

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

it also the idea of an universal people acknowledging God's rule. And even the late Canon Streeter, who held that ἐντός ὑμῶν can only mean 'within you,' spoke of our Lord's conception as including the idea of a corporate national regeneration of this earth. The conclusion of scholars seems to be that our Lord's use of 'the Kingdom of Heaven,' will include the idea of community, and that such an idea is compatible with the use of the Greek phrase as current in His times.

Mr. NOEL goes on to examine the text of the Gospels themselves, and their evidence on the main question. He admits that many of the parables suggest God reigning, though he does not deal with the parables that emphasize most strongly the idea of spiritual inner experience, those of the leaven and mustard seed. But he has no difficulty in finding many passages that cannot very well bear any other meaning than that of a renewed community. And towards the end of his essay Mr. NOEL seems to reach a conclusion which common sense will regard as harmonizing both views, outer and inner.

'Even if "within you" be the right rendering,' he says, 'there need be no contradiction, for the ideal of a commonwealth, in which God's own justice and mercy should be made paramount, must first be an idea within the heart—not only in God's heart, but in many hearts inspired by Him—before

it becomes actualized and takes shape and dwells among us. Socialism is a collective idea, but it is first the dream of many hearts for which they will give their lives. . . . Home Rule was the dream held sacred within the hearts of many Irish folk. If it had not been within them, it would never have been realized "without" in the outside world of affairs. So that even if "within you" be the correct interpretation, there is here no contradiction.'

And Mr. NOEL concludes: 'People may say, what, after all, is the difference? Is this not only another controversy between theorists? What practical effect can it have on life? Reign or commonwealth—what does it matter? Do not many of the advocates hold that if individual after individual accepted God as the ruler of his life, events of a world-shaking nature would be bound to happen? Would not the very face of the world be changed? Is it not, after all, by the conversion of the individual to God that the world will at last be redeemed?' Mr. NOEL thinks there is real and vital importance in his insistence on community as prominent in the mind of Jesus. For sheer religious individualism, and the conception of religion as a purely interior affair, carry in them serious dangers. It is urgent for us to realize that Jesus meant to change *this world*, and change it so radically that God's justice would, and will, prevail over the individualism that keeps so many of our neighbours from the life God designed them to have.

The Basis of Worship.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID H. HISLOP, D.D., ARDWELL, STRANRAER.

ONE characteristic of the age in which we live is a great interest in, if not a heightened sense of, worship. This may arise in part from a leading trait of our era that it is religious though obviously not Christian. For to-day there is the tendency for every one to turn his attitude to life, be it political or scientific, æsthetic or moral, into a religion which dominates his life, thrills his heart, and claims his obedience and allegiance. The atmosphere of this

time is one in which men bend their views and thoughts to the demands of a mystical intuition, for not alone in Russia or in Germany does every appeal of politics, art, or science engage those dispositions which are primarily religious in their nature. It is thus not unimportant that men's thoughts should be directed to that act of the soul in which the religious spirit finds expression.

Alongside this temper of to-day there is also found

in certain quarters a mood, engendered by the study of comparative religion which evaporates the sense of worship into something else, and by equating the values in all religious experience from the earliest times, reduces worship to the expression of some psychological need in man's nature. Worship can then become nothing more than a contrivance to overcome some inner difficulty which man can outgrow in his development. Worship, individual or collective, appears but as a relic of the past, and the need which once it met is now satisfied by other activities of the mind. But such a purely humanistic standpoint surely puts the cart before the horse. Little or nothing is explained in the worship of developed religion by pointing to its supposed origin. But perchance a light may fall—even on what seems but a groping superstition in the darkness, if the impulse that lay behind is seen in the light of a higher revelation.

Thus at the outset it is imperative to insist that worship, as seen in the light of the Christian revelation, is no ingenious discovery of the human spirit; it is the response of man to the revelation of God. Worship is the answer of man's spirit to the revealed Word; thus worship implies faith, and faith is not the consequence of man's struggle, but the gift of God. The word of the Psalmist gives the profound analysis of worship: 'Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek.' The initiative comes from God. God's hand reaches forth and man's spirit is awakened. This is axiomatic of all worship. God acts: He reveals His glory, His loving-kindness, His grace, His purity, and the purposes of His Kingdom. His spirit touches the soul and the soul expresses its adoration, its thanksgiving, its penitence, its intercession. The basis of worship in its ultimate sense rests on God's revelation. It is surely wiser and more in accord with truth to interpret the impulses of the lower religions in obedience to this postulate of Christian worship than to infringe the inviolate fact that worship is from the hand of God. Christian worship certainly has this definitive basis. God the Father reveals through creation and in redemption the Eternal Word, and the worshipper through Christ and in the Spirit worships. Thus worship can never be a work of merit, for in the deepest sense it is God's Spirit that creates the desire and makes the response to His grace and glory.

This insistence on the primary action of God's Spirit in worship does not involve that the Spirit does not use means. As Berdyaev says in another connexion: 'In the spiritual life there is no distinction and opposition between ends and means.' The fact

that the Spirit acts through the constitution of human nature means that a psychological account can be given of this action. Most psychologists deny that there is any special religious instinct at the basis of worship and resolve this instinct into primary emotions. The sense of submission and wonder when united give rise to admiration, and when fear blends with admiration there is awe, and when the feeling of tenderness is linked to awe there is reverence. Otto, as some others, finds the sense of the Holy as primary. But this question need not detain us. At its best such a psychological analysis gives only the ingredients of devotion, the bricks not the design of the architecture, the raw emotion not its significant form and meaning.

However we account for the development of the instinct to worship, it is deeply rooted in man's life, and must be regarded from the standpoint of the Christian faith as a basal fact of human nature. Nor does the experience of the seemingly non-religious, or those who would describe themselves as such, refute this statement. That a man has no appetite for wholesome food is no contradiction of the fact that food is necessary to the human body. It may mean that he is sick. Again, not a few of the extravagant follies of mankind appear to be the misuse of this worshipping attitude, whereby a man devotes himself to what seems greater than himself. And it is most apparent that the attitude of will which is fitting to the Creator is not only unfitting but ethically disastrous when given to any creature. Further, there are sins of flesh as well as of spirit which testify to the clamant need that man must lose, though but for a brief moment, the sense of his restless and unsatisfied self. Nor do the testimonies of noble spirits who have walked the way of the agnostic contradict this statement. Witness is borne to this universal craving by the noble stoicism of such a verse:

Be still, be still my soul; it is but for a season
Let us endure an hour and see injustice done.¹

Or in such words written by one who professed no belief in God:

I spake to the sea. I desired to have its strength,
its mystery and its glory.²

From the viewpoint of Christian worship we must recognize the existence of these emotions of resignation and of adoration which are not conscious of their own witness. The fact that worship is an essential activity of man's spiritual nature, as eating is of his bodily nature, makes wide the horizon of

¹ A. E. Housman.

² Richard Jefferies.

Christian worship. For then worship is no cloistered corner of the soul, but is the expression in conscious form of what lies in the heart of mankind. Man, says the Hebrew story, was made in the image of God and what lies in the deeps of this strange nature of ours is the imprisoned spirit. Worship in its widest sense includes the insight and rapture of the poet's dream and the vision and form of the artist's imagination. These things belong to adoration: they are the unconscious witness of God's presence. Worship in its definite sense is the conscious direction of these emotions and capacities to the Eternal God, and Christian worship is this direction to God through Christ in the Spirit.

From this it follows that worship is no accidental thing. It is an essential element in the rhythm of mortal existence. Worship is not the whole of life, for our days are divided into many hours and our existence embraces many interests and emotions. Into each fragment of life the activity of the soul goes: into work, recreation, the life of the body, eating and drinking, exercise, the life of the mind, art, music, literature. Yet each of these however engrossing is but partial, and however insistent its claims, is not universal. There is an attitude of the soul not to a part of life but to the whole, and that attitude is the attitude of worship. For man's attitude to the whole of existence is his attitude to God. This belongs to the ebb and flow of mortal living. For the soul must return from the distraction of its many interests and from the exhaustion of its many tasks to seek renewal at the fountain-head of life and energy. An old Christian hymn makes this invocation: 'O God the persistent energy of things' (*Deus rerum tenax vigor*). As sleep refreshes and as food restores, so worship renews the energy dissipated by living and spent in activity. 'My soul he does restore again' is a plain statement that worship is a necessary part of man's life. In another respect worship belongs to the cycle of living. 'Our little life is rounded with a sleep'; and in the twilight the values of life grow uncertain, and in the shadow its joys seem unreal. To find a meaning in the medley of existence and to know in the soul that life is the good thing which blind instinct in its groping feels, man must see life as a whole; he must be lifted above the hazard and the harass of time's happenings into the peace of the Eternal. The necessity of worship is the need for security in this perilous existence when all we are and all we value seem at times to be at the mercy of death's relentless stroke or life's withering breath. These two needs of man—renewal and security—find their satisfaction in

worship, because worship is the attitude of the soul to the whole—to God.

This attitude of worship is communion with a Power that is other than ourselves. Over against man stands the Other. The character of our worship depends on the Being with whom we have communion. In his worship, man's nature needs two things—the Ultimate and the Intimate. The religions of history have not seldom separated these two needs. The Divine Being worshipped has been remote beyond the reach of man's piteous appeal, or so close to man's life that the Divine shared in the vicissitude of time and was partaker of mortal weakness and failure. The Ultimate was inaccessible and the Intimate was so merged in the mortal that the Divine became the ideal reflection of man's own life. But worship calls for the Absolute beyond whom there is none other. Not like the Greek pantheon with Necessity beyond, nor like Setebos with the 'Quiet' overhead. Worship calls also for the Intimate: 'closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.' Not like the Immanent Will of Hardy's *Dynasts* 'past the sense of kindly-eyed benevolence,' nor like the Deity of Carlyle who does nothing. It is in the Incarnation that this twin demand of worship is met, and through the Christian doctrine of the Trinity—the Eternal Father, God the Creator, the Eternal Son, God the Reconciler, the Eternal Spirit, God the Deliverer who sets free—the Ultimate and the Intimate meet. The God in whom we live and move and have our being, the Word who was made flesh and dwelt among us, the Spirit who maketh intercession.

Thus the faith that is expressed in Christian worship is faith in God—transcendent and immanent. To separate these moments of thought in worship leaves us either with the abyss of the Divine of whom nothing is known for nought is revealed, or with the Divine as the embodiment of human aspiration. It follows then that God's unlikeness to man as well as God's likeness to man come into worship. For man is a creature infinitely removed from the Creator, and the sense of this absolute difference is essential to the worship of the Almighty and All Holy; but man is also a creature made in the image of God, and by his vision of ethical purity and through his human love he finds an interpretation of God's goodness and of God's loving-kindness. This interpretation is made assured in the revelation in Jesus, whose constant name for God was Father, and in the incarnation within our little life of that Spirit who redeems the life of man from sin and self-despising. The soul in worship

is ever in a holy place wherein there is no familiarity, for the intimacy of God in redemption is redeeming because it is God the Infinite who redeems. 'Love and Dread,' says Juliana of Norwich, 'are brethren'; and awe and love are blended in worship as man is in the presence of God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible, and of Jesus Christ, who for us men and our salvation was incarnate, lived and suffered and conquered.

Worship has thus these three aspects: the feeling and the awareness of the Divine, the expression and affirmation of faith, the communion with God's Will. It is therefore not one part but the whole of man's nature that is involved in this experience. The emotions of the heart are there, for to worship is something other than to think. Feeling envelops the beliefs of the worshipper, changing them from abstraction into vital things. Feeling also surrounds the submission of the will. Communion with the Divine gives rise to emotions of love and reverence, but these emotions are also the means by which the worshipper knows that he is in the presence of God. The Will is active in worship, for man's will is directed to God as the prelude to worship, and man's will seeks obedience to God's Will as the fruit of worship. Communion with God is the laying of our wills beneath God's Will. The activity of thought is present in intuition and in interpretation. In worship there is the intuitive sense of God's Presence, vague or definite, the sense of a Veiled Presence or a definitely conceived Personality. Also there is the endeavour to interpret this experience of communion and to express this faith. On the level of conscious life, feeling, will, and thought are involved.

But in addition to this, worship is also concerned with what does not fall directly within the focus of consciousness. It is obvious how associations count here. Associations, of which we are not aware, linked to the sound of words or to the sight of objects are frequently most potent factors in our worship. Words like the Lord's Prayer or the Te Deum, objects as the Holy Table, or the Bread and the Wine of the Sacrament, have in them the sense of the numinous. Associations that have little or nothing to do with their meanings are linked to hymns and to texts of Scripture. In yet more subtle ways the subconscious mind plays its part in this experience. In worship the primitive feelings are sublimated, to use the language of psychology, or, to use the language of religion, the Spirit of Christ makes use of these caged instincts and primitive feelings that have been repressed by moral

standards, and these are delivered from their bondage and find relief in praise and exultation.

The subconscious enters into all worship, be it private devotion or the public service. Its effect, however, is more potent in public worship, for the presence of other worshippers impinges on our conscious and subconscious mind. 'It does not help me,' wrote Matthew Arnold, 'to think a thing more clearly that thousands of other people are thinking the same, but it does help me to worship with more emotion that thousands of people are worshipping with me.' This characteristic utterance of Arnold is true so far as it goes, though perhaps it does not take us very far. It is a truism to say that men act differently in a crowd from what they would do as individuals. The temper of the crowd is more emotional than that of any individual in it. This is so in the first place, because the individual loses something of his self-consciousness, and this blurs his sense of responsibility; and in the second place, because the individual becomes more suggestible and this makes him more readily adopt a course of action or a way of thought. These qualities in themselves are not good things for they may mean that a crowd is capable of unbridled passion or of fanatical prejudice. But this influence of others upon the individual does provide in public worship an avenue for the action of the Spirit. Contact with others helps to overcome that consciousness of self which is so grievous an obstacle to communion with God, and the influence of others makes more pliant man's mind to the reception of new impulses and fresh aspirations. The worshipper at a public service by reason of the contact of other minds upon his subconscious mind possesses a receptivity that would be hard to obtain otherwise. It may be true that what is new and original is oftenest born in the silent stillness of the solitary place, but it is not always so. Certainly it is through the practice of public worship that a new light can fall upon the familiar, and the ordinary happenings of every day are invested with a glory not of this world. From the constitution of man's mind it would seem then that a greater receptivity and a keener sensitiveness are possible in public worship than in private devotion.

Till now I have spoken of the psychological aspect of worship as an inner experience, but by its very nature the spirit of worship must seek an external expression. It is a condition of man's existence that the inner impulse or mood only becomes our own in the act of expression. As one surveys as things apart the various forms the spirit of worship has taken, they seem dull and dead, like

the seaweed left on the beach by the ebbing tide. To worship in spirit and in truth, it has been argued, is to dispense with all the external expression of worship. Certainly the embodiment of the spirit of worship does give it definiteness. But this definiteness is a corollary of revelation. Worship is not an emotional haze before the Infinite: it is the response of a creature to the definite revelation of an Infinite Being—a response of joy and reverence before the glory, of awe before the mystery, of adoring gratitude before the wondrous grace of God's love and redemption. An artist's dream is vague, haunting, and illusive until the dream has found embodiment in colour and line. So the soul of the worshipper demands definite expression for the mood of worship. This applies to private devotion, for if the practice of meditation or the contemplative prayer be more than thinking or reverie, it is because our mood finds expression in the case of meditation in new resolves, fresh lessons, and direct aspirations, and in the case of contemplation, because our mood finds fulfilment in the direct communion of the soul with God.

Yet far more apparent is this need for expression in public worship, for there must be a common utterance of devotion that links through the meaning of word, the significance of action, the associations of sound and of sight, one worshipper with another. Thus worship as an inner experience implies the use in the public service of things belonging to the world of sense in which are incarnate the soaring aspiration and the offering of the soul's devotion. Perchance the worshipper is prone at times to feel in the public service that the adoration far transcends his feelings, that the confession of penitence exaggerates his sense of sinfulness, that the resounding praise is beyond his somewhat limited sense of gratitude. That doubtless is so, for few there be that can claim the soaring vision of the prophet or the adoring joy of the saint, and so many of us come to the service with minds but half withdrawn from 'the busy trade of life.' But let us bear in mind that the public service is not only the expression of our spiritual mood. It certainly ought to be the offering of our high thanksgiving, deepest longing, and our surrendered wills, but it is more. The service ought to be not only the expression of our inner life but the suggestion of the Presence of God and of Christ. Thus language that seems scarce fitting for our little souls is yet the only fitting language in the presence of our Divine Lord and Master. Just as we turn to the great poetry of the world in our mood of love or of sorrow and find an utterance beyond our highest effort, so in the sphere of worship we find the voice of prophetic inspira-

tion and the vision of the saint. This does more than express our mood: it suggests heights we have not trod and deeps we have not fathomed. Not for us—at times we may feel these resplendent robes of the soul, but none the less our souls well know they are the fit 'garments of praise' in the presence of God's glory and exceeding grace. Thus the external means of worship are not only the expression of the soul's offering, they are also the suggestion and the shadow of the Divine Presence.

While it is true that God is always the initiator of worship, for as Jacopone da Todi says: 'Thou art the Love with which the heart loves Thee,' it is also true that God initiates the act of worship in two ways. There are two psychological movements at the basis of worship we may say, if we choose to use such language. It may be that it is but two standpoints, but this gives rise to two figures or shapes in worship. The one may be termed the soul's ascent, the other may be called the spirit's descent. Historically the distinction is seen between the type of religion which emphasizes the aspiration of the soul to God, and this is 'mystical' in character, and the type of religion which dwells on God's approach to man, and this is 'prophetic' in character. Psychologically the difference is between the consciousness of the soul reaching upwards to God and the consciousness of the soul receiving from God. Of course both of these figures within the ambit of the Christian revelation acknowledge that God's hand directs. In the former case, the soul's seeking is in response to God's call; in the latter, the soul is quiescent before God's revelation. The former brings into special prominence the aspect of God's Being, the mystery of His glory, and the wonder of His Grace; the latter stresses the power of God, His action in creation and redemption.

There are therefore two figures or shapes in accordance with these two aspects, and both belong to the heritage of the Christian faith. The former has its highest point in adoration where the sense of self is lost in the contemplation of God's glory and grace. It passes through the recognized stages of purgation, illumination, to unity. The soul by confession before God is cleansed by His forgiveness, enlightened by God's truth, and finally is united in adoration, and in the ocean of God's fullness the cramping sense of self vanishes. The second figure of worship has its most profound moment in the awe of the creature before the Creator, the wonder of the redeemed before the Deliverer. In the confession of man's creatureliness the sense of Divine Majesty dominates all, but

though the self is as nothing before the face of the Eternal and the littleness of man who is but as a breath is made emphatic, the very fact that the worshipper is so conscious that he is a creature means that his sense of identity does not disappear. This confession of creatureliness leads on to the status given by God's grace to the creature as His child, and in the light of God's revealing truth the soul of the worshipper discovers the purposes of God's Kingdom and learns his duties in the world in which he is set. So the end of this figure of worship is a soul disciplined and equipped for the conflict. What has to be noted is that here the sense of self is not obliterated, it is affirmed. The sense of obeisance before God does not here create as does adoration the sense of unity with God, but rather makes more poignant the difference. These two fundamental patterns of worship need to be related in some order or system.

But not only has worship a figure or shape or pattern, it has also a colour or tone. 'The Eternal light of revelation,' says Karl Adam, 'is differently reflected in the prism of each age with different angles of refraction.' Not only is this so, but the light of revelation is reflected in the pieties of diverse kinds with different angles. The colour or tone of worship varies as the piety is different. This is one of the reasons that the Church has been broken into different communions. What is fundamental in worship is not to be found by ironing out all the differences and finding a lowest common denominator. Nor can we find a common basis of worship if we ignore the tones. For each form of piety expresses the basic or fundamental element in worship through its tone or colour, and so to blot that out leaves nothing worth.

What are these pieties? I am not here dealing with differences of temperament. In the spiritual realm the experience of saints shows how temperament can be transcended. These differences are familiar to any one who has dealt with the prayer life of different souls. There is an *attrait* in each spiritual experience, and the different methods of private devotion as practised (vocal prayer, meditation, affective prayer, contemplation, and mystical prayer) reveal the differences. We can distinguish

the following tones: There is objective piety which is sometimes termed ordinary piety, disciplined piety, affective or emotional piety, intellectual piety, and mystical piety. Setting aside theological differences and making a sweeping generalization, I should say that the typical Anglican and Benedictine belongs to the first, the Puritan and the Jesuit to the second, the Wesleyan and the Franciscan to the third, the Presbyterian and Dominican to the fourth, and to the fifth all those souls in all communions at every level of culture and stage of intelligence to whom has been given the mystical nature. They all have their obvious failures when the light of revelation fades and the power of the spirit fails, and may become conventional or cold or fligid or arid or vague. But the basis of worship is not something that can be separated from the tones the spirit of worship has painted, and the public worship that is to be the offering and oblation of the Church and the Power and Veil of the Presence must embrace in its white light the tones of each and of all.

Worship as an offering of devotion and thanksgiving and as the surrender of man's will, means that something is done. Worship as the revelation of God's Word and Will means that something is received. Worship as fellowship means that one soul is united with the souls of other worshippers in the spirit of Christ and we are one body because Christ is the spirit of each. Worship is thus a supernatural thing. It is not simply the coming together of decent folks for their edification. It certainly should be for their good. It is not only a witness to our faith. It truly is that, and perhaps it is too little remembered that to meet for worship is to make our witness. Worship is also the offering to the Creator of the praise and thanksgiving of all creation which find in man alone its conscious voice; it is also the offering by the Church of the redeemed, of the praise and gratitude of lives delivered from fear and death's menace. 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I.' The Unseen Presence amid such ordinary people, the Hidden Glory shadowed in a meeting that seems so dull and barren, the Veiled Face only to faith uncovered.

