

INDIAVOUR

magazine

Spring 1975

THE ENDEAVOUR MAGAZINE.

IN THIS ISSUE.

No. 46	Spring 1975.
Editorial	Page 1
The Faith of Abraham	2
Titles of Jesus The Lord	8
The Song of Solomon	10
The Eucharist	14
Correspondence	21

(This issue incorporates the News Letter in the text.)

DID JESUS INAUGURATE A BREAKING OF
BREAD SERVICE

Two articles have appeared in Endeavour. The first, "The Sacramental Life" (Issue No. 45) suggests that Jesus did not actually inaugurate a Breaking of Bread Service, while the second "The Eucharist" (this issue) is emphatic that he did. The first article we understand was not intended to start a theological discussion but to emphasize that the memory of Jesus for his followers was an active devotion to others in the spirit of Jesus (The washing of the feet). Both agree that Jesus celebrated the Passover with his disciples and that Jesus gave the bread and wine at that feast a special significance. Both agree that the service of the Breaking of Bread was an early practice of the Church. The difference of view lies in whether Jesus actually said - "Do this in remembrance of me". Although it seems quite clear that Paul was convinced that Jesus had said these words, the silence of Mark and Matthew is most remarkable. Would they have left such a inauguration out if they believed their Lord had uttered it. Indeed it is in Luke with the exception of one Codex (Bezae) which omits the phrase.

THE FAITH OF ABRAHAM.

by J.T. Murrell.

'Are not sparrows two a penny? Yet without your Father's leave not one of them can fall to the ground ... So have no fear; you are worth more than any number of sparrows.' Matt. 10:29.

There are good scriptural grounds for the view that MAN is to be understood as a body made up of individuals having various attributes, persisting, or growing through the ages and complete only with Christ as head of the body. The Creator and Father of mankind is inseparably involved too, since He, loving the world, spared not his own Son. Man therefore, can have no final meaning without Christ, and the body of mankind would be meaningless without its Head. The body of mankind is, in its turn, inseparable in its created setting with the whole natural world.

'Up to the present, we know, the whole created universe groans in all its parts as if in the pangs of childbirth.'
Rom. 8:22.

We are already committed to the view that MAN persists, even into the spiritual order, but in Paul's sense of the 'terrestrial glory' the world is a unity where no sparrow is without its essential place; the alternative is a world other than that of our experience. One of the valuable insights of Teilhard de Chardin was to observe that MAN was a growing entity, like a tree, but moving always towards more consciousness or higher consciousness and involving always an increased unity. The transformation into spirit, for example, did not utterly destroy the prior entities. These will have made their contribution to the unique work of creation. If this were not so, there would be no point in the Creator choosing to work with the natural world.

Like a tree, the body of mankind grows up through its many generations. One man's life may well be seen as the life of one leaf of a tree, small in comparison to the growing tree, single against the many leaves which maintain the life and growth of the whole, yet essential, because if there were no leaves, there would be no life and no tree. Each Spring brings a new set of leaves and each individual leaf has contributed to a future maturing or peak of glory - though not all will be contemporary with it.

Belonging to the body of mankind was the man Abraham. This man was made aware of his temporal limitations when he experienced a 'deep sleep' and 'a horror of great darkness'. Accompanying these vivid impressions of death was the explanation that Abraham's descendants would languish for several centuries in captivity before entering Canaan, and that he would see none of this nor of the better things awaiting his seed during his lifetime. Since Abraham is a typical figure in exhibiting faith, we note that the quality of faith lay in the test of death. It must have been clear to him that all his endeavour in serving an eternal purpose was to be given with the certainty that death would provide the closure. Nor was he an exception in this; he was typical again of all who would die in faith, not receiving the promises. Every generation would need to take thought and apply themselves to the peculiar circumstances of their time and so serve an eternal purpose. The 'quick' at the return of Christ would be the exceptions. Jesus was not an exception. He died in faith, exhibiting it in the short term as it happened, but there was the same need to surrender all to Him who only could give a more abundant life.

There is comfort in the thought that the personal lifetime is counted as an essential part of the tree of man or of the body of Christ, though single lifetimes exist in a vast complex of creation that could otherwise appal, seeming to dwarf the individual by its lengthy processes. There is instruction also, in the necessary acceptance of the limitations placed upon us. We are under obligation, as was Abraham, to apply ourselves thoughtfully and actively in our time to the eternal purpose. We may learn from the

situation of Abraham; we must learn from Jesus, though we cannot re-live his or the first century daily circumstances. We have to meet the challenges of our own time. We have been called to action, as surely as was Abraham. God has spoken to us through Jesus, the voice speaking as from heaven and to this we turn for guidance.

THE VOICE FROM HEAVEN.

"The sight of the people moved him to pity; they were like sheep without a shepherd, harassed and helpless, and he said to his disciples, 'The crop is heavy, but the labourers are scarce; you must therefore beg the owner to send labourers to harvest his crop.'" Matt. 9:36-38.

In view of the supreme need in people observed by Jesus when he uttered the words quoted, it might be thought that they would welcome a teacher sent from God - none other than His own Son. But they would not let Jesus gather them under his wings. (Matt.23:37). Object lessons are therefore provided. There are blocks in human personality to hinder the receiving of the heavenly teacher's words. A long conditioning of the people of Israel had produced a system of 'righteousness' which hid their true needs from them - the needs so obvious to Jesus. Since we are all subject to conditioning, we can understand Jesus saying that unless we become as children, we shall not be open to receive the kingdom of heaven. It is apparent further, that the pattern of the past was to be repeated in Christian times (Matt. 23: 33-36). There was to be no spontaneous welcome to the words of life. The words, in fact, were cast into the world and the process of time would be involved, and prayerfulness would be involved and shortage of labour too in this harvest of Gentile times.

It is as urgently necessary as ever that we listen to the voice of Jesus in its simplicity if we are to both hear and labour in this harvest effectively. The kernel of the teaching is given in the section from Matt. 5 to 7 inclusive,

and known as the Sermon on the Mount. Elsewhere, there is illustration and extension of what is laid down in this section. To receive this teaching does not require intellectual brilliance. The paradox of rejection in the Gospels is that the simplicity of the new way of Jesus conflicted with an existing system made complex by men. The way of Jesus was new to the established system, and strange to it, so the simple was judged too high, whilst the old was a tangle of complexity - but being familiar it was acceptable. Further, though the teaching was simple to understand, it was very difficult to put into action, so the established ways prevailed.

In two key verses, Jesus says expressly that he is giving new authority to the Law and the prophets (Matt.5:17 , 7:12). In the first, he says that not a stroke shall pass from the Law, and in the second, the whole Law is expressed thus:-

"Always treat others as you would like them
to treat you: that is the Law and the
prophets."

Not by a stroke; not by the smallest part can this be reduced. There is no possibility of exceptions or exemptive clauses to this teaching which, in the giving, consistently avoided reduction to codes. The brother was to be forgiven times without number, not just seven times. Reminiscent of Cain was the example given by Jesus, where a gift brought to the altar had no relevance while one remained unreconciled to a brother. The Lord's Prayer is integral with the context, for the teaching is from the Father in Heaven. The prayer is the guide to show the conjunction of heaven and earth - of the Father and the suppliant. We are indebted to Moulton for pointing out that the prayer is an envelope figure where the 'conclusion' is held in abeyance until all which applies has been set forth:-

Our Father which art in heaven,
Hallowed be Thy Name,
Thy Kingdom come,
Thy will be done,
In earth as it is in heaven.

In this figure all the parallel clauses are to be connected with the common opening and close. The heavenly God is to be realised and glorified in the earth; his sovereignty and his will revealed in men; and how is it to be accomplished except in each believer, and by what means other than the teaching of Jesus? So, (Matt.7:7-8) the Kingdom of Heaven is to be brought to earth by the process of asking, knocking, and seeking, so that individually we may be aware of the application of Christian teaching to the world of our experience.

In the last part of this section (Matt.7:16-21) Jesus turns to the subject of action; there is saying, and there is doing - 'Not everyone who calls me "Lord, Lord" will enter the kingdom of Heaven, but only those who do the will of my heavenly Father ...' The figure that follows could not be more to the point. Again, we are indebted to Moulton for his observations. Two verses form point and counterpoint or strophe and antistrophe, the words indicating the movement to left and right of a procession while singing or reciting succeeding stanzas. The action emphasises the opposing nature of the two parts of the figure. Every line in the first verse is matched by its counterpart in the second. So precise is the matching that the ear waits for the repetitive word. There is one change insisted upon by Moulton, a variant giving the element of surprise and thereby increasing the power of the figure. It is the choice of the word 'smote' for 'beat' in the second stanza:-

Every one therefore which heareth these words of mine,
and doeth them,
shall be likened unto a Wise Man,
which built his house upon the Rock:

And the rains descended,
and the floods came,
and the winds blew
and beat upon that house;
and it fell not:
for it was founded upon the Rock.

And every one that heareth
these words of mine,
and doeth them not,
shall be likened unto a
Foolish Man,
which built his house upon
the Sand:

And the rain descended,
and the floods came,
and the winds blew,
and smote upon that house:
and it fell:
and great was the fall thereof!

To treat others as you would have them treat you is to build a house upon rock.

To leave the matter there would be tempting, because the harder part has still not come under review. How shall we, individually and together in the body of the Church, put into practice a Way that sets no limits short of the perfection of the love of Christ? And how shall we set about the task in our time and geological situation and in our social milieu? (to borrow words from Leslie Paul).

Our study began with the thought of Abraham occupying his brief portion of time long ago. Of him being forewarned of the stretching out of time ahead of him, lest he expect too much, too soon. We have noted Jesus observing men compassionately, but accurately, as sheep for slowness of understanding and resistance to guidance. Time seems to be of the essence of creation. Jacob, representing mankind, put up a night-long resistance to God's encounter and one individual can spend a lifetime before awakening. Jesus, caused a ripple in Judea, not a revolution. He must weep over Jerusalem and be satisfied that he, at least, had accomplished his mission so far. Of such was the faith of Abraham. There can be no doubt that if, tomorrow, the world should decide to put into operation Matt. 7:12, the Kingdom of God will have come on earth, but creation does not work that way.

So Jesus committed the 'harassed and helpless' to the prayerful labour of disciples, and the night of human resistance to the voice from heaven has already stretched out over many generations in Christian times. The Church was commissioned to take the lead; to be the agent, with Jesus, of the harvest, but it has tended to share the sheep-like behaviour of the world. No disciple can ignore the body of which he is a part,

but neither is he relieved of ultimate responsibility for his own discipleship in his own times. It is a challenge that has come to us in our turn. With no top limit to our commission, a conscience quickened by Jesus is the fully sufficient guide:-

'Well then, the man who knows the good he ought to do and does not do it is a sinner.'
James 4:17.

TITLES OF JESUS

THE LORD

by J.H. Weaving.

Continued from No.44, p.16.

Vincent Taylor (1) analyses the usage of the word "Lord"; the number of times it appears in the New Testament amounting to the surprisingly large total of 345, and he remarks that whilst the usage is early, it does not belong to the period covered by the life and ministry of Jesus. There is but one reference in Mark and Matthew and Vincent Taylor considers Luke's references (19 in number) to be editorial and John's (9) traditional. It is very difficult to be certain of this, but for our purpose it does not matter as, it is the general usage that is important. The preponderance of references to 'Lord' occurs in Acts and the Epistles of Paul and from these it is clear that this title is used by his followers to designate the risen and glorified Jesus: indeed, as we have seen, to 'confess him'. For example, Paul starts his first letter to the Corinthians.....

"Paul called to be an apostle ... to the congregation of God's people at Corinth....
Grace and Peace to you from God our Father
and The Lord Jesus Christ..... There is
indeed no single gift you lack, while you
wait expectantly for our Lord Jesus Christ

to reveal himself. He will keep you firm to the end; without reproach on the Day of our Lord Jesus. It is God himself who called you to share in the life of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord; and God keeps faith".

Paul designates Jesus as Lord six times in the first nine verses of this letter.

There is a further reference to Lord made by Peter at Pentecost.....

Let all Israel then accept as certain that God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Messiah. (Acts 2:3-6).

What did the early Christians, as represented by Peter and Paul, mean by Lord? (Greek = KYRIOS) We really have to start with the Hebrew usage in the Old Testament, because the first Christians were mainly of Jewish nationality. There are two basic terms denoting Lord in the O.T. - 'baal' and 'adon'. 'Baal' describes an owner one who has possessions, while 'adon' is the one who disposes of power and authority especially over men (2). In both cases, total dependence and subordination are basic to their meanings, e.g. master and slave. The concept may be used in a profane or religious sense. Thus, in a religious sense 'baal' denotes a God. And in like manner 'adon' was used in place of 'Yahweh' - the supreme governor and sole Lord.

In the Septuagint (LXX) 'KYRIOS' is used to translate both 'adon' and 'baal', but the latter only in a secular sense. If a God is implied, 'baal' goes into the Greek untranslated or rendered 'idol'. However, throughout, 'KYRIOS' is used for 'Yahweh'. This, then, is where we start and the problem still remains.

The early Christians in calling Jesus, 'Lord', could have meant anything from 'Master' to 'God'. This is why it is relatively unimportant whether or not they used the term in his earthly life. The fact that in John 13:13 Jesus

acknowledges that his disciples call him appropriately 'Lord' and 'Master', certainly implies by the juxtaposition of the two titles that they are of similar weight. In other words, there is no concept here of a Lord conceived as the second 'person' of a triune Godhead. The range of meaning that is possible for the word 'Lord' forces us back to the proposition we noted earlier of trying to answer the question, "what did Peter, Paul and John understand by the title when they used it?" This we will consider later, but before reaching any conclusion, we must also look at the usage of the all-embracing title, 'The Son of God'.

References

- (1) Vincent Taylor. The person of Christ. p. 144
(Macmillan).
- (2) Hahn Ferdinand. Titles of Christ. p. 70
(Lutterworth Press).

THE SONG OF SOLOMON (concluded)

by J.T.Murrell

THE POETRY.

The maiden in the Song of Solomon does not say, 'I had a dream;' she says, 'I was asleep, but my heart waked.' Similarly, but in a different context, a poet does not say, 'I am growing old,' but 'Sixtysix times have these eyes beheld the changing scenes of Autumn....' Here, the poetic treatment transforms thoughts of decline from possible painful and gloomy foreboding into a pleasurable reflection.

In discussing the poetry of the Bible in his section on the Song of Solomon, R.G.Moulton contrasts two kinds of poetic treatment of the subject of Old Age. Sackville's lines draw a 'cruelly direct' picture of an old man -

....Crookbacked he was, tooth shaken, and blear eyed,
Went on three feet and sometimes crept on four,
With old lame bones that rattled by his side.....

The first lines of Ecclesiastes 12 begins the poem that uses the art to transform the subject of old age, and the marvel is that it can be read with pleasure; 'a melancholy pleasure' no doubt, but Moulton points out that the swiftly, succeeding allusions in the poem 'have no visible resemblance to the spectacle of old age', but 'A long string of life's dull infirmities, from all of which realistic imagery must shrink as of all things unlovely, has been transformed into a thing of enduring beauty by casting over it the softening veil of symbolism' -

Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth:
Or ever the evil days come,
And the years draw nigh
When thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in
them.

Or ever the sun,
And the light,
And the moon,
And the stars,

Be darkened
And the clouds return after the rain.....

It is the indirect treatment that solves the problem, and it would be destructive to attempt to equate the allusions with reality by a line-by-line correspondence.

In the Song of Solomon the same principles are applied to the subject of courtship leading to marriage in what has been called 'the greatest honeymoon song in the world'. The indirect treatment achieves, without embarrassment, the full emotional content of 'being in love'.

The need to get completely away from direct, visual correspondence of allusions is seen in the following examples from the Song. The words are directed to the maiden -

I have compared thee, O my love,
To a steed in Pharoah's chariots....

Thy neck is like the tower of David builded
for an armoury,
Whereon there hang a thousand bucklers,
All the shields of the mighty men....

Thy neck is like the tower of ivory;
Thine eyes as the pools in Heshbon,
By the gate of Beth-rabbim;
Thy nose is like the tower of Lebanon,
Which looketh towards Damascus.....

R.G.M. chooses these examples to point out the disastrous results of building up direct images from the allusions (if this should be attempted). The oriental mind (he says) would understand that only the perfection in the allusion is intended; the lover is saying that his beloved is just perfect. All the figures are standards of excellence in their own right. The maiden can, in turn, allude to her lover's head 'as the most fine gold', and then in apparent contradiction say, 'His locks are bushy and black as the raven.' There is no contradiction since only the perfection of the raven-black and the fair-as-gold is intended.

Allusions in the Song have an accumulative effect - allusion after allusion in profusion create emotional intensity. Examples of accumulative effect are seen also in Eccles. 12, already referred to. The king of Tyre is credited with every precious stone, and these are listed, to indicate his mock godlikeness and are added to his cherubic and his Edenic status. Prodigality finds a different setting in the Apocalypse in the allusions to the Holy City. Attempts to build composite pictures from Bible symbology would lead to bizarre results. The visions of Ezek. 1 and 10 are of a literary order also, not to be transposed into visual art. The allusions in the Song, as we have seen, are accumulative in their effect, though separate wholes to be set side by side. The lion and the lamb stand separately in the Apocalypse, as do the cherubim and the flaming sword in Eden.

Perhaps the greatest disservice to the Song is to force upon it a fragmented set of spiritual counterparts for its allusions. This has been attempted and it can only be said that once set upon this course, the greatest strain is put upon the material to bend it to such ends. Such division is as destructive to the nature of this poetry as any dissection would be to an organism. Possibly the confusion of sex and sin in Christian theology has led to the idea that spiritual parallels must replace the sensual realities in the Song. However, in view of the place that courtship and marriage and 'pure conjugal affection' have in the human scene, and in view of the Bible being the book of Man, dealing with every human and divine relationship, it would be most odd if such powerful elements in human life were not featured in the Bible, and being featured, were not presented in the most suitable form and the highest example that the art could offer. As an Idyl, the Song would not have to justify its existence by being representative of a higher theme. A perfect example of love between a man and a woman presented in the Bible is expressive of the early Bible ordination of the relationship of the human pair. It is to be accepted in its own right for what it is. If it were to be used explicitly or implicitly as a basis for the higher relationship of Christ and his Church according to the usage of parallelism, it would have to be accepted first in its lower ideal in completeness and perfection.

DO NOT FORGET

THE SUMMER SCHOOL

SUNDAY JULY 20th. - 26th.

FIRCROFT COLLEGE, BRISTOL ROAD, SELLY OAK, BIRMINGHAM.

For details write Ian McHaffie, Moray Lodge, 176 Granton Road,
Edinburgh. 5.

THE EUCHARIST.

by Ralph Lovelock.

"If anyone, if we ourselves or an angel from heaven, should preach a gospel at variance with the gospel we preached to you, he shall be held outcast I must make it clear to you, my friends, that the gospel you heard me preach is no human invention. I did not take it over from any man; no man taught it me; I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ."

Gal. 1:6-10.

In the last issue of Endeavour (45) there appeared an article under the title; "The Sacramental Life", in which much that is said about the 'quality' of life which is pleasing to God is beyond cavil. To make the tacit assumption, however, that any question of 'sacraments' may be ignored, and are a matter of "temperament and upbringing" is quite unwarranted. Admittedly, the over-emphasis of the importance of sacrament and the ignoring of quality of life is an abhorrence to God (a "smoke in His nostrils") but although Israel under Moses were required to rise above the mere letter of the Law, the sacraments (feasts) were an important element in their then present position designed by God for their own assistance. As Paul says "a kind of tutor in charge of us until Christ should come" (Gal.3:24). Again Paul (1.Cor.13:12) states, "My knowledge now is partial" and it follows that we remain in need of further education, and the Christian sacraments stand in the same position to us as did the feasts of the Law to Israel; the presence of Christ in the sacraments is as real as was that of Yahweh on the day of Atonement.

The purpose of this present article, therefore, is to take up the rather misleading and over-brief reference to the Eucharist, where it is suggested that it has no scriptural authority behind it, the statement being backed by no scriptural facts, but by a single quotation from a secular,

American work. For those who would wish to become familiar with the true facts about this issue, they may be found examined and analysed in the following short list of works:-

- | | | |
|---------------|--|--------------------|
| Wilberforce. | The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. | Smith 1885. |
| E.S.Ffoulkes. | Primitive Consecration of
Eucharistic Oblation. | Hayes 1885. |
| F.E.Warren. | Liturgy & Ritual of Anti-Nicene
Church. | S.P.C.K.1897. |
| F.L.Girlot. | The Early Eucharist. | S.P.C.K.1939. |
| G.Ogg. | Chronology of the Public Ministry
of Jesus. | Cambridge
1940. |

These works should be consulted for full details, this short article merely summarising the position as there presented, to indicate how misleading, through excess brevity and one-sided quotation, was the article on the sacramental life.

Date of The Last Supper

The first of several controversial points about which no one can be definite, concerns the date, and consequently the nature, of the Last Supper. The one fact known for certain is that it was a 'formal' Jewish meal partaken by Jesus and the Disciples on the evening before the Crucifixion. It is equally certain that it was either the formal Passover meal, or the semi-formal meal of the evening before the Passover offering was eaten. Ogg devoted 38 pages to the details of this matter, and after a full and impressive analysis he draws the following conclusion:-

"Thus, as regards the two chronologies of the Passion, the Synoptic and the Johanne, while it cannot be said either that the former was everywhere a more recent adoption or that it had no supporters of note, the balance of Patristic testimony in the period extending down to early years of the third century does appear to be weighted rather on the side of the latter.....When we have invoked all the aids at present available, we still find ourselves

unable to impart any note of absolute certainty to our findings. In view, however, of its own internal probability, in view of features in the Synoptics which bear testimony to it, in view also of its acceptability to many of the earliest days of the Church, the tradition preserved in John, it seems to us, ought to be preferred and the crucifixion of Jesus assigned to the 14th, rather than the 15th. Nisan."

Giriot accepts this conclusion, and commences his work with the words:-

"To the present writer the reasons appear decisive against accepting the Synoptic chronology which would identify the Last Supper with the Passover Meal. Assuming here the establishment of this conclusion, it will be evident at once that we must look elsewhere for the Jewish antecedents of the Eucharist - if indeed it had any antecedents. Since the Eucharist was by its whole history a corporate meal or rite, we need not look among individual or private meals for any likely antecedents."

His first chapter continues to present and analyse all relevant information on this subject, and should be consulted for detail.

The words of Jesus, "How I have longed to eat this Passover with you before my death! For I tell you never again shall I eat it until the time when it finds its fulfilment in the kingdom of God," do not decide the question one way or the other; they could equally be a statement that he was about to eat the formal Passover Meal, or that he had wished to do so, but would not find it possible until he should be present with them in the Kingdom. In any case, although of great theological interest, the decision does not affect the question of the Eucharist in detail, since the details of the meal in all narratives are not affected by it.

Formal Jewish Meals.

Both the formal meals where a group are gathered together, and also those which form part of the official feast such as Passover, have two factors in common, and whichever that partaken in the Upper Room may have been, it will have commenced and ended in the same way; only the nature of the food and ritual in between will have differed, but it is only the beginning and ending which concerns the later Eucharist. When all were assembled, the leader took a loaf, blessed it (grace before the meal) and broke it, distributing the fragments to the guests as the formal opening of the meal. When the meal had concluded, the leader took a cup of Wine (the cup of blessing) blessed it (grace after the meal) and passed it round the company. If the meal had been a formal feast, such as Passover, this cup of blessing was then followed by a second cup over which a prayer for the day (Kiddush) was said before passing it round. Such meals were known as 'Haburah' under which title further information may be sought.

When the two were joined by Jesus on the road to Emmaus, and invited him to stay with them for that night, they would automatically follow the Haburah procedure in view of the presence of a guest, and would invite that guest to open the meal by blessing and breaking the loaf. It was the manner in which Jesus did this which immediately recalled to them his similar action in the upper room, and brought recognition to their eyes. During the days following Pentecost, the still small community in Jerusalem had "all things common" and Luke tells us that, "With one mind they kept up their daily attendance at the Temple, and breaking bread in private houses, shared their meals with unaffected joy as they praised God and enjoyed the favour of the people." The Last Supper would be ever present in their minds, as would also the meal at Emmaus, and in praising God and following the Jewish custom of grace before and after meals, the Last Supper would then be vividly recalled daily in the evening as they supped together.

In the 11th, chapter of Paul's first letter to Corinth, we gather that this habit of partaking of a formal meal together, during which the Last Supper was recalled in the blessings of bread and wine, was a formal practice "when you meet as a congregation." It is unlikely that this was a daily practice by then, when each led private lives, no longer having all things common, but had probably assumed what became the common practice later of meeting on the first day of the week. Since there is evidence that the first day was chosen in commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus, this 'agape' at Corinth would be more a re-acting of the meal at Emmaus than of that in the upper room; since however the result of that at Emmaus was immediately to recall to their mind the Last Supper, it was natural for the connection to focus on that.

The Eucharist.

We gather that the partaking of a common meal, in which each brought his own provisions, apart from the opening loaf in which all shared, and the closing cup, likewise provided and shared, led to the statement, "Your meetings tend to do more harm than good" because of the inequality of the intervening repast, and the intemperance shown by some. It would probably be because of such considerations as this that the common meal was not continued, but allowed to degenerate into the common bread and wine commemoration of their Lord, with no intervening meal.

The decision to continue with the bread and the cup would be taken, doubtless, because of the significance of 'body' and 'blood' laid down by Jesus during the Last Supper. That these words were remembered, and were recalled at each meal, is evidenced by Paul's words to Corinth. These words were written within 20 years of the resurrection, and their definite and categorical questions - "When we bless the cup of blessing, is it not a means of sharing in the blood of Christ? When we break the bread, is it not a means of sharing in the body of Christ?" indicate that within this short period, when most of the Twelve were alive and active, such a commemoration and association was

normal and fundamental to the early Christian Church. His words in the previous chapter demonstrate beyond all question that at that time, and to the mind of Paul, the bread and wine held a full sacramental nature, and were far from being "largely a matter of temperament and upbringing".

"Look at the Jewish people. Are not those who partake of the sacrificial meals sharers in the altar? What do I imply by this? That an idol is anything but an idol? Or food offered to it anything more than food? No; but the sacrifices the heathen offer are offered (in the words of scripture) 'to demons and to that which is not God'; and I will not have you become partners with demons. You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. You cannot partake of the Lord's table and the table of demons. Can we defy the Lord? Are we stronger than he?"

Food offered to idols was still food, and the bread and wine were still bread and wine. But the table of the Lord was the equivalent of the Jewish altar of sacrifice, which led the offerer into intimate communion with God, although the animal offered remained a mere animal. The man who approached that altar in uncleanness brought that uncleanness into contact with God, to his own detriment. So Paul can say of the loaf and the cup, "For he who eats and drinks eats and drinks judgement on himself if he does not discern the Body." So also, in the Epistle to Hebrews, the same association (sacramental) is made - "Our altar is one from which the priests of the sacred tent have no right to eat".

Authority.

It is assumed in the article on the sacramental life that the sole authority for the establishment of the Eucharist rests on a single passage in Luke for which there is divergent, manuscript evidence, some sources omitting it. On the basis of this one doubtful reading it is categorically claimed "there is nothing to suggest that our Lord had the intention of founding a permanent rite of any kind". Such a statement is surely based on complete ignorance of both the New Testament, and of early Church history! We shall search the gospels in

vain for a record of any detailed organisational instructions for the Church, although Jesus intended such an organisation to be set up as shown by his words:-

"On this rock I will build my Church, and the powers of death shall never conquer it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; what you forbid on earth shall be forbidden in Heaven, and what you allow on earth shall be allowed in heaven".

What we do find in Luke's gospel, however, is a statement of certain reading, "Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures". So also, John records the promise of Jesus, "When he comes who is the Spirit of truth, he will guide you into all the truth".

If we do not accept that the Holy Spirit was active in the Church, guiding it into conformity with the will of God, then we have no acceptance of the reality of Christ, or of the Christian religion. To argue that the presence or absence of a single passage in the written gospels can determine whether the Eucharist is God intended or merely a matter of human whim is most illogical. The gospels were written long after the earlier letters of Paul, and unless the Spirit was active within the Church during its formative years, then the whole of our New Testament is the vapourings of the human caprice. The Eucharist was firmly established in the sacramental worship of the Church well within the lifetime of the Apostles, and has continued so for centuries without change. It is true that the Spirit is capable of changing regulations to suit circumstances, as when Moses gave place to Christ, but unless we believe that the Spirit has been active during the last five centuries to this effect, then we must accept the full sacramental institution of the Eucharist, or else reject Christianity altogether. I know of no such recent activity of the Spirit to this effect.

Somewhat analogous ideas have been advanced in recent times about the initial institution of water baptism as a sacrament, and arguments have been advanced against it on similar lines as those against the Eucharist considered above. It might be enlightening to survey the facts as opposed to fancies on this subject in a later article.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Dear Editor,

The article "WHO IS MY NEIGHBOUR?" had considerable interest for me. The appeal which followed it was for financial help, but the number of Samaritan branches requiring money is matched by at least as many in greater need of prospective volunteers. The article may have awakened in some minds consideration of the possibility of helping in that direction and there is no doubt that such work, though undertaken for a "non-religious organisation", in practice involves the volunteer in a giving of self to others.

Depending upon the pressure of other commitments, this self giving can be as great or as small as seems desirable to the volunteer concerned; whilst he or she will be subject to certain disciplines, no volunteers are asked to undertake more periods of duty than they can well perform.

Mention has been made of the non-religious nature of the organisation; in fact many branches were formed by groups of ministers of religion the quality of whose pastoral work fell below their aspirations and who saw in the Samaritan organisation a means of reaching a wider flock than their dwindling congregations allowed. Arising from this genesis many branches have a large proportion of active church members among their volunteers. All accept the rule that religious matters will only be discussed with clients if such is the client's wish. Some of your readers may regard such a rule as an unwarrantable restriction upon their duty to preach, but of course, it is no such thing, since, in practice, it is impossible to preach to those who are

unwilling to listen.

A few of your readers may be troubled by the phrase (dare we call it overworked?) about unequally yoking ourselves with unbelievers. A volunteer is committed only to accept the (benevolently) autocratic rule of the director of his branch and the restriction already discussed.

With some amazement many years ago, I listened to a Congregationalist minister say that until he had become a Samaritan volunteer he had known almost nothing of mankind, of life, or even of himself. He went on to say that the experience thus gained enhanced greatly his appreciation of what Christ had done for mankind. These many years later, this volunteer can only echo his words. The self-giving involved in the performance of Samaritan work, for all the frustrations and occasional successes, for all the peaks and nadirs, for all the spells which seem a barren waste of time, can be a work of self-realisation and a real awakening as to "what the Lord requires of thee"; in short, a very humbling experience.

Yours etc

(Philip Jarrett)

THE ENDEAVOUR MAGAZINE SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Great Britain 75p per annum, (Students 50p). Single copies 20p.(post free)

Canada, USA & Australia \$2.00 (Air mail \$3.50). South Africa R1.50.

Great Britain, Europe & South Africa (also articles and correspondence), The Endeavour Magazine, 150 Chessetts Wood Road, Lapworth, Warwickshire, England.

Canada & USA, The Endeavour Magazine, 108 North Orchard Rd, Linthicum Heights, Maryland 21090, U.S.A.

Australia & New Zealand, The Endeavour Magazine, PO Box 213, Box Hill, Victoria 3128, Australia.

Dear Editor,

I can recall considerable attention being given in the past to "proving" that the account by Jesus of 'Dives and Lazarus' was a parable and not a true story, because "there is no immortal soul, nor heaven nor hell and therefore it is just a parable." This "proof" seems to overlook the fact that if parables were to mean anything, they had to be in terms which were meaningful to the listeners of the day, i.e. those to whom Jesus was speaking. Indeed, the parables were couched in everyday language and dealt with everyday things, activities or ideas, as, for example, with the parables of the sower, the wheat and the tares, the vineyard and the wicked husbandman, etc.

Does the same apply to the story of Dives and Lazarus? (Luke XVI:19-31) If it is a parable, it will relate to commonly known ideas. If it is not a parable, but some sort of story, Jesus might conceivably be introducing some new ideas into the Jewish thought of his day. In either case, it raises some problems for our traditional views on the matter, if we care or dare to ask, "Why this parable or this story?".

It is agreed that the O.T. in the main teaches clearly silence and unconsciousness in death: "in the main", because, although Enoch and Elijah are irrelevant here, and the Witch of Endor only marginally so, there are Ezekiel XXXI:17-31, and Isaiah XIV:9-11, where consciousness in death is implied.

It is true Isaiah speaks of the worms that surround the bodies, and of the kings of the nations lying each in his own tomb, but he still uses the concept of the long-dead speaking to the newly-dead.

However, the major interest in these notes concerns ideas about the state of the dead which were current among the Jews during the times of Jesus and the Apostles.

If one accepts Whiston's Josephus as reliable, at least as regards the "Antiquities", the "Wars" and "Against Apion", there would seem to be little doubt that the

Pharisees and the Essenes did believe in a conscious state after death. The Pharisees certainly also believed in some form of resurrection, whilst the Sadducees believed in neither the resurrection, nor angels, nor spirits (Acts XX11:8 AV).

A more recent authority than Whiston is Prof.N.Glatzer, who in his "Jerusalem and Rome" 1960, quotes Josephus as giving details, which agree with Whiston's work. Pharisees: hold all souls to be imperishable, but contend that only the souls of the good migrate into other bodies and that the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment. Sadducees: hold that souls die with the bodies. The soul's permanence after death and the punishments and rewards of Hades they reject. Essenes: believe that bodies are corruptible.....but that souls are immortal and imperishable.....they hold that good souls inhabit a region beyond the ocean.....refreshed by ever gentle winds from the ocean. To the wicked souls they allot a gloomy tempest filled cavern, replete with never-ending punishments.

"The Discourse Concerning Hades" included in Whiston's Josephus claims that we (the Jews) picture all souls awaiting judgement, but the souls of the righteous in that part of Hades where there is peace and happiness and called the "Bosom of Abraham", whilst the souls of the wicked are in view and in torment reserved for the guilty after the judgement.

"For all men, the just as well as the unjust shall be brought before God the Word; for to him hath the Father committed all judgement; and he, in order to fulfill the will of his Father shall come as judge, whom we call Christ."

This discourse seems a strange one to come from a Jewish friend of the Roman empire at a time when the last of the Apostles was probably still alive. It is claimed that some of the references in Josephus to Jesus and Christ are interpolations by later, well-meaning but mis-guided

Christian apologists, and since I have no informed opinions on the Discourse it will be omitted from the present discussion.

However, the undisputed sections of Josephus regarding the beliefs of the Pharisees and Sadducees make sense of Christ's use of the parable of Dives and Lazarus, of Christ's discussion with the Sadducees on the resurrection, and Paul's action before the Sanhedrin after his capture.

If the Christadelphian teaching on the complete mortality of Man and of unconsciousness in death is correct, and I believe the weight of evidence supports this stand, why do we find Jesus using the parable of Dives and Lazarus without reporting in any way the obvious background idea of immortal souls? Why do we find Jesus, through John, using the figure of the souls of slain saints crying to God from under the altar? Rev. V:9-10. It is certainly a striking symbol, but if belief in such souls is incompatible with the believer's chance of salvation, why is there no warning against it? I can honestly find none.

It seems to me that large numbers, if not most Jews, who listened to Jesus and the Apostles did believe in some such existence after death, just as they believed in demons causing illness.

A probable explanation may be that it is academically and theologically correct that souls are mortal, but that belief in the type of existence after death, such as is obvious from Josephus and from the parable of Dives and Lazarus, is unimportant as regards salvation, provided there is belief in the resurrection and judgement, plus, of course, obedience to the two great commandments of love. That belief and action are centred, of course, on the death, resurrection and return of Jesus the Christ.

Yours etc

(S. Marriott)

NEWS ITEMS

CENTRAL LONDON BIBLE CLASS.

Details of the 1975 session at the Friends Meeting House, Euston Road, London, have been received from Bro.

E. Garner.....

Study Title,	THE CHRISTIAN AND THE WORLD
Class Leader,	Bro. E. Wille.
Session,	10 weeks, on Tuesdays, commencing 30th September.
Starting time,	To be announced.

.....

The following transcripts of previous C.L.B.C. studies are available -

The New Testament Church and the Twentieth
Century Ecclesia -

a comparison.
by Bro. L. Richardson.

.....

Daniel (A study of the Book)
by Bro. D. Pitt-Francis.

The price for these studies is 65p including postage. Apply to E.R. Garner, 11 Ferrings, College Road, London, SE 21.

A study of the Apocalypse by Bro.D.Pitt-Francis, entitled, Meditations on the last message of Jesus, is available, price 50p including postage inland, from J.T. Murrell, 109 Westland Avenue, Hornchurch, Essex. RM11 3RX.

When Paul says he received it of the Lord himself, we cannot be sure exactly what he meant; as he prefaces the statement with - "For the tradition which I handed on to you....." (1 Cor. 23-6). Is he perhaps referring to the instruction he received via Ananias?

Jeremias (1) has made a very comprehensive study of this subject and his arguments are weighty. He has no doubt that the last supper was a Passover Meal, but suggests that this Passover meal with the disciples was one of many regular meals of fellowship, albeit a very special one, that he enjoyed with his followers. These meals Jeremias suggests were continued after Jesus' death (Acts 2:42). By comparing the four records he finds a common core of phrases. For instance, "taking bread and having given thanks" or very similar, is present in each. This is true of several other phrases. He suggests therefore this form of words had become a familiar liturgy at the time of writing. The "tradition" of which Paul writes to the Corinthians.

Luke says quite distinctly that in writing his gospel that he followed traditions of eyewitnesses. How difficult even for an eyewitness to remember actual words after he had been reciting a litany for a decade or two, which might in fact have differed from the actual words of the Lord.

There are problems and the main purpose of this editorial is to say there is weighty evidence for either point of view and it is hoped that a calm and a reasonable discussion will be profitable to all.

Nobody doubts that a purely ritual service is of little benefit but on the other hand a spiritual contemplation of the Lord and his life of service, as the emblems are shared undoubtedly means a great deal to a lot of his followers. Some however feel that they can get fellowship with the Lord more closely in active service and for them this is their spiritual mode of worship* - A Washing of the Feet Service.

J.H.W.

* (See Romans 12:1-2).

Jeremias Joachim - The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. (1)