

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

by Frances Horner, says: 'He [Newman] taught me so much I do mind—things that will never be out of me. In an age of sofas and cushions he taught me to be indifferent to comfort; and in an age of materialism he taught me to venture all on the unseen, and this so early that it was well in me when life began, and I was equipped before I went to Oxford with a real good panoply, and it has never failed me; so if this world cannot tempt me with money or luxury, and it can't, or honours or anything it has in its trumpery treasure house, it is most of all because he said it in a way that touched me—not scolding nor forbidding nor much leading—walking with me a step in front.'<sup>1</sup>

There is one more thing that must be added. A mere negation is never satisfactory; it is never the only thing that has to be said. There is no virtue in suffering just for the sake of suffering. If we say 'No,' we must have something to put instead of the rejected thing. A Lent observance which consisted entirely of doing without some bodily satisfaction would represent some slight economy in the household expenditure, and nothing else. The economy might, or might not, be noticeable, and worth making. If so, there is that to be said. If not, there is nothing to be said. It has no other relevance. The action has no repercussion in the spiritual world of character. Our Lord said, 'Man does not live by bread alone.' He would not shrink from the converse proposition, 'Man does not save his soul by abstinence alone.'

There is a word, now rather overworked, but nevertheless most convenient, the word 'sub-

<sup>1</sup> P. 120.

limation.' It is a new word, but the thing it describes has been practised by Christian people for centuries. This must not be done because it is wrong. Yet it appeals to powers that we possess. We know that it would give an outlet for those powers. *But* it is wrong. What can be done? We can do what Jeanie Deans did when she could not perjure her soul to save her sister's life, but walked from Edinburgh to London to appeal to the Queen's Majesty in person. Or we can do what John the son of Thunder did. His was the fiery nature which desired to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable people of Samaria. Yet his final appearance on the field of history is as the Apostle of love. Had he weakened in the interval? Or had he turned his strength another way? What does St. Paul mean by 'having nothing, and yet possessing all things'? Does he mean that laborious self-denial will be rewarded by compensations in the life to come? Or does he mean that service may *be* freedom, and sacrifice may *be* happiness? 'Sublimation,' a modern word, an old, familiar, necessary thing.

It is certain that our Lord in the wilderness had a reason for His thrice repeated 'No.' He had an alternative policy, a positive purpose. Of that time it might be said of Him, as it was said of the later time when the conflict was even fiercer, and the forces of evil were all mustered for the final shock, 'For the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising shame.' There is only one thing to do with shame, and that is to despise it. There is only one motive that will make this possible, and that is some joy set before us.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> S. C. Carpenter, *The House of Pilgrimage*, 143.

---

## The Present Relations of Church and State.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, D.D., LONDON.

THE world-wide crisis—economic, political, and international—has in several lands resulted in the substitution of dictatorships of various types for democracy; and in justification of these the theory of the *totalitarian* state has been advanced. This claim by the State to direct and control the 'total' life and thought of a nation has necessarily raised the problem of the relation of Church and State in an acute form, and has challenged Christian thought to a serious consideration of it with a view

to its solution. I have already in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES called attention to phases of the German Church controversy, but now I am venturing on a discussion of the general problem.

### I.

(1) In the Hebrew nation Church and State were one; religion and politics were inseparable, but in Isaiah's *remnant* and Jeremiah's disciples a detach-

ment begins. The Jews returned from exile not a State but a Church, and the conflict of Church and State emerged. In the Maccabean revolt we have an instance of the struggle for religious liberty. The story of martyrdoms under the Roman Empire shows the danger of the *totalitarian* state to religion. Much of the theological thought of the Middle Ages was concerned with this problem; and the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in our own land offer instances of the dilemma—God or Cæsar, for not always is the solution our Lord commanded—God and Cæsar—possible. His teaching as well as that of the prophets lends support to the view that violent resistance of the State is not the duty of the Church; but patient endurance of the penalties it may inflict, if its behests are not obeyed. Some thinkers of last century believed that they had found a solution in the *slogan* 'A free Church is a free State'; but in view of the necessary extension of the functions of the State into many spheres of interest and activity and the welcome widening of the vision of the Church to Christianize all spheres, no such separation of spheres is possible. The State is claiming, and for the most part rightly, an expanding sphere, not so much of domination as of service; and the Church hears the call to pervade by the influence of Christ and His Spirit the whole range of human conduct. If the circles are not concentric, yet they do to a large extent intersect; and no question of to-day deserves a more thorough scrutiny and a more careful judgment by the Church than its relation to the State. We should in this study get down to the fundamental principles.

(2) We cannot, as did the thinkers of the Middle Ages, assume a Natural Law, expressive of the creative will of God, absolute before, relative after the Fall, because that event brought in a punitive element in God's dealings with man. We may, however, start with human personality, as a Christian idealism conceives it. Man as personal is rational, emotional, æsthetic, moral, religious, social. As spirit-in-body, he is related to, because dependent on, Nature; but that relation is not limited to the provision of material objects to meet his physical necessities (economics). He has an intellectual relation in his pursuit of knowledge of physical forces and natural laws (physics), an æsthetic in his appreciation of the beauty of Nature, a moral in the subordination of his physical needs to his personal interests (ethics), even a religious in his recognition of a divine presence, purpose, and activity in the physical universe (theism). The conquest of Nature is one of the elements of human progress, and his co-operation with his

fellows for this end demands the regulation of the State, so as to secure justice to all. As it is God's will that the bodily needs of His children on earth should be met by the abundant provision which He has made in Nature, and that man should by his labour claim for his own use this provision, the Church can approve any action of the State which helps and does not hinder this manifest purpose of God. So also any contribution the State can make to man's pursuit of truth and appreciation of beauty. It is, however, in the spheres of morals and religion that the problem of the relation of Church and State becomes most acute. A State may tolerate or even approve conduct which a Church may condemn, for example, the use of contraceptives and sterilization, or require beliefs and rites which religious conviction rejects, for example, the worship of Cæsar in Ancient Rome, or the oath of loyalty to Hitler in Modern Germany.

The individual is in all his interests and activities dependent on society, and Church and State are societies. Accordingly in investigating further their relations, we must form as clear a conception of what society is as we can.

(3) As having common interests and engaging in common activities, man constitutes with his fellows a *community*, and there may be as many kinds of community as there are interests and activities—domestic, industrial, cultural, moral, religious. Wherever and whenever man *wills* a relation with his fellows, there is a society. When he wills a society to give effect to community, he forms an *association* with others with a more or less rigid and permanent organization, as the conditions may demand. Such an association has regular and continued modes of common activity, and these are its *institutions*. To give the two relevant illustrations, Christian believers form a community of interest and activity because of their *common possession* (Koinōnia) of the Holy Spirit, through whom the revelation of God and the redemption of man through Jesus as Christ and Lord are continued. Their *association* together is the *Church* (ecclesia); among the *institutions* of this association which give practical effect to their *community* are the *ministry* and the *sacraments*. A *nation*, however constituted geographically, biologically, historically, is a *community*; its *association* as such is the State, its *institutions*, autocracy, democracy, parliament, cabinet, law-courts, police, army, navy, etc. There may be an association with its institutions wherever and whenever there is a community of interests and activities as the motive of, the reason for, the

willed relation of society. That man may exercise his liberty, realize his responsibility, develop his personality as fully as possible, it is desirable and even imperative that both Church and State should not discourage and prevent, but encourage and promote such associations and institutions, so long as their purpose and their method do not lessen the common good of the society which might be affected by them. The totalitarian state endangers these varied common interests and activities, when for its own ends it seeks to control such associations; and the Church in rejecting and resisting such interference is not only protecting, but is preserving the liberty, the ability, and the opportunity for the full expression of human personality. In a Nazi, Fascist, or Bolshevik State culture, character, and conviction are all imperilled, and need to present a common front of opposition; and on the Church there rests the duty of wise, righteous, and courageous leadership. The State is not the only association possible, desirable, legitimate; it has no claim to exclusive dominance in every sphere, although it may claim to be supreme in its own sphere, that it may discharge its own function. The community of interest and activity it represents and makes effective is the need of the preservation, the protection and the promotion of the common life in a society against aggression from another society, or conflict of the associations within itself with one another; its function is not merely to ward off invasion, or to maintain order among its subjects or citizens so as to prevent wrong or injury to person or property; but as a society develops, becomes increasingly a community, the promotion of any interest or activity which confers general benefit, and demands corporate action for economy and efficiency may be included in its province, such as sanitation, health, education, culture, morals. No rigid limit can be set to the extension of its functions, and no abstract definition can be given of those functions. A qualification regarding the authority of the State must be added. It claims the right, a right challenged only by *doctrinaire* anarchists, to use physical force to secure obedience to its commands, to effect its purposes. Whether such use of force is morally justified will depend on the content of the command, the character of the purpose. It is, however, a false view of the State that its authority rests on force only: if so, its authority has degenerated into a tyranny. A State is an organ of community only as it is so functioning as to fulfil the purpose generally accepted in the society, which it is representing and for which it is acting. If it bases its activities

on force, it is so far failing as the State which can impose any moral obligation or arrogate any religious sanction. The assent, tacit if not co-operant, of subjects or citizens is a condition of its being an association of persons. In relying on force exclusively, it is treating persons as things; it treats them as persons only when it can command their conscious and voluntary allegiance and support. Force there must be in reserve, but only as a last resort. This does not condemn force as such, for force as physical is morally neutral; its moral character depends on the use which is made of it. Excessive use is violence, unnecessary use is cruelty, and both fall under moral condemnation. The Church may fully recognize, and firmly support the authority of the State when it is rightly based and rightly used; otherwise it may be its sacred obligation to condemn and resist, or to submit under protest.

(4) As religion is not concerned with only one department of life, and the Christian religion especially claims to be the leaven (Mt 13<sup>33</sup>) pervading and transforming the whole lump of human interest and activity, the Church is not concerned only with what is mistakenly distinguished as the sacred from the secular, since the Spirit of God seeks to sanctify 'the whole manhood of all mankind.' Ethical, cultural, and even economic problems in so far as they relate to the full development and free exercise of human personality in its supreme and controlling relation to God must be the concern of the Church, that they may receive as far as the Church's testimony and influence can command nothing other or less than a Christian solution. It is evident that as the function of the State expands, and as the Church's pervasion and transformation of human society extends, they will come into ever closer contact, and it may be into ever acuter conflict. The Church may, being wise as a serpent as well as harmless as a dove (Mt 10<sup>16</sup>), recognize that the legislation and the administration of the State cannot be far in advance of public opinion and popular sentiment, and must often fall short of the Christian standards, and accordingly may abstain from censure or opposition; but it cannot acquiesce and compromise within its own membership; it must insist on the whole demand of Christ so as to give to the world around an example, it must use all its resources to raise the general standard, and it must seek to win men and women from the world around to share its witness and work. Not indifferent or hostile to, but interested in and supporting any activity of the State which is required for and promotes the

common good, in view of the teaching of Christ on the infinite value of the individual soul, the Church must guard individual liberty and responsibility against any unnecessary interference of the State, the motive of which is its own self-aggrandisement, or sectional interests, and not this common good; but it should give no countenance to a factious opposition, which rests only on individual preference; it should in such cases declare submission a duty, and resistance a wrong. Even when the individual conscience defies the authority of the State, it is not always the function of the Church, while defending freedom of conscience, to approve and further every assertion of it; and it is at this point that a wise discrimination is necessary. A general principle may be briefly stated, but the necessary limits of space forbid detailed illustration. If the individual conscience is 'ahead of' the common beliefs and standards, which the State is enforcing, then resistance will be a duty, whatever its penalties may be; if it is 'behind' the State's requirements, repression may become the duty of the State, although tolerance is permissible, if the interests of the community are not imperilled. The Church should stand by the progressive conscience, but give no sanction to the reactionary, while pleading for tolerance where permissible.

## II.

(1) A provisional description of the Church has been given; but we may now enter into fuller detail to show why by necessity of its nature the Church must take up the challenge of the 'totalitarian' State. While men are saved individually, yet as united by faith to Christ as Saviour and Lord, they are at once brought into the Society of the saved, of which the Holy Spirit is the 'common possession' (2 Co 13<sup>14</sup>), and which by that Spirit becomes a community of motive, purpose, witness, service, the body of Christ, in which He dwells, and through which He is fulfilling the divine purpose of the redemption and reconciliation of all mankind. It is His complement, as He is completing all things in all men (Eph 1<sup>23</sup>). To put the same truth in other words, the saving sovereignty of God in Christ (the Kingdom of God) is exercised in the Church in a twofold way; the community of believers is its *object* in order that it may become its *organ*; men are saved that they may serve the divine ends of salvation.

(2) The Church's primary, distinctive function is *soteriological*; it is the agent of God's saving sovereignty. But as it is an *association* of men

with *institutions* in the world of time and space, it has its *sociological* form. Two problems here emerge and call for solution. The one theological-ecclesiastical, the other political-ecclesiastical. (a) Is there so intimate and direct a dependence of the sociological form on the soteriological function, that it can be asserted that only one organization of the Church can claim to correspond to its inspiration, e.g. the threefold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, the apostolic succession, the historic episcopate, or does its unity and continuity as a human society, divinely sustained and guided, not require uniformity, but allow a wide range of adaptation to the local and temporal condition? The seemingly irreconcilable opposition of the 'Catholic' and the 'Protestant' conception is the now seemingly insuperable obstacle to the reunion of the churches, and the present challenge of the State may do good if it brings home the danger of division, and the duty of union. (b) The German situation has raised another problem. It is agreed by the 'German Christians' that while in its *soteriological function* the Church is independent of the State, its *sociological form* should *conform* (*Gleichschaltung*) to that of the State. They are careful to insist on their fidelity to the confessions of the Reformation, but seek to impose on the churches an organization similar to that of the State. This is, of course, consistent with the 'totalitarian' conception; not only shall the State control all associations, but the same principle must be exemplified in their institutions—one race, one nation, one leader, one policy in Church as in State. Accordingly, while Hebrew Christians may retain their membership in the Church, since that is included in the *soteriological* aspect, yet as the ministry is a social institution it belongs to the *sociological* aspect, and so the State policy of exclusion may be defended. To be the people's church (*Volkskirche*) the Church should identify itself with the policy of the State. We may remind ourselves of King James' conviction: 'no bishop, no king.' Adaptation in the Church there must be, but it is an adaptation that will make the Church more effective in the discharge of its distinctive functions, and not a conformity to current prejudices, conveniences, expediencies. With Paul the Church must be 'all things to all men,' not at the behest of the State, but at the command of Christ 'by all means to save some' (1 Co 9<sup>23</sup>).

(3) In the measure in which the Church is the body of Christ, the habitation of His Spirit, it is evident that it cannot be subjected to any human authority; but for its distinctive functions it is

on the one hand subject to the authority of God alone, and on the other the agent of that authority towards men. As regards its property, the relations of its members to one another and to their fellow-citizens, it will recognize the legitimate authority of the State and enjoin obedience for conscience's sake (Ro 13<sup>b</sup>), unless conscience forbids. But in discharge of its function 'by all means to save some,' it can brook no rival. As the purpose of God embraces 'the whole manhood of all mankind,' its authority as exponent of the will of God is universal as human life; no human association, not even the State, can withdraw itself from the authority of God. Its authority is not coercive, but persuasive, constraining; its appeal is to

reason, conscience, spirit; it cannot use force as its last resort, as does the State, but must leave to the judgment of God those who resist the truth, and refuse the grace which it mediates for God and ministers to men. The authority it exercises is not a privilege claimed, but a responsibility accepted, which must be discharged at any cost, martyrdom if need be, for the Cross, and not the Crown, belongs to its regalia. To be worthy and fit to exercise that authority, it must never allow itself to 'be fashioned according to this world,' but must be 'transformed by the renewing of its mind,' by a constant divine inspiration that it may prove and proclaim to the world 'the good and acceptable will of God' (Ro 12<sup>2</sup>).

---

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Varia.

IN view of all that is commonly believed about Germany, it is interesting to find that at least one large book of Jewish origin was published in Berlin last year. This is B. Jacob's extensive commentary on Genesis,<sup>1</sup> a work which commands the respect of every Old Testament student. The author describes himself quite frankly as 'a son of the people for whom the Law was written,' and he takes, naturally and inevitably, a conservative critical position, devoting the last hundred pages of the book to an appendix in which he discusses the methods and results of the normal critical analysis. The translation is arranged almost in individual verses, though often several are taken together, and each verse or group of verses is followed by the comments. These latter show a very wide range of learning, a freedom from racial and theological prejudice, and sometimes a striking originality. Where the translator finds the Hebrew text unintelligible (as in 4<sup>7</sup>), he does not hesitate to say so, though he is not prepared to find a way out of the difficulty through conjectural emendation. He has at his finger-ends the writings of all the great Jewish scholars, and is familiar also with most of the Christian literature on the subject, freely quoting and accepting opinions which appeal to him, from whatever source they may come. Philological notes are abundant, though they are not especially marked off from the rest of the com-

mentary, and they exhibit a rich store of Hebrew knowledge.

The fact that the author is able to take as literal history all that is said of the patriarchs gives him a real advantage in exegesis. For, even if we are not prepared to accept this view for ourselves, we should all admit that it was held by the narrators of the stories as they have come down to us. So we have here, in the exegetical comments, a striking vividness, which often brings before us a new clarity and sharpness of outline. It is as if our vision were, from time to time, focussed with fresh accuracy on the scene before us, and often a light touch reveals the picture as it presented itself to the original writer. This is something which we often miss in modern commentaries on the Pentateuch, and we owe a debt of gratitude to any writer who can recover it for us.

While, then, we may often find ourselves in disagreement with the author, it seems impossible to estimate too highly the learning, the patient research, the conscientious thoroughness, and the insight of this enormous work. Few will want to read it right through, but it will long remain a mine into which a reader may delve with interest and with profit.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Das Erste Buch der Tora: Genesis, übersetzt und erklärt* von B. Jacob (Schocken, Berlin, 1934; pp. 105; Rm.42).