
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

strongly for a recovery of spiritual values. 'The command of Nature has fallen into man's hand before he knows how to command himself,' one writer asserts. And Professor McDougall means much the same when he says that 'every step of progress physical science may make in the near future can only add to our dangers and perplexities,' and he goes on to plead that only a shift of emphasis from the mechanical to the biological sciences can save us, meaning by 'biological sciences' those which are concerned with life, physical, mental, and spiritual.

These voices are representative of the rapidly growing revolt against the mechanistic standard of values that has been so prevalent. There is among thinking people an increasing realization that the prime need of mankind is the recovery by the soul of man of a power of control over his own manifold activities, a capacity to direct those currents of change on which he seems now to be floating without apparent concern for whither he is drifting, or ability to stem the tide, when he knows full well that it is carrying him far out of his course. The tide will not turn of itself. There is no reason why it should turn at all. And the perception of this has created in thoughtful minds in all spheres of life an intense sense of the need of a spiritual foundation for life.

The drift of Canon ELLIOTT's book is just that the Church should be awake to this prospering wind of heaven. If this age of mechanism is near the point of exhaustion, and a new era is being born in which the spiritual will be dominant, this is a great opportunity for the Church, which has as its very heart and soul the message such an age is awaiting, that faith in God is the one security in a perishing world, and that the eternal worth of man, redeemed by Christ, a child of God, can only be secured by its gospel of grace. And so he proceeds to ask, first, what are the churches for? And on the back of that, what do we need? He is very practical and plain spoken on both these matters, and his answers will do much to reinforce the appeal to the nation that has inspired his book.

The Beatitude of Giving and Receiving.

By the Very Reverend Richard Roberts, D.D., Toronto.

I.

'I HAVE coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel,' said St. Paul on taking leave of the Ephesian elders. 'Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have shewed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive' (Ac 20^{33-35}). The *logion* seems to fall into its place here with perfect aptness. Nevertheless, there may well be some hesitation in accepting the saying, as it stands in English, as a faithful rendering of our Lord's mind. Blunt, in the *Clarendon Bible: Acts*, suggests that 'it may be an authentic saying of Jesus, or it may be Paul's summary of many words of Jesus.' It is true that there are 'many words' in the Gospels that bear upon the grace of giving and upon the manner of giving. But it would be difficult to find a group of sayings which, summarized, would give us this particular result. For it is one thing to say that it is blessed to give, and quite another to say that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

For that is not necessarily true. There cannot be givers without receivers. Giving and receiving are the obverse and reverse sides of one and the same transaction; and there is no reason why both should not be equally blessed. The man who is too proud or independent to receive what is offered to him in simple generosity is guilty of the sin of frustrating a gesture of fellowship. It may be that it requires less grace to give rightly than it does (for some persons at least) to receive rightly, and that consequently it may sometimes be more blessed to receive than to give. Certainly there is no blessedness in any but gracious giving. The giving which is marred by patronage or condescension blesses none, neither him that gives, nor him that receives; and there may be grudging and ungenerous giving, which hurts both giver and

receiver alike. Such gifts are better ungiven. But where there is noble giving and no ignoble receiving, then, as Shakespeare's Portia says of mercy,

> It is twice bless'd ;
> It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.

Giver and receiver are embraced in a happy reciprocity which enriches both.

II.

Probably the word *take* represents St. Paul's mind better than *receive*. The word λαμβάνειν may mean either. *Take* appears to fit the context better than the more passive *receive*. 'I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel,' said St. Paul. Clearly the contrast intended is between covetousness and generosity. The covetous man is the man who would like to take what is not his own ; and not unoften he does. In that sense, it certainly is more blessed to give than to take. We have latterly become familiar with the phrase 'the acquisitive instinct.' It would not be unfair to paraphrase our Lord's word thus : Generosity brings more happiness than acquisitiveness. That is a doctrine which does not appear in the creeds of worldly wisdom ; and in our time, successful acquisition of material good has usually paved the way to secular honour and glory. It is, to be sure, no new thing in the world ; but at no time has it come so near ranking as a virtue as it has in ours. The pursuit of wealth has become almost sacrosanct. But it has not yielded much of anything that Jesus would be likely to describe as blessedness. The instinct of acquisition is native to man and beast—not only native, but necessary ; and its exercise is legitimate. But we are prone, because it is natural, to condone its excesses ; and from that, it is only a few steps to glorifying it.

However, there is another instinct in us which condemns a man who 'takes more than his share' ; and here lies the true corrective of undue acquisitiveness—namely, the law of fellowship, which is perhaps more immanent than active in ordinary life. Whatever we have gathered, whether of wealth or of knowledge or of grace, we are required to share. 'Let him that stole steal no more : but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing that is good, *that he may have whereof to give to him that hath need*' (Eph 4^{28}). That is the Law ; and it is inexorable. Wealth unshared becomes a soul-destroying obsession. Hoarded knowledge breeds a sick mind. Grace unshared is no longer grace. Any sort of selfish withholding is self-defeating. There is no blessedness in getting without giving, or happiness in taking without sharing. 'In the course of my life,' a man said in my hearing not long ago, 'I have known a fair number of wealthy men. Of them all there were only two whom I would describe as really happy men ; and the characteristic of these two men was their continual and almost quixotic giving.'

III.

No giving is blessed which is not right giving ; and upon the subject of right giving, the New Testament has much to tell us. The root of the matter is in St. Paul's saying : 'He that giveth, let him do it with liberality' (Ro 12^{8}, R.V.). St. Paul's word here is ἁπλότης, which signifies *simplicity* (and is so translated in A.V.), or *singleness*, and so by a not unnatural transition, *whole-heartedness*. Let there be no mixed motive, no double mind in our giving. But whole-heartedness is much more than unthinking generosity. Right giving is outwardly determined by the circumstances—the ability to give and the need to be met. If the giving is not proportionate to the ability or adequate to the need (where there is ability to make it adequate) there is failure in whole-heartedness and a forfeiture of blessing. It follows that no giving is of that integral kind that St. Paul has in mind, if the giving be not intelligent ; if, that is, there has been no effort to ascertain the nature and the dimensions of the need. There is no whole-hearted giving without taking thought—and trouble. One of the dangers of these times lies in the facilities that are provided for giving at second-hand, in the societies and agencies to which we are invited to delegate our giving. On this side of the Atlantic, we have 'community chests' and 'federated charities' which have the effect of placing the individual giver at the farthest possible remove from the beneficiaries. This is not to say that these agencies are not valuable and necessary. Undoubtedly they secure a reasonable equitableness in the distribution and prevent unscrupulous individual exploitation of the available benevolence. On the other hand, they do us the hurt of making our giving impersonal and of letting us off too easily. A cheque to the 'community chest' may be taken to absolve us for the next twelvemonth from the duty of giving thought to our less fortunate neighbours. While, in the contemporary scene, with its vast areas of human need in town and country, we should thank God for the agencies which seek to deal with it, it is nevertheless good for our souls that we reserve an area, however small, for ourselves in which we can enter into friendly personal relations with necessitous folk.

There is another Pauline word which is pertinent here: 'The Lord loveth a cheerful giver' (2 Co 9^7, obviously a reminiscence of Pr 22^8 in the Septuagint). The word ἵλαρος may mean anything from *cheerful* to *merry*; but the more reticent word is the more seemly just here. The essential point is that there should be joy in the giving, a joy showing itself in the countenance and the manner of the giver, which means that he is offering more than his gift. He is indeed offering friendship which is also the offering of himself. It is instructive in more than one way to observe the contempt with which the reluctant giver is treated in popular speech. He is, for instance, a niggard, a churl, a screw, a skinflint, a crimp, a lick-penny.[1] Some of these insults may have been the bitter invention of disappointed beggars; but their survival constitutes a public judgment upon the mean and tardy giver. No giving comes up to the New Testament standard which is not giving with a whole and undivided heart. With all our giving, we give nothing, if we do not give ourselves; and our giving is blessed according to the measure of our self-giving. James Russell Lowell set down nothing less than bare truth in the familiar lines:

> The Holy Supper is kept, indeed,
> In whatso we share with another's need;
> Not what we give, but what we share,
> For the gift without the giver is bare;
> Who gives himself with his alms feeds three,
> Himself, his hungering neighbour, and Me.

IV.

'Freely ye have received, freely give' (Mt 10^8). Giving is right in spirit and manner only when it issues from right motives. There is a giving for self-glory; that is not giving, but purchase. There is a giving for advertisement as a matter of crude business—the firm's name high up in the list of contributors to the 'community chest' is a good investment. That also is purchase. The giving which has grace in it is that which originates in a sense of honourable obligation. 'Freely ye have received, freely give.'

'I am,' said St. Paul, 'debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise.' So are we all. Surely some competent person should write a treatise on Ethics based upon the doctrine of universal mutual indebtedness. We live, as the saying goes, by taking in each other's washing. Life is supported in this world by a vast, largely unconscious and unintended co-operation. Consider your breakfast table: and ponder what wide area its freight has been borne from—the tea or coffee, the milk and sugar, the oatmeal and the marmalade, some of which have come from far-off lands, and all of which are the product of the toil of a multitude of persons whose names we do not know and whose faces we shall never see. To them you owe your breakfast. Consider the miracle of a safe railway journey. Once I travelled by a fast train from Cambridge to London in the company of an aged minister whom I knew. At the journey's end, we walked along the platform at Liverpool Street; and when we came to the engine, my companion looked up at the engine-driver and said to him, 'Thank you for a safe journey.' Then he turned to me and said simply, 'I always do that.' To me, it was one of those incidents that seem to light up a dark room in the mind—this time, a room full of unrealized or forgotten obligations and possibilities. But why the engine-driver only? There was also the stoker and the guard, signalmen and telegraph operators, platelayers and others who had all co-operated to bring me and my friend safely from Cambridge to London. These are two commonplace instances of the unrealized co-operation by which we live. It is true that one's breakfast and railway journeys have to be paid for in good money. But money is only an expedient by which I exchange my commodity for other commodities which I need. I cannot, however, pay for the moral qualities that go into the products and the services which I purchase; those are things that cannot be bought or sold. Yet without those moral qualities, the far-flung co-operation that sustains our life could not endure. 'Freely ye have received,' and we are debtors to all honest men who work for a living.

Nor is that the whole tale of our indebtedness. Our accounting must reach back through the centuries into an undiscoverable past. We moderns are like St. Paul, debtors to the Greeks and to the Barbarians—and how indebted to the Jews!—and to a multitude that no man can number who have a place in our physical, spiritual, and cultural ancestry. The loves, the hopes, the longings, the thoughts of the ages are incarnate in us. We are loaded with a debt to the past which we can do no more than begin to measure; and to our myriad benefactors we can offer but a very general grateful remembrance.

To be sure, an honest man will render his own meed of service to the great common cause of life; and the more honest he be, the more will he render,

[1] In the course of preparing this paper, I incidentally noticed on the top of a page in Liddell and Scott, the word κυμινοτριστοκαρδαμογλύφος literally 'cummin-splitting-cress-scraper,' more summarily, skinflint. It occurs in *The Wasps* of Aristophanes.

for he knows that his debt is beyond measure. At the end of the story such men will say, 'We are unprofitable servants; we have done what was our duty to do.' Nor will they regard any giving beyond their due of service as a work of supererogation. They will say to themselves, 'Freely ye have received, freely give.'

V.

Not even yet have we reached the full extent of our indebtedness. When St. Paul was making his 'collection for the saints,' his argument was: 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich' (2 Co 8^{9}). He grounds his appeal upon 'the unspeakable gift of God.' 'But God,' he writes to the Ephesians (2^{4-8}), 'who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in trespasses and sins, hath quickened us together with Christ: (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus; that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.' . . . Once more, 'freely ye have received.'

Therefore, 'freely give.' And first of all surely, give thanks. For such good as our own skill and toil have enabled us to enjoy, we still have to thank God—'the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy' (1 Ti 6^{17}), and that 'giveth thee power to get wealth' (Dt 8^{18}). And how are we to give thanks for all that we have inherited from the past, and all that we still continue to receive from our unknown comrades and helpers in the common business of life, if we do not thank God? And most of all, for God's gifts in revelation and grace, crowned by the supreme gift of His Son, we should never cease to give thanks.

But thanksgiving implies more than it says. That is not true thanksgiving which does not provoke us to self-giving. 'First,' says St. Paul, concerning the grateful and generous Christians of Macedonia, 'they gave themselves unto the Lord, and unto us by the will of God.' And it is so that St. Paul accounts for their generosity. Self-giving is not merely an accompaniment of our giving; it is the very marrow of it. For St. Paul has this also to say of the Macedonian Christians: 'that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality. For to their power, I bear record, yea, and beyond their power they were willing of themselves; praying us with much intreaty that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints' (2 Co 8^{2-4}). Out of gratitude comes a self-giving that returns to the giver in an increment of grace and rises to God 'an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable and well-pleasing unto God.'

VI.

To such self-giving there is an assured return. 'Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again' (Lk 6^{38}). Not in kind—there would be no point in that. For the whole-hearted friendly giver there is a more precious reward—the reward of affection and friendship. Yet the reward is proportionate to the gift. 'He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully' (2 Co 9^{6}). Not that one should give for the sake of the reward. That is indeed forbidden. 'Do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again' (Lk 6^{35}). The reward is there, none the less: 'Your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest' (*Ib.*).

But what does the reward consist in? The word μακάριος is usually translated *happy*; but we may well believe that on the lips of Jesus it would bear a richer content. Perhaps that was why the translators used the more substantial word *blessed*. The word is applied to God in 1 Ti 1^{11}, 'the gospel of the glory of the happy God,' the implication being, as Bruce suggests in *Expositors' Greek Testament* (Mt 5^{3}), that 'the happiness of God consists in being a Redeemer, the bearer of the world's sin and misery.' N. T. D. White, in a comment on μακάριος in 1 Ti 5^{16}, quotes a passage from Philo in which God is described as 'the alone blessed.' Perhaps we may infer from all this that the μακάριοι have a happiness of the same order as that of God, which can therefore be no other than a happiness which God Himself confers upon them. They receive the perfect and ultimate gift, which is the grace of God, the very outgoing of the divine essence toward the receptive creature. The true giver has his own portion of divinity. His happiness does not depend upon any auspicious outward circumstance, but upon the gracious gift of God implanted within him. He is happy, as God is happy, in himself.