

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

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

than their conclusions,' and his conclusions are so important that we may be thankful that his friends accepted his conclusions, whether because or in spite of his arguments.

It is hardly too much to say that the whole future of Christianity in Europe depended on Paul's refusal to let the gospel be tangled up with the old Law. As a variant of Judaism, Christianity would never have permeated and dominated the Western world. Dr. Claud Montefiore has said that Jesus took the treasures of Israel and made them available for mankind. This is a tremendous truth, but it took nothing less than the death of Jesus to break the shell of Judaism, and release its inner treasures. Paul saw this. A crucified Christ has discredited Judaism as a system, and set the Gentiles free from any obligation to accept the Law. Christ died to secure this freedom for us and to build up a new society across the differences of Jew and Greek, slave and freeman, male and female. The new society thus entered on its career without being in bondage to the past, and if it developed a legalism of its own, at least its canons and standards were its own reaffirmations of Old Testament and Stoic ethics, and not a blind adherence to Jewish traditions.

But the early Church did not rise to the level of Paul's insight, and so Galatians has continued to be a revolutionary ferment, particularly active whenever Christianity has crystallized afresh into a legal religion. Luther's commentary on the Epistle remains a classic record of its awakening power.

Perhaps we are never more than half convinced that the attractive power of Christ, the deep sense of obligation to Christ who has died for us, is the power of God unto salvation, and not rules and regulations. It is amazing, this confidence of Paul that comparatively undisciplined Gentiles will become clean-living, will instinctively do the right thing, and live in the right spirit, if only they love and adore the Lord Jesus. Yet we do know what old Dr. Chalmers meant when he spoke of the expulsive power of a great affection. Formal codes of conduct, rules and regulations, may have their place, even their necessary place, and their function may not be as purely negative as Paul seems to have supposed. Yet they do not go to the root of the matter. They give you, Paul might have said, a tamed and disciplined animal, but not really a new creature. William Penn said of George Fox that 'he was civil beyond all forms of breeding.' Fox was country-born-and-bred. He knew little of the rules of polite society. Yet his loyalty to Christ made him so respect his fellows that men felt in him the essential gentleman even if outward polish might be lacking. On the other hand, a courtier with a full knowledge of etiquette and perfect manners, may smile and smile and be a villain still. The true change of heart can never be effected by regulating conduct from without. God's gentlemen are those who, like Paul, can say, 'the life which I now live, I live by faith, by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me.'

Grace and Order.

BY PRINCIPAL A. E. GARVIE, D.D., NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

I. IF we may assume that the Kingdom of God on the lips of Jesus, and Grace in the Apostolic writings both mean God's *sovereign saving activity*, His love in action, and if that activity within the believers is by the operation of God as Holy Spirit, we can approach the subject of Order with a guiding conception which should lead us towards fuller understanding. It is entirely consistent with the Christian conception of God that the Spirit's operation in the believer should result in Church, Ministry, and Sacraments; and an extreme Pro-

testantism which in its opposition to Catholicism regards these as human institutions and not Divine appointments seems to me to err seriously. This contention may be briefly justified.

(1) Biology would describe man as a gregarious animal, philosophy interprets him as social personality. Human personality is realized only in society. Men have many common needs, interests, activities, and these constitute them a community. (a) Religion in its earliest phases is not individual, but communal (tribal or national); and even when

individualism in religion appears, the social bond is not severed, for the individual realizes his relations to God in his relations to his fellow-men. One of the falsest things ever spoken about religion on either its human or its Divine side is that it is 'the flight of the alone to the Alone.' The historical founders of new religions called individuals into a society. (b) The very nature of Christianity as the universal Divine Fatherhood, the common human brotherhood in Christ, love to God and equal love to self and neighbour as the supreme law demands more than any other religion community; and does not merely command, for, as Augustine's two sayings, *Jube quod vis* and *Da quod jubes*, suggest, God in the Spirit as the common possession of believers gives; in that common possession they are necessarily made a community, one body of Christ, one temple for God, because one habitation of the Spirit. As God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is one, so the Church is in its essential nature a unity; its external divisions are deplorable, tragic, historical accidents, using the word in the scholastic sense; they do not belong to its essence. I am entirely in agreement with those who regard these divisions as unhappy, and unity as what is to be made man's endeavour because it is God's purpose. Nor am I content that this unity should be *invisible*; to call it *spiritual* is to regard Spirit as it is never regarded in the New Testament as power which fails to manifest itself. As the love of God found its manifestation in the grace of Christ, in the Incarnation the Word became flesh, God seen and known by men as man, so this unity of the Church seeks and should find manifestation in a common ministry and common sacraments; and so long as our divisions forbid and hinder that, the Church as unity remains invisible.

(2) While we must affirm that all believers have the Spirit of adoption, so that all can say, 'Abba, Father,' that all as God's children have freedom of access unto God in Christ, that He alone is the High-priest of our confession, and He has redeemed men to become a Kingdom of priests unto God, yet that does not exclude a ministerial priesthood as well as prophethood in the Church. I have never been able to understand how those who are prepared to accept the prophethood are so opposed to priesthood. There was false prophecy as well as corrupt priesthood in Israel; and men may abuse their office in representing God to men as well as in representing men to God. The theologian who claims to be an infallible oracle is just as great a danger as the celebrant who claims to be an exclusive channel of mediation between God and man.

Abuse does not remove use. In leading men in their worship to God as in making known the gospel, there may be, and must be in the Church as a body, differentiation of organs, functions, gifts. If God by His Spirit calls a man to the ministry, and endows him with the proper gifts for the efficient discharge of his vocation, he may be regarded, valued, and used as a gift of God's grace. That there should be a ministry ordained as representative of the community to discharge its corporate functions of preaching the gospel, administering the sacraments and exercising the cure of souls or pastoral oversight is no contradiction of the priesthood of all believers or their common possession of the Holy Spirit. Rigidity and exclusiveness are forbidden by the consideration, that 'the Spirit breatheth where it listeth' (Jn 3⁸ RVm); and by the evidence of that truth in the history of the Church, when the *latent* prophethood or priesthood of the Christian people became *patent* to meet an urgent need. To this consideration we must return; but meanwhile it may be conceded that liberty with order can best be realized in the Church when for its corporate functions it has representative organs, to whom God has given the *charism*.

(3) As a Protestant, and as I understand the New Testament, the primary and most important, if we can make any distinctions here, function of the ministry is the preaching of the gospel, to which as the Protestant Confessions maintain the administration of the Sacraments must be subordinated. As at Lausanne there was agreement on the message of the Church to the world—the gospel—the place of the preaching in the Church is not a subject which divides. But a few words must be directed against the tendency among some Christians to depreciate preaching in comparison with the sacraments. It is true that man is body as well as soul, that there is access to the mind through all the senses, that the object seen may in some persons make more impression than the language heard, that, as the new psychology insists, the subconscious has a potent influence on experience and character no less than the conscious; but all these considerations do not justify a challenge of the truth that it is the consciousness which must for mental health direct and control the subconscious phenomena of mind, and that articulate speech is the most effective channel for the conveyance of instruction and influence from mind to mind. The sacramentarian who calls the new psychology to his aid needs to be reminded that this psycho-analysis has much more to do with mental disease than mental health, and that to be

the subject or victim of unknown and unwilling complexes is not a condition to be much desired. To repeat a figurative statement I once used before, Christ is much more likely to be found amid His disciples in the lighted upper room of conscious reason, conscience, spirit, than in the dark, and, as many psycho-analysts represent it, foul, cellar of the sub- or un-conscious. A religion which attaches importance to truth will not prefer other approaches to the mind of man to the hearing ear and understanding heart.

(4) This aberration, as I must regard it, set aside, we may admit the value of sacraments, the outward symbols of the inward grace. In using the word symbol I am not depreciating the effectiveness of the sacraments; for a symbol is real only as it conveys what it signifies. The water in baptism, and the bread and the wine in the Lord's Supper are symbols only in so far as they convey cleansing and nourishment to the soul by the Spirit. But we must surely add that while the gift of God is there, it is received and can only be received by faith; spirit with Spirit must meet. Just as in the preaching of the gospel grace is offered, so in the sacraments; but can we say that it is given until it is received? Recognizing the dangers of superstition, the following considerations may be offered in urging that the depreciation of sacraments no less than the depreciation of preaching is to be deplored.

(a) If it be the case, as I believe it is, that Christ appointed the two sacraments as the symbols of initiation into and continuance in His community, then loving obedience to His loving command may anticipate love's reward. We are not under law, but under grace; but, if we love Him, we shall gladly keep all His commandments.

(b) As God conveys His beauty and truth and goodness in the order of Nature, through material objects, and physical processes, as God was manifest to men as man in the flesh, as in His teaching the Incarnate Word embodied truth in a tale, taught the Heavenly Father's goodness in His care for the flowers of the field and the birds of the air, as instead of defining God's love, He told the story of the lost sheep and the lost coin, so visible objects and processes may as fitly serve as the expression of truth and the channel of grace even as audible words. That there is in this world-wide sense a *sacramental* principle must be conceded; only it seems to me too universal to justify the exclusive use which is often made of it.

(c) We must fully recognize the necessity for *symbolism* in religion. God is not the altogether

inscrutable, the altogether ineffable, as mystics have often maintained; but that we cannot fathom the depths, or scale the heights, of the Divine reality in our thought or speech we must gratefully and not regretfully confess. For a God whom we could measure by our ideas or our words would not be great enough for our need. Jesus, who knew and made God known as no other has done, did not give a definition of God. He gave a symbol. 'Our Father which is in heaven.' That conveys more to the developing Christian experience than any definition could express. A symbol may be acted as well as spoken; and thus the sacraments may convey more than words could express.

(d) A minor consideration which, however, deserves to be mentioned, is that in the sacraments the celebrant, if he is careful to use only the language consecrated for such use, and to adhere to the acts so consecrated, is less distractingly present than is the preacher; his personal peculiarities do not intervene, and the blessed memories and the sacred associations that through the centuries have been transmitted from the Lord Himself may and do, to the sensitive imagination, make Him alone present with no human barrier between.

II. I hope in the preceding paragraphs to have shown how far a convinced and consistent Protestant can go to meet what claims to be the Catholic position. Regretfully and reluctantly I turn to indicate more briefly where differences emerge. It is the rigid exclusiveness of the Catholic contention which offends both my reason and my conscience.

(1) I cannot find in the New Testament any warrant for the assumption that Jesus concerned Himself at all about questions of order. He gathered His disciples around Him, and when His bodily presence was withdrawn He left them to the Spirit's guidance. Nor can I find that the Apostles, in organizing the Church, laid down laws of permanent and universal validity. Organization was necessary; but what organization there was was not uniform, because adapted to varying local circumstances or associations. The Apostles held a unique position because of their personal relation to Christ as His disciples and witnesses of His resurrection. It was endowment by the Spirit which qualified for any function as organ of the one body. With the highest possible respect for the late Bishop Gore, I cannot regard his procedure in beginning with the second century and going back from it to the New Testament as legitimate. I must take my stand with such Anglican scholars as Hatch, Hort, Lightfoot, and Streeter. Such a structure as the Catholic position would in my

judgment demand a foundation in the New Testament so plain and sure that there would be no room for differences among scholars. The Protestant position, as I hold it, is not in the same way affected by this uncertainty, as it does not put forward any such rigid, exclusive claim for its Order.

(2) For me the question cannot be settled by any appeal to the Apostolic Age. We must distinguish between absolute eternal and relative temporal values, the divinely essential and the humanly accidental. God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is an absolute eternal value. Grace as God's favour, action, quality from God imparted to man is an absolute eternal value, manifested and communicated in time. Even Church, Ministry, and Sacraments are so closely related, as I have tried to show, to that Grace, the operation of the Spirit, in man, that we can regard them as temporal values inseparable for us from the Eternal. But I cannot, although I have tried to discover an organic vital relation between the organization of the Church which emerged in the second century and these absolute eternal values which it served to preserve and protect under the local and temporal conditions. That organization was so very largely determined by those conditions, the dogma by Greek philosophy, the polity by Roman Imperial administration, that I cannot regard it as belonging to the absolute eternal values by any inseparable connexion. I am not of those who would dismiss all these developments as merely a secularization of the Church; their relative historical value I freely admit; but history means change; progress depends on adaptation of the permanent to the changing; and this principle I cannot exclude from the Christian Church in what has been called its sociological aspect as a human institution in time. The history of the Christian Church is also its judgment. The unity of the Church has led, as conceived in the Catholic position, to an enforced uniformity, revolt against which has resulted in division. The hierarchy has become too often a hindrance and not a help to pure and undefiled religion. Reliance on sacraments has led to superstition. It cannot be claimed that this

organization has proved itself so effective an organ of the Spirit that it and it alone can be accepted as legitimate. Judged by its fruits, it cannot put forward a claim to be the only proper expression of the purpose of God. Surely the world has so changed since the early centuries in the Roman Empire that what was necessary, appropriate, and effective then and there cannot claim acceptance in all continents and by all centuries. God fulfils Himself in many ways; what has emerged under historical conditions may deserve to be submerged when these conditions change. The Epistle to the Hebrews should teach us not to confuse eternal substance and temporal shadow.

(3) My conception of God, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Preserver and the Ruler of mankind through all the generations, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Father of all men in Him, makes it quite impossible for me to think of God as imposing one order as the exclusive, or even regular channel of His abounding truth and grace. I believe that the Catholic position, or any dogmatic, exclusive Protestantism rests on a yet imperfectly transformed conception of God; and such a transformation, emancipation from the letter of Scripture, adaptation to the thought and life of a progressive race, and above all the revelation of the Father by the Son and the continuing enlightenment of the Spirit demand of us, and make possible to us. I cannot think of God as the *doctrinaire, disciplinarian, martinet*, who will be sure to bless only by this or that prescribed channel. It is only in a purified and elevated conception of God, common to all Christians, that we can hope to find the reconciliation of the Catholic and the Protestant position. Protestantism no less than Catholicism has much to unlearn and forget, much to learn and remember before that reconciling truth can be reached. The final emancipating word can come not from ecclesiastics but from theologians, from seers, and saints unhampered, unhindered by the traditions and customs of the past, and inspired by the vision of the Church that is to be, in which Christ shall make for Himself a body fitter and worthier than any which has hitherto been His.