

*THE WORK OF THE PARACLETE.

BY Z. T. CODY, D.D., GREENVILLE, S. C.

Preparatory to what I have to say in this lecture, I will call your attention to the fact that the Gospel of John and the writings of the Apostle Paul occupy different points of view in their treatment of the work of the Holy Spirit. As we saw, the Apostle Paul stood at the cross; and for him the cross mediated the work of the Spirit. This is not the standpoint of the Gospel of John, at least not in that part where it gives the work of the Paraclete. The point of view here is the throne of the risen and reigning Christ. It is important for us to feel this. In that discourse of our Saviour in which the work of the Paraclete is most fully treated, John 14-16, we find that the Paraclete is the abiding representative of Him who ascended to the Father. The coming of the Paraclete is constantly associated with the fact that Christ goes to the Father. It is the exalted Christ that sends Him. It would be His work to give the vision of the reigning Christ, "A little while and ye shall see me, because I go to my Father", and "He shall glorify me for he shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you". But I need not take time to indicate the many ways in which the Holy Spirit is here associated with the thought of the reigning Christ.

The enthronement of Christ is a tremendous fact. It has a bearing upon absolutely everything that pertains to the human race: and the Church of Christ exists to testify to this all-meaning fact and to apply it in its infinite bearings to this world. The Gospel of John conceives that it is the Paraclete's work to make effective this testimony. As we may say, He is this all-significant Fact, conceived as living and operating in this world.

So then we must think of the Holy Spirit's work as an elipse, and the two foci of this elipse are the cross and the

*Gay Lectures for 1918.

throne. With the Apostle Paul, He is the Spirit of Grace; with the Gospel of John He is the Paraclete or the Spirit of the Throne.

As I have indicated, we find the teaching concerning the Paraclete in the Gospel of John, especially in chapters 14-16. But the book of Acts casts much light on this teaching. Both viewpoints of the Holy Spirit's work are found in Acts. But upon the whole the viewpoint of the Gospel of John is what is illustrated in the accounts that we have of the Spirit's work in this book. I will take up first the teaching of the discourse in John's Gospel and then in part that in Acts.

FROM THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

In the Paschal discourse, John 14-16, the name given the Holy Spirit, according to our Common Version, is Comforter, which is a misleading translation of the word *paraclete*. I do not know what English word best represents this Greek term. If we are to translate it, perhaps Helper would come nearest to the idea. But there is no need to translate it. In this discourse our Lord was not giving His apostles comfort in personal sorrow; but was promising them help in the work of founding and guiding His Kingdom in a hostile and unbelieving world. The going of Jesus was seemingly leaving on their hands an absolutely impossible task. As these men faced it they were hopeless; and it was to this hopelessness our Lord spoke throughout the discourse. He approached it from many sides, and in many ways assured them that the coming of the Paraclete would meet their every need and problem.

1. *The Question of Fitness.* The apostles felt themselves personally unqualified for the task of founding Christ's Kingdom. How could they, mere peasants, with the consciousness of peasants, meet and measure up with the world's great ones? If they were to remain what

they were, with a sense of inferiority in their innermost souls, they could not do this work, that had to be done before kings, judges, high priests, and the noble of the earth. They might influence a few peasants and begin a little sect; but they could not found a Kingdom. What our Lord first of all promised them was a Helper who would give them a new consciousness and a sense of superiority to this world at its highest. (See John 14:16.)

The Paraclete is here called the Spirit of Truth, not, as I understand, because He would impart information about God, but because He would create in the hearts of the apostles the conviction that they represented Christ, the King of kings. He would give them a new consciousness. "At that day, ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me and I in you." "Ye shall *know*." Such knowledge, not as information, but as consciousness was strength itself. It would give to the apostles the bearing of the Court they represented. The leaders and princes whom they would have to face in founding the Kingdom would be the best that the blood, power, and culture of this world could create; but they would not have what the apostles would possess—the consciousness that they stood for the Christ. "A little while and the world seeth me no more: but ye see me: because I live ye live also." Seeing the unseen King they would share in His poise and power. This more than royal dignity and bearing would be theirs, not as an assumption, but as a nature bestowed of God.

And this which was promised is what happened when the Spirit came. After Pentacost these peasants became princes, the ambassadors of a Court not of this world: and in a way that was more than miracle, they at once became the peers and superiors of the great of the earth. Judges and rulers instinctively felt their superiority, and those who had seen the Master, traced their dignity to its proper source, Jesus. But we will note the fulfillment more in detail when we come to Acts.

But the context gives some of the effects that would come from this new consciousness, this possession of the Spirit of Truth. The most amazing is that mentioned in the twelfth verse: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do because I go unto my Father." To be qualified to do greater works than the mighty deeds of the Master would be qualification indeed. But, we ask, was it done? The Master's mighty miracles have not been repeated and in our estimate are unapproachable. But we miss this verse when we measure it by "our estimate". Our Lord was not speaking according to *our* estimate of works, but according to *His own* estimate. As He sees things, the conversion of a sinner may be a greater work than the raising of the dead. What I think is promised here is that those who should speak in the consciousness of the Paraclete's presence would produce greater and more permanent moral and spiritual effects than Jesus Himself produced by His words and deeds. There are other promises in this context to this new consciousness of the Spirit of Truth. There is the promise of prayer: "If ye shall ask anything in my name I will do it" (v. 14). And there is the promise of complete knowledge in the things of Christ. "He shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." We know how wonderfully these words were fulfilled in the case of these first disciples. They came to have the very mind of the Master. Having His consciousness all the seeds that He had sown in their dull ears at last sprang up. They did not have, what may be called a new knowledge. It was only a revived memory, and a new understanding, of what Jesus had taught them.

2. *The Question of Expediency*: Even though the Holy Spirit would fit them for the tasks of the Kingdom, still would it not be better for Jesus Himself to remain and have supervision of the work? This was hardly a ques-

tion with the apostles. And perhaps to them the strangest thing said on that eventful night was this: "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." By staking His veracity for the truth of this utterance, our Lord makes it impossible to doubt it. His words have reference to two possible methods of founding the Kingdom and assert that both of these methods could not be used. It must be by one or the other. He was not, of course, asserting that He and the Holy Spirit could not be in the world at one and the same time. The two conceivable methods were, first, that in which Christ should be present in visible form and have personal supervision of the work, the method desired by the apostles. The other was that in which the Paraclete should have supervision of the work.

Why, it may be asked, could not both of these methods be used? Because they are fundamentally different. If Christ should remain, He would not, of course, remain as the Jesus of flesh and blood, whose divinity was hid behind His peasant form: but rather He must remain as the risen, glorified, and reigning Son of God. The normal development of the race would not be possible under that visible Presence. History would at once cease to have a natural course and would become miraculous. Sight, rather than faith, would become the fundamental principle of the Kingdom, and spiritual education and discipline, if possible at all, would be limited indeed. Such a method would be a setting aside all that we know of the ways of providence in the guidance of the world. On the other hand, the coming of the Paraclete would continue the method of providence in the guidance, saving, education and development of the race and at the same time bring into this method a power that would make it effective.

Anyone can see and feel that both of these methods could not be followed, for they are mutually exclusive.

But to this day men differ as to which is the better. There are those who are very sincere in the belief that before Christianity can triumph, it must come back to the method of our Lord's visible presence. But Jesus Himself said that the second method was the better of the two. It accords with the wisdom of the Father in His providential guidance and development of the race: and it brings into the work of saving and educating all the grace and power of Christ. It is the slow method. But we must not despair of it.

It might be thought that the method of the Paraclete would be sufficient for the guidance of the church, of believers, but would it reach and overcome a hostile, unbelieving world? Must not the glorified Lord Himself remain, if this triumph comes? How can the preaching of the apostles, whatever their fitness and whatever the spiritual help they may receive, accomplish this? Our Lord did not fail to answer these questions.

3. *The Question of a Hostile World.* "And when he is come he will convict the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go unto my Father and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged." Our Lord was facing the problem as it existed. He knew what the hate of the world to His gospel was and called attention to it (15: 17, 18, 20). He knew how the world turned away from what was distinctive in His gospel—sin, righteousness, and judgment. He saw as no one else ever did see that nothing could be done unless the world was brought to a moral conviction on these things, seemingly the most difficult of all things to bring about. And He knew as the conditions of this conviction, that men must be brought to recognize Him as the King over all. How could such a condition ever be fulfilled! You see our Lord's clear eye was resting on the problem of a hostile world in all of its impossibilities. When He sent forth His apostles

to testify to Him and His gospel before the world, He knew the task He was setting them to. They saw it, somewhat. He saw it full. And in the presence of it He spoke this great utterance. Let us take it up more in detail.

(1) "Of sin." The word *convict* is a very strong word and points to such a conviction of the truth of a thing in dispute that the other side is left without a case. What lies in the background of this passage is the thought that the apostles and the world are in a controversy. The apostles are charging sin on the world; and the world is sneering at their charge. What will happen is that the Paraclete will work with the apostles and produce a conviction that will leave the world itself speechless.

"Because they believe not on me" is not exactly the same as the sin of unbelief, though it points to this. The sins, which the apostles would have such a time in making men realize that they were sins, were those against the gospel of Christ: First of all, those against the person and name and rights of Jesus. Men had crucified Him as if He were a dog and had gone on their way as if they had done nothing. And then to convince men that it was sin to violate the words of Jesus, His words about the "little ones"; His words about His Church; His words about forgiveness; His words about humility, and all the rest: The only way to get men to realize that to violate these was sin would be to make them know that Jesus lived and reigned. It was and is their unbelief in Him that caused them to sin and that kept them indifferent after they had sinned. How the crucifiers of Christ changed when at Pentecost they were made to believe that Jesus lived and reigned! Then they saw their conduct in a new light. They heard again their own cry for His blood and it seemed to them the doom of their own souls. The Paraclete in one hour after His coming worked this seemingly impossible conviction and did so by the new light He cast on the throne of Christ. It was a sample of His work and an earnest of His final and complete triumph.

(2) "Of righteousness." We do not connect conviction with righteousness as we do with sin. But the conception here is felt to be natural when we remember the background of thought: The apostles are contending with men that this righteousness of Jesus is the law of life for this world. The Paraclete will convict the world of the truth and justice of the apostles' contention.

The *righteousness* of this passage is primarily the righteousness that Jesus requires. It is the other side of sin. If it is sin to violate the words of Jesus it is righteousness to keep these words—to really keep them, that is, human life and human society must be shaped in accord with the teachings of the Master. The *little ones* must be protected, educated, given their opportunity and elevated to the position of brothers. And this involves all manner of changes in our laws, customs, and habits. But the righteousness of Christ is more than a fraternal program for a world of equals. If it is sin to reject the sacrifice of Christ, it is righteousness to accept that sacrifice and to stand in its merits. If it is a sin to despise the Lordship of Jesus, it is righteousness to submit to that Lordship. And righteousness in this is the parent of all the righteousness of the Christian social program. It is a mistake to pit the one against the other. What the apostles and preachers stand for is the full and undivided righteousness of Christ, not for the elect merely, not for the Church only, but for the world and the whole world.

Will they ever succeed? "Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven", will that petition ever receive a full answer? "Yes", answer some: "When Jesus returns in glory with His holy angels and men see Him as He is. In that day He Himself will establish His righteousness on this earth." That is not the answer our Lord Himself gives here. "And when He is come . . . He will convict the world of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more." We may not be able to see the reasons in this answer, but we

cannot possibly deny that this is what our Lord said. The condition of success is that Christ be at the Father's right hand, that He be unseen. As we have seen these are the conditions of the Paraclete's method. He must use faith, rather than sight. He must use the gospel given to preachers, rather than commands given to angels. And what is asserted here is that the method of the Paraclete will succeed. Let us never despair of it.

(3) "Of judgment." "Because the prince of this world hath been judged", is a reference to the verdict which the cross, with its resurrection, passed on Satan, the god of this world; but it is very difficult to see the exact setting of this thought, and what I have to say is only by way of suggestion.

The heaviest problem before the apostles of Christ was that of convincing men of the cross, of the fact that the Ruler of this world had died a sacrifice for men. This was a stupendous and alien fact to put to the faith of a hostile world. But this fact also carried with it a life view which the world rejected, namely, that the life of the cross or the life of humility, self-sacrifice, and service, was the true highway to all the real prizes of life. Men do not come to this view easily. They often come to accept the Christian program as to *sin* and *righteousness* without accepting the cross. They come to think of humility and self-sacrifice as beautiful, but not as the one key to what men really live for. "They are very beautiful, but if you want success you must not follow them too closely." Do we not meet this everywhere? It means when you sift it down, that men feel that if the successes of life are reached and the things worthy of approval, some allegiance must be shown to this world. What a hold this conviction has! Take those sins which spring from *honor*, such as dueling, returning a blow for an insult, sins that are most diametrically opposite to the Christian spirit, and yet they have been the hardest to overcome.

Is it possible ever to convince the world that the cross and the cross-life are the one key to all that is worth while? That is what the preacher stands for. Will he succeed? is a question that almost staggers the faith of the most hopeful. He will not succeed until men lose their fear of men. He will not succeed until men lose their faith in chance and superstition. He will not succeed until men reach the conviction that sin gets nowhere; that the wisdom of this world is folly; that selfishness defeats itself; that the *kick* of revenge is more deadly than its bullet. And all this means that the preacher will not succeed until he can bring the world to the conviction that Jesus, the crucified, is now the Lord over this life and controls all that relates to it. Can this final conviction be wrought into the conscience of the world? Our Lord's answer is in this verse, and it is a mighty Yes. "And when He is come He will convict the world of judgment; because the prince of this world hath been judged." The triumph of the cross over Satan will at last be inwrought into the conscience of this world and men will no longer believe the lies of the deceiver of mankind.

One other question remained: How could these apostles ever guide the Kingdom of Jesus Christ? What our Lord had promised does not meet this question; but He comes to it in verses 12-15.

4. *The Question of Wisdom.* "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come He shall guide you into all truth: for He shall not speak from Himself; for what things soever shall He hear, these shall He speak; and He shall declare unto you things that are to come. He shall glorify me; for He shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore, He shall take of mine and shall declare it unto you."

To raise the question whether Christ is speaking here only of Christian truth, or of all truth, scientific included,

is to miss the trail. He was not dealing with the intellectual nature, but was making a promise to reinforce the side of practical wisdom, in which the apostles, who were being entrusted with the direction of a great and developing Kingdom, felt so lacking. Our Lord speaks here, not of truths or thoughts, but of "things", "what things soever", "things that are to come", "all things whatsoever", etc. A "thing" is a thought wrought into a reality. There was the thought of democracy: but when this thought was wrought into the form of a New Testament church, it became a "thing". On the cross our Lord wrought the loving thoughts of the Father into redemptive realities, which were all to be put into the "things" of God's great and growing Kingdom on earth. What the apostles needed was a statesman-like wisdom and this the Paraclete would give them. There are two things marked out concerning His guidance: (1) He would not become another authority. "He will not speak from Himself. But whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak. . . . He shall receive of mine and shall declare it unto you." Christ would remain the sole authority in Zion. The apostles knew Him and His teaching. All that Christ had taught would stand forever unchanged and whatever developments that were to come would be in accord with what the apostle already knew of Christ. (2) "And He will show you things to come." This promise may have included the knowledge of specific future happenings, but I do not believe that this was its essence. Rather it was a promise that the apostles would know which of the "things" of today would have the future. Much of today's work is always that of planting and cultivating insignificant "mustard seeds", and much of the world's work has the appearances of being far greater, and more hopeful of triumph. But the Paraclete would guide the apostles to know the "things" that would hold the future. He is the guide of history and represents Him who determines the course of all things. Christian ministers

yet have this help and it gives them the conviction to stick fast to a gospel the world often despises, and to work on at those tasks of the Kingdom which are great only in their prophecies.

FROM THE BOOK OF ACTS.

The descriptions that we have in the book of Acts of the Spirit are almost all of His work as the Paraclete; though there are in the book abundant evidence of His work as the Spirit of Grace. I wish that I had time in this lecture to take up every reference to His work in this book and in the epistles, but this is out of the question. Allow me, though, to say this: I believe it is a mistake to take every distinct word concerning the Spirit as referring to a separate sphere of His work or to a distinct experience. There are books which give separate chapters to the baptism of the Spirit, the enduement of the Spirit; the infilling of the Spirit; His anointing; His sealing, etc., as if they referred to separate works or experiences. This tendency has given us our "second blessing" doctrines. It is better, I think, to take these many references to the work of the Spirit, as pointing to the one and same work but as seen from different standpoints and, some of them, as meeting different needs of man's nature. For instance: the sealing of the Spirit points to His work of giving assurance; the anointing, to His work of enlightening; the infilling, to His special enduement for extraordinary occasions, etc. But I wish to take up a few of these for a little fuller treatment.

1. *The Baptism of the Spirit.* The great difference between the work of Christ and that of John the Baptist was in the fact that Christ gave the baptism of the Spirit, an experience John was unable to impart. This baptism was *the* gift that our Lord came to bestow. All are agreed that the promise of it was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost; but all are not agreed as to the interpretation of this experience.

I have noted three views that call for answer:

(1) There are those who distinguish the baptism of the Spirit from regeneration and look on it as a "second blessing", an experience the regenerated should seek and can receive. Those who received this baptism at Pentecost were already believers. (2) There are those who look on the baptism of the Spirit, Pentecost, as the baptism of the church, performed on that day once for all. (3) Others take the view that the baptism of the Spirit consisted in the "tongues" of Pentecost and in the miraculous powers with which the apostles were endowed. Some who hold this view think that this endowment was only for the apostles who thus were fitted for founding the Kingdom: but others think that Christians can yet receive these gifts, the only evidence of the baptism of the Spirit.

I cannot undertake to answer these views at length. If the baptism of the Spirit was *the* gift our Lord came to bestow, not a one of these interpretations can be true, for they all point to an experience which is less than regeneration, which I take to be the baptism of the Spirit. The believers at Pentecost did receive the Spirit some time after they believed, but they were exceptional in that they lived in two dispensations. They came to faith in an age before the Holy Spirit was given and necessarily received the great gift later. As to the baptism of the church: the only possible way to baptize a church, whether with the Spirit or with water, is to baptize the individual members who compose its fellowship; and there is as much sense in speaking of the church having received water baptism once for all, as that it has received the baptism of the Spirit once for all. As I understand it, water baptism is but a symbol of the baptism of the Spirit, and has a right to continue because that which it symbolizes continues to be repeated in the history of the church. But the most foolish of these views is that which looks on the miracles of Pentecost as the baptism of the Spirit. It mistakes the sign that the Spirit has come for the pur-

pose of His coming. When the doctor comes he rings the door bell. But he does not come to ring the door bell; that is only the sign that he has come. We can know the *purpose* of his coming from the nature of his calling and the need of his presence. The wonders of Pentecost, and of the days following, were but the sign that the Spirit had come. We know the purpose of His coming from all the work and promises of Christ. But there are those who seem to think that He came to ring the door bell; and at it they would keep Him through the ages!

We hesitate to call regeneration the baptism of the Spirit, because we are now accustomed to think of regeneration as a quiet work and feel that the baptism of the Spirit is an overwhelming experience. But this is to confuse a work of the Spirit with a psychological disturbance. An experience may be attended with psychological upheavals and yet signify nothing. Whereas, a "quiet" work of the Spirit may be overwhelming in the moral and spiritual changes made possible by it.

2. *The Enduement of the Spirit.* After His resurrection and before His ascension, our Lord said to His apostles, "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit has come upon you." This promise has also been connected with a "second blessing" received in an experience subsequent to conversion. But it is better far to see in this promise the grant which every believer has in regeneration. Without doubt many good men have, in some one experience subsequent to conversion, received an enduement of power that proved a blessing to them and to the Kingdom. This cannot be questioned. But it does not follow that this individual experience of their's confirms the doctrine of a "second blessing". We are not shut up to either denying these experiences, or accepting this explanation. The gift of "power", like the gift of sanctification or the gift of knowledge, is always in the gift of the Holy Spirit. Where He is, there, also, are the possibilities of all these. But men must "stir up the gift that is in them". The gift is theirs to be made theirs.

This will be felt if we analyze the peculiar power that came to the disciples on and after Pentecost.

(1) It was a talking power. Nothing ever stirred the human tongue as did the coming of the Spirit. Everyone began to talk, men and women, old and young, servants as well as masters, the ignorant as well as the knowing ones. Those apostolic churches were something new under the sun. It is fashionable in our day to sneer at talk. But when the whole body of a church begins to talk from an irresistible impulse, there is a wonderful power in it; and in the apostolic days these talking churches stood in marvelous contrast to those heathen temples where the worshipers were "drawn away to those dumb idols". All on Pentecost, or after, did not talk alike. Those disciples who had knowledge talked sense and the wonders of God's love: those who knew nothing much, talked, but men thought they were drunk. There was talk and talk. But in all there was a new power come into the world.

(2) It was a courageous power. Again and again it is said of the apostles that they spake with "boldness". This bold speaking was a distinguishing mark of the Spirit. Lexicographers tell us that the Greek word here is not quite rendered by our word "bold": and anyone can feel this who will study the accounts in Acts of bold speaking. Our English word "bold" exactly fits Luther at Worms. "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. God help me." Luther's words reveal that he was conscious of danger, but despite it he spoke the truth. Now in the Acts accounts this consciousness of danger is absent and we know the apostles were bold, not by any great effort to hold themselves to duty, not by any tremor or steadiness in their voice; but solely by our knowledge of the circumstances. In every situation they found themselves in they spoke from a loftiness that seemed lifted above danger and from a consciousness that was free from self. Their message was their only concern, its righteous application and also its grace. We will look in vain for any-

thing else like it. And we must remember that these were the men who followed Christ in such weakness a few months ago.

(3) It was a Spiritual Power. To say of the Spirit's power that it is spiritual, sounds like tautology. And such it is; but it is a needed tautology. What He gave power to were the spirits of the apostles: and they won their battles because their spiritual elevation and conviction was superior to anything they met. Elymas could not face the gaze of Paul, Simon Magus cringed and cowed under the power of Peter's spirit. These two were samples of the spirits then trying to control men. It was in view of such victories everywhere won by the new religion John wrote "because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world." It is a mistake, I think, to attribute these victories, which the apostles won over all that met them, to miraculous manifestations. They could work miracles. But they, themselves, became powerful, in convictions, in will and resolution. This same power was manifested in overcoming all those other enemies which usually crushed or embittered men, poverty, suffering, disgrace, public reproach, prisons, stocks, the lash and the rod. These men never met any men or any situations or any circumstances that were superior to them. In their own spirits they were more than a match for all that opposed them.

Concerning this power, I have two things to say:

(1) The ambassadorship of the apostles was a reality to them. They knew that they represented the King of kings. The Paraclete gave them this knowledge and this was the knowledge He gave. It was more than knowledge to them. It was consciousness. They knew it, as they knew that they were human beings. They acted on it instinctively. This consciousness that they represented the King of kings accounts for their unusual bearing among men and for that "boldness" that was so unique. This was what the Paraclete gave them, and when we think of the power, of the enduement of the Spirit, we

must think of this definite thing, and not of a mere ecstasy.

(2) A sudden influx of power is not what the mind should be fixed on. Without doubt, power has more than once come to men in some one great experience; but in every such case these men had back of them years of Christian living and thinking. The apostles came to power at Pentecost, but the apostles had spent three years under Jesus Himself. The Paraclete gives to the heart the sense of the authority of Christ. This at times may come to prepared hearts in some one experience. But it does not follow that thus suddenly the Paraclete imparts this power to all. All that enters into Christian discipline and Christian education have their place in this impartation of power, and because they do, power may come gradually, as usually it does.

In conclusion, let me say that we must recognize that the apostles, as men who were inspired to found Christ's Kingdom and to give us the New Testament, were endued with the Spirit to a degree and perhaps in ways that were peculiar to them. The Apostle Paul in his missionary journeys, had a divine guidance that does not seem possible to men of today. But the gap between them and what is possible now can very easily be made greater than the New Testament makes it. When we get away from our barren experiences and go to its pages, we see that as the redemptive work of Christ and His lordship are for every succeeding generation, even to the close of the ages, so it supposes that the gifts, the illumination, the grace and the power of the Holy Spirit will be for all. And the degree to which the Christian life can come under His influence is but little realized by us. Perhaps, believers need today nothing so much as they need to know their possessions in the Holy Spirit. If it is written, "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him"; it is also written, "But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God."