iv. 7; iv. 33; vi. 8; viii. 13; xix. 11.

³ Acts i. 21-2.

bring out vividly the real character of the evil against which the Church as the "Body of Christ," endowed with His Spirit, is called to fight. They suggest the existence of a law of spiritual correspondence by which the human will has some active share with the Divine will in the restraint of the destructive power of evil, a share which depends for its full activity upon that "will to good" which was part of God's original endowment of the human spirit and which is lost when that human will is so far perverted that, putting itself in active opposition to the holiness of God, it forfeits the protection of His love.

They are illustrations within the immediate experience of the Church of the power of the Evil One to hurt the body as well as the soul, against whom the Lord warned His hearers when He was laying down the conditions under which the Gospel of love should displace the religion of fear and so bring man to the full realization of the true life in Christ.¹

It is to be noted that in both cases the spiritual perversion preceded the physical penalty, and was the occasion of it. In the case of Ananias there is no evidence that St. Peter intended to pass "sentence of death." He simply revealed the enormity of the sin, and physical death came upon Ananias because he had himself killed that principle of spiritual life which would have been able to resist the onslaught of the King of Terrors. It is the occasion which is startling as well as the fact, for it is an emphatic assertion that the whole life of man, physical as well as spiritual, depends upon his union with God, the Source of life.

But they have this significance also in the present inquiry. They are the first recorded instances of that power of "discerning spirits" (*διακρίσεις πνευμάτων*) which was recognized later² as one of the definite charismata of the Holy Spirit. And in the case of Elymas, the authority which that particular gift conveys seems to extend even to defining the penalty to be suffered.

¹ St. Luke xii. 5.

² 1 Cor. xii. 8.

But generally the activity through which this Divine energy displayed itself was, in the records of the Acts, that of ministry or service, *διακονία*. It was the way in which the Church began to realize the meaning of her corporate vitality in the direction of mutual duty. The energy of the indwelling spirit is not here displayed in opposition to the evil in the world, but as meeting the varying needs of the members of the Body. They are generally, in the Acts and the Epistles, spiritual needs to which the Church ministers, and thus the significance of *διακονία* differs here from its significance in the Gospels, where it implies, if it does not explicitly mention, service to bodily needs.¹

But even so, the Lord's application of the term to His own work² fills out its meaning in either direction. And although from the first beginnings of the Apostles' thought of *διακονία*, as applying to their mission³ it is in connection with spiritual things, yet the occasion of the appointment of the seven⁴ arose from the necessity of making provision for "serving tables." But so important a part was this ministry to take in the development of the Church's corporate life that only those were to be chosen for the office who were "full of spirit and wisdom."⁵

Other charismata also can be seen in operation in the Acts, though not yet formally classified. Some grew in importance, some waned, or at least became locally disused.⁶ Among the former, "prophecy" seems rapidly to have become an outstanding mark of the continued presence and work of the Holy Spirit, for although not formally named it appears in several passages.⁷ *Παράκλησις*, (consolation) seems so far to become a personal endowment as to be embodied as an outstanding characteristic in the "Christian

¹ Cf. St. Matt. iv. 11; St. Luke x. 40.

² St. Luke xxii. 27. ³ Acts i. 18, 25.

⁴ Acts vi. 2. ⁵ Acts vi. 3.

⁶ Cf. Swete, *Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 99 n.

⁷ Acts xi. 27; xiii. 1; xv. 32; xxi. 9 f.

name" given to one of the Apostles. *Ἀντιλήψεις* (helps) is foreshadowed perhaps in St. Paul's address to the Ephesian elders.¹

We do not propose to discuss the meaning of these gifts of the Spirit at this point, but only to mark their significance in regard to the whole life of the Church. It is to be noted that the chief gifts in the Acts have all to do with the corporate life of the Church, not with the individual lives of her members.² The virtues or gifts which belong to the latter are of a different order and have to do with excellences of moral or spiritual character. They are summed up in Galatians v. 22, where these personal virtues are described as the fruit of the Spirit, i.e. the effect of spiritual vitality within the individual.

Doubtless the charismata of power or of sympathy or of administration or of utterance are bestowed chiefly if not solely upon those who respond most completely to the working of the Spirit in their individual lives (St. Barnabas is perhaps an illustration of this), but there is behind this personal aspect a sense of something larger. The Church as a whole is entrusted with a mission for God in the world, and the gifts by means of which she carries out this mission are gifts of the Spirit which animates and endows her whole corporate life. It is by the standard of this corporate life and activity that individual gifts or qualities are measured and placed. In the Acts we witness the outpouring of this central vitality upon Gentiles as well as Jews,³ and we see some indications of the directions in which that vitality will work, or the methods by which it will express itself, but it is not till we read the Epistles that we can fully realize in the various charismata in actual operation the abundance of the gifts with which God has endowed the Church for her great mission.

The history of the Church is a record of the expansion of

¹ Acts xx. 35.

² St. Peter's defence implies this.

³ Acts x. 46.

opportunity, and "history is the handiwork of God": as Goethe's "Time Spirit" sings:

'Tis thus at the loom of Time I ply
And weave for God the garment thou seest Him by.

And this is especially true of the history of the Church. Guided by experience she can confidently appeal to the principles which have defined her life from the earliest days. But she is not a casket of jewels, exquisite and precious: she is a living entity in which the Spirit lives and works, she is the instrument through which God reaches mankind to-day, and as she faces the problems of to-day and to-morrow, she may well turn to the long yesterday of her past to scan again the beginnings of that activity of the Spirit of which it is the privilege of her calling to be the living channel. She can see in those early records how the Spirit of God endowed her (and through her, her individual members) for her special work, and she may humbly believe that those endowments are commensurate with the demands which at the present time, no less than in those early days, are being made upon her faith and energy. But to-day, as in the first days, the gifts are a corporate endowment, and in order to secure their full development, she must now, as then, continually seek to renew her sense of corporate unity and corporate mission.

That is the task to-day before the broken unity of Christendom: not first the piecing together of separated organizations, but the welding together in a renewed sense of corporate life and possession of that organism through which it pleases God the Holy Spirit to reveal Himself to the world. It is thus from the standpoint of life, rather than that of machinery, that the historic development of the Church needs to be studied.

IV

GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT (I)

THE years covered by the narrative of the Acts are not only years of great missionary activity on the part of the infant Church, during which a policy of action was slowly evolved, it is a period also of exploration in the realm and measure of spiritual power. The double movement in her life ran on parallel lines; it was both intensive and extensive. The Church is learning the real meaning of the Gospel. It is not only a message from God in heaven, it is not only an appeal to higher motives and standards for men. It is all this, but it is much more besides. It is a vital force, actually touching the lives of men, actually capable of demonstration both as a power of spiritual regeneration in individual lives and as a power which could reach those needs which seemed to men to be external to their inner being. In attempting any estimate of the power of the Gospel in those early days, the miraculous element must be given full weight. It arrested attention, it stirred men to consider the message with which the miracles were inseparably connected. They challenged them to realize its intrinsic value. But more than that the miracles of the early Church challenged men to revise their whole view of life, of their relation to God and to the world in which they lived. The miracles, and especially the miracles of healing, demonstrated to them that their view that God was the author of the ills which oppressed them, needed revision; they saw a work going on which claimed to be the work of God, and which

was as potent to relieve their bodily ills as to release their souls from spiritual bondage. They could see, if they would, that the power of God was present to heal, and that the holiness of God was to be reflected in the wholeness of man. The redemption of the body was to them a completely new idea. It dawned on the world with the Incarnation of God, and as yet the fact and the implications of the Incarnation were but dimly perceived. It would appear that the physical miracles, whether of the Gospels or of later days, had this for their ultimate object : to demonstrate to men God's will for their salvation from the Evil One, whatever the form the malignity of that Evil One might take. Men found that God was not afar off, One whom they might reach with infinite toil and trouble, but One Who Himself was seeking them, seeking avenues through which He might reach them and bring release.

Very slowly the Church in the New Testament begins to learn and to understand the conditions under which that power acts and the end towards which it moves. New conditions continually arise in which she must test the validity of that vital force. But in each case it answers to the test and its reality and power become more and more evident. It is clear at once that "the Name" and faith in the Name is the pivot on which all fresh experience is to turn. And for men of Jewish training like the Apostles "the Name" had a special and peculiar significance as a religious fact. It had meant in the history of the chosen people a revelation of God, an attribute of His holiness, love or power, which they had to learn to understand as a condition of advance in spiritual life. Only, for the Apostles "the Name" was now inseparably associated with One of Whom they had personal and intimate knowledge, Whose days had been spent among them as a friend, Whose counsels were known to them, Whose purpose had been consummated in personal encounter with that evil force which it was the obverse of His Gospel to reveal. It was only when measured by the

standard of His life that the earliest disciples could begin to perceive the thralldom of evil over humanity, and could begin to measure the meaning of the mission of release with which they had been entrusted. And although the full meaning of that mission only gradually appeared as the horizon slowly widened, it was clear from the first that its purpose was to carry on the work of the Master in the Master's spirit. They were soon to learn that the meaning of the Pentecost was that their work was also to be carried on in and with the Master's power. We are so accustomed to the miraculous element in the New Testament that we are apt to overlook its real significance. We do not, for instance, take sufficient account of the complete revolution which had occurred in the minds and ideas of those first teachers of Christianity, nor which more slowly took effect among those who were compelled, whether willingly or not, to recognize the new movement. It was not altogether a matter of surprise that miraculous powers should be manifested in a single individual. Many causes hidden from common sight might conduce to that. They might be accounted for by training, by environment, by personal holiness. And yet even if all these elements had their place there was still a sense of wonder apparent among the people. St. John Baptist, the most commanding figure of his time, "did no miracle," and so it would seem that the Teacher of Nazareth was in touch with a power which could not be accounted for simply by training or by environment, or even by personal holiness.

But the wonder with which the people and the disciples had watched those works of the Master deepened into awe, and even into fear,¹ as they perceived that the power had not been withdrawn with His departure, but was clearly still flowing out, still clearly as active and as efficient as in the days of the Master's earthly life.

The meaning of it seemed to be that the power which was

¹ Acts ii. 43.

so absolutely manifested in the Master's life and work (and His life and work is, *par excellence*, the Gospel) was to have permanent place in the world, was to be an abiding element in the new relation between God and man which He had established. Only, there must still be an open channel down which this power can flow, and it is to be found in the company of men and women who, bound together in loyalty and love, were called by their Lord to be the body through which He could still manifest the completeness of His saving power to men.

It is not, then, sufficient to limit the place of the Apostolic miracles simply to their evidential value in support of the Apostolic claims. It is not enough to think of them merely as stirring the hearts of men, uplifting their thoughts towards the light, leading their reason once more into touch with the Divine Logos. The miracles did all this, but they did much more. They were not merely "the winged sandals and the staff of the messengers."¹ They were part of the equipment of the Church, for they were part of the first Evangel which Jesus sent His messengers to preach. And the charismata grew out of them. They, too, were miraculous, not in the sense of being portents or marvels, incapable of being brought into subjection to the known laws of nature, but miraculous in the sense that they were signs of the presence still among men of that new vital force which they had first perceived in the life of the Nazarene Teacher.

In the Acts we see the outpouring of the Spirit which is to ensure this end, the single gift of vitality which is to energize all the future life and work of the Church. We can see some indications of the method, some foreshadowings of the direction in which that vitality will work and will show itself. But the book of the Acts is like the first sketch of a great picture. The landscape is indicated rather than defined, the *motif* beginning to declare itself, but not yet

¹ St. Thomas Aquinas.

complete with all its implications. It is enough to point those who have eyes to see to a great conception: it shows a master mind at work, but the stages are as yet elementary. The main theme here is the Gospel of deliverance, and the barriers which it will have to attack as well as the avenues along which it will travel are indicated. A growing consciousness of corporate life with its corollary of corporate mission, a not less clear sense of the nature of the difficulties to be encountered, difficulties which are consistently ascribed to a power which is not measured by merely human misunderstanding or ill will, and with it all a joyous, elastic sense of the possession of a life, a vitality, which will be equal to all the demands which may be made upon it. These are the characteristics of the earliest days. If St. Stephen has his vision of the power that will help men to die worthily—a vision not without its effects on the onlookers,¹ St. Paul has his vision of the power that will help men to live worthily: a vision that never loses its appeal nor abates its force as the great apostle of the nations fulfils his life work in teaching men to realize that new life of the Spirit, which, touching the very springs of man's spiritual being, spreads out in ever-widening circles to influence and affect the outermost bounds of his natural needs.

The sketch which we can trace in the Acts we can see being filled out in the Epistles. To follow the steps of St. Paul in his missionary journeys is to discover the demands which will be made upon the charismatic gifts of the Church. And the Epistles reflect those demands and show how they were met. Sometimes, as in the earlier Epistles, it is personal growth, moral and spiritual, which calls forth teaching about the spiritual gifts. Sometimes the teaching is evoked by the presence of some spirit of hostility without, sometimes by lack of perception or of proportion within the Church. Here it is for edification, there it is for organization. In one letter the Apostle may deal with particular

¹ Cf. Acts vi. 15.

circumstances, in another he may lay down axioms of universal application. Sometimes he seems to speak as a prophet, applying the truth to the special needs of a local body of Christians, sometimes he speaks as a seer, thinking in "universals" and bringing the life of the Church within the sweep of eternal laws. But always the governing idea for him of the Christian Church is that it is a life "in Christ," and through Him, a life that has its centre and pivot in a realm which lies outside and beyond the ordinary purviews of human activity, but which must nevertheless be translated into action and conduct of which men can become at any rate cognizant.

To understand something of what the charismata meant to St. Paul and something, therefore, of what he meant the Church to understand by them, it will be best to take the Epistles in groups, bound together and distinguished as those groups are by some special central idea called forth by the special necessities which dictated their composition. And we must bear in mind while we try to estimate the meaning and the place in the life of the Church of particular charismata that the whole conception of the separate gifts has a broad and deep background in that thought of *χάρις* as the "favour" or "good will" of God which is so characteristically the thought attached to it in the New Testament. The word passed through many stages before it reached this special tone, but having reached it, that note is never entirely absent in New Testament usage. And the charismata are based on it to such an extent that on the one hand that eternal life which is the gift of God in Jesus Christ is described as a charisma, while on the other the word is also used of the individual fitness for the married or the unmarried state. The former use is indeed peculiar to the passages in the Epistle to the Romans: "elsewhere it appears always to be used for those personal endowments which are the gifts of the Spirit"¹ But they are very widely

¹ Sanday and Headlam, *Epistle to the Romans*.

differing gifts, ranging, e.g., from apostleship to almsgiving, from prophecy to personal kindness. And while their wide variety suggests that some of them may be what are called "natural" gifts, yet the implication in the New Testament is always that the gifts are connected with the supernatural life of the Christians in whom they are manifested. Some of the gifts may be classed as "private," i.e. as having to do with the personal character of the recipient and manifested in his private personal acts. Some, on the other hand, may have to do more directly with the "public" life of the Christian community, but both classes alike are to find their measure and standard of value in the corporate consciousness which was to be shared by every individual member of the Church. And indeed it seems in 1 Corinthians xii. 31 as though the Apostle wished his converts to realize that those gifts which were most useful to the common life of the Church were to be reckoned as the greater gifts, though, distrustful of that factious spirit which had already showed itself in the Corinthian Church, he at once goes on to insist on the unrivalled supremacy of that love which along with faith and hope not only may, but must, be a common and fundamental possession of all Christians.¹ It is by this virtue alone that all the charismata can become fruitful, for love alone demonstrates that the possessor of any particular charisma stands in that right relation to God and man which enables him to use his gift with rightful purpose and in the true direction.

The moral basis on which the use of the charismata must rest is not dependent simply on the special circumstances of any particular group of Christians: it belongs absolutely to the primary relationship in which Christians stand to God. They are not only "called,"² nor even only "called to be saints"³: they are called to be bond-servants (*δοῦλοὶ*) of Christ,⁴ so that with the vigorous life which is theirs in

¹ 1 Cor. xiii.

² Romans i. 6.

³ Romans i. 7.

⁴ Eph. vi. 6.

Christ there must always go the sense that that life in all its manifestations is His only, and must be developed and used only in His service. This would be a corrective against pride of possession in the Christian Church, and it would be no less the standard by which might be judged the true character of those gifts displayed by individuals both within and without the Church. The vitalizing element in the charismata, as in all other relations of the Christian Church, lay in that spirit of love which showed itself in service, whether of her Lord or of her brethren.

The earliest group of St. Paul's Epistles is that of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, and they give us the first glimpse in the New Testament of European Christianity. There is evidence in them of much disquiet and unrest among the Christians of that important Macedonian city. The Jews from the outset had been bitterly hostile to the new teaching and teachers.¹ But they were not the greatest nor the subtlest danger. The old heathen standards of life and worship were powerful and attractive. The new standard of Christianity was difficult and arduous. But though both these dangers added to the difficulties of these young Christians, they were dangers external to the Church and against which they could be on their guard. There was a more serious danger within the body itself, more difficult for them to recognize and deal with since it appeared to be the outcome of a spiritual gift: the gift of prophecy.² It tended to create an unbalanced, almost hysterical attitude of mind, and to lay them open to the machinations of evil men—even, perhaps, to expose them to the imposition of forged messages purporting to come from the apostle himself. To meet their need for perseverance and for discernment, St. Paul reminded them of the "power" which had been manifested among them at the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.³ The term may be used here to emphasize the inspiration which was beyond mere

¹ Acts xvii.

² I Thess. v. 14 ff.

I Thess. i. 5.

eloquence and which compelled the assent of those who listened with open hearts. But the Gospel came "in power and in the Holy Spirit," and this conjunction, taken together with the command "despise not prophesyings,"¹ implies that the Thessalonian Christians were, in their measure, endowed with the charismata as were other members of the Church. And their gifts were to find practical use in face of their particular dangers and needs. While they looked forward to the Parousia, the coming of the Lord, they were to realize that whether He came sooner or later, their proper preparation for His coming lay in the right use of that power which had been given them for building up a life of faith and holiness which had already made them examples to Macedonia and Achaia.² But while they must not despise prophesyings, as their experience with regard to prophesyings about the immediate coming of the Lord might have tempted them to do, they are, still depending on the gift of the Holy Spirit, to "prove all things," or to "hold fast that which is good."³ That brings into view something greater than an individual judgment and measure, something which will by its operation give stability and firmness to each Christian who may be affected by the test, and we are irresistibly reminded that when the apostle at a little later date gives directions to the Roman Church with regard to the use of this same gift of prophecy, he directs it to be exercised "according to the proportion of the faith" (*τῆς πίστεως*),⁴ as though the Christian consciousness of the truth (i.e. the Gospel) expressing itself as an attribute of the Christian Body should be the rule and test of even undoubted gifts with which individuals

¹ 1 Thess. v. 20.

² 1 Thess. i. 7.

³ 1 Thess. v. 21.

⁴ Rom. xii. 6. S. and H. refer *τῆς πίστεως* to the faith of the individual prophet (subjective). But many commentators take *π.* objectively, and having regard to the fact that it is the corporate use of the various gifts which is here being considered, a corporate standard of judgment may be predicated in the use of *π.* as a test of the validity of the prophesyings.

may be endowed. Without this corporate consciousness of truth actively asserting itself as a test to which every gift must respond if it would prove its validity, the Church will fail to fulfil her great mission, and will instead become the prey of mutually destructive elements. This is insisted on in other of the apostolic letters, dealing with other aspects of the Church's life, but the peculiar dangers of the Thessalonian Church bring it at once to the forefront of the apostle's mind. It is precarious to hazard the conjecture that 1 Thessalonians v. 20 "implies the existence of an order of prophets" ¹ as a definite part of local Church organization, though their recognition already in Syrian Antioch (Acts xiii. 1) would not preclude this on the ground of the early date of the Epistle. But the whole tone of the Thessalonian letters is so full of the note of personal spiritual life, and so completely dissociated from teaching about the organization of the Church, that it seems better to regard the prophesying as a gift diffused in the body and manifested through certain individuals (perhaps visitors to Thessalonica from neighbouring Churches) than to think of it as referring to a special order of Church ministers locally established. The confusion and distress of mind which had so troubled the Thessalonians was largely due to those who claimed to speak as prophets ² ("by spirit"), and whatever latitude was allowed to prophets, a local "order of prophets" would have been subject to tests which would have reduced their opportunity of misleading their hearers to a minimum.

While the Thessalonian letters "do not carry us beyond the experience of primitive Christianity,"³ it is clear that the Christians of that Greek seaport city, finding it hard to struggle against external hostility, whether of Jewish origin or of heathen practice, finding it still harder to main-

¹ Pullan, *The Books of the New Testament*, p. 128.

² 2 Thess. ii. 2.

³ Swete, *Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 176.

tain a calm serenity of faith in face of distracting claims to direction from self-appointed and unscrupulous teachers, are taught to rely upon the guidance and inspiration of a Spirit the evidence of Whose presence was to be sought first in moral courage and purified ideas of life, but Who also was not without witness in those charismata which were the possession of the whole Body and by which they should be able justly to appraise the source and value of individual inspiration.

The next group of Pauline Epistles—Romans, 1, 2 Corinthians, Galatians—may be described as the anti-Judaic group, for running through them all is a common view of the Christian defence against the Judaisers. But each member of the group has its special method of dealing with the common problem. In one is developed philosophical argument, in another a system of practical theology. Already there appear in view the two great hindrances to the acceptance and expansion of Christianity which have marked its history through all its stages of development: the intellectual fallacy and the magical fallacy.¹ The great Apostle of the Gentiles is aware of them and of the hold they have upon those to whom he is sent to preach a living gospel of deliverance. The magical fallacy was predominant among the Judaisers, for to them it was inconceivable that God could act outside the bounds of the ancient ordinances. Circumcision and the observance of the Law were not merely the sole passports to Divine favour: they practically compelled it. The intellectual fallacy, too—that which mistakes theology for religion—is met and answered in these great Epistles of Christian apologetic. It is in the Epistles of the Captivity that the apostle shows by the breadth and splendour of his own vision the utter inadequacy of theology alone to capture the inner secrets of that spiritual vitality which is the distinctive feature of the Christian faith. But he does not wait for

¹ Peile, *The Reproach of the Gospel*, p. 69.

these later letters before setting forth a doctrine of the operation of the Holy Spirit which will equip his converts in such fashion that they will be able to stand firm before the assaults of those who sought their inspiration either in the "magical" or the "intellectual" fallacy.

For the purposes of our analysis it will be convenient to place the Epistle to the Galatians first, both because of its relation to the slightly later Epistle to the Romans where a doctrine of the charismata is more fully worked out in relation to the problem which is common to both Epistles, and because in Galatians the fundamental doctrine of the relation between the Holy Spirit and the Christian converts is set forth in clear and concise terms. It is a redemptive relation and is established as a consequence and result of the redemptive work of God the Son. "God sent forth His Son,¹ made of a woman, made under law, that He might redeem those under law, that we might receive the adoption," and "because you are sons, God sent forth² the spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." "The purpose of the Son's mission was to give the rights of sonship; the purpose of the Spirit's mission, to give the power of using them."³

This vitalizing relationship shows itself in those moral qualities which mark the difference between those who walk by Spirit, and those who obey the lusts of the flesh.

It is important that this true relation of the Holy Spirit to the whole nature of man and to all his qualities should be understood from the first, for without such understanding it would be impossible to gain a clear perception of the meaning of those gifts which marked off the Christian community as different from the people among whom they lived. The gifts, charismatá, which were evident

¹ Gal. iv. 4-6.

² ἐξαπέστειλεν. Cf. St. Luke xxiv. 49, of the mission of the Apostles. The mission of the Son, of the Holy Ghost and of the Church are thus linked together.

³ Swete, *Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 204.

among them were not to be ascribed to natural powers, they were not to be dissociated from the whole faith which the Christians held and professed, they were to be regarded as not merely a consequence of that faith, but as a distinguishing mark of it; they were, in fact, gifts of the religion of the Incarnation and of it alone. They were direct manifestations in terms which all could acknowledge of that law of life based on the love of God which it was the mission of the Son to establish, of the Spirit to empower, of the Church to proclaim and to verify.

And before such manifestation the "magical fallacy" of the Judaizing party must give way. It is the very point of the apostle's argument against these opponents of the Christian Church that they could show no such evidences of vitality. Their adherence to the law, their scrupulous observance of the rites of their religion, did not carry them beyond the region of moral rectitude. Their attitude towards the fact of evil, whether in the world at large or in individuals, whether manifested in moral weakness or physical infirmity, was entirely negative. Their outlook was bounded by the requirements of the Law, their ancient sacrificial code had scarcely looked beyond the necessity for repairing ceremonial faults. But those who had heard the Gospel of the Love of God had been called into such obvious union with a supernatural power, enabling them to meet and overcome evil in all its myriad forms, that the apostle reminds his readers that here lay their strongest weapon of defence, the most convincing argument for loyalty. The evidence of the truth of their claims is to be sought, not only in the cleansed and purified lives of the members of the Church, but also, and with even greater cogency, in those miracles (*δυνάμεις*) which are the direct outcome of the supply of the Spirit,¹ the actual and visible fruit of that baptismal union with the Incarnate Christ by which the channel of the Spirit's operations were freely

¹ Gal. iii. 2 ff.

opened to them. Their baptism had been a true new birth (*παλιγγενεσία*),¹ the life which was thus given to them was the first stage of that new creation² (*καινή κτίσις*) now manifesting itself in the microcosm of each individual soul within the Church, but already part of that greater *παλιγγενεσία* which the Lord Himself had taught His disciples to expect when the work of deliverance should have been fully accomplished.³ In the days of His earthly life, the contrast between the great Forerunner and the Christ lay just in this that while John the Baptist did no miracle, the very signs which Jesus wrought were proof to those who saw them of the truth of His claim; ⁴ and proof too of the truth of the Forerunner's claim to be the messenger of One greater than himself. And as in those days the darkness did not overcome (*οὐ κατέλαβεν*)⁵ the light, so in these days of testing and trial for the Galatian Christians, the "light" still showing itself by these wondrous signs would not be overcome by the surrounding darkness.

That the miraculous gift mentioned in Galatians iii. 5 was the common possession of ordinary members of the Church, and not the possession only of their teachers, may be inferred both from the whole tenor of the Epistle—written to reassure a body of ordinary Christians, not trained teachers or missionaries—and bringing to mind things of ordinary occurrence within the circle of the Christian society, and also from the fact that St. Paul had withdrawn from this dangerous region, to be followed as soon as possible by his co-missionaries, St. Silas and St. Timothy.⁶ There is no evidence yet of the appointment of successors to these apostolic men, to whom the ordinary folk might look for a continuation of the manifestation of miraculous power as by right of office. On the contrary. St. Paul deals with the question here, as he does in the

¹ Titus iii. 5.

³ St. Matt. xix. 28.

⁵ St. John i. 5.

² Gal. vi. 15.

⁴ St. John x. 41.

⁶ Acts xvii. 14-16.

Corinthian Church, on the assumption that it is an acknowledged fact that his converts *do* possess these extraordinary powers.¹ That is a fact of very great importance, for in a peculiarly graphic way it depicts the apostle as urging on his converts a means of stabilizing their own faith and of confuting their enemies by the exercise of the powers which were their own birthright in the Christian Church. It is true that elsewhere (1 Corinthians xii.) he speaks of this power as being exercised by particular members of the Body, but here he does not doubt that it is a common possession of the whole Body and that every member shares in that possession. And it raises grave questions as to the Church's attitude to such things to-day. It is commonly said that these charismatic powers slowly declined and finally died out because their purpose was purely evidential, and that after the recognition of Christianity had become general this purpose no longer served. But such an explanation does not prevent questions arising which are hard to stifle. Whether it be that this cessation was due to the organization of the Church which gradually concentrated the exercise of the charismata in the hands of certain "orders" within the Church, or to the gradual lowering of ideal and of the sense of mission which was so sadly clear from the fourth century onwards, or whether it be due on the one hand to the rivalries of a divided Christendom, or on the other to the tacit abandonment of such exercise in favour of the widening circles of scientific knowledge, the fact is clear that while the Christians of the New Testament had claimed and used the charismatic powers as part of the whole Gospel of deliverance, we to-day can only point to the moral effects and spiritual qualities as evidence of the truth of our religion. The strength of the world's challenge is not less in the twentieth century than it was in the first. Are we entitled, in face of that challenge, to acquiesce complacently in the view that the Holy Spirit

¹ Cf. Lightfoot *in loc.*

has withdrawn those great evidences of His presence and power, and has left the Church to fight her battle robbed of half her armoury and bereft of her greatest means of appeal to the hearts and consciences of men? The Church may have to retrace her steps towards her early faith if she is to regain her early power. She must find some way to knit up again the seamless garment of the Christ that it may become again the vesture which clothes a living Presence and a living Power. And she must needs remember that till this is done, the Christ is without His full witness and His members robbed of their full exercise of those powers by which they in the first days became most truly His witnesses. There are evidences to-day of the reawakening of the corporate sense in many directions of human activity, and not least in the life of the Church. It is along such lines that we may work for the recovery of her ancient gifts and power, and as our thoughts move towards that larger corporate life which involves the unity of the Churches, we may believe that the new hopes and desires of to-day are due to the promptings of that Spirit of Power who waits still for the faith of men in order that He may reveal Himself to the world. It is not in the federation of Christian organizations agreed on some matters but differing on others that this new revelation will come, but in the realization of that living organism which, responding to external demands and stimuli, is able by its essential unity to become the channel of power and of life which has its origin, not in the faith of men, but in the purposes and love of God.

V

GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT (II)

IN the Epistles to the Thessalonians and the Galatians the apostle is concerned to teach his converts to look for, to expect, and to use special charismata which shall meet the special needs of their condition. His doctrine of the Holy Spirit is in these writings of a most practical character. There is no formal exposition. The need is too urgent for some practical direction, and he is content to point to certain vital relationships between the Holy Spirit and the Church as a ground of special experience and special expectation.

Among the Thessalonians the distress and unrest caused by unbalanced interpretations of the apostle's message, or even perhaps by the work of false prophets, have to be met by the exercise of that gift of discernment which will enable them to put all things to the proof,¹ a proof of which the validity is vouched for by their knowledge of the power which accompanied the outpouring of the Spirit upon them.² It was by the corporate exercise of that power which the apostle at a later date describes as "the spirit of wisdom and revelation"³ that the Thessalonian Church could as a whole guide and strengthen its weaker and more facile members.

The Epistle to the Galatians deals, as we have seen, with a peculiar danger, which, arising out of the claims of the Judaising party, would tend to make some of the Galatian Christians doubtful of the reality of their true "sonship"

¹ 1 Thess. v. 21.

² 1 Thess. i. 5.

³ Eph. i. 17.

(*υιοθεσία*), and this danger is met by the teaching about the spirit of sonship. That Spirit is the Spirit of God's Son,¹ and connects their present experiences of the Christian life with the redemptive work of Christ. And its reality is attested by those works of power (*δυνάμεις*) which were part of their common life² and were in accordance with Christ's own promise.³

In the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle has to deal with an entirely different situation. The Roman Christians are living at the centre of that wonderful system of government which was the greatest civilizing power in the world. They experienced the benefit of a rule which by its strong hand curbed hostilities of feeling and of action which in the outlying parts of the Empire were less amenable. They were touched by currents of philosophy which had a large influence in clothing their ideals and beliefs in practical form. Seneca was ruling in Rome⁴ as well as Nero, and the influence of the humanitarian and universalist philosophy of this greatest of the Stoics was far-reaching and formative in the ideas and conceptions of Christian duty. So near is his teaching in some respects to the teaching of Christianity that Tertullian speaks of him as "often our own," while St. Jerome calls him quite definitely "our own Seneca."⁵ Its intense moral earnestness and its exclusively ethical character made Stoicism the one philosophy which alone could pretend to rival Christianity in the earlier ages of the Church.⁶ It was doubtless the familiarity of the Roman Christians with philosophical forms of thought that made it possible for St. Paul to address to them the most formal and philosophical of all his Epistles.

But in spite of the attractiveness of Stoicism, "it was

¹ Gal. iv. 6.

² Gal. iii. 5.

³ St. John xiv. 12.

⁴ Cf. S. and H., *Romans*, p. xvii.

⁵ Tertullian, *de anim.*, 20, "*Seneca sæpe noster.*" Jerome, *adv. Jovin.* I. 49, "*Scripserunt Aristoteles et Plutarchus et noster Seneca de matrimonio libros,*" etc. Quoted by Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 270 n.

⁶ Lightfoot, *op. cit.* 271.

founded on despair—in religion, in politics, even in philosophy itself,” and St. Paul is not writing to rehabilitate a philosophy, nor to rejuvenate a religion. He has but one message to Christian or non-Christian alike: it is “Righteousness in Christ,” and in the development of his theme he traces not only the basis of that righteousness, but the methods of its operation and the means of its attainment.

But if on the one hand there is the element of discontent, or even of despair, in the general atmosphere surrounding the Roman Christians, there is on the other hand, at least in one direction, an element of certainty and satisfaction so firm and strong as to rouse at once a deep and instinctive hostility to any system of faith which seemed to challenge it. The greatest danger to Christianity in the central city of the world came, not from Paganism, nor from philosophy, but from Judaic theism.

The Jews of Rome were not only secure in the tenets of their ancient faith, they were entrenched in the favour of long-standing privilege, for their religion had now the safe position of a *religio licita*. So secure were they in both official and popular favour that members of the Idumean royal house, now by grace of the Emperor holding sway in Judea, were residents in Rome, and this alone both gave and attracted social influence for the Jews. Only occasionally was this position of privilege interrupted, when for some reason the presence of the Jews in the capital city became obnoxious to the State.

The Christians were in the difficult position of owing their own security to the fact that the Imperial power regarded them as a sect of the Jews and therefore entitled, so long as they were not considered dangerous to the well-being of the State, to all the privileges enjoyed by the Jews. But when the legal privileges of the Jews were withdrawn, as they sometimes were, the Christians were involved in the same fate, as, e.g., in the case of Aquila and Prisca.¹ It

¹ Acts xviii. 2 ; Romans xvi. 3.

is even possible that Suetonius, writing of this event,¹ intends to ascribe the cause of the tumults to the preaching of the Christ.

St. Paul, however, is not for the moment concerned with questions of the relation of the Christians to the State, but he is greatly concerned to make the actual position clear both to the Christians and to the Jews. There must be no danger of confusion, no notion on either side that Christianity is merely a modified form of Judaism. With all its lofty ideals, appealing as they did to so many thoughtful minds among the Pagans, Judaism yet fell far short of what the religion of the Christ had to offer to men. And the contrast between them is so strong that St. Paul does not hesitate to speak of the old religion as bondage, of the new as freedom. And while his thought and his language are deeply influenced by the religious teaching which he has inherited from his forefathers, his task in the Epistle to the Romans is to lead his readers to perceive, as he himself does, the immeasurably greater privilege and hope and power of the new faith of which he is a chosen apostle.

The eighth chapter of the Epistle is the great exposition of his doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and is the necessary background for a consideration of the several charismata of the Church. And it is to be noted that the apostle's doctrine of the Spirit as he here sets it forth is connected, on the one hand, with the Incarnation, and on the other with the "life in the Spirit": the Christian life *par excellence*. That is to say, he deals with his subject only from a point of view which comes within the cognizance of men. He is concerned to prove that what men see of difference in the Christian life as compared with any other is due to the presence of an indwelling Spirit; but nevertheless it is what men *see* that is explained and is referred to its rightful cause. It is that which enables them to reach still higher levels and

¹ *Judaeos impulsore Chriesto, assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit,*" Claud. 25 (but see S. and H., *Romans*, p. xxi. n.).

to understand that the riddle of the universe is not insoluble, but that "God in Christ is reconciling the world to Himself," and is calling the Christian Church into such relation with Himself that through it are being taken the first steps towards a restoration, not of mankind only, but of the whole creation itself. And although the process is so slow and gradual that even those who "have the firstfruits of the Spirit" (τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ Πν.) "groan within themselves, waiting for the redemption of the body," yet they do possess (as others do not) a real ground for hope, a real experience of present power. And the evidence of that power is to be found in the charismatic endowments as well as in the moral and spiritual characteristics of the Church.

That is not a doctrine of evolution, of natural law slowly and automatically working out of itself towards continually higher levels till at length it attains perfection.¹ St. Paul's thought is much nearer akin to the Hebrew description of the world at the creation: "and the earth was waste and void, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." It has been thought that the פְּתוּחַ וְצִבְרוֹתָי of Genesis i. 2 indicates a previous creation which has been brought to chaos. And if the conjecture of Godet and other commentators be correct, that Satan was originally God's vicegerent of this planet and that his rebellion brought about the state of chaos, to be succeeded by a second creation in which man should be the vicegerent of God, this would give a reason for that enmity which brought about the Fall, and make the redemptive work of God a necessity in order that His will should not be thwarted. But be that as it may, the whole work of the Holy Spirit is redemptive, and

¹ Basilides the Alexandrian gnostic (A.D. 120-130) used Romans viii. 17-22 as a basis of much of his teaching, which either in its original form (Baur, Uhlhorn, Jacobi, etc.) or in its later form, influenced by later Greek pantheistic ideas (Hilgenfeld, Lipsius, Volkmar, etc.), was that of a system of evolution rather than of emanation (cf. Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* i., para. 27). But St. Paul's doctrine here is neither of evolution nor emanation, but of endowment.

this conditions both His manifestations and the lines of progress along which He works. And in the breadth of his outlook and his intense sympathy with Nature, St. Paul parts company with the old Rabbinical teachers, and reinterprets those deep longings which seem to him to stir the breast of Nature as much as the hearts of men. The Holy Spirit is working for the deliverance of the whole creation, and the first evidence of that work is to be found in those who realize their own true sonship. It is the manifestation of the sons of God which will be the instrument and means by which the redemption of the universe shall be made effective: and already that manifestation is, in its measure, apparent.

It is this calling of the Church to be the instrument through which the redemptive forces of God may act which gives to the charismata their deep and abiding significance. And especially in that Roman society—with its large body of people not yet definitely allied either to Jews or to Christians, yet so amenable to religious influences that they have been described as “the seed-plot of Christianity”—this aspect of the charismata would supply evidence of the active good will of the God whom the Christians worshipped and served. That alone would mark this new religion as *sui generis*, for in no other system of belief, whether Jewish or Pagan, was this a cardinal point—that God was Himself working out the redemption of man. All other religions laid stress on man's effort towards God. The ancient systems of sacrifice, e.g., were eloquent of this and emphasized it so strongly that even in the purest systems there grew up the idea that all sacrifices were in some sense “propitiatory” of an angry God. But Christianity displaced this by a belief, learnt from the Incarnate Son Himself, in God's effort on behalf of man. “God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” And the first Christians were learning the next step in the

knowledge of God : that not only is He working to this end, but that He calls men to co-operate with Him on behalf of their brethren. The charismata supported no claim to special privilege or favour on behalf of those who possessed and exercised them beyond the privilege and favour of being God's instruments of service for other men.

It is in 1 Corinthians that St. Paul first expounds his sublime conception of Christians with their various gifts being indeed the members of the living Body of the Christ,¹ identified with Him in life and mission, and therefore each entrusted with some manifestation of the Divine life.

To the Roman Christians he writes ² of a corporate unity in Christ which shall determine the place and value of those several charismata which the different members of the Body display. The emphasis here is upon the life in the Spirit as realized sonship, giving unity and purpose to the Body as a whole : the visible effect of God's purpose of redemption in Christ. And although the letter is addressed rather to the "house Churches" of the imperial city than to a great central body, yet there is this principle of universality underlying it. There is a universal vitality shared by all members of the Church, fundamental to all her activity and precedent to all her organization. It is the "*civis Romanus sum*" translated into terms of spiritual life and full of corporate significance, not only of privilege, but of corresponding duty. The charismata are to have for the Romans an analogy with the civic virtues which belonged to their ordinary conception of life. And St. Paul, with his keen perception of the meaning of citizenship, does not hesitate to make use of that analogy. If some Christians have the gift of prophecy, of an insight into the meaning of the revelation of life, a gift which will certainly ensure to those who possess it a commanding influence among their fellows, yet those to whom it is addressed must be able to gauge its value by the "common

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 12 ff.

² Rom. xii. 4, 5.

faith" on which both their own and the prophet's life is based.¹ If one be called to exercise conspicuous gifts of service or of teaching, those gifts must be marked by diligent application for the common good.² The guide or ruler (*ὁ προϊστάμενος*) must especially display this quality of diligence. In Rome he could scarcely escape the associations of his office, but like the "patron" must render service to those less fortunate or less able than himself. His leadership must not be only that of a strong and outstanding personality who can foresee and plan work for the whole community. It must also include the making opportunity of common service for those members of the community who, though endowed with less conspicuous gifts, yet have somewhat of value to offer for the common life.

Possibly the deacon fulfilled in the Roman Church the same office as in the Christian Church of Jerusalem,³ but it is significant that St. Paul seems to avoid drawing any comparison between the "ministrations" of the Church in Rome and the "ministers" of the synagogue. In the Pastoral Epistles the character of the Deacon must be marked by the same humility, modesty, simplicity as was required of the Chazzan or minister of the synagogue. The "elders" in those Epistles are not unlike the *ἀρχόντες* of the synagogue, the Methergeman had his analogue in the "interpreter" of the Corinthian Church.⁴ But the absence of any similar parallels in the Epistle to the Romans is not accidental. The whole idea which we gain of the composition of the Roman Church compels us to conclude that it was at the time completely separated from the Jewish population of the city and from the synagogue. This alone agrees with the language of Romans ix.-xi. The apostle presupposes as a fact the infidelity of the Jews in the mass: they are regarded as if from a distance.⁵

¹ Rom. xii. 6. ² Rom. xii. 8 (*ἀπλότητι . . . σπουδῇ . . . ἰλαρότητι*).

³ See Swete, *Early History of the Church and Ministry*.

⁴ Cf. Edersheim, *Life and Times of the Messiah*, i. 438 ff.

⁵ Weiszäcker, *Apostolic Age*, ii. 96 (2nd English Edition).

The importance of realizing this separation of the Christian body from the Jews is much more than simply negative. It emphasizes in a special way the growing consciousness of corporate life among the Christians, independent of any other organization, even the sacred organization which embodied the old theocratic consciousness of the Jews. The spiritual gifts are to people in a state of salvation; the work of the Holy Spirit is, as always in this Epistle, in relation to soteriology; ¹ the gifts are part of the process of salvation, of setting free. And at the very outset of his argument the apostle reminds the Roman Christians that gifts are imparted by ministry—and that a ministry within the Christian body.² And the gifts are always and unmistakably the fruit of the new covenant of grace; they in themselves point the contrast between the new covenant and the old. They are a consequence of the union between God and man in Christ through that “new and living way, the way of His flesh” which is now open to the whole Christian body.

The distinctive element then in the organization of the Church in the imperial city must at this stage be sought, not in the direct influence of the Jewish community, but in the indirect influence of those institutions which were common to the whole social life of the city, part of the very fabric of its civic activity. There were trade guilds, dramatic and athletic associations, burial clubs, dining clubs, literary societies, financial societies.³ These were the forms in which the whole life of the city, political, religious, social, were cast. It was not only that the Church obtained recognition as one association among others. That might satisfy the state authorities, and would certainly be more attractive to the “outer fringe” of religiously minded people than any organization framed on distinctively Jewish lines. And the fact that the Christian community was organized expressly for religious purposes

¹ Swete, *Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 212. ² Romans i. 2.

³ Cf. Hatch, *Organization of Early Christian Churches*, p. 26.

would create no difficulty for each and every sodalium in the city had its own religious observances. There was even an apparent similarity between the offices held by the members of some of the sodalia and some of the activities exercised by the Christian body. But the similarity was only on the surface. It extended no farther than a certain analogy and it did not exhaust the Christians' account of themselves and of the body to which they belonged. It is significant that in the list of charismatic gifts in Romans xii. attention is directed rather to activities than to offices—still less to officers. The gifts are here regarded as evidence of corporate vitality rather than equipment for various offices. In this respect they are more akin to the "unsystematic" list of 1 Corinthians xii. 8, than to the "systematic" list of 1 Corinthians xii. 28, but in both Romans and 1 Corinthians xii. 8 the same fact is stressed—the reality of the charismatic gifts—although there is but slight mention of the definite channel of office through which some at least of those gifts may express themselves. In 1 Corinthians this aspect of the question is dealt with later in the same chapter (xii. 28 ff.); in Romans it is excluded by the conditions obtaining both within and without the Church in the imperial city.

The broad distinction of treatment in Romans and 1 Corinthians is that in the former Epistle the charismata are regarded as the endowment of sonship, and therefore evidence of the reality of that sonship; in 1 Corinthians, especially in the more systematic list in xii. 28 ff., they are descriptive of the functions of that "body of Christ" of which the apostle has just been writing, and through which the Holy Spirit of sonship is manifested to the world. It is this difference of treatment which leads him to specify some of the charismata, in their entirely characteristic activities of the indwelling Spirit, as specially prominent or effective in certain members of the body.

These particular charismata were to be regarded as all

together forming a manifestation of the Spirit, and in their interaction within the body they were to be thought of as complementary to each other. One member might, e.g., possess power to heal certain kinds of disease, but not the power to heal other kinds of disease.¹ But that was not to say that either the one member or the other lacked the gift of the Holy Spirit, the gift of sonship. The Holy Spirit vitalized the whole body and gave to each member of the body some special function to perform, and his performance of that function was his essential contribution to the work of the whole body: his witness to his sonship.

In 1 Corinthians xii. 5, 6, there is some hint of the broad distinctions which would mark the manifestation of this one central vitality.² There are not only "divisions of gifts" (*διαίρεσεις χαρισμάτων*), but there are diversities of function. The main stream divides into two arms which carry those diversities of gifts to their proper end. On the one hand there is the function of service within the body (*διαρέσεις διακονιών*), and on the other the function of witness to those without the body supplied and furnished by the *διαρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων*. The sphere of both functions was within the body—they were activities of the same Spirit which vitalized the whole body—but their objective was different. The one function had to do with what may be called the building up (*οἰκοδομή*, 1 Corinthians xiv. 5) of the body by the constant inflow of spiritual force, and therefore becoming specialized as the particular duty of particular members towards the other members of the body. The other functions had to do with the activity of the whole body in regard to the world in which it moved: its evidential function towards those outside the Christian community.

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 9 (*λαμάτων*) and Ellicott's note *in loc.*

² The steps towards realizing this central unity of life are indicated in 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff.

διαρέσεις δε χαρισμάτων . . . τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα.

διαρέσεις διακονιών . . . ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος.

διαρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων . . . ὁ αὐτὸς θεός.

The Church's method of emphasizing that difference of function was quite clear. The former class of charismata was *conferred* in response to the solemn act of the whole (local) body acting ministerially through its appointed leaders. The latter was *accepted* by the Christian body after certain tests as self-evident and needing only the recognition of the Church in order that its evidential function might have full validity. Both classes of charismata were gifts of the same Spirit, but the one class was bestowed mediately, the other immediately, the corporate consciousness of the whole body being concerned in their proper place and use within the community.

There is no evidence that the "evidential" gifts were ever as such sought or bestowed in the same way as the ministerial gifts. Prophets and teachers within the Church certainly took part in ordinations (cf. Acts xiii. 1-3), but not in order to ordain other prophets or teachers. That claim on the part of the Montanists was regarded as an innovation and was rejected by the Catholic Church.¹ That rejection was consistent with the Church's view that the functions of the charismata were distinct and the method of their bestowal distinct also. Ordination was at first regarded as conferring only specific gifts, and the gifts of service within the Church differed from her other charismata which did not require ordination as the channel through which the members of the body should receive them. There is, however, an interesting development in the Canons of Hippolytus² where, at the consecration of a Bishop, what had hitherto been consecration to specifically episcopal functions only now becomes enlarged to include a petition that the Bishop may *also* have the powers of an exorcist and a healer. While this marks an advance in an explicit conception of the sacramental character of ordination or consecration, it marks also some departure from the

¹ Swete, *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, p. 272 ff.

² Op. cit. p. 382.

primitive conception of charismatic gifts being not an official equipment, but a general endowment within the Church.

It is not unlikely that an intermediate stage was the formation of groups of people within the local churches possessing some distinctive charismata (e.g. prophets, healers, etc.) and the consequent need of directing their activities for the Church by setting over them as leader one whom the Church recognized as exercising his authority by due appointment, and gradually this would develop into a fusion of the two groups of functions, and perhaps the theory of transmission would gradually be applied equally to both groups.

But the general tendency was in any case to restrict the exercise of these particular charismata to those who were officially recognized by the leaders of the Church, and so grew up at a later stage those minor orders to which the official exercise of these charismata was at last confined. It is to be noted, however, that in the East the minor orders were reckoned as entirely outside the hierarchy, while in the West, even when the system of minor orders was most fully developed, no one outside the ranks of the major orders received ordination by the laying on of hands, but each one was admitted to his rank by the Bishop's blessing and by the delivery to him of the symbol of his office.¹ And it must not be forgotten that the offices exercised by the minor orders were but shadows of the early realities. The important point is that as the charismata, which originally belonged to the whole body of the Church, became associated only with ministers within the body, and then only with particular ministers, they fell into disuse and ceased to be regarded as part of the ordinary endowment of the Church. And with this cessation there grew up the theory that the gifts were only granted to the first Christians as means of convincing an unwilling and incredulous world of the truth of their mission.

¹ Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 352, English translation 1910.

Part II
THE CHARISMATA

VI DIVERSITIES OF GIFTS (I)

IN the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul indicates some of the moral qualities which must accompany the exercise of certain charismata, and on examination it appears that these particular charismata would be difficult to bring under the direction of authority or within the cognizance of the whole body, and that therefore the test of their reality is to be sought in the moral characteristics of those who exercise them. Those moral characteristics could be noted and approved by the whole body, represented by the local Church, and would be themselves a guarantee of the genuineness of the more personal charismata. The gifts which are of more public or corporate significance, as, e.g., prophecy, ministry, teaching, exhortation, are to be tested by another standard. The common faith will here be the guide and test, the mutual and humble recognition that the gifts *are* gifts, and are not the mere exaltation of personal or natural qualities as such.

In 1 Corinthians the apostle enlarges this teaching and fixes its centre. He gives the norm¹ by which *all* the charismata are to be tested and appreciated. The first condition both of reception and of use is that spirit which recognizes the source of all the gifts to be in Christ. It is the same Spirit who actuates faith in the Christ Who also bestows the gifts—but they are gifts “in Christ.” It is

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 3, 4.

clear that, like the Christian Sacraments, they are "extensions of the Incarnation." That is the standard for the due understanding of the spiritual gifts. It must also be the standard for their due and proper use. There must be some point of reference to the Life of the Incarnate Lord by which not only the presence but the purpose of the charismata may in whole and in their several parts be justly appraised.

Many elements go to form the conception of the actual activities of those gifts: that they are elements which all together go to make the evidence of Christ's perpetual presence and power in His Church—a presence and power no less real and effective than in the days of His Incarnation, of His personal revelation. The Apostles' standard is the spectroscope through which the different charismata are seen to be interdependent and all together parts of the manifestation of that one true Light that, coming into the world, lighteneth every man.

It is important to emphasize this common foundation of all the charismata, for it will give not only an explanation of their origin, but also a measure of their purpose. And it will co-ordinate the various gifts in their several relations. It is to be noted that belief in Christ is belief in Him as Lord: "No man can say that Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." While the appeal is to the historic Jesus, it is to Him as Lord—and the word is equivalent to the "unnameable Name" Jahveh of the Old Testament—at once reminding the reader that the historic Christ was to St. Paul and the early Church the very manifestation of the Godhead. Beyond the personal matter of faith, there is involved in this belief some reference to the Eternal Nature of Him by Whose Spirit the charismata are given. And looked at from this point of view the question is bound to arise whether it is right to consider the charismata as purely temporary manifestations of a particular power granted to the early Church, but afterwards withdrawn. If we are

right in believing that the reference here ¹ is to the eternal nature of the Incarnate Son, is not the inference to be drawn that the truth of His revelation is eternal and the terms, in which it is expressed not exhausted by mere process of time? It is more likely that the faith of the Church has failed than that God should have repented Him of His gifts.

The contrast in St. John ² is pointed and complete, for there the human side of this confession of faith is given as a test by which to try the spirits. But St. John is writing perhaps of personal spiritual existences, or perhaps of spiritual influence, as, e.g., the "corporate spirit" of a movement. He is not analysing that spirit, still less is he describing the spiritual gifts of the Christian body. He is, on the contrary, describing the power against which the Christian body must strive. And so it is sufficient for his purpose to invoke the faith of every Christian in the historic Christ as the great light and revelation of God, teaching men to discern the truth and error of their ways.³

St. Paul, however, while (especially in the Epistle to the Ephesians) he is conscious, and wishes his readers to be conscious, of the spiritual powers against which the Church is set, is here intent on teaching her the true nature of the positive gifts which she possesses. It is significant that in the formal lists in 1 Corinthians xii. 28 ff. and Ephesians iv. 7, 8, 11, the verbs are all aorists, as though to connect the gifts with some definitive past action on God's part. In a word, the apostle is in these passages dealing with the *origin* or source of the gifts, while in the informal lists of Romans xii. 8 ff., 1 Corinthians xii. 8 ff. he is dealing with their manifestation, their possession and use by the Church, and therefore he uses either the present or the perfect tenses. In Ephesians iv. the bestowal of the gifts is described as an essential outcome and consequence of the

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 3.

² 1 St. John. iv. 2, cf. Alford *in loc.*

³ Cf. Bishop Gore, *Epistles of St. John*, p. 168 ff.

Ascension, i.e. a direct result of that work of redemption of which the first stages were completed by the Ascension of the Lord Who had lived and died and risen again in order to accomplish it.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews takes the same point of view in regard to the Ascension, and describes the whole action of it under the aoristic sense of final completion. The life of humiliation and limitation is definitely ended, the life of power in redemption is definitely begun. The writer of the Hebrews uses that fact as a foundation for personal faith and life. St. Paul sees it manifested in the charismata with which the Church is equipped for her work and which are the direct gift of her ascended Lord. It must be remembered that the preaching and writings of the Apostles all have this as their standpoint: the standpoint of the Ascension, that is, the completed and glorified Life, not the standpoint of the Life beset by limitations which is the necessary condition of the Gospel narratives. It is this which forms the proper background to that teaching of present and effective power which is the dominant note in all the Epistles.

One matter of primary importance in this association of the charismata with the Ascension of the Lord is that they are thus associated with the human as well as the Divine element in His Personality. It is not that the humanity is simply a channel through which some spiritual gift properly belonging to the attributes of Godhead is conveyed to mankind, but that the gift is in some way mediated through the double nature of the Second Person of the adorable Trinity.

We may thus look for and expect not only the development of new faculties in human nature, but the use and illumination of faculties already there, but now empowered to higher levels of redemptive activity of which they were in themselves, and without the Divine Spirit, incapable.

But this emphasis must not be over-stressed so as to

exclude the Divine side and make them simply human faculties. While the ultimate standard of the Church's comprehension of the gifts is the standard of the Incarnate Life, by which indeed we are alone able to "know the Father" and therefore to learn the mysteries of God, there is a balance in the apostle's statement: "There are diversities of gifts, but the same *Spirit*, diversities of administrations and the same *Lord*, diversities of workings but the same *God* who worketh all things in all."¹ It may be possible to associate each class: "gifts," "administrations," "workings," with what we know of the distinctive activities of each Person in the Godhead Who is here mentioned, but it is clearly the apostle's teaching that the spiritual gifts come from and lead up to the central Divine Unity.

APOSTLES, PROPHETS, TEACHERS

Απόστολοι	{	Governments [κυβερνήσεις]	
	{	Leadership [προϊστάμενοι]	
Προφῆται	{	Prophecy, προφητεία	
	{	Revelation, ἀποκάλυψις	
	{	Ministry, διακονία	
	{	Tongues, γένη γλωσσῶν	
	{	Interpretation, ἐρμηνεία (γλωσσῶν)	
Διδασκάλοι	{	Teaching, διδασκαλία	} διακρίσεις πνευμάτων
	{	Word of Wisdom, λόγος σοφίας	
	{	Word of Knowledge, λόγος γνώσεως	
	{	Comfort or Encouragement, παράκλησις	

It would be fallacious to seek to divide the spiritual gifts into groups dominated on the one hand by the ideas of transmission in the orders of the historic ministry, and on the other by the idea of freedom and of untrammelled exercise. Such a method finds no support in the New Testament, and history is not without its warning in the

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 6.

failure of attempts to reduce a theory of this kind to practice. In ancient times the stress was laid on freedom both in regard to the gifts themselves and their use and exercise. There is equal danger in the more modern tendency to limit the gifts to the ordained ministry of the Church. Both views alike ignore the balance of the New Testament teaching. *All* the gifts are there described as "charismatic," ranging from apostleship to showing mercy, from prophecy to liberality. Their standard of value is not to be sought merely in their apparent importance or their obvious prominence, but in the purpose for which the whole body was endowed with gifts, a purpose which falls nothing short of continuing that redemptive work begun by the Church's Lord and described in the pages of the gospels. They are each in their degree an expression of the vitality shared by the whole body, and the limitation of those gifts to a special ministry (and eventually to the hierarchy alone) has resulted in regard being paid only to those ministerial gifts which are believed to be transmissible, while the other gifts have fallen completely out of sight. It led in course of time to a separation of the idea of authority (*ἐξουσία*) from that of power (*δύναμις*), with inevitable weakening of witness as well as of unity.¹

In the two formal lists ² the three ranks or orders, Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, appear, with Apostles and Prophets at the head of each list. In Ephesians the rank of Teachers is amplified by the addition of Pastors, and Evangelists are also added. This last class were probably exponents of the events in the life of the Lord, communicating their knowledge or their recollections either by preaching or

¹ Even where St. Paul is using his Apostolic authority (*ἐξουσία*) to direct the judgment of the Corinthian Church (1 Cor. v. 3), or to correct it, even to the point of overriding it (2 Cor. ii. 5 ff.), his appeal to the corporate consciousness of the Church arising out of the possession of a common power (*δύναμις*) in which he shares is noteworthy.

² 1 Cor. xii. 28 ff. ; Eph. iv. 11.

expounding, as in the case of Stephen and Philip (two of the original *διάκονοι*),¹ or by writing down isolated events of which they had been witness, as mentioned by St. Luke in the introduction to his Gospel.²

In Romans the corresponding abstract terms Prophecy . . . Teaching are employed, but there is no reference to any recognized rank as in the formal lists.

In the unsystematic list in 1 Corinthians xii. prophecy is again mentioned, but not Prophets, while perhaps the matter of teaching (*λόγος σοφίας, λόγος γνώσεως*) takes the place of "Teacher" in that passage. The apostle is here speaking of the gifts as inherent in the body, not of those gifts as, so to speak, focussed in any individuals or classes of persons within the body. It is doubtless for this reason that "Apostles" (*ἀπόστολοι*) are not mentioned in the unsystematic lists, but only in those which refer to particular offices or orders in the body.

It is outside the purpose of this essay to discuss the place and work of the Apostolate in regard to the historic development of the Church's ministry. The position of the Apostolic body in the New Testament, whether of the original members or of those who were subsequently joined to them, was necessarily supreme and of plenary power, though even among them there seem to have been ranks or degrees of eminence, at least in the estimation in which they were held by the Church.³

The Apostles themselves exhibited all the charismata of the body, but some of their gifts, being associated with their governmental power, became almost exclusively identified with authority (*ἐξουσία*) and were eventually exercised solely through the Orders of the Church.⁴ It was a necessary

¹ Acts vi. ; viii. 30 ff.

² St. Luke i. 1 ff.

³ Cf. Gal. ii. 9 ; *στύλοι* (of James, Peter and John) ; Romans xvi. 7, *ἐπίσημοι* (of Andronicus and Junias) ; but cf. Acts xiv. 4, 14 ; 2 Cor. viii. 23 ; 1 Thess. ii. 6 (cf. i. 1), where *ἀπόστολοι* is used in a wide sense.

⁴ But cf. note (1) of previous page.

part of her equipment, and, as in 1 Corinthians v. 6, 1 Timothy i. 20, was exercised by the apostles as inherent in their office. Such exercise of authority is rare, but quite distinctive and quite normal. Generally their office is exercised in virtue of the "power" which they share with the whole body, though with a complete consciousness of leadership flowing from their call by the Master to be His Apostles.

(i) PROPHECY

The most notable gift which the Apostles shared with other members of the body was prophecy, i.e. that gift which, however mysterious and individual it might seem, had to do with the "edifying" of the Church. And with prophecy are associated other intellectual gifts such as teaching and the gift of tongues. It is possible that this association may serve to throw some light upon that very mysterious gift of glossolaly which otherwise is so difficult to place in the life of the Church.

That the gift of prophecy was freely exercised by the apostles is clear.¹ The recognition of Saul of Tarsus as a Prophet² is the first step towards the commanding position he afterwards held as an Apostle. The author of the Apocalypse claims acceptance of his book as a prophecy.³ St. Peter and St. Jude have prophetic elements in their writings.

Before examining some special features of the prophetic element in the primitive Church, it must be remarked that the conception of prophecy held by the Jews at the beginning of the Christian era was apocalyptic rather than predictive. The element of prediction had always been subordinate to the prophet's conception of the Kingdom of God. That was the ultimate object of his prophecy, in whatever shape he cast it. He used the circumstances of the times as material through which his message might be conveyed, and perhaps interpreted. But Ezekiel had brought a new

¹ Eph. ii. 20 ; iii. 5.

² Acts xiii. 1, 2.

³ Apoc. i. 3.

element into prophecy—the apocalyptic element—and this profoundly modified both the method and the meaning of the prophet's work. It influenced the Jews' idea not only of the Kingdom, but of the individual and his relation to it. It was indeed balanced by Ezekiel's counter-conception of Judaism and legalism, i.e. of privilege and obligation, and these elements of his teaching finally gained popular ascendancy among the Jews. But it is important to observe that the apocalyptic element, and still more the eschatological, had increased in influence among those who could lay no claim to the perfection of the Pharisaic system, so that to the primitive Christians this element in their own prophets would perhaps be expected to be the most prominent factor in their utterances. Vision and ecstasy and symbolic acts had also their place in Ezekiel's idea of prophetic inspiration,¹ and these elements are reproduced in the New Testament conception of prophecy. His teaching also of a new conception of Israel's future destiny, of spiritual restoration, of new life in the new state, had the deepest influence on New Testament thought, and almost naturally led to the exalted regard in which the prophetic office was held by the Christians, till at length in the Montanist system it issued in a revival of the old rivalry between the prophets of the new system and the priests of the old, as represented by the settled ministry of the Church. Nor is it altogether absent to-day in the differing conceptions of the ministerial office.

There are some instances recorded in the Gospels and Acts which form interesting links between the later Jewish conception and the early Christian conception of prophecy. In them the spiritual element is clearly dominant and is in general in marked contrast to the legalism of the age.

¹ Vision, Ezekiel i. 1 ff.; iii. 22-27; xl. 1 ff. Ecstasy, viii. 1 ff.; xi. 1 f., 24; xxxiii. 22; xxxvii. 1 f. Symbolic acts, iv. 1-3, 4-8, 9-17; v. 1-4; xii. 1-16; 17-21; xxi. 6, 7, 19-21; xxiv. 1-5, 15-24; xxxvii. 15-24.

The inspiration of these early New Testament prophecies is in each case attributed to an inward cause, and not, as in Ezekiel's prophecy, to an inspiration conveyed by some external means. They are placed in direct relation to the Incarnate Life of the Christ, and they are predictive of the results of that Life as well as retrospective of its historical setting. Not to mention the Magnificat, which holds a unique position, Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna have each their contribution to make to this intermediate stage of prophecy, and in each case their inspiration is ascribed to the Holy Ghost. And although this may in fact be due to post-Pentecostal thought, yet it must not be forgotten that, as evidenced by many passages in the Old Testament,¹ some doctrine of the Holy Spirit had gained a place in Jewish theology. It is of interest to note that twice in the narratives of the Lord's life this gift of prophecy is associated with the priestly office in the Jewish Church. Zacharias the priest prophesies in the Benedictus the purpose of the Incarnation,² Caiaphas the High Priest "officially" prophesies the fact and purpose of the Atonement,³ though probably without any clear perception of the true significance of his utterance.

But while these intermediate prophecies have generally a distinctively apocalyptic tone as their chief characteristic, the purely predictive element is shown in the instance of Agabus and the events he foretold.⁴ Agabus is a Christian prophet coming from Jerusalem and attracted to the Christian "school of prophets" at Antioch, but, from the way in which he is markedly connected with Jerusalem and Judea in the passages in which his name occurs, as well as the form of his prophecy, which in both cases is purely predictive and lacks the distinctively Christian attribute of "edifying" the Church, it seems probable that he was a Jewish prophet who had been converted to Christianity.

¹ Cf. *H.D.B.* iv, 612a; ii. 402 ff.

³ St. John xi. 50; xviii. 14.

² St. Luke i. 17 ff.

⁴ Acts xi. 28; xxi. 10.

From his association (in both instances) with the Apostle of the Gentiles it seems not unlikely that he had known the brilliant young leader in Jerusalem and had been attracted, perhaps by personal friendship, to follow his career in the new religion, and to join the Christian fellowship. But the scanty references to him do not enable us to place him among the teaching prophets of the Christian Church, although he is found as an honoured guest in the household of Philip the Evangelist at Cæsarea.

This then is the background of the idea of prophecy in the New Testament. It inherits the main idea of the Old Testament that prophecy is "speaking out the counsel of God" in whatever form the message may be given. The whole colour, whether in the Old Testament or in the New Testament, is of a prophet being "lifted above" his everyday self rather than "set beside" it.¹ It speaks of order, not confusion, of reason, however exalted, not fury. The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets² and their message is capable of being tested by the Church.³ The significant absence of any approach to the idea underlying the ordinary Greek idea of *μάντις* is eloquent of the difference, not between Old Testament and New Testament conceptions of prophecy, but between the idea common both to Jewish and Christian teaching and the idea of the peoples outside that sphere of revelation.

Some attention should be paid to the names by which prophets are designated in the Old Testament, because the ideas mentioned in those names served to colour the whole religious conception of prophecy. The most usual word (נָבִי, *nābi*) emphasizes the aspect of the prophet speaking out the mind of God, though the word is on occasion used to describe heathen prophets.⁴ It is used of the coming Messiah⁵ and, incidentally, in that passage describes the prophetic office of Moses.

¹ Trench, *Synonyms*, p. 23. ² 1 Cor. xiv. 32. ³ Rom. xii. 6.

⁴ 1 Kings xviii. 19. ⁵ Deut. xviii. 15; cf. Acts iii. 22.

A more ancient, but much less frequent word (רֹאֵה *r'ôeh*) seer. The word is described in 1 Samuel ix. 9 as the ancient name for a prophet, and in Isaiah xxx. 10 both words are used as though describing two distinct classes of men. The difference persists in the later history of the Jewish Church and passes over to the Christian Church in which "visions" were a vehicle of revelation as well as more formal prophecies. The apocalyptic literature affords a middle point where the activities of these two classes of teachers apparently become, for the time being, fused. On the whole it is the apocalyptic element which becomes the more prominent in the New Testament.

There is, however, one broad distinction between the exercise of prophecy in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. In the former the people were not infrequently the victims of false prophets, and there appeared to be no special criterion by which to decide between the true and the false. Sometimes (e.g. in the case of Jeremiah) the true prophet was disbelieved in favour of the false prophet. It was Hananiah,¹ with his prediction of an exile lasting only two years, who was listened to rather than Jeremiah, with *his* prediction of an exile of two generations. In the New Testament this element of uncertainty is, with the possible exception of some eschatological utterances, altogether absent. The test and standard is supplied by the corporate consciousness of the Church. The eschatological prophecies were, after the manner of the time, interpreted literally and as of immediate imminence, and history falsified that interpretation. But they were not false prophecies in substance, intended to mislead, but only imperfectly understood. Substance, not circumstance, was then as always the proper subject of prophecy, and in this particular case the substance has found its place as an integral part of Christian belief.

Taking then the main idea of true prophecy in the New Testament to be the same as in the Old Testament, namely

¹ Jer. xxviii.

that of speaking out the counsel of God,¹ we may examine some of the instances in the New Testament where this charisma of the Church is claimed or its use discussed. The most important characteristic, and one strongly insisted on, is the intelligibility of the prophet's utterances when he is speaking to the Church. A whole section of 1 Corinthians xiv. is devoted to this theme, and in other passages this inference is necessary to the conclusions advanced.² The prophet's mind is clearly at work upon his message, and the mind of his hearers is at work as well. It is cast in a form which engages the intellect, yet which touches even deeper springs. And it is impossible to notice this without recalling the distinctive Johannine title of the Christ—the Logos³—the spoken mind or thought of God. The being of man is one central unity, though that unity is manifested through the activities of body, soul and spirit (to use the distinctions most frequently employed in the New Testament), and the work of redemption reaches and influences each part of his nature. In the intellectual sphere that redemptive work is to teach men to regard life and its meaning and its circumstances *as a whole* from the Christian standpoint—to provide a Christian interpretation of experience without as well as within what is commonly called the "religious" life. It is, in short, to be the unifying principle of human life in all its aspects, and this implies the redemption of man's intellectual powers no less than the redemption of his spirit or his body. The mind of man is not essentially alien from the mind of God, but has only become so by the action and influence of evil. The human mind of the Christ could and did provide a fitting vehicle for the revelation of God within the limits imposed by the kenosis, and so He taught His disciples as well as His

¹ A similar idea upon a lower level held good among classical writers, cf. illustrations in Trench, *Synonyms*, p. 21.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 3-19; Eph. ii. 21; 1 Thess. v. 20; Romans xii. 6.

³ St. John i. 1, etc.

critics that men could become the servants of God within the sphere of their intellectual activities as well as within the sphere of their other faculties. And this is carried on in the work of the New Testament prophets.

Two instances in the first Corinthian letter are conspicuous. In xi. 23, the apostle states in the clearest and most precise way that he is speaking by direct inspiration (i.e. as a prophet) on a matter of primary importance to the Christian Church, namely, the meaning of the Sacrament of Holy Communion, while in xv. 3, he appears to refer his teaching about the resurrection to the same source. Both passages are remarkable for their clear and definite form, as far removed as possible from anything even approaching fervour or enthusiasm. They are both almost cold in their precision, yet they are none the less claimed as due to prophetic inspiration. But they can only be appropriated by men in whose minds the Divine Logos is at work as a redemptive force. The problems of the present day and our immensely enriched knowledge of psychological law combine to urge upon the Church the necessity and the opportunity of renewed and clear teaching in this direction. The gift of prophecy, "speaking out the counsel of God," has not been withdrawn from the Church; it is indeed capable of expression with fresh and renewed emphasis by that body which stands in the world as the witness for God, and now, as always, it is "the mind of Christ ¹ which must inform and illuminate her.

The Correlative Charismata of Prophecy

Prophecy is in the Apostolic writings a fundamental gift upon which several other charismata depend. They may be described as correlative or even subordinate to the greater gift, and in so far as they minister to its full exercise they become fruitful themselves, in so far as they become detached from it they become vain or misleading. The

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 16.

main characteristic of prophecy in the New Testament is that of direct inspiration for edification, and the subordinate gifts suggest aspects of the chief gift or methods of its manifestation. These methods vary with different individuals, and although one person may possess more than one gift of this character ¹ it is evidently more usual for the charisma bestowed on a particular individual to be limited to a particular kind.² There is no evidence that any one beyond the Apostolic circle possessed all the subordinate gifts.

It is to be remarked that both the directly "spiritual" faculties and the more distinctively "intellectual" faculties are employed, but the spheres of their action appear to be quite distinct. It is the spiritual faculties which are employed in receiving the matter of prophecy, while the intellectual faculties are called into play in order that the substance of the prophetic communication may be transmuted into matter for the edification of the Church. The spiritual faculties are receptive, the intellectual faculties are selective. But in marking this distinction it must be noted that even in regard to the exercise of the spiritual faculties, it is mystic not mantic energy which is described in the New Testament. Whenever energy of this kind is described its focus is always God-ward not man-ward. It is an energy penetrating the mysteries of God, rather than an energy expressing those mysteries in the "fury" which distinguished the Greek *μάντις*.³ The seer is lifted above, never set beside himself, although it may be necessary that some other member of the body should co-operate with him by the exercise of his own particular gift in order to bring the seer's gift to fruition. Indeed it may be said that this

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 18-19.

² Even in gifts of healing (*ἰαμάτων*) this is observable.

³ Note in 1 Cor. xiv. 19, the contrast between *τῷ νοῖ* and *ἐν γλώσσῃ* does not appear to be between coherency and incoherency, but between an inspiration which will enable the apostle to interpret his message and an inspiration which does not include this.

need of co-operation was itself a safeguard against the danger of Christian prophecy being confused with heathen forms of divination.

The term Apocalypse (revelation) is used in the New Testament to denote the subject-matter of Christian prophecy, and ἀποκαλύπτειν marks the method of that revelation. It is a disclosing to sight what has been hidden, and it is this revelation, permanent and progressive, which is always the background of prophecy. It is only in its more technical use that the word has become descriptive of a particular form in which prophecy may be cast, a form approximating to vision rather than to utterance. This usage coming down from the writings of the Maccabean period, definitely passed over to Christian times, though it is interesting to note that while it occurs as a description of the great Christian Apocalypse, it is entirely absent in the other Johanine writings.¹ The word in the New Testament is linked with other terms connected with the method or effect of revelation,² but in itself it connotes the central and permanent facts of God's dealings with men, facts which can only be gradually apprehended and applied. In Romans xvi. 25, Christianity is itself described as a revelation of a mystery (κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου) hidden through times eternal, but now revealed.

There is a significance in its use in this connection, as distinct from the use of the word prophecy, which must not be passed over. It is, in general, a broader word than prophecy. If the distinction may be allowed, it may be said to deal with "universals" while prophecy deals with "particulars." It is a difference which appears in the old distinction between the "seer" and the "prophet." The

¹ For a discussion of the meaning of Apocalypse see Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 9 ff. n.

² γνωρίζω ; φανερώω ; ἀποκάλυπτω, cf. Eph. iii. 3-5 ; Romans xvi. 26 ; i. 17 ; iii. 21 ; 1 Peter v. 1, 4. The first regards the individual knowledge, the second the outward manifestation, the third the essential permanence of what is set forth (Westcott, op cit.).

ancient term¹ had for ages been dispossessed, but in the Grecian period of Jewish history had regained its ascendancy through the Apocalyptic writings of the time, marking as they did the passage from Prophecy to Revelation, and so passed over to Christian usage. The seer may not even understand what his vision means; he may need an interpreter before he can gather its import²; the prophet is quite clear as to the implication and application of his message.

Taking then Apocalypse (revelation) as being the substance of the matter communicated to the Church through the Christian prophets we are able to go on to a consideration of the relation of prophecy to the other charismata associated with it. The communication of Apocalypse engages the purely spiritual faculties of the prophet, and seems to proceed by regular stages towards completion. There is first the stage of exaltation. The prophet is "in the spirit" (*ἐν πνεύματι*)³ when he receives the Divine revelation. The usual word ecstasy appears, apart from St. Mark's Gospel and the Lucan writings, to be studiously avoided in describing this condition,⁴ and even where it is used it is to emphasize the novelty of the event which produces it. Probably the word is disused by the Christian writers, partly because of its suggestion of the displacement of normal faculties, partly also because it ceased to be an adequate term by which to describe what had become a normal phase of Christian experience.

The stage of exaltation is preparatory to that of per-

¹ 1 Sam. ix. 9.

² Cf. Ezek. xxxvii. 3 ff; Dan. vii. 15; viii. 15; Zech. iv. 5, 11 ff.; Apoc. xvii. 7.

³ Apoc. i. 10.

⁴ The only New Testament passages in which *ἐκστάσις* occurs are: St. Mark v. 42; xvi. 8; St. Luke v. 26; Acts iii. 10. These instances describe only the natural feeling of amazement. Acts x. 10; xi. 5; xxii. 17. Only these instances have any relation to an "Apocalypse."

ception, which may be either by seeing (visions, *ὄπτασίαι, ὀράματα, ὀράσεις*) or by hearing. It is this power of perception which is claimed by St. Peter as the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy.¹ Perception may sometimes extend to interpretation,² sometimes what is seen or heard is incapable of further elucidation.³ But if the seer's experience is intended for the edification of the Church a final stage is reached in the Apocalypse, the revelation with which he is entrusted and which he must communicate to his fellow-members in the body. That communication may take many and various forms, but it will be comprised under the single generic term of prophecy, just as in the Hebrew Old Testament the prophetic writings included everything except the Torah and the Hagiographa, and even the two chief exponents of these exceptional writings were regarded as prophets.

*Teaching, word of wisdom, word of knowledge,
exhortation (encouragement).*

διδασκαλία, λόγος σοφίας, λόγος γνώσεως, παράκλησις.

But in order that the revelation to the seer may become the common property of the Church, other charismata must come into action. They are gifts whose seat lies in the intellectual faculties rather than in the purely spiritual realm. Where the seer has not also the charisma of the prophet—i.e. where he cannot reduce his vision of "universals" to the "particulars" of ordinary need or of the special experiences of his times⁴ so that the Church might be thereby edified, the office of the teacher finds its place. It is his work to separate, to sift, to select, to analyse and to apply. That the teacher had a distinct gift which distinguishes him from other members of the body is implied by the apostle's question in 1 Corinthians xii. 29, "Are all Apostles, are all teachers?" and the exercise of that

¹ Acts ii. 17, cf. Joel ii. 28.

² Acts xvi. 9-10.

³ 2 Cor. xii. 2.

⁴ St. Paul was clearly able to do this. Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 23; xv. 3.

gift had the very widest bearing both on the belief and, later, on the organization of the Church.

The office had its roots deep in the history of the Jewish Church. Torah, one of the most venerated terms in the ancient religious conception, was used by the "writing prophets" for teaching, direction, etc.,¹ before it passed to its technical use as indicating the books of the Law, and Rabbi becomes, later, the title of those who were recognized teachers, though it was not till after the time of our Lord that the title was officially given in Palestine to those who were authorized to decide ritual or legal questions.² In our Lord's time it was used as a courteous title of respect. The use of the equivalent διδάσκαλος by the Sadducees and Herodians, and afterwards by the Pharisees³ was perhaps ironical, or it may have been dictated by fear of the effect of a discourteous address upon the people. It is in its ancient sense of Master (in contrast with Slave) that our Lord forbids the disciples to desire or to use the title Rabbi,⁴ for it is part of His commission to them that they should be teachers.⁵

Although the charisma of teaching is a distinct gift,⁶ it is generally associated in the New Testament with some other gift or office in the Church, and that association seems to mark the estimation in which it is held. The pre-eminence which such a gift bestows upon its possessor marks him out for prominent place in the settled organization of the body and a gradual progress in this direction can be observed until the gift itself becomes in the New Testament exclusively associated with the foremost office in the Church. In Acts xiii. 1, prophets and teachers are joined together in such a way as to suggest that they are

¹ Cf. Hosea iv. 6; viii. 1; viii. 12. Amos ii. 4; Isa. i. 10; ii. 3; Zeph. iii. 4.

² *H.D.B.* iv. 190 *a.*

³ St. Matt. xxii. 24, 36; cf. St. John i. 38.

⁴ St. Matt. xxiii. 7, 8. ⁵ St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

⁶ 1 Cor. xii. 29.

the same men. In general the prophets exercised an itinerant ministry, and the association here would imply that teachers had at first a similar position, unless it be supposed that there was at this time a resident "school of prophets" at Antioch. By the date of the Epistles of the Captivity, teachers had gained a position of practical oversight in local churches,¹ and in the Pastoral Epistles their office is merged in that of the "bishop."²

The process of merging is not, however, complete, for in the sub-Apostolic age, though the tendency is still marked, the office is as yet distinct,³ due to the usual conditions of the teachers' ministry. They were itinerant ministers and were distinct from prophets as well as from bishops and deacons. In the Shepherd of Hermas they were officers of the Church between bishops and deacons.⁴

The Substance of the Teaching.

λόγος σοφίας, λόγος γνώσεως.

In the informal list in the Epistle to the Romans the gift of teaching is mentioned as one of the charismata, carrying with it obvious duties, which are however not defined either as regards matter or form. But in the companion list in 1 Corinthians xii. 8, there is a clearer definition of the matter of teaching, though neither the gift of teaching nor the office of teacher is specifically mentioned. But "word of wisdom," "word of knowledge," imply both. 1 Corinthians ii. may be taken as an example of the word of wisdom, while 1 Corinthians viii. provides an instance of the apostle teaching the "word of knowledge." The one has to do with the fundamental Christian verities, the other with the practical significance and obligations of the Christian revelation. They are often closely inter-

¹ Eph. iv. 11.

² 1 Tim. iii. 2, cf. Titus i. 9.

³ Didaché xi. (but "the Didaché is eminently a prophetic work," Selwyn, *Christian Prophets*, p. 78).

⁴ Vis. iii. v. 1.

woven for Christian practice must be based on Christian belief, but they are distinct charismata, not as a rule given to the same person. They are two aspects of Christian knowledge, each needing due and careful exposition, and as emphasis is laid upon one or other of these aspects, so the instruction becomes "doctrinal" or "practical." The Epistles of the New Testament are expositions of this "knowledge" of God, appealing to the intellectual as well as to the purely spiritual faculties of those to whom they are addressed. The need of intellectual as well as moral truth is shown, e.g., in the Epistles of the Captivity, where the Christian faith meets the challenge of a "philosophy" which is a "vain deceit" determined by human tradition and resting on foundations, whose roots are to be found in "the world" and not "in Christ." These Epistles become expositions of a Christian philosophy to equip the Church against the subtleties of a system of thought which while it claimed to explain the mysteries of God yet did so by "worldly" wisdom and not by the true "wisdom of God." The Christian needs and can obtain the spirit of wisdom and of illumination¹ by which truly to know and to understand these mysteries,² and this spirit is only his "in Christ."³

The same idea is prominent in the Pastoral Epistles, where Christianity is presented as itself a teaching or doctrine (*διδασκαλία*). But the teaching is always of moral import,⁴ and its rejection by some is due to lack of moral correspondence or perception. In 2 Peter, "knowledge" has a certain prominence, akin to the Pastoral Epistles. It is a saving knowledge, and growth in knowledge and grace are a single process.⁵

The Epistle to the Hebrews may be regarded as illus-

¹ Eph. i. 17.

² Col. i. 27-8.

³ For words in the Epistle to the Ephesians indicating knowledge, cf. Holtzmann, quoted in *H.D.B.*, iii. 9 b.

⁴ Titus i. 1.

⁵ 2 Peter iii. 18.

trating both aspects of Christian teaching. It deals with the deepest mysteries of revelation, with the fundamentals of faith, and is therefore a *λόγος σοφίας*, and it interprets and illustrates the meaning of those fundamentals by facts which are within the cognizance of those to whom it is addressed, and it is, therefore, so far a *λόγος γνώσεως*. It is to be noted that *γνώσις* does not occur in the Epistle and *ἐπίγνωσις* only once,¹ but a large part of the writer's purpose is to build up a true knowledge of the organic unity between the Old Testament and the New Testament and so lay a true foundation for a philosophy of life which is definitely Christian.

In the other books of the New Testament knowledge in this almost technical sense is not a characteristic conception, but the instances cited above will serve to show that it holds an important place in the life and equipment of the Church. It is never merely intellectual knowledge, dissociated from other faculties of our nature, but is part of that vital relation into which Christ's body, the Church, is brought with the Author of Salvation. It is one of the elements in producing

Encouragement (παράκλησις).

The effect of Christian prophecy, its essential aim, is described in 1 Corinthians xiv. 31, as comfort or encouragement. At the beginning of this chapter, which is the apostle's exposition of Christian prophecy and its relation to the whole life of the Church, this effect is described as being consolation or exhortation in contrast with edification and comfort. In Romans it is reckoned as a charisma, distinguishing certain members of the body as prophecy, service or teaching distinguished other members. But beyond this there is no indication of any specific form or method in which the gift may be manifested. The right understanding of the Old Testament may be a channel

¹ Heb. x. 26.

through which it may become fruitful in the body,¹ or it may be produced by the teaching of the Apostles² or through the exercise of the gift of prophecy in the assemblies of the Church.³ Sometimes it is spoken of as colouring the whole message of Christianity,⁴ sometimes as affecting the whole Christian character. The conspicuous instance in the New Testament of the latter aspect of the gift is St. Barnabas, whose name embodies the thought of the Church in the matter and is clearly due to the personal characteristics which he displayed. It seems to denote that kind of calm and equable certainty which can communicate to others courage on the one hand, and reasonableness on the other.⁵ The sense of advocacy which lies at the root of *παράκλησις* is never far absent from its use in the New Testament whether that advocacy be mediated through preaching or through conduct. The members of the body may emulate the boldness of the apostle and entreat men on behalf of Christ,⁶ or they may be humble servants carrying a message of encouragement to other members of the body,⁷ but alike they are engaged in work which is building up the Christian character and temperament, which in itself is the great witness to the world of the spiritual reality given in the revelation of Jesus Christ.

¹ Rom. xv. 3.

³ 1 Cor. xiv. 31.

⁵ Acts ix. 27; xi. 25 ff.

⁷ Phil. iv. 18; Col. iv. 7, 8.

² 1 Thess. ii. 3 ff.

⁴ 1 Thess. iii. 11.

⁶ 2 Cor. v. 20.

VII

DIVERSITIES OF GIFTS (II)

DIVERS KINDS OF TONGUES
THE INTERPRETATION OF TONGUES
DISCERNING OF SPIRITS

(γέννη γλωσσῶν, ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν, διακρίσεις πνευματῶν)

PROPHECY is not limited to those members of the body who habitually exercise it and in whom it may be recognized as their peculiar gift for the edifying of the Church. Such men became the prophets *par excellence* of the Church and exercised an itinerant ministry¹ second in importance only to the ministry of the apostles.

But there is another, local occasional manifestation of prophecy. It can be sought and obtained by every member of the body,² and so far he can make his individual contribution to the building up of the whole body in faith and knowledge.

And there is a yet wider corporate use of it. The apostle contemplates the exercise of this charisma by the whole assembly of the local body,³ and it is this possibility which leads to the clear and definite rules which he lays down for the exercise of prophecy in the assembly.⁴ It is clearly a gift which in its full exercise can be understood and appreciated by the unbelieving or the "unlearned"⁵ and which carries conviction with it.

¹ A hint of this is given in 3 John 6. Cf. also Didaché.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 2.

³ 1 Cor. xiv. 24.

⁴ Cf. Selwyn, *Christian Prophets*, p. 2 ff.

⁵ 1 Cor. xiv. 24-5.

That is consistent with the whole idea of prophecy in the New Testament. It appeals immediately to the understanding, and it seems to have a subjective quality akin to that of discerning spirits.¹

But "prophecy and Apocalypse are not co-extensive."² Apocalypse may be described as incomplete prophecy.³ It carries no necessary power of self-expression. It may go no further than arousing the sensibilities of the individual who receives it. It belongs to the receptive faculties, it does not reach the selective faculties. Consequently it needs other charismata for its development, and without the operation of these other charismata it remains isolated and unfruitful beyond the exaltation of the individual. It is only manifested so far as the corporate body is concerned in the gift of tongues, and even this by itself is not "for edifying."

The gift of tongues is first mentioned as part of the equipment of the Church in the doubtful appendix to St. Mark's Gospel,⁴ but no light is thrown on the nature of the utterance. The interpolated *καινῆς* (new) is not of sufficient authority to warrant the conclusion that "tongues" meant language which the speakers had not previously learnt. (Thayer.)

In the first record of the speaking with other tongues, although *διαλέκτω*⁵ may seem to convey the impression that the Apostles were speaking in "foreign" (*ἑτέρας*)⁶ tongues, it must be remembered that all the people mentioned were Jewish proselytes, possessing a common knowledge of the Græco-Aramaic tongue ("dialect"). The catalogue follows the order of the three Great Dispersions of the Jews—the Chaldean, Assyrian and Egyptian⁷—

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 25.

² Selwyn, *op. cit.*

³ Meyer regards Apocalypse as the ground of prophecy. It is the interior element as prophecy is the external element of spiritual activity.

⁴ St. Mark xvi. 18.

⁵ Acts ii. 8.

⁶ Acts ii. 4.

⁷ Mede, quoted by Alford (Acts ii. 8).

and there appears to be a real difference between this particular exercise of the gift of tongues and its more usual exercise at a later date. In this case there is no need of an interpreter,¹ and therefore it may be thought that at the Pentecost the "tongues" expressed language addressed to men and not to God. It would then be a genuine instance of prophecy, and as such it seems to have been understood by St. Peter.² It would be an indication that the *γένη γλωσσῶν* were not different languages (as distinctive of different peoples) but different and varying modes of expressing the matter of the prophecy or vision.

There is probably some connection between the daily practice of the Apostles after the Ascension, as recorded by St. Luke at the end of his Gospel³ and the manifestation at the Pentecost.⁴ The disciples were daily in the Temple, blessing God, and the comment of those who heard them speaking at Pentecost was that they spoke "the mighty works of God," i.e. that they magnified or praised God.⁵

This element of praise is a distinguishing mark of the gift in its early manifestations. It is present in the Apostles, it is present in the conversion of Cornelius,⁶ and it continues in some degree as a settled function of the gift in the Corinthian Church.⁷ Where this aspect of the gift is prominent it is to be noted that all the recipients have had some previous religious training or experience, and in the instances recorded in the Acts there is always one governing condition—the presence of men uninstructed in Christian belief or actively hostile to it. The actual exercise of the gift of tongues has in these instances first and chiefly an evidential purpose. To the Ephesian Christians it was proof that they had received through the

¹ Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 28.

² Acts ii. 17.

³ St. Luke xxiv. 52-3.

⁴ Acts ii. 11; 46, 47.

⁵ Cf. Acts ii. 11, τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ, and St. Luke i. 46. Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου. The word does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. It is purely Lucan.

⁶ Vide note 3 *supra*. Acts x. 46.

⁷ 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

laying on of hands the same gift of the Holy Ghost as the apostles themselves had received at the Pentecost.¹ In St. Peter's account of the conversion of Cornelius the same evidential sign² brings to the Church in Jerusalem the conviction that the Gentiles were also called to be heirs of the Kingdom.

But, while this gift continues to be a possession of the Church a new purpose in its use comes into view as organization grows. It is no longer a sign of fulfilment, but a measure of rebuke and even of condemnation to those without the Church.³ The truth of the Christian claims is to be sought in other directions, to be attested now by other means; the disciplined and enlightened life is to be the witness by which those without may judge of the value and truth of the Christian profession. The meaning of the gift of tongues is now to be sought within the Church, it becomes esoteric instead of exoteric. But it is to be used for the edifying of the whole body. Those individuals to whom it was granted (and they were many in the Corinthian Church) must recognize that it is only valid in so far as the whole assembly can share in its message; like the greater gift of prophecy, the lesser gift of tongues is not of private interpretation, and to disregard this rule is to introduce an element of weakness in the corporate Christian life. The unregulated exercise of the gift would tend only to the exaltation of the individual⁴ at the expense of his brethren. It would contradict that practical ideal of brotherhood which was one of the fundamental necessities of Christian corporate life. It would induce separation, isolation, rather than unity.⁵

¹ Acts xix. 6, cf. xix. 17.

² Acts xi. 15, *ὡσπερ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ*: xi. 17, *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν.*

³ Compare the quotation from Joel ii. 28, in Acts ii. 17, with the quotation from Isaiah xxviii. 11, in 1 Cor. xiv. 21. Isaiah's message is condemnatory and is quoted in that sense by St. Paul.

⁴ 1 Cor. xiv. 4.

⁵ 1 Cor. xiv. 11.

The rightful use of the gift was therefore one of the problems of the Corinthian Church, and the directions given in 1 Corinthians xii.-xiv. are entirely concerned in guiding the Church in regard to it.

A new characteristic appears which is not prominent in the Acts, though indeed it is implied even there.¹ The gift is not self-sufficient, nor even self-contained. It is a means to an end, it is a subsidiary ancillary gift. There is a hint of this in the Acts, where it is linked with Baptism,² and through Baptism and the laying on of hands, with prophecy.³ It is thus marked at the earliest stage (in the Acts) as a distinctively Christian gift, connected with the reception of the Christian sacraments. But the Christian sacraments are essentially part of the Christian corporate life; they bring the individual into vital relation with the whole body, and the gift of tongues can only be rightly understood and appreciated when it is considered in relation to that corporate life. In the later stage, therefore, the apostle is concerned to teach its distinctively Christian use and purpose, i.e. its place in the complete equipment of the Christian body. His teaching about it follows the exposition of the great social Sacrament of Holy Communion, itself the pivot of the Christian's relation both to God and to his fellow-Christians.

The teaching on tongues (given in response to a request for guidance from the Corinthian Church) is the more important because the near neighbourhood of Delphi with its world-renowned Oracle of Apollo had familiarized the Corinthians with a phenomenon of a similar character. And there were not wanting signs that this was perplexing the minds of the Corinthian Christians.

The apostle had already laid down the standard by which the genuineness of the gift might be tested. Loyalty to the Lord Christ was its essential note⁴ and would at once

¹ Cf. Acts ii. 17 ff.

² Acts x. 44.

³ Acts xix. 6.

⁴ 1 Cor. xii. 3.

serve to distinguish it from the "tongues" of heathen prophets. In Chapter xiv. he makes two further points quite clear: The Christian gift was not a "mantic" energy incapable of control or regulation.¹ The speakers were to take their turn, and to observe due order. And if any speaker refused to be guided by this direction, which is to be regarded as a Divine command,² he is to be ignored.³ Thus the apostle deals with the individual exercising the gift. And the other point about which he is equally clear is that the final standard by which the validity of the utterance is to be judged is its service to the corporate life of the Church. If the message could not be translated or interpreted, the Church was to disregard it and the speaker was to keep silence.⁴

This section of the Epistle is, in fact, an exposition of the whole meaning of inspiration in the Church, of which the gift of tongues is a notable and outstanding illustration. The old Hebrew idea was that the tongue is the leading instrument by which the praises of God are proclaimed.⁵ This passed to the more rigorous conception of inspiration which regarded the tongue as directly put in motion by the Holy Ghost.⁶ But the Christian doctrine is far wider, and it is to the special application of the Christian doctrine to the gift of tongues that the apostle here addresses himself. The inspiration of the Holy Ghost is not mechanical but vital,⁷ and influences the whole personality. But that personality only finds true completion in relation to other personalities. Sometimes the inspiration may find complete expression in certain directions in the individual,

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 27.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 37-8.

³ 1 Cor. xiv. 38, cf. reading, and Alford's note *in loc.*

⁴ 1 Cor. xiv. 28-9.

⁵ Cf. Psalms xxxiv. 28; lxxv. 17; lxx. 24; cxxv. 2; Acts ii. 26; Phil. ii. 11.

⁶ Cf. Philo, ver. div. hæc. § 35:

καταχρήται ἕτερος αὐτοῦ τοῖς φωνητήρισι, ὄργανοις, στόματι καὶ γλώττῃ πρὸς μνησιν ὧν ἂν θελή.

⁷ 1 Cor. xiv. 6-9.

as e.g. in the Apostles and Prophets, sometimes it is only fully expressed in combination with gifts bestowed on other members of the body, as e.g. in those to whom an apocalypse is given, and who speak with tongues yet are unable themselves to interpret or to explain. In these cases the contribution of the individual to the corporate efficiency of the Church is completed by the communication of what he has gained through his special charisma to others through whose mediation the message can become the common property of the whole body. A tendency was already observable in the Corinthian Church to exalt those who possessed these lesser, subsidiary gifts, to magnify the individual, whose gift, thus displaced from its proper relation to that of other members of the body, became a source of weakness rather than a channel of power.

In 1 Corinthians xiii. the gift of tongues is co-ordinated with knowledge and prophecy and faith, all of them regarded as transitory gifts in relation to the abiding power of love as the way of fulfilment. But while each of these three gifts has its fulfilment in the wider sphere of the future life, "tongues" have no place in that development. It has no element of permanence and is not in any case to be thought of as complete in itself apart from these other gifts. But while in 1 Corinthians xiv. the exposition is chiefly concerned with the relation of "tongues" to knowledge and to apocalypse, it is to be noted that neither of these latter gifts find place in any of the lists of *charismata*.¹ They are both, however, subsidiary to prophecy and may be regarded as included in that charisma in both formal and unsystematic lists.

That apocalypse was a frequent form of prophecy is evident,² but unless it is given through a fully endowed prophet (as distinguished from a "seer") it requires other

¹ Cf. Selwyn, *Christian Prophets*, p. 3 f.

² Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 10; xiv. 30; 2 Cor. xii. 1; Gal. i. 12, 16; 1 Peter i. 12.

gifts of other men for its effective expression. Speaking with tongues is to be regarded as a gift subsidiary to prophecy and more particularly attached to apocalyptic prophecy, i.e. the setting forth of an unveiled mystery which may be conveyed to the seer either by vision or by "hearing" or by an inner ineffable consciousness of its truth. And when he utters what he sees or hears or feels the utterance is in some appropriate terms which he himself may be entirely unable to interpret because his ordinary faculties are in quality or training inadequate to the task. The "diversities of tongues" would then be the different forms appropriate to the different kinds of revelation. It may be "a psalm, a teaching, a vision,"¹ but these are different varieties of mystical impressions. The first condition is that the seer must be "in the spirit," and in that condition he is receptive of spiritual knowledge which needs expression in a variety of ways.

The ancient opinion that at the Pentecost the apostles were endowed with a facility for speaking foreign languages is now generally abandoned,² though it has the support of St. Cyril,³ St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine. Meyer pronounces it to be neither "logically possible nor psychologically and morally conceivable."⁴ In place of this opinion the more modern commentators have inclined to the view that the gift extended to the hearers as well as to the speakers, giving the former a new ability to understand languages before unknown to them. But the difficulties of this position are even greater than those of the ancient school.⁵ Others again⁶ understand the utterances to be ecstatic and uttered in languages hitherto unknown to the speakers. And Dr. Wright⁷ justly cites modern psycho-

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 26.

² Schaff, *History of the Church*, i. 232.

³ On Psalm xix. 3.

⁴ Commentary on Acts ii. 4.

⁵ For a discussion of these points cf. Wright, *Problems of the New Testament*, p. 277 ff.

⁶ Dean Alford on Acts ii. 4. Dean Stanley takes the same view.

⁷ Op. cit., p. 290 ff.

logical teaching on the subjective mind as possibly supporting this conclusion. But it must be remembered that the subjective mind retains and reproduces knowledge already acquired in the past, and there is no evidence that this was a condition obtaining among the "tongue-speakers."

While the latter view has much in it that commends itself to the inquirer, undue stress still seems to be laid upon the *language* in which the communication is made rather than stress being put on the *matter* of the communication and the form which that matter assumed. Yet that seems to be the chief thought in the apostle's mind when he discusses the question in the passage under notice. The difficulty of understanding what the seer has to communicate is not merely a difficulty of language—it is a difficulty of substance, of content. If the Church cannot understand the substance of the seer's communication, no interpretation of the language in which it is conveyed would avail for edifying. And the apostle is so much concerned that this should be kept in view as *the* matter of supreme importance that he interjects his warning "let all things be done unto edifying," in the midst of his explanation, and ends with a final reminder that God is not a God of confusion.

If, however, divers kinds of tongues be regarded as the various forms in which the mystical impressions of the seer are embodied, difficulties seem to be lessened. It is not the language itself, but the idea conveyed which needs interpretation. Illustrations from the prophets of the Old Testament as well as from the Apocalypse of the New Testament are not wanting to give support to this view.¹ The sagas, the Psalms, the visions, the Prophecies of the Old Testament are in themselves the ultimate forms (the *γενῆ γλωσσῶν*) in which the great spiritual truths were progressively conveyed. And frequently we are made aware that the recipient himself needs help to interpret

¹ See p. 99, note 2, *supra*.

and understand the message with which he is entrusted. Sometimes, also, he needs an intermediary to convey the message which he has himself received to those for whom it was intended. Moses received the Divine communications with regard to Israel's future, but it was through Aaron that the message was conveyed to Pharaoh—and it is to be noted that Aaron was enabled to do this by a special gift of the same spirit by which Moses was inspired.¹

The modern scientist or poet thinks and writes in the language of his craft. That is his "gift," his contribution to the common store of knowledge or of idealism. And though he writes in a tongue which is native both to himself and to his readers, yet the substance of his teaching may be entirely beyond his readers' grasp until some one can interpret it more nearly into the language of their everyday thought. Possibly it was in some sense analogous to this that St. Peter's account of the Incarnate Life needed the "interpretation" of St. Mark² before it could become the common property of the Church, while Silvanus may have filled the same office in regard to St. Peter's first Epistle.³

It is clear from several passages in 1 Corinthians⁴ that the hearers may be aware of the different kinds of communication which may from time to time be made, though, with one exception, they may not understand its content. The exception is in the case of fundamental truths,⁵ where the hearers can apparently at once judge for themselves the truth or falsity of the utterance provided they are true to the standard laid down. The passage just cited implies that the hearers could understand the matter, and therefore *a fortiori*, the language of the communication, but such understanding is apparently limited to this class of subject. In other cases the substance of the communication needs further elucidation, although its main tendency, whether it

¹ Exod. iv. 13-16.

³ 1 Peter v. 12.

⁵ 1 Cor. xii. 3 f.

² Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 39.

⁴ xii. 3; xiv. 6; xiv. 26.

be a devotional or a didactic utterance, an apocalypse or an interpretation, can be perceived and so far appreciated.

The real danger to the Corinthian Christians was not that they might not be able to understand the matter of the communication, but that they might think there was no need to understand it. Unless they followed the apostle's directions they might be imposed upon by the false claim of some one in their midst to be able to give them a communication which because it was unintelligible might on that account be regarded by an uninstructed hearer as Divine.¹ The near neighbourhood of Delphi to Corinth has already been noted as justifying the apostle's fear and giving point to his meaning. And the Corinthians were notoriously facile in expression and adaptability.² The corrective is to be supplied by the corporate mind and conscience of the Church, for the gift of tongues is not for private use, but one which is to be exercised in the congregation.

This gift must then be studied in its relation to the other subordinate gifts of prophecy and as one of them, not as an isolated phenomenon. It is not the abnormality of the gift which gives it importance, but its place in the orderly unfolding of spiritual knowledge given for the whole body, depending for its full expression on differing gifts of different members and never given for the advantage of the individual alone. Regarded by itself and as a private gift to the individual it may become (as is evident in the Corinthian Church) a source of pride and emulation and so defeat the end for which it is given. It may even be mistaken for the greater gift of direct prophecy and so be entirely displaced from its rightful position. It must be remembered that the seer would probably only "see" things which harmonized with his own belief,³ and it is his belief as well as his vision

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 2.

² 2 Cor. iv. 3. The "trade words" expressing this facility are noteworthy in 2 Corinthians.

³ Cf. Selwyn, *Christian Prophets*, p. 56 n.

which must be attested before his contribution to the Church's store can be accepted. The seer was an ordinary member of the body, gifted occasionally with extraordinary powers; he was not a recognized leader of the body as the prophet was. And the matter of his vision must pass through recognized channels in order to its full acceptance by his brethren.

The gift of tongues is the first of a series of charismata which link together perception of certain aspects of Divine truth and the communication of that truth to the body of Christian people. On the one side is Apocalypse, revelation, given in many different forms, and on the other interpretation, discrimination, teaching. The tongues vary as they express the different kinds of revelation; they clothe in outward form the inner experience of the seer, but until the series is complete the revelation and its meaning cannot become the common property of the Church. In the prophets the conscious faculties appear to be directly exercised both by the speakers themselves and their hearers. In the lower order of the seers this does not seem to be so, and it is not till their gift, expressed through the tongues, shall have been reinforced and completed by the exercise of the gifts of interpretation and discrimination, usually by other members of the body, that it can take rank side by side with the gift of the prophets. It is only when this process has been completed that the message can become available for the teachers, to be first resolved by them into words of wisdom or words of knowledge and then applied by them to the edifying of the whole body.

ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν. Interpretation of tongues.

διακρίσεις πνευμάτων. Discerning of spirits.

Between its most ancient use and its final place as a definite gift or charisma of the Christian Church, interpretation passed through many phases or grades of use. Most ancient of all was its use in connection with dreams,¹ but coeval

¹ Cf. Gen. xl., xli.; Judges vii. 15; Daniel ii. 4, etc.

with that function there appears another which remains constant throughout—the function of translating from one language to another¹ until the Methergeman becomes a recognized and important official in the Synagogue worship.

But these are ritual uses connected with the life of the court or the temple and are purely official. Alongside of them ran a parallel use, the interpretation of the Divine will, and in this sense the interpreter becomes almost an ambassador. Sometimes he is a prophet,² sometimes an angel.³ The earliest Targums, based on an oral tradition of a synagogue interpretation, bear witness to the elaborate system of interpretation which had grown up among the Jews, and in the later synagogue worship even the Methergeman had, by the unchallenged use of Haggada, passed from the position of a mere translator of the sacred text to a position closely approaching that of teacher. The standard had so far been dictated by loyalty to the letter of the sacred writings, and the ingenuity of the interpreter was exercised in building up the “hedge of the law” in order to provide against its slightest infraction. The guiding canon was that in no case could any writing of the Prophetic books or of the Hagiographa supersede or contradict the Torah, but could only enforce or explain it.

It is clear from the narrative of the Acts that the Apostles and the members of the Apostolic Church had gained an entirely new standard of interpretation which would belong to the whole body of the Church and not simply to its officials. The Incarnation of the Christ had opened a new world to them and had transformed the old. A fresh light illuminated the ancient scriptures, and, from the journey to Emmaus onward, had, on the authority of their risen Lord, set the lines upon which, for them, interpretation should proceed. He was Himself the centre and focus of the old revelations, and it would be His voice they would listen to in future communications of God’s will. It was this new

¹ Gen. xlii. 23.

² Isa. xliii. 27.

³ Job xxxiii. 23.

standard of interpretation which brought them into conflict with the religious leaders of the age, but they received constant confirmation of the truth of the new standard in the evidences of Divine power which was being exercised as and so far as they were loyal to it. It was this new standard of interpretation which became the constant guide of the Church both in teaching and in action in the first years of her history. In 1 Corinthians xiv., two separate actions are depicted: the interpretation of a message, not merely its translation, by one member of the congregation, and the judgment on the message, in which apparently the whole congregation takes part.¹ But the two things are often interwoven, especially when the apostles themselves are dealing with any particular situation or with any particular teaching. They had been taught by the Lord Himself to be careful in discerning the spirit in which they themselves judged the attitude or action of others,² and to be equally careful in discerning the real point at issue in such action.³ These were their first lessons in the use of that power which was to be given them in its fullness later on, and which would always draw them back to Him as the Supreme reference in any judgment they might make. Clear and accurate knowledge of the truth or falsity involved in word or action is implied in apostolic dealing with Ananias and Sapphira⁴ or with Elymas,⁵ or with the incestuous person at Corinth,⁶ or with the judgment of the Corinthian Church in regard to him.⁷ These instances have reference to action, but the judgment, the discrimination, or "discerning" is as clear in regard to teaching, as the Epistle to the Colossians and the Pastoral Epistles clearly show.

The two charismata of discerning of spirits and of interpretation are, in fact, interdependent. They have to do with inner motive and with external expression of that

¹ vv. 27, 29.

³ Mark ix. 38.

⁵ Acts xiii. 8.

² St. Luke ix. 55 (Text. Rec.).

⁴ Acts v. 3.

⁶ 1 Cor. v.

⁷ 2 Cor. ii. 5-11.

motive. It is not first the welfare of the Church which must be thought of, but something which, while it involved the lesser thing, and indeed on which that lesser thing ultimately depended, was itself of far greater import. The greater thing was loyalty to Christ. The Church had always to strive to express the mind of Christ, always to be guided by that standard. The special charismata of discernment and interpretation were given for this end, and though interdependent emerge as separate gifts in Christian congregations depending for guidance on their own sense of the indwelling spirit and without the guarantee which the presence of an apostle would afford. It is to be part of the enlightenment in which the whole body shares in order that its teaching and its action may always be true.¹ The general sense of *διακρίνω* in the New Testament, "making distinctions,"² implies a supreme standard, and this standard is found in the Christ. But neither interpretation nor discernment was confined to messages delivered in the congregation, though that is the particular question discussed in 1 Corinthians xiv. and the particular matter on which the Church would most need general guidance. The whole matter goes deeper and wider than this special aspect of it.³ It touches conduct as well as speech, definite and ordered teaching as well as mystic and enraptured utterance, and it rests upon the broad foundation of the redemptive action of the Divine Logos on the intellectual faculties of the members of the Church. It enforces the claim of the Christ upon the whole and complete service of His people, it enforces, too, the apostolic claim that the Church is the body in and through which the Christ continually expresses

¹ The consciousness of the need of continuous enlightenment for teaching is shown in a prayer of the end of the fourth century, quoted by Milligan, *Vocab. New Testament*, Pt. ii. p. 158. *Φώτισον ἐν τῇ [ση πα] ρακλήσει· ὅπως καταζιωθῶμεν . . . τῆς μεγαλοφθοῦς διδασκαλίας τῶν εὐαγγελίων τοῦ σ. ἡμῶν. I. X.*

² Cf. "No discerner durst wag his tongue in censure." (Henry VIII. i. 1.) Cf. also 1 Cor. iv. 7.

³ Cf. notes 4-7, p. 119, *supra*.

Himself. It is in virtue of His indwelling presence that the Church has the duty of interpreting and judging by her corporate consciousness the utterance and conduct of each one of her members. "The Name" was the power by which evil spirits were cast out¹ or bodily health was given²; it was the power which gave authority to Apostolic judgment on conduct³; it is the same Name which is powerful to inspire a right judgment and a sound faith in the whole body and in each member of it.⁴ In the Thessalonian Church the presbyters are exhorted to make use of this gift of judgment (discrimination) in regard to prophesying⁵; in 1 Corinthians xiv. it is the whole assembly of the local Church which is to accept and undertake this duty. It was in the exercise of this charisma of discernment that the Church at a later date and without any formal synodical declaration formed the earliest canon of her sacred books, and by common consent placed them in the three classes of "received," "disputed" and "rejected."⁶

The place of these subsidiary gifts of perception and communication in the work of edifying the Church may be summarized thus. They form a middle term, touching on the one side powers which in their exercise appear to be largely spiritual or mystical, and on the other side powers which find their immediate field of action in the intellectual sphere. In the Epistles they are in every case regarded as active within the Church and for the edifying of the body, and so far differ in their purpose from the use described in Acts ii. The sequence moves in the following order:

(i.) *Gifts which engage the purely "spiritual" functions:*

(a) *Exaltation, ἐν πνεύματι, "in spirit."* This is a primary and fundamental condition present in all forms of prophecy, but most marked in that lesser degree of prophecy (sc. Apocalypse) which

¹ Acts xvi. 18.

² Acts iii. 6.

³ 1 Cor. v. 4.

⁴ 1 Cor. ii. *passim*; 1 Cor. iv. 19 (*δύναμιν*). ⁵ 1 Thess. v. 20-21.

⁶ Eusebius, *H.E.* iii. 25. ὁμολογουμένοι . . . ἀντιλεγόμενοι . . . ῥήθιοι.

does not itself involve the intellectual faculties.

- (b) *Perception, ἀποκάλυψις*. Revelation of various kinds or types. Less complete than prophecy in lacking the power of clear enunciation. Apocalypse may be communicated to the subject by sight, hearing, or feeling.
- (ii.) *Intermediate gifts of communication (expression, exposition and selection)*.
- (a) *Form, γένη γλωσσῶν*. Divers kinds of tongues. The form of expression varies with the nature of the revelation.
- (b) *Matter, ἐρμηνεία*. Interpretation. A gift which is necessary to the exposition of the revelation. The speaker in tongues may personally possess this additional gift, or it may be given to some other member of the body.
- (c) *Selection, διακρίσεις πνευμάτων*. Discerning of spirits. A gift especially evident in assemblies of the Church and proper to its corporate action. Although in 1 Corinthians xii. it is placed after prophecy and before "tongues," yet in 1 Corinthians xiv. it is clearly exercised in regard to both prophecy (the whole) and tongues (the part). In this connection the gift may be exercised either by the whole local body or by a group or groups within the body. It is a corporate gift and has a reference to conduct and motive as well as to speech.
- (iii.) *Gifts which engage the intellectual faculties*.
- (a) *Διδασκαλία*. Teaching. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{(i.) } \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma. \text{ Word of wisdom.} \\ \text{The fundamental verities of the} \\ \text{Christian faith.} \\ \text{(ii.) } \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma. \text{ Word of knowledge.} \\ \text{Practical significance of these} \\ \text{"words of wisdom."} \end{array} \right.$
- (b) *παρακλήσις*. Exhortation.

At this point the contribution of the prophets and seers becomes available for the edification of the whole body. It may come through men whose special gift it is to discern fundamental truths, and therefore to guard their fellow-Christians from errors of belief, or it may have in it some direct and practical guidance in Christian duty, or again, some message of encouragement or consolation. It is significant that while the activities of Christian teachers must have largely taken the form of preaching, this is not mentioned as one of the charismata of the Church, though perhaps it is included under the designation "evangelists" in Ephesians iv. 11. But the office of teacher and the work of teaching is so important that it is put in the front rank in three out of the four lists in which St. Paul enumerates the charismata of the Church. On the faithful use of this gift depends that capacity for witness to the truth which is the object of the Church's existence, and it therefore becomes the vital issue both of the main gift of prophecy and of those lesser gifts with which the exercise of other forms of prophecy is connected.

VIII
DIVERSITIES OF GIFTS (III)

THE CHARISMATA OF POWER AND SYMPATHY

I Cor. xii. 9.	{	<p><i>πίστις</i>. Faith.</p> <p><i>χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων</i>. Gifts of healings.</p> <p><i>ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων</i>. Working of miracles.</p>
I Cor. xii. 28 f.	{	<p><i>δυνάμεις</i>. Miracles.</p> <p><i>χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων</i>. Gifts of healings.</p> <p><i>ἀντιλήψεις</i> (helps). Nursings.</p> <p><i>κυβερνήσεις</i> (governments). Wise counsels.</p>

Rom. xii. 8. ὁ μεταδιδούς . . . ὁ ἐλεῶν. He that imparteth.
. . . He that showeth (active) pity.

It has already been noted that the charismata appear to be divided broadly into four groups—of power, sympathy, administration, utterance. In some of these what may be called natural gifts or qualities are claimed as channels through which the Holy Spirit may work in the Church, in others, the gifts appear to be of a special character, which precludes their being attributed to any “ natural ” qualities. Of the four groups, the third is so closely connected with organization and so with the history of the Church’s Orders that it does not come within the scope of the present essay. The chief channels outside the channels of Holy Orders through which the charismatic powers of the Church have been manifested are those of power, sympathy and utterance, and of these the charismata of utterance have claimed

attention first because they have had the most important place in the history of the Church and in the world's recognition of her claims. To-day the regard in which she is held is almost limited to regard for those two groups of charismata of sympathy and utterance (however modified in their modern manifestations) by which her activity is attested and its real value is judged.

In Tertullian's classification¹ the earliest extant outside the New Testament, it is apparent that the gifts of speech and of moral qualities are already outweighing in popular estimation the other gifts with which they are associated. But his grouping is broad and capable of closer analysis. It is simply a classification of the gifts according to their generic relation, without further examination.

But a mere classification is incomplete and insufficient. In order to arrive at some estimate, not only of their relative importance, but also of their actual value in the life and economy of the Christian Church, it is necessary to pay regard to their purpose as well as to their origin. If, for instance, they are clearly temporary gifts, given for a special purpose, and limited to a special period in the Church's history, they may be regarded as having only a secondary place, as simply evidential. But if, on the other hand, the charismata are connected with some fundamental purpose of the Church's mission, then such an account of them would be clearly inadequate. Nor would it be sufficient to ask for evidence of the continued use of charismata as a test of their permanent value. Many causes may have contributed from time to time to their disuse, but their validity is not thereby disproved or disposed of. The obvious persistence of some of the charismata, while some others had apparently disappeared, would still have to be explained, unless some more or less arbitrary line were drawn dividing them into necessary gifts and special gifts. The conditions which brought about this distinction would have to be

¹ See p. 45.

accounted for, and there is no evidence in the New Testament that any such distinction existed. They are all regarded there as necessary elements in the life and equipment of the Church. It might be supposed that if any of the charismata are to be regarded as special gifts belonging only to the first stage of the Church's life and work, a line might be drawn at the close of the New Testament era. But the evidence of the sub-Apostolic period shows that the gifts did not cease with the New Testament era, and this by itself gives sufficient reason for believing that they were not specially attached to that period, but were intended to have a more permanent place in the life of the Christian community. It is necessary to seek for some condition or some principle which was operative and was recognized as operative during the whole period in which the complete charismatic equipment of the Church was active. The change of the condition or the eclipse of the principle would more reasonably account for the cessation of charismatic activity than any theory that the charismatic power had been withdrawn, for it must not be forgotten that the New Testament portrays the operation of divine and therefore eternal forces in the lives of men.

In the study of the charismata we have continually to keep in mind the purpose for which the Lord constituted the Church, and that cannot be explained apart from the fundamental truth of the Incarnation itself. That central fact of history was, as the Christian consciousness affirms, evidence both of the Divine will for the good of man and of man's capacity to share in the operations of that will. And the charismata are active so long as the cognizance of this primary principle is the mainspring of the Church's life. It is not the organization of the Church, necessary as that was to her orderly activity, but some change in her ideal and her outlook which affected the operation of the charismata, because that change of outlook and ideal created a psychological condition hostile to their activity.

In the earliest Christian writers the dominant note is, with few exceptions, the effect of the Incarnation as the final and complete revelation of God and of man's relation to Him in Christ,¹ and the earliest corporate Christian experience was an exploration of what this relation involved and implied, both for the Church and for the world. The historic point where a change of ideal became clearly manifest was the conversion of the Emperor Constantine, A.D. 326. Up to and including the Council of Nicaea theological activity had centred on Christology—it was an effort to explore and define the implications of the revelation which had been committed to the Church by her Divine Master. From that time onwards, although doctrinal controversy still dominated much of her thought, a new element became visible. Her outlook was changed and apparently enlarged. She became a power in the imperial world, and the tendency grew to exert her influence in alliance with political forces. It was at this point that her change of ideal became clear, from that of an embodiment of power, spiritual vitality, *δύναμις*, to that of an embodiment of authority, *ἐξουσία*, dependent still, so far as her own inner consciousness was concerned, on the spiritual sanction of her mission to declare the truth, but measured so far as the world outside was concerned by sanctions which depended on her harmonious relations with the temporal power. The effect of this new ideal within the Christian body can be traced in those divisions which broke the Church into separated and often hostile communities. The history of her later development became largely a history of conflict with the temporal power in the assertion of the ideal of authority in directions which at times overrode the just province of civil authority, and which did not hesitate on occasion to invade the region even of intellectual knowledge. The importance of this ancient conflict lies in this—that though the actual contro-

¹ "The doctrine of the Logos was the stock out of which Christian theology grew." *Semisch*. Just. M. ii. s. 247.

versies are long since past, their heritage is still with us in the tendency to give an undue and disproportionate weight to the idea of authority and a corresponding loss of the idea of dynamic force in men's conception of the Church. Nor has the result of this change of ideal been less marked or less disastrous in the sphere of intellectual knowledge. Galileo's *Eppur se muove* was the natural revolt of his own integrity against pretensions which could be sustained only by reference to an authority which had been stretched beyond its proper sphere till, in the course of centuries, it seemed to have become the enemy of an aspect of truth which men found to be as imperative as moral truth itself. And although that attitude has long since been abandoned, one result of it still remains in the tinge of antagonism which colours discussion when the miracles of the New Testament or of the Church are under review.

In such discussions the miracles have generally been isolated and examined as things apart. No general principle has been looked for beyond their evidential value in regard to the validity of the Church's claims in other directions. No law has been sought which might on examination reduce their quality as *τέρατα* (portents), but which might enhance and explain their value as *σημεία*, signs of a power at work which would be capable of investigation along the lines of its own manifestation, as Newton's falling apple was the sign of a power which, though of universal import and in ceaseless operation, was as yet unknown and unrealized. There has been no constructive theory advanced which could be examined and explored, and by which the miracles could be tested, either singly and alone or in connection with other facts which were susceptible of clear and independent proof.

The discussion generally proceeded along one of two lines according as it was based on the premise of material or philosophical tenets. In England Hume was the originator of modern destructive criticism of miracles. It is to be

remembered that he starts from the point of view of declared hostility to the moral claims of Christianity, and it must not be forgotten that his criticism coincides with the beginnings of that historical criticism of the sacred text which has so completely shattered the old idea of mechanical inspiration, in his time the sincere but uncritical belief of English Christianity. Among the critics of the miraculous who may be ranged with Hume, though not always sharing his presuppositions, are Goethe, Renan, Strauss, J. S. Mill, etc., and their criticism is always based on the theory that no causes other than material can come within the cognizance of man. On the other hand, Spinoza's theory that "nothing happens in nature which is in contradiction with its universal laws" (and therefore any really miraculous event is impossible) has set the lines upon which almost all philosophical discussions of miracles have proceeded, in spite of the ambiguity of his use of the word and idea of nature and his almost pantheistic idea of the relation of God to the world. A corrective of this view is to be found in the truth which St. Augustine puts forward (*De civitate Dei*, xxi. 8) that Nature as we know it is not to be identified with Nature as God knows it.

Two modern discussions of miracles from the theological standpoint are of special importance to our subject. Professor Mozley¹ discussed them in their connection with the Christian religion as a "new and striking revelation of the Divine character and therefore a new impulse to action," and he formulates the proposition that there are only two modes of reconciling miracles with natural law in the scientific sense: (i.) "The discovery, if it were possible, of intermitting laws of nature, i.e. that miracles, though exceptions, were recurrent exceptions and exceptions which recurred with the same invariable antecedents. (But no such intermitting law of miracles is seen in nature.)" (ii.) "Some hypothesis, which, if true, would bring them

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, "Miracles," 1865.

out of their apparent isolation and reduce them to the head of known classes of fact, as is done with respect to eccentric natural phenomena." ¹

In Archbishop Temple's *Bampton Lectures* he says: "Healing may be no miracle at all. It may be an instance of the power of mind over body, a power which is undeniably not yet brought within the range of science and which, nevertheless, may be really within its domain." ²

These two quotations will serve to show the new lines along which inquiry was moving. They foreshadow a position and attitude which has been justified by the new knowledge which has become available since the day when they were advanced in plea of recognition of the "miraculous" as an actual fact of experience. And it is possible that a fresh examination of the miraculous element in the New Testament from this point of view may greatly enrich not the apologetic armament only, but the constructive energy of the Christian Church.

Professor Mozley's second tentative hypothesis and Archbishop Temple's implied adoption of it as a possible basis for further investigation in one particular direction forecast lines of advance which are not yet fully explored and which promise fruitful results. They would remove from the discussion the old disabling antinomy of the materialistic and the philosophic conception of the world or of nature, and they suggest possible reconciliations of divergent lines of thought. And more recent psychological investigation has tended to establish the soundness of their suggestions.

It is the object of the present essay to suggest that evidence of such a law, expressing as do all other "natural" laws an energy of the Divine mind, can be traced in the operation of the charismatic gifts. Its foundation is to be sought in that relation between the Divine and the human which was disclosed by the Incarnation, and which

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. xiv. f.

² *The Relations between Religion and Science*, p. 195 (1884).

formed the necessary condition by which the full power of the Incarnation was manifested. The New Testament teaches that the Incarnation was of eternal purpose (and therefore always a present fact in the Divine mind), and the laws which were manifested through it must therefore be as valid as any of those natural laws which it has been the glory of science to discover and to formulate. The fundamental law is that of true correspondence between man and God. The laws of this correspondence were revealed in the Person of the Redeemer and made operative in human life by His personal work. That work is presented in the New Testament as the setting free of man's spiritual self from disabilities, the lifting up of his whole nature to higher levels of attainment and of possibility. The Gospels describe this setting free as due to the conquest by the Christ of a power of evil which thwarts the Divine will, and when this victory has been accomplished the way is clear for the outflow of Divine power, not as eccentric occurrences, but as the law of life in its completest sense. The potential union of human and Divine in order that the Divine power may be set free to act according to its own laws is completed by the reciprocal action of man's will reaching out towards the Divine.

It must be remarked that in all the discussions of the Gospel miracles the point of view has practically always been with reference to the Lord's Person, scarcely ever with reference to His work as Redeemer, and this has necessarily limited the area of discussion. The miracles have been regarded as proofs of His Divinity, in spite of His own deprecation of such an attitude,¹ or as signs of His personal power and goodwill for men. The idea of His unique personality has been extended to the "works," to the exclusion of any other aspect of them. Their super-normal characteristics have been linked with their supernatural origin in such a way as to remove both from the field of ordinary

¹ St. John xiv. 11.

experience, and it has thus become impossible to regard them as other than peculiar to the special circumstances in which they were wrought. The emphasis has been on the actual manifestation of power, not on the law which governs such manifestation.

But part at least of the Lord's work was to fit human nature for a wholeness of endeavour which might correspond with the purposes of God, and, regarded from this point of view, the miracles of the Gospel become not so much personal credentials of the Christ as indications of the working of that power which was intended to become the dynamic of human life.

And the fact is urgent for consideration that the Lord's work of redemption did not consist merely, if it may be so expressed, in the restoration of man's true spiritual relation with God, the triumph over the moral evil which had brought that relation into disharmony, but that this restoration included also the setting man free from those physical ills and disabilities which appear in the Gospels to be the evidence or consequence of that disharmony. The miracles of the Gospels may be regarded as signs of a power which was at work to secure the wholeness of man's whole nature, both his spiritual self and the physical organism through which that spiritual personality expressed itself. The physical ills which were remedied by a word or a touch of the Lord seem to be expressions on the physical plane of the same power of evil whose activity had resulted in the spiritual disharmony which made the Atonement necessary. Man's nature is one and the Lord's redemption affected the whole of that unity. Beginning at the centre, its effects were to spread to the circumference and so to embrace the whole of man's being and life. But human life only finds its fullness in corporate relationships, and redemptive power needs the corporate life of the Church for complete expression. It is only in such corporate relation that those moral qualities can be exercised which

are a primary condition for its complete and unfettered work.

And if that be so, the wonder is, not that miracles should have had so large a place in the work of the Christ, but that they should have come to have so small a place in the Church's conception of her mission to the world. For it is indisputably true that her commission included work for the wholeness of man's body as well as for the holiness of his soul, and it was in the strength of this conviction that the first Christians undertook the evangelizing of the world.

The service (*διακονία*) which is the contribution of personal help or offerings to the common support of the Church must not be limited to material gifts or formal ministerial activity. There is another kind of service, the right use of the charismatic gifts with which individuals may be endowed. It is the Church's office, as we see it set forth in the New Testament, to work for the whole salvation of man, and while one form of *διακονία* may extend to teaching, setting forth, the conditions of spiritual freedom; another form of service, in its place not less important, may be the setting free of man's physical nature from bondage.

It would be equally impossible to regard such a service as either self-originating or self-sufficient. It is not the Church's mission simply to set men free from physical ills. These lie upon the circumference of life, and her mission is to work from the centre. It is here that the corporate life of the Church, the mutual interdependence of her members each with his own gifts, becomes increasingly important. She must be one in action in order that she may be one in witness. And in the group of charismata which have to do with the redemption of man's physical organism the danger of separating these gifts in their application to those needs which are most obvious and most insistent in the consciousness of man from those

gifts which bring help to the spiritual side of his nature is seen and guarded against. They must be recognized as coming from the same God, working with the same intention as those other gifts. And all together they must be recognized and used as the equipment of the whole corporate body. They as a whole are to be regarded as extensions of that Divine power which was first clearly manifested in the Person of the Son of God Himself. And He had already taught His disciples that the redemption of the body from the evil power depended ultimately on the working of the redemptive power in the soul.¹ And whatever the diversities of ministry, it was the same Lord through whom they came, whatever the differences of working it was the same God, the Supreme Source, the unifying Power who was acting through them all.

The consciousness of this fact is constant throughout the Pauline Epistles. The apostle so frequently uses *ἐνεργεῖν* (to work) and its derivatives that the word may be regarded as characteristic of him. Aristotle had used *ἐνεργεία*, "actually," in contrast with *δυνάμει*, "potentially," and in the Ethics he defines man's life as an activity of the soul (*ψυχῆς ἐνεργεία*),² and his natural powers or faculties as *δυνάμεις*.³ But St. Paul goes beyond this. For him *ἐνεργεῖν* has practically always a personal reference. It is a reference to God, or sometimes to a personality which is evil, and is not to be identified with man.⁴ It is not an abstract force isolated and self-evident, but is connected with various activities. Those activities range from the whole cosmic relation⁵ to the personal activity of man,⁶ though this last use is peculiar to this particular passage.

¹ St. Matt. ix. 2 ; x. 13, etc. ² *Nic. Eth.* i, 6. ³ *Ibid.* ii, 1.

⁴ 2 Thess. ii. 9, 11 ; cf. 1 Kings. xxii. 21-23. In the Thessalonian passage the similarity of manifestation *δυνάμει . . . σημείois . . . τέρασιν* with the manifestations in the Church are to be noted. The law of correspondence between human activity and a source of spiritual power still holds good.

⁵ Eph. i. 11, 19.

⁶ Phil. ii. 13.

It is important to note the very large influence in the Pauline teaching of the sense of God working in and through human nature and human capacities. It is true that in the only passages in the Gospel where *ἐνεργεῖν* is used in its active sense¹ it is closely connected with miracles, but in St. Paul's teaching it is a vital activity of which miracles are only a particular manifestation. And while St. Paul constantly uses the active *ἐνεργεῖν* of persons, he never so uses the passive *ἐνεργεῖσθαι*. In this sense his constant thought is not of things to be done, but of powers to be set in operation.² The bearing of this on the operation of the charismatic gifts is important and obvious. "It reminds us that the operation is not self-originated: the powers 'work' indeed, but they are made to work."³

Πίστις (Faith)

Accordingly, the first place in the group of charismata in which this "working" is most obvious is given to faith (*πίστις*). It is the condition precedent on man's side to all working of the Divine Energy,⁴ the first movement Godward of man's being. Without it man is not even in possession of his own soul,⁵ his full powers cannot be exercised. It alone prepares and fits the individual to become the instrument of the Divine purpose. It is the channel of vital relationship to God, so that through it the Divine *ἐνεργεία* may find expression and scope in redemptive activity. It is of much more than individual significance, and in the charismata it bears a different character from that "saving faith" of the individual about which so much is said in the New Testament. To St. Paul there is a broad and clear distinction between these two aspects of faith: practically it is the distinction between individual and corporate faith. They ought both to have part in the life of the Christian, but that depends upon his "will to

¹ St. Mark vi. 14 (St. Matt. xiv. 2).

² Cf. Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 246.

³ *Ibid.* p. 247.

⁴ Heb. xi. 6.

⁵ Heb. x. 39.

believe." He must beware how he builds, even though the foundation be true and firm. The saving quality of his personal faith may stand even the test of fire, while the products of that faith may perish in the testing. It is significant that the whole passage in which this warning occurs¹ relates to the corporate life of the Church and not to the moral or spiritual qualities of the individual Christian. It is his contribution to the stability of the whole edifice which is in question and may be in danger, not his own personal salvation. Such faith is capable of helping others by more than mere influence. It has some quite definite contribution to make, for even the apostle himself claims for his own help this active charismatic quality in the faith of the Roman Christians, of which he is already assured.² He measures their gift by the quality and power of his own charismata, and there is no doubt in his mind that their faith has some certain quality which can help him.

What then is the peculiar quality of this charismatic faith? It may be said that if the faith which is necessary to personal salvation may be described as the Godward attitude of the soul—akin in its measure to what St. John describes³ as characteristic of the life of the Eternal Son, *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, "towards the Father"—the faith which is part of the charismatic equipment of the Church may be described as faith flowing out in action, not as regards the character or the moral qualities of the individual, but as regards the work and mission of the Body of Christ.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews⁴ there is an almost formal definition of faith which describes it in what has been called its aspect as a "psychological function."⁵ In whatever aspect it is presented in the New Testament it is never mere reliance on a promise, but always reliance on

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 1-15.

² Rom. i. 12.

³ 1 John i. 2.

⁴ Heb. xi. 1.

⁵ Inge, *Faith and its Psychology*, p. 15.

the Promiser. The New Testament deals with personality, and faith is always presented as an act of personality. It is this which determines its special psychological character and is paramount in the charismatic gift. Its direction varies according to the object to be attained, but its quality remains essentially the same. It is to be broad enough and strong enough to become the channel of that Divine energy (*ἐνεργεία*) exerted in redemptive action which it is the main office of the Church to exhibit to the world.

But it is mediated by individual members of the body acting in mutual relation to each other and to the invisible Head of the body. The faith, e.g., which will set the healing power of the Christ free to work in the Church may be the special charisma of some individual member, though he may not himself possess the actual gift of healing. But the member who has that charisma may not be able to use it effectively, may not even know that he possesses it until his brother's faith has set it free to work. In their common faith that the living Spirit of the living Christ dwells in the Church, and carries on the work of redemption through her agency, each must take his proper contribution to her efficiency according to the charisma with which the Spirit has endowed him.

Among the many aspects of faith set forth in the New Testament this particular aspect of its being a contribution by the individual Christian to the general efficiency of the whole body is, if not unique in relation to the charismatic gifts, at least more clearly defined there than elsewhere. External circumstances had their part in developing the sense of mutual dependence among the first Christians,¹ but the sense of brotherhood had deeper roots than this. It sprang from their relation to the common Lord. It was the product of a faith in which, from the first days, the

¹ The use of *δοθῆναι* of the Christian body in Acts is significant of the growth of this sense of mutual relation: e.g. Acts i. 14; ii. 46, of worship; iv. 24, in persecution; xv. 25, in deliberation.

elements of mutual interest and responsibility were not wanting, and this faith is a constant theme in the Apostolic writings.

Vicarious or representative faith is a familiar feature in the Gospel narratives, especially in connection with the Lord's miracles,¹ and in some passages in the Epistles, *ἐν πίστει*, while it properly describes the sphere of belief, appears to pass over to the idea of instrumentality. It becomes the "instrumental cause."² In the Gospels also a proportion between faith and its effects is sometimes suggested,³ and the effects of faith may possibly vary with the end for which the trust is exercised.⁴ The faith of the individual believer might, then, be exercised in regard to any of the objects described in the Lord's commission to the Church as part of His Divine purpose, and would thus become a channel for the Divine energy in this particular direction. And as the brotherhood perceived this, the conviction that the Church was in actual fact an instrument of Divine power would grow and deepen, and the whole body would be helped and strengthened by the charismatic gift of faith with which the individual brother was endowed. The unity of the Church's action was guarded by the limitations of the gift. To one is given the gift of faith, to another gifts of healing, to another working of miracles, to another prophecy, but it is one and the same God Who worketh all in all, and as each brought his several gift to the service of the body, that body became efficient for the Master's work. The corporate value of the charisma of faith was a necessary development in the conception of Christian brotherhood, but it was essentially a development

¹ E.g. St. Matt. viii. 5-13; ix. 1-8; St. Mark v. 36; St. Luke ix. 37-43; St. John iv. 50, etc.

² Gal. ii. 20; Col. ii. 7; 2 Thess. ii. 13.

³ St. Matt. viii. 13; cf. viii. 10; ix. 29; xv. 28; xvii. 20; St. Luke vii. 9; xvii. 6.

⁴ St. Mark x. 51; *ἵνα ἀναβλέψω*. Cf. Gal. ii. 16, *ἐπιστεύσαμεν ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν*.

also of the Master's teaching to His disciples.¹ Its special function was the perception of the Church's relation to her Divine Lord, as the body which not only enshrined His Spirit, but also carried on His work, and in this way it served to bring the other gifts of other men into active reality. It differs from the other charismata in the degree in which the will is involved. In prophecy, for instance, the will of the prophet is not involved as a *causa causans*, while in teaching it is the understanding rather than the will which is primarily active. But in the use of the charisma of faith, with its direct effect upon the whole body of the Church, the characteristic note is the exercise of that faculty of the soul which rightly directed brings man into true relation with Infinite power, so that through him that power may become operative in the lives of men. The signs of power (*σημεία*) follow such faith: ² they are not scattered broadcast in the world, they are not portents to overawe and terrify; they are manifestations governed by a definite law on which they depend. It is the law of unity between Christ's body, the Church, and His indwelling Spirit, involving as it does the joyful and expectant surrender of human faculties to become the instruments of Divine purpose. And it is a significant indication of the conditions under which this law works that wherever in the Gospels the obligation of faith is enjoined in face of difficulties, the promise of power is given not to separate individuals, but to men united in a common impulse or obeying a common command.³

¹ Chrysostom: Πίστιν οὐ παύτην λέγων τὴν τῶν δογμάτων ἀλλὰ τὴν τῶν σημείων περὶ ἧς φησιν. Ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως. κ.τ.λ. (St. Matt, xvii. 20), καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς ἠέλιον λέγοντες προσθεὶς ἡμῶν πίστιν (St. Luke xvii. 5), αὕτη γὰρ μήτηρ τῶν σημείων ἐστίν (Hom. xxix.).

² St. Mark xvi. 17.

³ St. Matt. xviii. 8 f.; St. Mark vi. 7.

IX

DIVERSITIES OF GIFTS IV.

THE CHARISMATA OF POWER AND SYMPATHY (*continued*).

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| (b) χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων. | Gifts of healings. |
| ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων. | Working of miracles. |
| ἀντιλήψεις. | Helps (nursings). |
| κυβερνήσεις. | Governments (wise counsels). |
| Rom. xii. 8, ὁ ἐλεῶν. | He that showeth pity (actively). |

THE supreme miracles of the Lord's earthly life are those which centre on His own Person—the miracles of the Incarnation and the Resurrection. And they concern His work no less than His Person. We are not here concerned with the manner of the Incarnation but with the Fact itself and its significance. The coming of God in the flesh was in itself a revelation of the Divine order of working, the supreme manifestation of the Divine ἐνεργεία in reference to the world of men. It took account of the failures as well as the powers of mankind and showed the Divine method of attaining that perfection of nature which is the ultimate will of God for man.

The Resurrection was the natural corollary of the Incarnation. Both carry us back behind the revelation in time of this Divine ἐνεργεία ("working") to its central source; both carry us forward to its ultimate end. The Resurrection supplies a standard by which men may interpret the Incarnation. For the first disciples, including the 500 brethren,¹ it was an irresistible evidence that the laws

¹ St. Matt. xxviii. 17; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 6.

of the universe were far wider-flung than the boundaries of man's sense-perception. The law of death, of universal operation, and of apparently final measure, had been demonstrated to be subordinate to another law, the law of life, and the disciples had to set about reconstructing their ideas in face of this new knowledge.

And first they would have to turn back to the life of that Person with Whom they had been associated for those three wonderful years. There was not only the teaching of that Life, but the deeds which had to be considered and reviewed in the light of the Resurrection. It alone gave the key to them. The miracles had amazed the people and stirred their curiosity. The disciples had shared the amazement, but they were aware also that there was something, as yet but dimly understood, which could account for them. The Resurrection taught them at length what that unknown quantity was—it was a supreme law of which the characteristic was “more abundant life,”¹ and without it Nature was not at its full stature, it was restricted both in scope and in operation.

The miracles of the Gospels fall broadly into three classes with many subdivisions. The great groups are (i.) miracles on Nature, (ii.) miracles on man, (iii.) miracles on the spirit world,² and each of these classes had some specific share in the manifestation of the law of more abundant life.

The miracles on Nature, the “cosmic” miracles, would seem at first sight to be mere portents (τέρατα), difficult to place in any scheme of a Life which before all things was the manifestation of the redemptive activity of the Divine mind. They would seem unrelated to the main purpose of that Life, and until they are considered alongside the other miracles they remain solitary, isolated, intractable. It is not till the final commission is given in the full glory

¹ St. John x. 10.

² Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, pp. 480 ff.

of the Resurrection that their real interpretation begins to appear. The Apostles are commissioned to carry on the work begun by the Christ, and this work is within its measure to be marked by the same signs of power as was His.¹

The true meaning of the Nature miracles was that they formed an important element in the disciples' education for their future work. They were to be called to unfamiliar work and to the exercise of unfamiliar powers, and first they had to learn the absolute supremacy of the Master they served even in the realm of Nature itself. It was of the first necessity that as they set out upon this work no doubtful mind should mar their witness, and here the first principle had been enunciated upon which they might build with clear and unfaltering faith. Hints had not been wanting in their training that even they themselves might attain to a share in this controlling power if their faith could create the channel for it. St. Peter might walk on the water,² mountains might be removed,³ nothing should be impossible to them.⁴ How could such promises of power be possible from Him Who is the Truth if natural law as we know it is the whole and complete account of the forces which control the universe?

The same thing can be observed in the miracles on the Spirit world. There is the same note of unchallenged supremacy, often confessed by the spirits themselves.⁵ That is not wonderful perhaps, but it is wonderful to find that men might have the same power of control if again their faith were strong enough, that is, if they were really linked to the Divine *ἐνεργεία*.⁶ There was no question of

¹ St. Mark xvi. 17-18; St. John xx. 23.

² St. Matt. xiv. 28. St. Peter is admonished as *ὀλιγόπιστος*, of little faith, not *ἄπιστος*, without faith.

³ St. Matt. xvii. 20.

⁴ St. Matt. xvii. 20.

⁵ St. Matt. viii. 28; St. Mark i. 24; St. Luke iv. 34, 41; viii. 28.

⁶ St. Matt. xvii. 20.

the disciples or of other men being able to originate such power. It was in being already, a function of the Kingdom of Heaven, a law of life waiting only for the right conditions in which it might work. It was not until after the Resurrection that the full significance of this higher law was learnt and the disciples were ready for the outpouring of the Pentecostal power.

The Gospel miracles of physical healing were on a somewhat different plane from those on the spirit world in so far that in the subjects of these miracles evil had not always invaded the innermost citadel of man's being. There are indeed cases (e.g. the paralytic man ¹) where the suffering is shown to be connected with personal sin, there are others (e.g. the man born blind ²) where such connection is declared to be non-existent. But for the most part evil is regarded as having touched only the circumference of life, not its centre. But disease is always regarded as evil in itself and as the product of evil. The Gospels nowhere teach that physical suffering is good or productive of good. That is their great point of contrast with the partial and incomplete knowledge of the Old Testament. Even the prayer of Gethsemane, when the Christ Himself is face to face with physical suffering in His own Person, must be measured and interpreted by the tenor and teaching of His own Life. There is nothing in that life or teaching to support the idea that the Father is about to inflict suffering on the Beloved Son, but endurance of the suffering which exists as a consequence of the power of evil in the world may be the only way (and is by and by seen to be the only way) of breaking its force. It is impossible to separate here the bearing of suffering from the bearing of sin. Both alike were alien to the Sufferer, but the full manifestation of the law of more abundant life cannot be accomplished until the manifestation of all the powers of evil be shown to be subordinate to it. And this could only be fully possible

¹ Mark ii. 5.

² St. John ix. 1 ff.

in the person of One who was Himself the manifestation of the greater law.

And before the final commission to heal the sick as well as to preach the Gospel was given to the disciples, the Resurrection supplied them with proof that the Master in Whose Name they were to work had submitted Himself to the universal law of death so that He might demonstrate its real limits within the operation of the greater law of life which He came to proclaim and to establish. And as the apparently supreme law of death was thus defined and superseded, this supersession also carried with it the subjugation to the same law of all that physical evil which culminated in death. It is to be remarked that the post-Resurrection incidents on the Galilean shore as well as the various appearances of the Risen Christ were all miracles in the world of nature, not miracles on man or on the spirit world. This would serve again to remind the disciples of the supremacy of their Master in the world of nature in spite of Calvary. It was the final stage in their training before the great commission was given. It led to that attitude of mind which St. Peter expressed in his declaration that the time of the restoration of all things was in sight,¹ or St. Paul declared in his teaching that man's sharing in that restoration was the first step towards the "adoption" of all nature in the new Kingdom.²

And the first step towards this restoration was an intrinsic part of the Gospel with which the first Apostles were entrusted. Their mission was for the redemption not of man's soul only, but of his whole nature, body as well as soul. And as knowledge extended and it became evident that man's life and the world he lives in is governed by immutable laws, it was of the first importance that the disciples should know and teach, not only for themselves, but even more for those who should come in later ages, that in coming to the freedom of the Gospel man is not

¹ Acts iii. 21.

² Rom. viii. 19.

coming into lawlessness (*ἀνομία*) but into obedience to a supreme law which has methods of expression in the physical as well as in the spiritual world.

That the method of this supreme law was only gradually to be discovered some of them had already learned in the miracle of the demoniac boy.¹ Their faith had been insufficient to effect a cure. The faculty of faith which would bring the power into operation had to be trained. That was a necessity, because the power worked through personality,² and full faith was to be the attitude of the whole personality towards it.

But the mission of the disciples was governed by one great condition. It was a mission of redemption, of release from disabilities, of freedom to fulfil the purposes of God for man. This alone would account for the absence of "nature miracles" in their work. They were sent to help men, not to overawe them. In this sense the "nature miracles" of the Lord's life were of esoteric meaning: they were part of the training of the disciples in complete reliance on the power of the Master. Nature miracles formed only a small part—and that by way of personal protection—in their future equipment. St. Paul at Melita³ is the only instance of the exercise of such power given in the New Testament.

For the same reason, the raising from the dead has but the smallest place in the New Testament records of the Apostles' activities. Dorcas at Joppa⁴ and Eutychus at Troas⁵ are the only cases cited. And the early Fathers note the cases of resurrection as unusual and special occurrences, in contrast with the miracles of healing which were matters of common experience.

The principles of the Apostolic mission would not extend

¹ St. Mark ix. 29.

² Cf. Lotze, *Microcosmus* ii. 9, 4; quoted by Illingworth—"Personality, Human and Divine," Lect. 2 n. 10 (ed. 1895).

³ Acts xxviii. 5.

⁴ Acts ix. 40.

⁵ Acts xx. 12.

to cosmic or nature miracles. These were ordinarily no part of the "setting free" which was the main object of the work. Where they occur they must be read in connection with some particular aspect of that work. Troas had been perhaps the scene of one of St. Paul's seizures of illness, where St. Luke had been called to give him medical attention.¹ Joppa had been the starting-place whence the first message of the Gospel had reached the Gentiles by the mouth of St. Peter. In both instances there would seem to be some necessity to indicate the claims made by these two Apostles to be preachers of a Gospel of power. The parallelism between the deeds of St. Peter and St. Paul as recorded in the Acts has been remarked as evidence of a certain rivalry in their claims to pre-eminence. The parallelism of the occasions will give a wider survey of the point at issue. In both cases where St. Peter and St. Paul are enabled to raise the dead the special conditions of the Church in the place where the miracle was performed must be taken into consideration. It was in each case a supreme credential of the Apostle who wrought it, and the narrative discloses the need for this evidential miracle.

But for the most part the Divine *ἐνεργεία* of which the Church was the appointed instrument was displayed in those gifts of healings (*χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*) and workings of miracles (*ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*) which gave clear demonstration of this power of "setting free" as an actual and active force at work in the Body of Christ.

The difference of classification in the unsystematic list of 1 Corinthians xii. 8, and the more systematic list of 1 Corinthians xii. 28, is to be noted, but it does not appear to be of special significance. In the former the grouping is faith, gifts of healings, workings of miracles (*πίστις, χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*); in the latter the order is reversed and the charisma of faith is not men-

¹ Wieseler's suggestion.

tioned. Two other charismata are, however, added to the group in this passage—helps (*ἀντιλήψεις*) and governments (*κυβερνήσεις*). These two charismata are more usually associated with the ministerial organization of the Church, but their significant association with miraculous gifts of healing, etc., must not be ignored and will be examined later.

The close connection of “gifts of healings” (*χαρισμ. ἰαμ.*) and “miracles” (*δυνάμεις*) in both groups, suggests some mutual and fundamental relation. Possibly *δυναμ.* includes *χαρισμ. ἰαμ.* as a generic term may include a specific instance, but it is more probable that they refer to different kinds of vital manifestations—that *δυναμ.* refers more particularly to miracles in the spiritual sphere, as, e.g., exorcism and kindred healings, while *χαρισμ. ἰαμ.* refers exclusively to physical healings. *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων* may mean those inner workings of which the outward manifestations are miracles. They would extend to miracles of disciplinary power,¹ and would also include, e.g., the incident of the viper at Melita.²

In the Gospels it is remarkable that when the narrative takes the form of comment or explanation of the Lord's works, the use of *δύναμις* is usual, as though the commentator would emphasize the central power itself without regard to the sphere in which it is manifested. But when He Himself speaks of that power (*δύναμις*) it is, with few significant exceptions,³ connected with the spiritual and not with the physical world. Perhaps it was a perception of this difference which led the Church of the subapostolic period to lay such stress on the office and work of the exorcists. They were regarded as a class of workers standing

¹ Acts v. 1 ; viii. 24 ; xiii. 11 ; 1 Cor. v. 5 ; cf. 1 Tim. i. 20, where the “giving over to Satan” implies not only excommunication but the supernatural infliction of bodily disease. Cf. Bishop Ellicott, Notes on 1 Cor. ; cf. also St. Matt. xvi. 19 ; xviii. 18.

² Acts xxviii. 5.

³ St. Mark. v. 30 (cf. St. Luke viii. 46) ; St. Luke v. 17 ; vi. 19.

by themselves, distinct from other workers and holding positions of special responsibility in the local Churches. Cornelius of Rome says that in his day they even outnumbered the Christian priests in the imperial city.

Gifts of healings (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων)

The plural "gifts of healings" is of more than {accidental interest, it is indeed of real importance in the right understanding of this power within the Body of Christ. It may be compared with the different means employed by the Lord Himself in the days of His earthly life. He was the supreme Source of healing, but He employed different methods of conveying that healing power by word or touch or outward means. In the Church that same healing power is to be mediated through human personalities, and the terms which describe the charisma of healing point to a diversity in the methods by which it is expressed and conveyed. The early institution of a separate class of ministers (exorcists) has already been noted. It implied a clear and broad distinction between the healing of those maladies which involve man's central spiritual self—his ego—and the healing of those maladies which touch the circumference of his life in his physical organism. And the very early use of unction for healing suggests that in obedient following of the Lord's own injunction, the Church has grown conscious of the corporate gift of healing expressed through sacramental channels. It is significant in this connection that in the two passages in the New Testament in which unction for healing is mentioned, it has in it the elements of corporate action. In St. Mark ¹ the disciples are sent out two and two, in St. James ² the elders (plural) of the Church are to be called in.

But the plural "gifts of healings" suggests that besides the broad division into "spiritual" and "physical"

¹ St. Mark vi. 7.

² St. James v. 14.

healings there is a further subdivision. There are some members of the Body who are endowed with power to heal certain kinds of disease, while other forms of illness need other healers with other special gifts. From the incident of the lunatic boy¹ it is clear that progressive attainment in healing power is possible. St. Matthew gives the true reason of the disciples' failure, but that very reason is a ground of hope for the future. The "little faith," at present insufficient for the task with which it is confronted, may yet grow to a power which will enable it to move mountains. But the work of freeing mankind from its fetters is to be the work of the whole Church, and each member of the Body still has his distinctive gift to contribute to that work.

The relation of these healing gifts to the methods of healing which belong particularly to medical or surgical science is no part of the present inquiry. Some observations, however, suggest themselves at this point. We note: (a) In our Lord's own work all classes of healings are represented—even surgical healing is not omitted.² (b) On examination, the miracles of the Gospel appear to have been performed on cases which were otherwise hopeless of cure. (c) There is no limitation to any particular class of cure in the commission to heal the sick as part of the Gospel message. (d) The terms of the commission are general both as regards field of operation and duration in time.

But the experience of mankind has taught that the healing gift committed to the Church is not the only, nor even the usual channel of healing. The Church's gift is conditioned by the larger purpose which is the reason of her existence. She is to exercise it always as *part* of the Gospel. The "signs" are to follow those that believe.³

¹ St. Matt. xvii. 14-21 and parallels.

² St. Luke xxii. 50, 51.

³ St. Mark xvi. 17.

Medical and surgical science have proved their claim to be the great channels of healing : the work of a doctor is only second to that of a Priest in helping stricken humanity. St. Luke (whom tradition assigns as one of the seventy and therefore one endowed with the special charisma of healing) certainly combined the work of the physician with that of the Evangelist. But modern science is showing how immensely larger the sphere of healing action is than was once suspected. It extends beyond the body to the mind ; it is no longer limited to material methods. But it has its limitations. It does not profess to deal with the spiritual undercurrent of life except perhaps to discover there the cause of certain illnesses. And there are certain morbid conditions which clearly lie beyond the power of medical science to help. They are incurable so far as science can tell us. They are an entrenchment of the power of evil which ordinary weapons are powerless to attack.

But the Gospel forbids that the power of evil shall be left in possession in any part of human life when once the power of restoration has been realized. The Church's work is to realize for herself and to teach men to realize that this power of help is in active operation. It is still part of the Gospel.

There are two fundamental facts which it is necessary for her to hold and teach clearly ; first, that disease is evil and is against God's primary will for man as we learn that will in the revelation of the Incarnate Christ. The healing miracles of the Incarnate Life were not meteors flashing across a darkened sky to be engulfed in the darkness ; they were manifestations of that Eternal Light which the darkness cannot overpower. Secondly, God wills the wholeness of man's nature, body and soul and He provides the means to that wholeness. Its source lies in Himself and is manifested in the Incarnate Christ, and that manifestation is now committed to the Church which is Christ's body.

There seem to be, so far as our knowledge goes at present, three "strata" in which the healing power works. There is first the ordinary method of therapeutic science, without any necessary reference to any spiritual facts at all (though even here it is to be remembered that healing is, in fact, due to a vital, i.e. a spiritual force in nature). Then there is the method which involves, directly or indirectly, mental factors—the method of suggestion and kindred psychological processes. This may or may not involve moral factors of character, etc. But wide as these two spheres may be, there lies beyond a region where medical and psychological science seems powerless. It is here that the central source of all disease is most clearly manifest, and it is here especially that the Church's commission to heal holds good. There is no hope of cure until the spiritual self of man is not only set free from, so to say, external evil, but is itself restored to full and clear correspondence with the Eternal Source of holiness and health.

ἀντιλήψεις ("helps," "nursings")

κυβερνήσεις ("wise guidings")

The last two charismata which have to be considered are the gifts which are described in the English versions of the New Testament as "helps" and "governments" and are generally regarded as referring to the specific duties of the hierarchy.

But the connotation of *ἀντιλήψεις* is quite distinctively medical, and other uses of the word have grown out of this primary idea of "assistance." The idea lying behind *κυβερνήσεις* ("governments") is that of guiding a ship by control of the helm. The usual exegesis gives a wrong colouring to these terms when it transfers them back to the first group of charismata, connected as that group is with the organization and oversight of the Church instead of retaining them in the group to which they properly belong, the charismata of healing.

But if they be retained in that group their meaning and

significance at once become clear. *ἀντιλήψεις* = nursings¹ has a definite reference to the bodily needs of the sick, *κυβερνήσεις* = wise guidings¹ has a definite reference to the right means to be used for the recovery of the sick. Together they amplify the "gifts of healings" and suggest not only different powers of help entrusted to different persons, but also thoughtful and informed counsels as to the kind of healing to be employed in any particular case. The action of these charismata as of all the other gifts is conditioned by one thing only—man's relation to God as he is in process of being saved. The whole action of care for the sick or of the healing of the sick is thus lifted up from the natural to the spiritual plane. Thus, while provision is made in charismatic gifts for the organization of the Church and for the due instruction and upbuilding of her members in the life of the Spirit, the work of restoration does not stop there but reaches out to the circumference of man's life in his physical being and brings that also within the sphere of action of the Incarnate Life now operative through the Holy Spirit, so that man's whole nature may share in that freedom which the Lord Christ came to proclaim and to establish.

The Post-Apostolic Age

It is the wide range and the present activity of the Incarnate power, and no mere evidential necessity of miracles which gives significance to the testimony of the early Fathers. In their time the need for evidence that the Church owed her existence to the Divine Commission of her Head was met on other grounds, but the needs which the Church was commissioned to meet and to remedy still remained. It is not, therefore, surprising that in the days succeeding those of the Apostles she appeals to and uses the power inherent in her without hesitation or doubt that it constitutes, not evidence of her claims (that is quite

¹ I adopt Dr. Selwyn's rendering, Cf. *Christian Prophets*.

secondary) but part of her natural and rightful duty, the very reason for her existence. There is as yet no dimming of her vision: she is simply and clearly carrying on her Master's work as He committed it to her. The evidence of the exercise of healing power in the first centuries of the Christian era is impressive by the very simplicity with which it is stated as part of the ordinary experience of the Church. It is indeed often adduced as constituting *the* test of difference between the Church and her opponents, whether Jew or Gentile, and as proof that the Spirit which vitalizes her is a Holy Spirit of saving power. Yet still, the proof on which she relies is the proof of her ordinary work for both body and soul of men.

QUADRATUS (A.D. 126): The fragmentary apology of Quadratus, the earliest existing apologetical writing, refers to the healings or resurrections which have taken place and are known to the Christian body.¹ He cannot, however, be cited to prove the presence and activity of healing power in the Church of his time, because his phrase is uncertain in its reference, whether to the work of the Lord Himself or to the work of His Church. But it is to be noted that his apology (so far as can be judged from the fragment) is based on evidences of a power strong enough to overcome physical evil rather than on moral conversion of spirit. This is more striking even if he is referring to the personal work of the Christ rather than to that work continued by the Spirit in the Church.

JUSTIN MARTYR (c. A.D. 100-163): Arguing with the Jew, Trypho is clear as to the existence of the charismatic gifts as part of the equipment of the Church in his time: "For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, another of the fear of God."²

¹ Quadratus in J. C. T. von Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum*.

² Trypho, 39.

In another part of the same dialogue¹ he speaks of exorcism in terms which show that the evidence was abundant and convincing. He even draws a contrast between the use of Jehovah's Name in exorcism and the Name of Jesus Christ, arguing that when the power of exorcism is claimed in the name of Jesus Christ it is always successful, while that is not always the case when Jehovah's Name is invoked.

IRENÆUS (A.D. 180) states that healing is a matter of common experience as occurring within the Catholic Church, and he uses this experience as an argument against the claims of heretical bodies which cannot adduce any such evidence of inherent power, extending even to raising from the dead.² He mentions laying on of hands as the means employed for healing the sick, and notes that such exercise of the charismatic gifts is of daily occurrence.³

ORIGEN (c. A.D. 250) says: "There are still preserved among Christians traces of that Holy Spirit which appeared in the form of a dove. They expel evil spirits, and perform many cures and foresee certain events, according to the will of the Logos."⁴

Later on in the same work he speaks of miracles "more remarkable than any which existed among the Jews" as having come within his own personal knowledge.⁵ His reference to the Holy Spirit "which appeared in the form of a dove" is remarkable as carrying back the source of the Church's healing power to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon our Lord at His Baptism rather than to the descent upon the Church in the form of fire at the Pentecost.

AMBROSE (A.D. 340-397) appears to limit the outflow of charismatic power to the relics of the martyrs, but this is due to the exigencies of his controversy with the Arians,

¹ Trypho, 85, cf. Second Apology, 6. Trypho, 30.

² Iren. *contr. Haer.*, Book II. c. 31, 2.

³ *Ibid.* c. 32, 34.

⁴ *Contr. Cels.*, Book I, c. 46.

⁵ *Ib.* Book II, c. 8. Cf. also Book VII, c. 8.

who denied the merits of the martyrs. He cites¹ the case of a well-known blind man, restored on touching the garment in which the martyrs' bodies were clothed, and proceeds: "Is not this like what we read in the Gospel? For the power which we admire proceeds from one and the same Author. . . ."

He is quite explicit as to the power to heal being within the Church.

AUGUSTINE (A.D. 354-430) speaks of miracles as still going on,² though not so widely known as the miracles of the Gospels. It is remarkable that so far from maintaining his earlier opinion that miracles had ceased in his time, he devotes some part of his treatise *De Civitate Dei*³ to recounting well-authenticated instances of healing.

CHRYSOSTOM (A.D. 347-407) speaks constantly of miracles having ceased in his time, with the significant exception of the healing of disease (in this case by anointing).⁴

EUSEBIUS, the Church historian of the fourth century, after quoting Irenæus as witness to the operation of the charismatic gifts, adds as his own comment: "These gifts of different kinds also continued with those that were worthy until the times mentioned"—(i.e. his own time). There is a hint here of the gradual cessation of the gifts and a hint also of the reason for that cessation.

In most cases in the Patristic references the means used is the laying on of hands, but there is also the parallel use of anointing, founded on St. Mark vi. 13, and on the practice described in St. James v. 14. This practice in time developed into a liturgical, sacramental use which has never ceased to be in force in one form or another in some or other part of the Catholic Church.

¹ Letters of St. Ambrose, No. 22, 17-18 (Library of the Fathers Translation).

² *De Civ. Dei.*, Book XVIII, c. 10.

³ Cf. esp. Book XXII, c. 8, etc.

⁴ Homilies on St. Matthew, No. 32.

These citations from the Fathers suffice, short as they are, to show that in the belief of these early teachers miracles of healing or of exorcism are to be regarded not so much as evidence of the Church's supernatural origin as a real part of the purpose of her existence and her work. Their real value lies in the fact that they present to us a Church which, having passed beyond the first stages of her existence as those stages are recorded in the New Testament, and having been organized to meet the demands made upon her by the needs of the world in which she lives her life, yet maintains unimpaired in those early days a clearness of purpose and an activity of faith which does not differ from her earliest inspiration.

The study of the evidence as to the place and meaning of the charismata in the life of the Church leaves on the mind a deep impression that the good news of the Kingdom is meant to be a present reality of power. The Church did not in the early days and does not now exist primarily to express human faith in Divine truth, though that is indeed an indispensable condition of her full life. But primarily she exists to be the instrument of the Divine life touching human need at every point, the Body in which even now the Christ is, through the Spirit, to be "all in all fulfilling Himself." And as the Church, recalling the promise of power (*δύναμις*) which was hers in the beginning and has never been revoked, rises to a clearer perception of this great aspect of her mission new stages in the growth of the Kingdom will reveal themselves.

INDEX

A

- Aaron, 115
 Achaia, 60
 Acts, 20, 21, 38, 39, 45, 50, 52, 55, 110, 118
 Administration (Charismata of), 45, 50
 Agabus, 92
Alford, 85 n., 107 n., 113 n.
 Almsgiving, 58
Ambrose, S., 154
 Ananias, 47, 48, 119
 Andronicus, 89 n.
 Angel(s), 21, 25, 26
 Animism, 23, 24, 27
 Anna, 92
 Anne (Queen), 36
 Anointing, 155
 Antioch, 61, 92, 102
 Ἀντιλήψεις, 50, 147, 151
 Ἀπαρχήν, 72
 Apostle(s), 13, 32, 36, 40, 41, 46, 47, 53, 88, 89, 106, 112, 119, 152
 Apocalypse, 98, 100, 107, 112, 114, 117, 121, 122
 Apollo, 110
 Aquila, 70
 Aramaic, 107
 Arians, 154
 Aristotle, 134
 Ἀρχόντες, 75
 Ascension, 32, 86, 108
 Assyrian, 13, 107
 Atonement, 92, 132
 Augustine, S., 113, 129, 155
 Authority, 11, 88, 89, 128.
 Azazel, 25
- Amos ii. 4—101
 Acts i. 1—32; 4—33; 8—47; 14—137;
 18—49; 22—47; 25—49
 ii. 121; 4—107; 6—41; 8—107; 11—
 108; 17—100, 108, 109, 110; 22—47;
 26—111; 43—54; 46—108, 137;
 47—108
 iii. 6—121; 10—99; 12—47; 22—93
 iv. 7—47; 24—137; 33—47
 v.—47; 1—147; 3—119
 vi.—41, 89; 2—49; 3—49; 8—47;
 15—56
 viii. 10—46; 13—47; 24—147; 30 ff.—
 ix. 27—105; 40—145 [89
 x. 10—99; 44—110; 46—50, 108
 xi. 5—99; 15—17—109; 25 ff.—105;
 28—92
 xiii.—47; 1—49, 79, 90, 101; 8—119;
 xiv. 4, 14—89 [11—147
 xv. 25—137; 32—49
 xvi. 9, 10—100; 18—121
 xvii.—59; 14 ff.—65
 xviii. 2—70
 xix. 6—109, 110; 11—47; 17—110
 xx. 12—145; 35—50
 xxi. 9 f.—49; 10—92
 xxii. 17—99
 xxviii. 5—145, 147
 Apoc. i. 3—90 n.; 10—99 n.
 xvii. 7—99 n.

B

- Babylon, 24, 27
 Babylonian, 13
 Baptism, 11, 12, 47, 110, 154
 Barnabas, S., 50, 105
 Basilides, 72 n.
Baur, 72 n.

- Benedictus, 92
Bergson, 24 n.
Bingham, 15 n.
 Bishop(s), 15, 79, 102
 Body, 11, 15, 16, 136

C

- Cassarea, 12, 93
 Caiaphas, 92
 Calvary, 144
 Capernaum, 31
 Catholic, 19, 154, 155
 Chaldaean, 107
 Charisma[ta] 12—14, 16—18, 20, 45, 47, 49,
 50, 55—59, 62, 63, 66, 71, 73, 74, 77, 79, 80,
 84, 86, 95—97, 100, 102, 103, 106, 107, 112,
 117, 119, 120, 123—6, 133, 135—7, 139, 146—8,
 151, 152, 156
Chase, (Bp.), 40 n., 41 n.
 Chazzan, 75
 Christ, (ἐν Χριστῷ), 11, 17, 33, 57, 72, 103
 120, 137, 150, 156
 Christian(s), 13, 14, 22
Christus Futurus, 34 n.
 Chrysostom, S., 113, 139 n., 155
 Church, 11, 12, 14—16, 19, 33, 34, 38—40, 47,
 53, 66, 67, 73, 119, 120, 124, 138, 150, 152,
 Commission, 28 [156
 Confirmation, 12
 Consecration, 36
 Constantine, 127
 Cornelius, 12, 35, 108, 109, 148
 Coronation, 36
 Corporate, 11, 12, 16, 34, 49, 51, 56, 67, 76, 77,
 85, 106, 109, 111, 121, 127, 132—4, 138, 148
 Counsels, 124, 140
 Creation, 41, 42
 Creed, 37
 Cross, 27
Curtis, 38 n.
 Cyril, S., 113
- Colossians i. 27, 28—103
 ii. 7—138
 ii. 8, 20—25
 iv. 7, 8—105
- 1 Corinthians ii.—102; 10—112; 16—96
 ii. 1—15—136
 iv. 19—121
 v.—119; 4—121; 5—147;
 viii.—102 [6—90
 xi. 23—96, 100
 xii.—35, 110; 2—116; 3 f.—
 83, 110, 115; 6—87; 8—48,
 85, 102, 146; 9—124; 12—
 33, 74; 26—113; 28 ff.—
 77, 85, 88, 124, 146; 29—
 100, 101; 31—58
 xiii.—58, 112
 xiv.—110, 119—121; 3—95;
 4—109; 5—78; 6 ff.—111,
 115; 11—109; 18, 19—97;
 21—106, 109; 24—106; 25—
 106; 26—108, 115; 27—
 111; 28—108; 30—112;
 31—104, 105; 32—93; 37—
 111; 38—111
 xv. 3—96, 100; 6—140
- 2 Corinthians ii. 5, 11—119
 iv. 3—116
 v. 17—41; 20—105
 viii. 23—89
 xii. 1—112; 2—100; 12—44
- Corinthians, 16—19, 35, 58, 62, 66, 74—121

D

- δαμόνια, 28
 Deacon(s), 75, 102
 Dead, 145, 146
De Civitate Dei, 129
 Delphi, 110
 Demon (cults), 13-15
 Devil(s), 29, 31, 32
 διαρέσεις, 78 n.
 διακονία, 49, 133
 Didaché, 102 n., 106 n. [119, 120, 122
 Discerning (of spirits), 35, 48, 106, 107, 117,
 Disease, 13, 14, 43, 78, 143, 151
 Divine, 131, 134
 Dorcas, 145
 Dreams, 117
Driver, 42 n.
Duchesne, 80 n.
 δυναμεις, 44, 45, 47, 69
 Dynamic, 128, 132.
 Daniel ii. 4-117
 vii. 15-99
 viii. 15-99
 Deuteronomy xviii. 15-93

E

- Ecstasy, 91, 99 n.
Edersheim, 75 n.
 Egyptian, 107
 Elders, 75
 Elizabeth, 92
Ellicott (Bp.), 78 n., 147 n.
 Elymas, 47, 48, 119
 Emmaus, 118
 ἐνεργεῖν, 134, 135
 ἐνεργήματα, 140, 146, 147
 Energy, 41, 97, 135, 137
 Enoch (Book of), 25
 ἐξαπέστειλεν, 63 n.
 Eschatological, 91, 94
 Esoteric, 109
 Ethics, 134
 Eusebius, 115 n., 121 n., 155
 Eutychus, 145
 Evangelist(s), 88, 93, 123, 150
 Evil, 29, 30, 95, 143, 150, 154
 Evolution, 23, 72
 Exaltation, 99, 109, 121 [122
 Exhortation (Encouragement), 100, 104, 107,
 Exorcism, Exorcists, 13, 15, 20, 36, 79, 147,
 148, 156
 Exodus iv. 13-16-115 n.
 Ezekiel i.-1 ff.
 iii. 22-27
 iv. 1 ff.
 v. 1 ff.
 viii. 1 ff.
 xi. 1, 24
 xii. 1-6, 17-21
 xxi. 6, 7, 19-21
 xxiv. 1-5, 15-24
 xxxiii. 22
 xxxvii. 1, 15, 24
 xxxvii. 3 ff.-99 n.
 Ephesians (Ep.), 16, 19, 85
 i. 11-134; 17-68, 103;
 20-45
 ii. 2-29, 90; 21-95
 iii. 5-90; 10, 11-33
 iv. 7, 8-85; 11-85, 88,
 102, 123
 vi. 6-58

F

- Fabius, 36
 Faith, 35, 67, 75, 85, 112, 124, 135, 137-9,
 142, 146, 149, 156
 Fallacy, 62
 Fear, 22, 27, 29, 30, 54

- Federation, 67
 Filioque, 37, 38
 Form, 122

G

- Galileo, 128
 Gamaliel, 21
 Gospel(s), 13, 50, 109, 146, 153
 Gethsemane, 29, 143
 Gift(s), 15, 18, 35, 56, 59, 63, 80, 83, 85, 88,
 90, 125, 133, 135, 149, 154, 155
 Glossolaly, 90
 Gnostic, 22
Godet, 72
Goethe, 51, 129
 Gore (Bp.), 85 n.
 Gospel(s), 27, 34, 38, 40, 43, 52, 53, 59, 64,
 131, 144, 149, 150, 155
 Governments, 87, 124, 140, 147, 151
 Greek(s), 16, 21, 26, 27
 Guilds, 76
 Genesis, 26
 i. 1, 21, 27-42; i. 2-72
 xl-xli-117
 xliii. 23-118 n.
 Galatians, 20, 25, 62, 63, 68
 i. 12-16-112 n.
 ii. 9-89; 16-138; 20-138
 iii. 2-64; 5-35, 69
 iv. 6-63, 69
 v. 22-50
 vi. 15-65

H

- Haggada, 118
 Hagiographa, 118
 Hananiah, 94
 Hands (laying on of), 155
Hatch, 76 n.
 Healer(s), 79, 80, 149
 Healing(s), 124, 137, 138, 140, 143, 145-9,
 150-4, 156
 Helps, 140, 147, 151
 Heretical, 154
 Hermas, 102
 Herodians, 101
 Hierarchy, 151
Hilgenfeld, 72, n.
 Hippolytus (Canons of), 79
Holtzmann, 103 n.
 Host, 25
Hume, 128, 129
 Hosea, iv. 6.
 viii. 1, 12-101 n.
 Hebrews, 25, 86, 103, 136
 x. 26-104 n. 39-135 n.
 xi. 1-136 n.; 6-135 n.

I

- ιαμάτων, 97n. 140, 146, 148
Illingworth, 145
 Incarnation, 27, 44, 53, 64, 71, 92, 118, 126,
 127, 130, 140
Inge (Dean), 136 n.
 Intellect, Intellectual, 62, 63, 97, 103, 122
 Interpretation, 87-100, 106, 114, 117-120, 122
 Irenæus, 154
 Isaiah i. 10-101
 ii. 3-101
 xxiv. 21-25
 xxx. 10-94
 xxxiv. 17-24
 xliii. 27-118

J

- Jacobi*, 72 n.
James (Prof.), 42 n.
 Jerome, S., 69 n.
 Jerusalem, 38, 40, 75, 92, 93, 109
 Jew(s) } 13, 16, 21, 50, 73, 76, 107, 118, 153,
 Jewish } 154

Joppa, 145-6
 Jubilees (Bk. of) 25 n.
 Justin, M., 25 n., 127 n.
 Junias, 89 n.
 Jeremiah xxviii—94
 Job xxxiii. 23—118 n.
 Joel, 100; ii. 28—109
 St. John i. 1—41, 95; 5—65 n.; 38—101 n.
 iv. 50—138 n.
 ix. 1—31
 x. 10—141; 25—44; 41—65 n.
 xi. 50—92 n.
 xii. 31—29.
 xiv. 11—131; 12—69; 30—29
 xvi. 11—29; xviii. 14—92 n.
 xx. 23—142
 1 St. John i. 2—136 n. iv. 2—85 n.
 3 St. John 6—106
 St. James v. 14—148 n., 155
 St. Jude—90

K

Καὶνὴ κτίσις, 41, 65
 Kenosis, 95
 Kingdom (of God, of heaven), 18, 29-31,
 41, 143-4, 156
 Knowledge (word of), 100, 102-4, 112
 Κυβερνήσεις, 140, 147, 151
 1 Kings xviii. 10—93 n.
 xxii. 19-25; 21-3—134 n.

L

Law, 62, 64, 139, 141, 143, 4
 Light/foot (Bp.), 25, 35 n., 66, 69 n.
 Lipsius, 72 n.
 Logos, 55, 95, 96, 120, 127 n., 154
 Lotze, 145 n.
 Levit. xvii. 7—24
 S. Luke i. 1—89 n.; 17—92 n.; 46—108 n.
 iv. 34, 41—142 n.; 39—31
 v. 17—147 n.; 26—99 n.; vi. 19—
 147 n.
 vii. 9—138 n.; viii. 28—142; 46—
 147 n.
 ix. 37-43—138; 49—45; 55—119 n.
 x—32; 17—45; 40—49 n.
 xii. 5—30, 48 n.;
 xiii. 16—31
 xvii. 6—138 n.
 xxii. 27—49 n.; 28 ff.—29; 50, 51—
 xxiv. 52-3—108 n. [—149 n.]

M

Maccabæan, 98
 Magical, 62-4
 Magnificat, 92
 μάντις, 93, 97
 Matter, 114, 122
 Mode, 107 n.
 Messiah, 46, 93
 μετάνοια, 31
 Methergeman, 75, 118
 Meyer, 107 n., 113
 Milk, J. S., 129
 Milligan (Vocab. N.T.), 120 n.
 Mind, 95, 96, 130
 Ministers, 19, 61, 75
 Ministry, 35, 49, 76, 87, 88, 91, 102
 Miracle(s), 34, 35, 43, 44, 52, 53, 55, 64, 124,
 128, 129, 132, 135, 138, 140-2, 144-7, 149,
 Miraculous, 17, 54, 55 [154-6
 Montanist(s), 79, 91
 Moses, 93, 115
 Mozley, 129, 130
 Mystery, 113
 Mystic, 97
 Myers, 42 n.
 St. Matthew, 27
 iv. 11—49 n.

viii. 5-13—138 n.; 28—142 n.
 ix. 1-8—138 n.; 2—134 n.; 29
 —138 n.
 x. 13—134 n.; xii. 23—31
 xiv. 2—135 n.; 28—142 n.;
 xv. 28—138 n.
 xvi. 19—147 n.
 xvii. 14-21—149; 20—138 n.,
 142 n.
 xviii. 8 f.—139 n.; 18—147 n.
 xix. 28—65 n.
 xxii. 24, 36—101 n.; xxiii. 7-8—
 101 n.
 xxviii. 17—140 n.; 20—101 n.
 St. Mark, 29, 107, 115
 i. 24—142 n.; 25—31 n.
 iv. 39—31
 v. 30—147 n.; 36—138; 42—99 n.
 vi. 7—139 n.; 148 n.; 13—155;
 14—135 n.
 ix. 20—145 n.; 28—119 n.; x. 51—
 138 n.
 xvi. 8—99 n.; 14—33 n.; 17—139 n.,
 142 n., 149 n.; 18—107 n., 142 n.

N

Name, 28, 32, 45, 53, 84, 121, 154
 Nature, 129, 130, 141-2, 145-6, 150
 Nazarene, 17, 42, 45-6
 Nicæa, 127
 Nicene Creed, 24, 37
 Nursings, 124, 140, 151-2

O

Objective, 42
 Œcumenical, 37
 Officers, 35, 36, 77
 Omnipotence, 23
 Ὁμοθυμαδόν, 137 n.
 Oracles, 16
 Ordination, 79
 Orders, 20, 124
 Organism, 11, 12, 36, 45, 67, 148
 Organization, 11, 12, 20, 36, 41, 45, 66, 74,
 101, 109, 126, 147, 151
 Origen, (Contr. Cels), 154
 Otto, J. C. T. Von (Corpus Apol.), 153 n.

P

Paganism, 70
 Page, 46 n.
 Παράκλησις, 49, 104, 105, 122
 Pastors, 88
 Paul (St.), 16, 17, 21, 40, 44, 50, 56, 65, 69, 73,
 83, 134-5, 144, 146
 Peile (Archd.), 62 n.
 Pentecost, 11, 12, 14, 39, 40, 54, 108, 109,
 Perception, 100, 121, 139 [113, 154
 Persian(s), 21, 27
 Person (of Christ.), 131, 140, 141, 143
 Personalities, 24, 27, 111, 148
 Peter (St.), 12, 46, 48, 50 n., 89 n., 90, 100, 103,
 108, 109, 115, 142, 144, 146
 Pharisee(s), 21, 26, 101
 Philip, 89, 93
 Philo, 111
 φιλώθητι, 31
 Πίστις, 60 n., 124, 135
 Pity, 124, 140
 Plummer, 27 n.
 πνευματα, 28
 Possession, 36
 Power (δύναμις), 11, 15, 33-5, 38, 46, 88,
 127, 142, 146, 156
 (charismata of), 45, 50, 124,
 (ἐξουσία), see "Authority"
 Presbyter(s), 15, 36, 121
 Priesthood, 39
 Principalities, 21, 33

- Prisca, 70
 Prodigy, 43
 Prophesying(s), 60, 61, 121
 Prophecy, 49, 58, 74, 87, 89-91, 93-4, 96-8, 100, 104, 106, 107, 109, 110, 112, 116, 123,
 Prophet(s), 35 n., 79, 80, 88, 89, 91-4, 96, 98, 100-102, 106, 112, 117, 118
 Προφητεῖαι, 75 [138, 139]
 Psychological, 136, 137
 Psalms, 114
 xxxiv. 28—111 n.
 lxx. 17—111 n.
 lxx. 24—111 n.
 cxxv. 2—111 n.
 Philipians ii. 11—111 n.
 ii. 13—134 n.
 iv. 18—105 n.
 I Peter i. 12—112 n.
 v. 12—115
- Q**
- Quadratus, 153
- R**
- Rabbi, 101
 Redeemer, 14, 131
 Redemption, 14, 53, 95, 132, 134, 137, 144, 145
 Redemptive, 27, 63, 69, 95, 135, 137, 141
 Religio licita, 70
 Renan, 129
 Restoration, 91, 150
 Resurrection, 32, 140-44
 Revelation, 23, 53, 87, 98, 99, 102, 104
 Robinson, J. A., 135 n.
- Roman(s), 13, 16, 19, 62, 63, 69, 71, 73, 74, 83, 89, 102, 104, 136
 i. 2—76 n.; 6, 7—58; 12—136 n.
 ix.-xi.—75
 xii.—77; 4, 5—74 n.; 6—75 n., 93 n., 95 n.; 8—75 n., 85, 124, xv. 3—105 n. [140
 xvi. 3—70 n.; 7—89 n.; 25—98, 112 n.
- S**
- Sacrament(al), 12, 17, 44, 84, 110
 Sadducees, 21, 26, 101
 Sagas, 114
 Sander (Prof.), 28 n.
 Sander and Headlam, 57 n., 60 n., 69 n., 71 n.
 Sanhedrin, 46
 Sapphira, 47, 119
 Satan, 28, 31, 72, 147 n.
 Schaff, 113
 Science, 24
 Science (Christian), 23
 Schism, 18
 σημεῖα, 43, 44, 128, 139
 Semitic, 24, 27
 Seer, 57, 94, 97-100, 112-114, 116, 117
 Setwyn, 102 n., 106, 107, 112, 116, 152 n.
 Seneca, 69
 Silas, 65
 Silvanus, 115
 Simeon, 92
 Simon Magus, 46
 Sin, 143
 Sonship, 68, 73
 Soothsayers, 16
 Spinoza, 129
 Spirit (Holy), 14, 18, 37-9, 43, 44, 47-51, 60, 63, 66, 71, 72, 78, 84, 92, 109, 111, 124, 137, 152-4, 156
 Spirits, 17, 21, 22, 25
 Spiritual (gifts), 12, 19, 20, 45
 Stanley, 113 n.
 στοιχεῖα, 25
- Stephen (St.), 40, 47, 56, 89
 Stoics, 69
 Strauss, 129
 Streeter, 42 n.
 Suetonius, 71
 Supernatural, 33
 Swete, (Prof.), 47 n., 49 n., 61 n., 63 n., 75 n., [76 n., 79 n.]
 Symbolic, 91
 Sympathy (Charismata of), 45, 50, 124-5
 Synagogue, 75, 118
 I Samuel ix. 9—94, 99
- T**
- Targums, 118
 Teacher(s), 79, 88, 100, 102, 118, 123
 Teaching, 87, 89, 90, 100-102, 104, 117, 122
 Temptation, 27, 28 [139, 153]
 Temple (Archbp.), 130
 répas, répara, 35, 43, 128, 141
 Tertullian, 45, 69 n., 125
 Thackeray (St. J.), 22
 Thayer, 107
 Theophany, 26
 Toledo, 37
 Tongues, 20, 87, 90, 106-13, 117, 122
 Torah, 101, 118
 Trench (Archbp.), 43 n., 93, 95 n.
 Troas, 145, 146
 Trypho, 153, 154 n.
 Tyler, 13 n., 21
- I Thessalonians i. 5—59 n., 68 n.; 7—60 n.
 ii. 3 ff.—105 n.; 6—89 n.
 iii. 11—105 n.
 v. 14—59 n.; 20, 21—60 n., 61, 68 n., 95 n., 121 n.
- 2 Thessalonians ii. 2—61 n.; 9, 11—134 n.; 13—138 n.
- I Timothy i. 20—90, 147 n.
 iii. 2—102 n.
- Titus i. 9—102 n.
 iii. 5—65 n.
- U**
- Uhlhorn, 72 n.
 uioθεια, 69
 Uction, 36, 148
 Understanding, 107, 153
 Unity, 39, 67, 74, 109
 Universal(s), 57, 98, 100
 Utterance (Charismata of), 45-50, 124-5
- V**
- Vicarious, 138
 Virtues, 50
 Vision(s), 91, 94, 100, 113, 117
 Vital, Vitality, 14, 74, 88, 110, 111
 Vitalism, 24
 Volkmar, 72 n.
- W**
- Will, 26, 139
 Wisdom, 41
 Word, 41
 " (of knowledge), 87, 100, 122
 " (of wisdom), 87, 100, 122
 Weisäcker, 75 n.
 Wieseler, 146 n.
 Westcott (Bp.), 98 n., 141 n.
 Wordsworth (Bp.), 15 n.
 Worship, 18
 Wright, 113
- X**
- χάρις, 57
- Z**
- Zechariah iv. 5, 11 ff.—99 n.
 Zephaniah iii. 4—101 n.

