

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 42.—OCTOBER, 1897.

I. THE FACT OF THE TRINITY AND THE FACTS
OF EXPERIENCE.

PRESENT-DAY philosophy may be characterized as an attempted explanation of the whole of human experience through a synthesis of its fundamental facts, on the basis of one ultimate and supreme fact. These fundamental facts, or principles, constituting the subject-matter of philosophy, are elucidated by a twofold method of procedure. First, an analysis of consciousness must disclose such principles, implicated in all experience as its necessary conditions, the *sine quibus non* of the very existence of human experience.

Next, the perils of faulty, incomplete, or fanciful analysis, and of the inadequate interpretation of the true and full significance of first principles, must be safeguarded by a supplementary and objective method. The evidences presented by the various aspects and successive phases of human experience, touching the character and significance of all ultimate facts must be scrutinized, and, if convincing, must be allowed due weight in the philosophical interpretation and reconstruction of experience as a whole. So far as may be competent to human intelligence, the sum-total of the results of the twofold method, must be brought into relations of harmonious adjustment.

Let us assume that through application of the methods indicated to human experience, including, of course, man's religious experience as an essential and supreme aspect of universal experience, a unitary conception of the ultimate principle of the uni-

On page 201, Nicholas I. is said to have renewed the ban against Photius in 882. Nicholas died in 867. The pope that renewed the ban against Photius was either John VIII. or Maximus I.

On page 335 we read: "Innocent III., in 1653, in the bull *cum occasione*, condemned five propositions purporting to be extracted from Jansenius' work." It was Innocent X.

On page 377 it is said: "Morgan's work was the revision of the composition of Warburton's once famous work," etc. The word *occasion* must be substituted for the word revision here, in order to either sense or truth.

Dr. Fisher, in the close of his work, represents Calvinism as dying out relatively. He attempts to explain its decadence. He calls attention to many facts painful to us. He betrays no large sympathy for thoroughgoing Calvinism. But these pages are worth reading. It might be profitable for all loyal Calvinists to ponder them.

In conclusion we advise every reader who can and will think for himself, and who wishes to study modern theology, to buy this book. It will introduce him well into this field.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

Hampden-Sidney, Va.

GORDON'S "THE MINISTRY OF THE SPIRIT."

THE MINISTRY OF THE SPIRIT. *By A. J. Gordon, D. D.* With an Introduction by Rev. F. B. Meyer, Minister of Christ Church, London. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1896.

The late Dr. A. J. Gordon was well, widely, and favorably known as a prominent Baptist pastor of Boston, and a man of great spirituality. Rev. F. B. Meyer notes the many treatises which in these days have dealt with the sublime subject of this volume, and says: "Each of these treatises has brought out some new phase in respect to the person or mission of the Holy Spirit, but I cannot recall one that is so lucid, so suggestive, so scriptural, so deeply spiritual, as this by my beloved friend Dr. Gordon." Many, no doubt, will concur in this judgment.

Dr. Gordon having been one of the ablest and most lovable writers on a theme which at this time elicits general interest, we believe that copious extracts will be not only pardoned, but welcomed. The reader will encounter many passages which will strike him as unique, fanciful, and even startling.

In chapter vii., on The Administration of the Spirit, are many things to approve, and many that set the reader on reflection. The author regards the election of Matthias to the Apostolate as unauthorized.

"Doubtless the mistakes of God's servants, as given in Scripture, are as truly designed for our instruction and admonition as their obedient examples. . . . Now, he (Jesus) had gone away into heaven, and his administrator had not yet arrived to enter upon his office-work. Surely, if the divine order was to be, that having 'ascended on high,' he was 'to give some apostles,' it were better to await the coming of the Paraclete with his gifts. Not only so, but we are persuaded that, with Christ departed and the Holy Spirit not yet come, a valid election of an apostle were impossible."

He doubts seriously the validity of orders in established churches, and questions the divine appointment of the Methodist ministry, though he does not name the Methodist Church.

“But the office of pastor, elder, bishop, or teacher still remains. And the divine plan is that this office should be filled just as in the beginning, by the appointment of the Holy Ghost.” On pages 138 and 139: “Is there any likelihood that that voice (of the Spirit) will be heard when the king or prime minister of a civil government holds the sole function of appointing the bishops, as in the case of state churches? Is there any certainty of it when an archbishop or bishop puts pastors over flocks by the action of his single will? We may congratulate ourselves that we are neither in a state church nor under an Episcopal bishop.”

He admits that “some conclave of ‘leading brethren’ may also set aside the Spirit’s appointment.” Our author’s view of the Lord’s prayer may be surprising.

“‘Lord, teach us how to pray as John also taught his disciples.’ Jesus complied *literally* with this request of his followers. As John, under the law, could only give rules and rudiments, not yet having come to the dispensation of grace and of the Spirit, so did Jesus give a form of prayer, a lesson in the ‘technique of worship.’ But only when he reaches the eve of his passion, when he announces the coming of the Comforter, does he lead his disciples into the heart and mystery of the great theme, teaching to pray as John *could not* have taught his disciples.” (Page 146, *italics his.*)

The Lord’s prayer teaches only as John taught to pray! His explanation is that only after Pentecost did they pray “in his name.” Then “we are in-willed by his will, because inspired by his Spirit . . . so that to ask what we desire of him is to ask what he desires for us.”

“When is sanctification completed?” is asked on page 121. The answer follows:

“At death, is the answer which we find given in some creeds. This may be true, but we say it not because the Scripture saith it not. So far as we can infer from the Word of God, the date of our sanctification or perfection in holiness is definitely fixed at the appearing of the Lord a second time without sin unto salvation. . . . Because we have been made ‘partakers of the Holy Ghost,’ we have thereby ‘tasted the powers of the age to come’ (Heb. vi. 4, 5, Revised Version), that age of complete deliverance from sin, and sickness, and death. But at most, we have only tasted as yet.”

This application of Heb. vi. 4, 5 to believers suggests some distrustfulness of Dr. Gordon as an exegete.

Another vagary of exposition we find on page 119:

“If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his ‘Spirit that dwelleth in you.’ (Rom. viii. 11.) It is not our dead bodies which are here spoken of as the objects of the Spirit’s quickening, but our mortal bodies—bodies liable to death, and doomed to death if the Lord tarry, but not yet having experienced death. Hence the quickening referred to has to do rather with the vivifying of the living saints than the resurrection of the dead saints. Of course the consummation of this vivifying is at the Lord’s coming. . . . but having the Spirit dwelling in us we have, even now, the first fruits of this transformation in the daily renewing of our inward man, in the helping, and healing, and strengthening which sometimes comes to *our bodies* through the hidden life of the Holy Ghost.”

This kind of experience is too attenuated and subtle for verification.

Our author holds on page 165 that the apostles actually received authority to forgive sins. But we will make only one more random reference, and that on the subject of election. On pages 208 and 209:

“The present is the age of election and not of universal ingathering. Paul says that there is at this present time ‘*a remnant according to the election of grace,*’

and a little further on, 'all Israel shall be saved.' . . . James says, 'God did visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name,' and 'after this will I return,' etc., 'that the residue of men might seek after the Lord and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called.' Here again is first an elective out-gathering and then a total in-gathering."

As was to be expected, Dr. Gordon was thoroughly wedded to Baptist principles. He will have it that there was no church prior to Pentecost. He insists as on page 56, upon translating $\epsilon\nu$ by in, and misquotes the Revised Version in Matt. iii. 11 thus: "I indeed baptize you *in* water unto repentance, . . . he shall baptize you *in* the Holy Ghost and *in* fire." That Dr. Gordon should make the Revised Version responsible for this rendering surprises us. "*In* fire" is not recognized even in the margin. The word for *fire* is in the instrumental dative, as is the word *water* in three of the eight passages which speak of baptism with water. "With" is thus determined by the word itself to be the proper rendering of $\epsilon\nu$ in the other five. "Purged *with* blood," of Heb. ix. 22, is $\epsilon\nu$, and this cleansing, we are told in verse 21, was by sprinkling.

The author will persist also in saying that the Holy Spirit's *presence* filled the room, though the sacred text, whose very words he holds to be inspired, says the *sound* filled the room.

We need scarcely forewarn the reader that his interpretation of the pentecostal baptism is in harmony with the immersionist theory that the baptism *in* the Spirit is a figurative and not a real baptism. His theory utterly flouts the doctrine of our Shorter Catechism, that water baptism symbolizes engrafting into Christ by real baptism *with* the Spirit. The Doctor's theory, accepted by many of our own people, is a strong ally of immersion. Let us confine ourselves now to that theory:

"Pentecost was the birth day of the Spirit," whose dispensation "begins with *Pentecost* and ends with the *Parousia*." "It is according to literal Scripture that the body of the faithful is indwelt by the divine Spirit. *In this fact we have the distinguishing peculiarity of the present dispensation.* 'For he dwelleth with you and *shall be in you,*' said Jesus, speaking anticipatively of the coming of the Comforter; and so truly was this prediction fulfilled, that ever after the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit is spoken of as being in the church. '*If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you*' is the inspired assumption on which the deep teaching in Romans viii. proceeds." (Page 22.)

On page 25 he quotes Pastor Tophel with approval:

"In an admirable work on the Spirit, the distinction between the former and the present relation of the Spirit is thus stated: 'In the old dispensation the Holy Spirit wrought *upon* believers, but did not in his person dwell in believers and abide permanently in them. He appeared unto men; he did not incarnate himself in man. . . . Affianced of the soul, the Spirit went off to see his betrothed, but was not yet one with her; the marriage was not consummated until the Pentecost, after the glorification of Jesus Christ.'"

"It was impossible that Pentecost should have preceded Calvary, or that the outpouring of the Spirit should have anticipated the shedding of the blood." (Page 28.) And why? "It was not the earthly Christ whom the Holy Ghost was to communicate to the church, but the heavenly Christ—the Christ reinvested with his eternal power, reclothed with the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and re-endowed with the infinite treasures of grace which he had purchased by his death on the cross." (Page 41.)

So far we find ourself in accord with Dr. Gordon. The last citation we commend heartily to our immersionist friends. That symbolism is not true which first baptizes into the dead Christ. "As many of us as were baptized into Christ.

(glorified) were baptized into his death"—into the righteousness which is due to his obedience unto death, and which is imputed to us. But it is imputed only because his life is first *imparted*. We are baptized into the living Christ, "who liveth and *was* dead, and is alive forevermore."

What, now, are the treasures of grace purchased by the death of Jesus which the Holy Spirit communicates in the baptism of Pentecost? A summary of these treasures we find truly given on page 62: "As by our natural spirit we are connected with the first Adam and made partakers of his fallen nature, so by the Holy Spirit we are now united with the second Adam and made partakers of his glorified nature." But alas! the rich meaning which these words suggest is not the meaning our author intends to convey. We would suppose that union with Christ meant "alive in Christ," acceptance in Christ, completeness in Christ. But not so. On the same page we have: "The baptism of the Holy Ghost into which we have been brought is designed to accomplish inwardly and spiritually what the baptism of water foreshadows outwardly and typically, viz., to *reproduce* in us the living and the dying of our Lord."

This baptism is "one baptism," according to our author, because it has been administered only once, on the day of Pentecost. On page 56 we find:

"His presence 'filled all the house where they were sitting,' and 'they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.' The baptistery would never need to be refilled, for Pentecost was once and for all, and the Spirit then came to abide in the church perpetually. But each believer throughout the ages would need to be infilled with that Spirit which dwells in the body of Christ. In other words, it seems clear that the baptism of the Spirit was given once for the whole church, extending from Pentecost to Parousia. 'There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism.' (Eph. iv. 5.) As there is one body reaching through the entire dispensation, so there is 'one baptism' for that body, given on the day of Pentecost."

On page 58: "To change the figure of baptism to another which is used synonymously," he refers to the anointing of Aaron as a typical illustration of the anointing of the Spirit. As the anointing oil ran down on the beard, and went down to the skirts of his garments, just so the baptism of the Spirit is the one baptism of the whole body. It occurs to him that the baptism of Cornelius presents a difficulty. It does not articulate with his theory. On this, therefore, he has to say something; but he has not, in our judgment, something to say that is pertinent: "It is true that in one instance subsequent to Pentecost the baptism in the Holy Ghost is spoken of. When the Spirit fell on the house of Cornelius, Peter is reminded of the word of the Lord, how that he said, 'John indeed baptized in water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Ghost.' (Acts xi. 16.)" We interrupt the quotation to remark that even the Revised Version says "*with* water," and gives in the margin no alternative "*or in*." To resume: "This was a great crisis in the history of the church, the opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles; and it would seem that these new subjects of grace now came into participation of an already present Spirit. Yet Pentecost still appears to have been the age-baptism of the church. As Calvary was once for all, so was the visitation of the upper room." Our comment is justified.

And so this baptism *with* the Spirit into Christ is converted into a baptism *of* the Spirit (subjective genitive?) into the church, the body of Christ; for in chapter iv. we have "The Embodying of the Spirit." In chapter v., as the practical result for the believer, we have "The Enduement of [by] the Spirit."

And this baptism is *not for every believer*. Chapter v. opens thus: "We have maintained in the previous chapter that the baptism in the Holy Ghost was given once for all on the day of Pentecost, when the Paraclete came in person to make his abode in the church. It does not follow, therefore, that every believer has received this baptism. God's gift is one thing; our appropriation of that gift is quite another thing." How, then, do some believers appropriate this baptism? "It seems clear from the Scriptures that it is still the duty and privilege of believers to receive the Holy Spirit by a conscious, definite act of appropriating faith, just as they receive Jesus Christ." (Page 68.) We have, on page 74, a form of acceptance: "O Holy Spirit, I yield to thee now in humble surrender. I receive thee as my Teacher, my Comforter, my Sanctifier, and my Guide." We fear that the influence of this good man's name will open the door to much error. It were well had he heeded his favorite text: "He [the Spirit] shall not speak of himself, but shall take of mine, and shall show it unto you." According to our reading, every believer receives the baptism with the Holy Spirit: "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believed on him [Jesus] were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." (John vii. 38, 39, Revised Version.)

What, now, is this enduement or baptism, which the believer may appropriate if he will? "We have had the enduement of the Spirit presented to us under three aspects: sealing, filling, and anointing; all of which terms, so far as we can understand, signify the same thing, the gift of the Holy Ghost appropriated by faith. Each of these terms is connected with some special divine endowment: the seal, with assurance and consecration; the filling, with power; and the anointing, with knowledge." (P. 92.) The reader will not admit that sealing and anointing are peculiar to some Christians only, who have received the Spirit by an act of special appropriating faith: "In whom [Jesus] having also believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance," etc. (Eph. i. 13, 14, Revised Version.) All Christians are anointed and all are sealed. All, however, are not filled with the Spirit, for Christians are admonished to be filled with the Spirit. (Eph. v. 18.) The enduement-with-power theory is utterly refuted by the fact, to which Dr. Gordon also seems blinded, that saints were endued with power and filled with the Spirit long before Pentecost. A few such are named: John the Baptist was filled with the Spirit; so, too, were his father and mother; so, too, were Bezaleel and Aholiab; and so, too, were all the saints in both dispensations who were efficient in service.

Nor can we admit that "assurance and consecration" can be restricted to the period between Pentecost and Parousia. If this be all that is meant by "sealing," then the Old Testament saints were assuredly sealed. Penitent David cried: "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit." (Psalm li. 11, 12.) "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad." (John viii. 56.) Said Simon: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." (Luke ii. 29, 30.) Surely there is assurance of hope in David's exclamation (Psalm xvii. 15): "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness." (By the way, this passage is cited by Dr. Gordon (page 125) to prove that holiness

will not be perfected till the second advent.) We fail to see that any endowment Dr Gordon's theory confines strictly to the dispensation of the Spirit as the result of pentecostal baptism was denied to Old Testament saints.

In chapter vi. the author concludes where he should have begun, with "The Communion of the Spirit." He says very truly (page 99):

"The familiar benediction which invokes upon us the 'communion of the Holy Ghost' has, probably, a deeper meaning in it than has generally been recognized." [We do not think that meaning is recognized by the author.] He continues: "The word 'communion'—*κοινωνία*—signifies the having in common. It is used of the fellowship of believers one with another, and also of their mutual fellowship with God. The Holy Spirit dwelling in us is the agent through whom this community of life and love is effected and maintained. 'And truly our fellowship,' says John, 'is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.' (1 John i. 3.) But this having in common with the first two persons of the Godhead were only possible through the communion of the Holy Ghost, the third person."

We contend that the "communion of the Holy Ghost" is not a something in common which the Spirit communicates, but the something in common which *is* the Holy Spirit. That communion is *with* the first two persons only plainly shows that the third person is the *κοινωνία*. In "of the Spirit" we have the subjective genitive, and not the genitive of the "agent." It is the Spirit himself who was promised and was given. Jesus baptizes every believer *with* the Spirit. The author's baptism "of the Spirit" is a baptism which the Spirit administers and of which the Scriptures know absolutely nothing. Jesus is the only baptizer at Pentecost. It is the baptism with the Spirit—the gift of the indwelling Spirit to every believer—which baptizes him into Christ, unites him with the second Adam. The one single sentence in all this volume which suggested that the author entertained the scriptural conception of baptism with the Spirit turns out to bear a meaning utterly foreign to the biblical doctrine. When the author says (p. 62): "As by our natural spirit we are connected with the first Adam, and made partakers of his fallen nature, so by the Holy Spirit we are now united with the second Adam, and made partakers of his glorified nature," he means not, that we are complete in Christ, partakers of his life, made the righteousness of God in him, but that the Spirit by his sanctifying processes works in us a righteousness of our own as a manifestation of the life of Christ: "he reproduces in us the *living* and the *dying* of our Lord." (P. 62.) This is his own explanation. And the following is his explanation of what he understands by the communion of the Spirit:

"In his promise of the Comforter, Jesus said: 'He shall take of mine and show it unto you.' As the Son while on earth communicated to men the spiritual riches of the invisible Father, so the Spirit now communicates to us the hidden things of the invisible Son; and if we were required to describe in a word the present office work of the Holy Ghost, we should say that it is to make true *in* us that which is already true *for* us in our glorified Lord. All light and life and warmth are stored up for us in the sun; but these can only reach us through the atmosphere, which stands between us and that sun as the medium of communication; even so in Christ are 'hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,' and by the Holy Spirit these are made over to us." (P. 99.)

The Spirit under the old dispensation took of the things of Christ to show them unto the saints. Remember that Dr. Gordon restricts all this ministry of the Spirit to the "church extending from Pentecost to Parousia."

The communication of the life of Christ to us is not the reproduction in us

of his living. "God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is *in* his Son." "He that hath the Son hath life." "He that believeth on *me* hath everlasting life," not he who subsequently by a definite act of faith appropriates the Spirit. Dr. Gordon's enduement theory is confronted with this dilemma. If by "life" he means life in Christ, *i. e.*, salvation by a definite act of faith appropriating the post-pentecostal Spirit of life, then, of course, all who died prior to Pentecost were lost, and so, too, those Christians who do not receive the baptism. This, of course, he does not mean. If, however, he mean, as we have shown he does, the power of holy living through the post-pentecostal communion of the Spirit appropriated by a definite act of faith, then he contradicts the records of Old Testament saints, who through faith wrought righteousness. This he has not considered. This enduement theory does not articulate with Old Testament Scriptures. Its *proton pseudos* is its repudiation of baptism *with* the Spirit.

The vivifying, sanctifying, energizing operations of the Spirit are by the author's theory logically denied to Old Testament saints. On the other hand, the theory that the gift of the Spirit by the risen, justified, and glorified Saviour was first communicated at Pentecost to effect organic union with the justified captain of our salvation, and guaranteed every believer, no more denies the operations of the Spirit who was with the Old Testament saints than it does the benefits of Christ's sacrifice for them, though he, the incarnate Christ, himself "was not yet."

Dr. Gordon advocates a theory which utterly fails in that which it attempts, to define the Pentecostal baptism and to draw a legible line of demarcation between the two dispensations as to the operations of the Spirit.

Greenville, Miss.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.

GORDON'S "IMMORTALITY AND THE NEW THEODICY."

IMMORTALITY AND THE NEW THEODICY. *By George A. Gordon, Minister of the Old South Church, Boston.* Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1897. Pp. x., 130.

This is the first Ingersoll lecture upon "The Immortality of Man," in Harvard University. This lectureship was established by Miss Caroline Haskell Ingersoll in deference to the wish of her father. The endowment is \$5,000. One lecture must be delivered each year. The choice of the lecturer is not limited to any one denomination. Our Southern institutions of learning suffer for the want of such establishments. Here is an open door for service and fame, for the entry of some liberal spirit. But this is digression.

The essay before us is brilliant until it dazzles. Its conceptions are startling; its language glows with rare beauty; its press-work is luxurious. But, in the biting words of Dr. S. M. Smith, it teaches that "the chief end of God is to glorify man, and to develop him for ever." It is a "new theodicy." It is not a development of the thought of the past, the clarifying and advancement of the old argument for immortality; it is repudiation, destruction, reconstruction. Until the rise of modern evolution, and perhaps before the issuance of this book, the world never had any sound basis for its belief in immortality! It has believed, but its belief has not been rational and intelligent. The author has "sincere sorrow" in departing "from able and honored men," but when the truth is at stake and the life of humanity involved, "the sorrow must be borne."