

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

have called you *friends*,¹ but is also always by His servants' side.

2. Secondly, companionship leads to assistance. There is in St. Mark 6, in the story of the storm on the lake which followed the Feeding of the Five Thousand, a good illustration of the helpful Presence of Christ in His servants' difficulties, with also a hint of how we may so easily miss His help. He was alone on the mountain praying: they were, according to St. Mark, 'in the midst of the sea,' according to St. John, 'twenty-five or thirty furlongs from land.' It was very late in the evening: and there is next to no twilight in those lands. Yet, we are told, His eye was on them: not on the boat—a speck, at best, in the gloom—but on them. 'When He saw them *tortured* in their rowing' is the force of Greek: His sympathy put Him, in effect, by their side. But it was not till 'about the fourth watch' that He actually approached them, 'walking on the sea.' Why the delay? Was He waiting for them to think of *Him*, and even wish, if they had not the faith to pray, for His presence? The next words suggest as much: 'He was prepared to go right past them'—not, surely, in callousness, when He had already gone so far to save them, but because *even still* they were trying to save themselves and forgetting Him. Then, when they did see Him, their first emotion was fear, and they jumped to the conclusion that He must be a ghost. But at least He had now caught their attention, and so was able

to put Himself in touch: to 'speak with them, and say to them, Cheer up, it is I. Don't be frightened.' Then, says St. John's version, 'they *became willing* to receive Him into the ship, and *immediately* the ship was at the land whither they went.' But the help might have been theirs as soon as the difficulties began. Is that perhaps a picture of how we also try to 'worry through' by ourselves, without calling in the help of His Presence? And yet there He is still, looking out into our present stormy night of the world, and seeing in the midst of the trouble and despair not merely a Church, a community, a cause, a household, but your individual life and mine—even to the expression on our faces, and the secret torture, perhaps, in our hearts. And, seeing, His one desire is to help—if we will allow Him. All that is part of what comes from serving 'before the face' of One whose back is never turned upon us.

3. And, thirdly, His Presence spells incentive. Not the incentive (save where our slackness needs it) applied by the master's eye fixed upon the schoolboy dawdling over his work, but the spur which the presence of one we love and look up to gives; supplying us at once with a motive for putting out our best efforts and also with a pleasant exhilaration which takes us straight to 'the top of our form.' How much is added to the possibility of making our service perfect by all that flows from this condition of service 'before His face'!¹

¹ E. A. Burroughs, *The Way of Peace*.

Fellowship in Relation to Christian Service.¹

BY THE REVEREND H. J. WOTHERSPOON, D.D., EDINBURGH.

ONE finds that many are speaking just now of fellowship, but that no one defines it. Mr. Clutton-Brock has told us that the Kingdom of Heaven implies a doctrine of fellowship 'which we have enjoyed with our emotions, but have never grasped with our intelligence.' And that is probably true. Most who speak of fellowship seem to have in mind social intercourse and what one has called 'little evenings.' Now social intercourse is an excellent thing, and little evenings may be pleasant; but neither can be thought precisely or adequately to satisfy what Mr. Clutton-

Brock refers to as a doctrine implied by the Kingdom of Heaven. Or, we have references to 'the comradeship of the trenches' and a desire for its continuance here at home in the form of 'fellowship'; and one feels that there we are nearer to a doctrine of the Kingdom—for in the trenches men were united in a cause, and had all things in common, bore one another's burdens, and even laid down life for one another; yet we have hardly in seeing this grasped the doctrine with our intelligence; we have only an illustration, casting light, certainly, on what we appreciate with our emotions; but we are no nearer to a defini-

¹ An address delivered at Aberdeen, September 19, 1919.

tion, or even to a description. Fellowship is something more than social amenity, and more even than comradeship.

Mr. Brock says that our Lord 'talked of it constantly'¹—I am not sure what he has in mind in saying so; I do not recall any direct mention of the subject in the Gospels: but the Apostolic writers do write frequently of it, and if we can grasp with our intelligence their conception, we are probably on right lines towards a theory of the matter. Their word² for the thing we render in our Versions 'communion' or else 'fellowship'; and the word seems to imply, perhaps always, community in some possession. There are two who share, and there is invariably a third term, the thing shared: explicitly or implicitly fellowship is *in* something; and the resulting state of matters—a consciousness of union or bond in the participation—is *κοινωνία*. Any theory of fellowship which can be grasped with the intelligence will evidently depend on our understanding of what the third term, the thing had in common, is taken to be.

Thus, *e.g.*, fellowship may be based on a sharing in material things. St. Paul bids the disciple communicate with his teacher in all goods; he speaks of being willing to communicate; the writer to the Hebrews tells us not to be forgetful to do good and to communicate.³ The fellowship there is in the substance of the givers.

Applied to spiritual things the same usage seems to hold: under the word there is always the idea of a third something in which the relation stands. At the Lord's Table there is a sharing of the Body and of the Blood of Christ. In the temple feasts of paganism there was a sharing with the demon in his altar and in the meals. The Corinthians are called into a partnership in Christ with their fellow-believers. St. Paul had a sharing in the gospel with the Philippians, and with Philemon in his faith. The fellowship in each case subsisted in these common terms.

Then there is also an absolute use of the word, as we have it, *e.g.*, in Acts, when the disciples are said to have 'persevered in the instruction of the Apostles and in the fellowship'—or in St. John's First Epistle, when he speaks of 'our fellowship,'

'your fellowship,'—with Apostles, with God, with Christ, with one another. But the idea of a something shared is obviously present; with St. Luke it is the teaching of Apostles, given and received, which creates the fellowship—with St. John it is the Light, in which man may have communion with God, and may be at one with his brother believer.

The mere sharing,⁴ however, is not the fellowship: the fellowship is rather a result of the sharing, a relation of mind to mind and self to self, which comes of having in common and of recognizing the community. Still less is fellowship in the scriptural sense equivalent to 'communion' in the ecclesiastical sense, as when we speak of being in fellowship with the Church, or of persons or bodies being in communion with one another—a relation which may exist where there is little *κοινωνία*. In so far as that formal conception may have entered the mind of the Apostolic age, it was probably otherwise expressed.⁵

Fellowship is, I think, a conscious mutual understanding and interest in the enjoyment of the same position or of the same possession. I say 'enjoyment': because the word is almost always used with a good connotation; St. John, indeed, speaks of communion in affliction, but even then for its mitigation. Fellowship may exist between two or among many; and when it exists, it constitutes a tie, more or less close in measure as the subject of communion is in the estimation of each more or less important or intrinsically precious. We may thus have fellowship in things external and objective, as husband and wife have in their children, or kindred in the bond of blood, or as members of a state have in its history and prosperity. The deeper fellowship is when the common term is subjective, and stands in possession of the same values, the same conception of the good, the true, the beautiful. It must always mean much to me if my fellow-man can 'see the invisible' as I see it, can believe as I believe, admires what seems to me to be right, and enjoys what seems to me to be lovely. I hail his agreement; it confirms me in my own positions; it gives substance to my convictions and appreciations. No man is certain of the worth of

¹ *What is the Kingdom of Heaven?* ch. iv. 'Politics.'

² *κοινωνία*.

³ Gal 6⁹, 1 Ti 6¹⁸, IIe 13¹⁶. Other passages are Ph 4^{14, 15}, all in the verbal form.

⁴ *μετέχην*, found with *κοινωνία* (2 Co 4¹⁶); *μετέχομεν* with *κοινωνία* (1 Co 10^{16, 17}). Cf. He 2¹⁴.

⁵ There is an approach to it, but in an unfavourable sense, in the use of *συναναμίγνυσθαι* (1 Co 5^{9, 11} and 2 Th 3¹⁴).

his beliefs or even of the validity of his moral judgments, so long as they are only his; he does not know whether he is misled by predilection, mocked by his imagination, or deceived by his desire to find one thing right, another true, a third thing admirable. The whole position is changed for him, if he discovers that he is not solitary in what has seemed to him to be perception. Another man has seen the same—it then exists. This other also approves what seems to me to be just; we have the same values together, he and I: and I am justified in my estimate of them. I find in him my own mind, my own conscience, my own sense of what is fair and excellent; and he finds his in me. I verify from him my thought, my sense of duty, my joy in what is lovely—I gain them from him; and he in turn is enriched by my coincidence with him. We establish one another, we can converse, we can think together, act together; and still be glad in one another. This in its measure is fellowship.

Fellowship, however, attains its highest significance when it rises to be communion in faith, and the relation shared is the relation to God. For this matters most. The principal thing is one's belief as to God, and one's contentment with God. That is happiness or gloom; that is peace or foreboding; that is acceptance of the lot, or it is rebellion. All that the world and my own existence may mean to me is determined by this. And it is purely matter of faith. The need of fellowship arises from this subjectivity of spiritual experience and from its inevitable solitude. The world may be read in so many ways, and to so different inference; it is everything to be confirmed in my own reading of it. I am thus intensely drawn to the fellow-soul which discerns the unseen with the same eyes as myself. I need him as I need no other. This partnership of faith is precious; the objectivity of my spiritual life depends upon it. And what my brother can in this do for me, clothing my faith with substance, I in turn can do for him: he comes to me with the same craving and he finds in me the same joy. Between two men, on the other hand, one of whom sees God and the other does not, or who see God differently, there lie gulfs which neither, if he would, can cross: they are in different worlds; their sympathy with one another can be but shallow; their thought diverges as soon as it penetrates to anything that really counts.

Only men who see alike in the great matters are capable of more than superficial fellowship.

But more than that: faith is law. Every principle of conduct runs down for root into belief—and into *this* belief, of what God means and is. Two cannot walk together unless they are agreed, at least so far. There is no agreement in values, unless there is agreement in God—life means a different thing to men of differing faith.

And all that becomes poignant when the question is of a wild and excessive belief such as that of the unreduced Christianity. 'Not every man says in the Spirit and with full intention 'Jesus is Lord.' It is a tremendous thing to accept the Incarnation, and it has serious consequences in the personal sphere. The venture of such faith is great, and calls for ventures in practice which no man makes lightly. Here fellowship counts. One wonders whether either the Christian affirmation, or the stride out into the actually Christian method of life is possible without its support. One tries to conceive a man brought *alone* to the point of conviction at which he feels constrained to say 'Jesus is God': will he not look round him to see if there is any other who is driven to the same astounding conclusion? What will it not mean to him to discover that he is not alone, but is in the midst of a company whom no man can number, who have been forced to say, as he desires to say, 'God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God'? Apprehending the fellowship, he may dare the confession. Who can measure the worth to him of this fellowship and its joy, which has brought such faith within his soul's compassing? Or, when he encounters the calling which follows belief, meets the concrete requirement, and doubts of himself 'whether he is able'—and finds that he has only to tread a beaten track, that others attempt the same, and that he marches in rank with faithful men, who solve with him the desperate problem? With them he will not shrink from the attempt. That is fellowship—the comfort and support of those who share with us the final motives, and side by side with us search out the path of life.

It seems, then, as though Christian fellowship were radically a fellowship in truth, and arises out of community in faith; as Augustine says, *ubi est fides sancta, ibi est sancta communio*. St. John¹ traces its ground and genesis: (1) The Apostles

¹ Jn 1⁹⁻⁷.

declare what they have seen and heard, in order that those who hear and believe may be in fellowship with them, as their fellowship is with God; the result being fulness of joy; (2) the message of Apostles is that God is Light, and the fellowship becomes a walking together in the light, fellowship being with God and with one another; and (3) in this fellowship there comes a cleansing; none of us can be perfected alone, the Christian graces being social graces and the Christian conscience a social conscience which implies God and the brother, God and the world, with a right relation to both: the fulfilling of the law is love. This, I think, is what Mr. Clutton-Brock has in view, when he says that we cannot be saved individually, but only by sharing in the Kingdom of God.

Community of faith is not the whole of fellowship; it is rather the root and condition of fellowship as that may develop in the intercourse of spirit, the pursuit of common inquiry, common testimony, common aims and shared effort, which community of belief induces in the deep and glad friendship which is attainable when life has one foundation and effort has the same inspiration and the same goal. Fellowship opens out in many lines; but all radiate from one root—they are all fellowship in the truth. For men may work side by side and for the same result, but have no fellowship, unless motive and principle unite them in the work. Coalition unfortunately is not fellowship. They may kneel side by side in prayer and have no fellowship, unless the object of worship is similarly conceived and they come to God by the same way and imagine the same answers to supplication.

The possible scope of fellowship (in the sense which matters) seems therefore to be determined by degree of coincidence in faith. One may make it more extensive by basing it on slighter agreement—that is to say, by more or less evacuating the content of that third term, the thing in which there is to be community. Or one may extend its area by obtaining approximation to agreement in belief. No third way is apparent. There may be superficial fellowship with many, or deep fellowship with fewer. Fellowship is a thing of degree. It has, for example, a certain basis in our common humanity—*Homo sum*, and so forth. Or there may be, and there is, fellowship in simple Theism—one is nearer in heart to a Jew or a Mohammedan than one can be to a Buddhist or a Confucian.

There is a narrower fellowship of all who recognize (let us say) the 'uniqueness' of Jesus: it includes not so many, but it is worth more. With every step towards fulness of assertion, you contract your circle, but the community of heart within it grows richer in its values. When you have finally dared the Catholic Confession of the Word made Flesh and have obtained of God to acknowledge the Holy Eternal and Undivided Trinity, you have reached a fellowship which consciously and in the certainty of the Christian experience is of a new and supernatural kind, and is on a new plane. In reaching it, you have sacrificed nothing of such companionship of soul as you may have found in the approaches and border lands of faith—that you still have for what it is worth: but these slighter participations have passed out of the comparison—they have no relevant significance. Here 'joy is full'—the disciples have all things common: one body, one spirit, one hope, one calling, one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all.

It follows that fellowship is not something that one practises, but something that one has. It exists or it does not exist. Two men either have faith in common, or they have not. If they have, they are in fellowship, and nothing can prevent it. Its manifestation may, or may not, be cultivated, and the intercourse which it makes possible may or may not be enjoyed—but it is there independently of manifestation or of fruition. On the other hand, if its ground does not exist in the common belief, conscience, and experience, it can be created only by attainment to them. Concatenation in external systems does not produce fellowship. Men come into fellowship as they come to find the same things in God and in Christ, and together to see the Kingdom of God in the Holy Ghost—that it is justice and peace and joy.

In relation to *service*, everything just now seems to indicate the common term, which may unite us with power and gladness in a common aim, as a renewed and glorified conception of that Kingdom. It is, I think, true that a time has come when once more 'the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand'; not in the sense of time, as though it should immediately appear, but in the sense that to-day it is accessible and within reach—near, if we could grasp it—'at the doors,' if we could admit it. We have claimed the soul for Christ, and we have

gained for Christ many souls; it is now time to claim for Him the world and its order. We have had a clear idea of the Christian life for the individual—now we need as clear perception of a Christian Society and Christian relationships, and of God's intention for the way of humanity as a whole. We need to work out the idea of the Kingdom of God in fact and practice and to reach one and the same conception of what it is, and to address our world with some plain sense of what it means to ourselves. To do this, we must learn to see it together: it must be the term of our fellowship, that in which we share, and the same to us all, because all of us see it with the same eyes.

Mr. Clutton-Brock tells us, and, I think, truly, that this means conversion, individual and social. What he does not tell us is the secret and power and method of conversion. How are we to be converted? In the past we have known conversion in one definite form—namely, as it comes about by contact with the overwhelming fact of Christ and His Cross—as it is illustrated in the typical conversions of a Paul, an Augustine, a Luther, a Wesley, a Chalmers, and in countless unnamed, uncelebrated examples, within our knowledge and in some measure within our experience. This conversion we know as adequate to revolutionize and to possess the entirety of the individual manhood—do we know any other which does so? We know that this conversion endues with spiritual capacity to appreciate all further spiritual truths—does any other conversion have this effect? We know that this conversion inspires and enables to social service and to success in such service, and in the past has stood behind the greatest social reformations—is there elsewhere evidence of

similar incentive to toil or daring or sacrifice? And we know the potentiality of this conversion to induce fellowship. Those who (in their own phrase) have seen the truth as it is in Jesus and have given up to Him, they the world over understand each other, and they have fellowship with one another, and their fellowship is also with Apostles and with the Father and with the Son. If one may know the tree by its fruits, theirs may be recognized as a fellowship in the truth. And the truth in which their fellowship subsists is that of human need and Divine sufficiency. Behind it stands the power of a supernatural religion, a Divine Christ, an unreduced faith; that, it appears from a large enough induction, is adequate (some may think, is alone adequate) to effect supernatural conversion of the whole self—the conversion which Mr. Clutton-Brock desiderates, but for which he does not indicate an efficient cause. He implies, I think, that religion which does not produce conversion is inefficient; and if conversions have become infrequent, it may be time for us to re-examine our religious data and to endeavour an evangelical vitalization of our religious thinking and doing. Fellowship in service may, on examination of the records of Christian experience, be found to rest on the power of the Cross to convert the soul: all revivals have taken their departure from individual conversions; but now, in view of that hovering nearness of the Kingdom of God, there must be more—there must be fellowship in the vision and apprehension of the Kingdom, and Christ be known as the Saviour of society as well as of the man; the aim must be social conversion—the conviction of the public conscience that Christ's way is the only way for the world of men.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

Preaching the Church.

IN his Bampton Lectures on the Doctrine of the Church, Dr. A. C. Headlam (remember who he is) warns us against much preaching of 'the Church.' He says: 'I would draw your attention to the methods of our Lord, and to the proportion observed in His teaching. It is only by com-

paratively slight indications, and to a large extent indirectly, that we learn that He intended to found a Church, or that a Church would be the natural outcome of His teaching. He only spoke of a Church twice. Clearly, if it is an essential part of His work it is a subordinate one. He preaches the Kingdom, not the Church. I believe that here also we may find a guide to ourselves. So far as my observation goes Christianity has always