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Preface.

A book should have a reason for its being. Especially with the ever increasing flood of literature and the cheapening of the process of reproducing it, one feels that it is becoming more and more imperative that every new writing should justify itself. In undertaking to say something about the fear of God one needs not go far to find a why and wherefore for his work. For while much has been said and written about such a fear from time immemorial we have after wide investigation been unable to find any particular treatment of the subject that will fill present day needs. It is true that many theologians of by gone generations dealt with it at length as a part of their general theology but our emphasis and views in these days have changed. Thus we no longer accept much less practice such a fear of God as was advocated by Jonathan Edwards and his contemporaries. In fact we are led to wonder what the present generation does believe about it. Only a brief glance at the opinions and beliefs current today on the subject suffices to impress us with the wide divergence of thought that is held with respect to it. We are left in uncertainty and confusion. This in itself should justify a thoroughgoing study of the whole matter.

Furthermore as far as we have been able to discover there has never been a comprehensive study of the subject in itself in recent years. As implied, whatever has been said has been almost of a cursory nature and incidental to a more general discussion. We feel that the subject in itself is of sufficient importance to deserve separate treatment.

As to how well this particular work fills the niche designated is a matter to be questioned. Altogether we are dealing with a subject that is extremely subtle and evasive and far reaching in its ramifications. However, as to the existence of such a niche and its need to be filled there can be no doubt.
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Introductory.

In stating our subject as "The Fear of God—a Study of the Fear of God in the Christian Religion" we have in view certain delimitations that must be made. Fear in itself is a broad subject with wide reaches and an extensive literature dating from the earliest times. Any work that would attempt to deal with it in all its phases must be of immense proportions. We therefore are treating it in only one of its aspects, namely that fear which has God as its object, directly or indirectly. This at once removes all earthly fears such as the fear of diseases, injury, and loss of property, outside the bounds of our discussion. It even eliminates certain of these fears which may lead us to God. As Doctor W.P. Paterson in his Gifford Lectures has pointed out man may come to God, not only because he fears his wrath or disfavor, but he may seek God as a refuge from the fears of the world—famine, drought, storm, flood, etc. With this latter type of fears, however, we are not concerned, except to introduce them later for the purpose of bringing out a certain apparent inconsistency in our relations with God. The fear we study is the fear that pertains to God and our relations with God.

Furthermore in limiting our study to the Christian Religion we shall need interest ourselves only in the fear of God as we know him in our religion. The fear of the god or the gods or any form of fear appearing under alien religions will not concern us directly and will be touched upon merely as they may throw light upon the fear of the God we know. The whole realm of comparative religions therefore will be only incidental in our study.

As for the chief points at issue before us, one need but pursue the subject at hand a little way until he is confronted with many problems. What has
occasioned the fear of God and what has nourished it? What has been its function and its utility? Has it been modified through the ages along with other elements of our religion? What forms does it take? Should it continue to exist and if so what may we expect of it? How does it relate itself to the love of God? Is it to be considered present in both believer and unbeliever alike? How can God be both a God of fear and a God of love? Is it to be distinguished from the natural fear instinct? Is it true that fear made religion? These and a host of other questions thrust themselves at us and while many of them must forever go unanswered except in the realm of the probable, yet they bristle with interest and we feel that even a partial answer is worthwhile.

Our task naturally resolves itself into five main divisions. Firstly, we shall need to define what is meant by the fear of God. This in itself will require care and exact delineation for the phrase has many diverse applications. But through a study of the instinctive bases and the development and characteristics of the Fear of God, we hope to make its nature and meaning plain. Having done this we shall proceed in the second place to a study of the grounds or excitants of this fear as set forth in the Old and New Testaments. The Scriptures must always be the first and the chief appeal in the Christian Religion. Can we find in them sufficient examples, command or other incentive to justify the fear of God? From this we are led to our third main division—a study of the role this fear has played in the two great systems of the Christian religion, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant. Following this we shall make a brief survey of the status of the fear of God in the present day Protestant world and mention some of the present tendencies in regard to
it. Lastly, in the light of our study we shall give our conclusions as to the place of worth, utility, or even necessity that is to be held by the fear of God in the Christian life.
CHAPTER I

The Instinctive Bases and Development of the Fear of God.

Fear, itself, may be considered purely as an emotion, in which case it is recognized by most authorities as a primary emotion, appearing among the first if not the very first of the emotions of man. Or if we take it in a broader sense and include the reaction or the impulse to reaction that accompanies it, such as flight or concealment, it may be called an instinct. For our own purpose whether it be considered an instinct or an emotion attending an instinct does not matter so long as we recognize that it is primal or instinctive in its nature. Of this there seems to be little doubt. Shand* for instance applies four tests to determine a primary emotion: firstly, its issuance in the first months of child life; secondly, its wide diffusion in the animal world; thirdly, whether it is irreducible by analysis to other emotions; and fourthly, whether it is instinctively aroused and manifested in its earliest forms. Judged by all of these tests, fear, he concludes, is one of the primary emotions and root forces of character. Especially regarding its appearance in life, he says it is the first or one of the first to show itself in child life. Ribot† who also verifies the primary emotions through child study, reaches the same conclusion. According to unanimous observation, he tells us, fear appears first among the emotions, and

---


†Psychology of the Emotions p 13.
he cites the testimony of Preyer who found it manifested after the first day of a child's life, of Darwin who found it revealed after four months, and of Perez who set two months as the limit for its first expression in the child. In short there is general agreement that fear is one of the earliest of the primary emotions and thoroughly instinctive in its nature.

But now can we take a further step and say the same thing of the fear of God? Are we justified in speaking of this fear as an expression of the common instinct? McDougall* would tell us we are. He would seek to build all religion out of the common instincts. "If we accept," he says, "the doctrine of the evolution of man from animal forms, we are compelled to seek the origin of religious emotions and impulses in instincts that are not specifically religious." In other words McDougall would have us believe that the fear of God in its origin is nothing more than the ordinary instinctive fear. Another psychologist J. R. Pratt* takes the same position except he adds the 'intellect' to the instincts, as in these words, "given a being endowed with intelligence and with the dozen or more specific instincts and tendencies of man, such a being is bound to be religious --- He is bound, that is to say, to possess at least the possibility or the beginning of some kind of conscious attitude toward the Determiner of Destiny." The logical deduction in both these cases is that religious fear may be generated out of the common animal fears. And these two men are but typical of a host of other men who in their quest of material facts and 'natural' explanations refuse to concede anything that cannot be explained by the principles of material and animal existence. This is but a part of the general undercurrent running through

---

*S Social Psychology p 89.

**The Religious Consciousness p 69ff.
much of our thinking that would attempt to eliminate the spiritual forces of life and leave us stranded in a world of mere matter.

But in this instance it is plain that a 'natural' explanation will not suffice. The fear of God is not the common fear instinct, nor is it to be accounted for by that instinct. This is apparent in that it has a colouring and tone of its own. There is something about it inherently different and we cannot mistake the difference in our own consciousness. Again there is an intrinsic difference in the two types of fear in reference to their excitants. Psychology, it is true, has never made much progress in determining whether common fear is natively attached to certain signs in the beginning or if it is, what those signs may be. Thus results such diverse views as Woodworth's* saying, "Fear we do not learn, but we learn what to fear", and Mosso,* after experimenting with a falcon and chicks, and pigeons and chicks, concluding that "there is an innate recollection which constitutes fear." But in general we feel that psychology is on right ground in defining the excitants of common fear in some such statement as that of Stout* who tells us that fear may be generated by bodily pain, by suddenness or intensity, and finally by unfamiliarity or strangeness. These are very clearly applicable to fear as in the case of a flash of lightning, or a loud clap of thunder, or an eclipse, or some strange animal but it is not so evident how they could pertain to the fear of God, (or of the gods in the case of the primitive beginnings). To begin with, the very perception of God must be on a different basis. It presupposes a certain ability to sense and find the Unseen or the Supernatural. It demands the existence of what we might call a religious instinct whereby man is impelled to strive for something that can be called God and whereby he

*Psychology Ch VIII * "Fear" p 228.

**Manual of Psychology** p 419.
is able to detect and recognize that God in His various appearances. In no way do we have here the workings of the common instincts and senses. Nor when such an 'object' or Being is found, will mere strangeness, or unfamiliarity, or suddenness account for the rise of fear. We feel that animal fear and the common instincts of man will in no wise account for the product. These will be contributing factors or will furnish a mould of expression but we have something here that is unique and peculiar to itself, unexplainable except on the basis of the religious nature in man and the existence of the Supernatural about man.

We would posit therefore a something that we call the religious instinct. The existence of such an instinct has always been a matter of debate and much objection in our own time comes from the psychologists who in general are opposed to it. McDougall* says he does not know of any that seriously favor it. And referring again to Pratt we have such a statement as this, "The true explanation of the religious sentiment must be sought in a combination of instincts which originally are too simple to be called religious. Religion would thus have an instinctive basis without our having to postulate any religious instinct."* It is true that there are a few who occasionally catch the gleam of something different, as when James makes this significant statement in his Varieties of Religious Experience, "It is as if there were in the human consciousness a sense of reality, a feeling of objective presence, a perception of what we may call 'something there', more deep and more general than any of the special and particular 'senses' by which the current psychology supposes existent realities to be originally revealed."* But in general the psychologists oppose such an idea and it is to be

* Social Psychology p 302.
*Religious Consciousness p 69.
*p 58.
remembered that the very evolutionary hypothesis in its materialistic forms which underlies much of their thinking, refuses the recognition of spiritual elements especially in the earlier forms of life and furthermore believes that what cannot be found there, at least in germ, cannot be found later, and vice versa. On the other hand among the students of religion there are those who recognize a religious instinct. Jastrow, Tiele, and Starbuck do so. Herrmann speaking of a man's finding God, says, "This is the work of the religious instinct, which draws men out beyond the world toward God." Doctor Paterson, likewise, in his Gifford Lectures makes much of such an instinct and says that however we may account for it the fact remains that man is endowed with religious tendencies of an instinctive nature. Again, quoting him at length, we find him saying, "The problem, then, is how a species which had become human through the possession of the spiritual mode of being came to form religious ideas, and to practice religious observances. The determining factor, it seems to me, must have been the tendency traceable throughout the history of the race, which is manifested in a yearning for God and an impulsion towards God. It is possible that the power of this instinct was felt in peculiar strength in the period when reason was less used and trusted than in later ages; or it may be that there was a point at which it was greatly intensified."

Marett* in his well known "Threshold of Religion" makes an analysis that is pertinent to our thought at this point. In discrediting the assumption that Animism is the sole element in the origin of religion he says that before it and along with it we must have had certain religious strivings, dim and undefined in their early stages. These arose out of a religious sense or instinct compounded of fear, admiration, wonder, interest,
love, and the like. The general name he applies to this feeling is "Awe" and its object is the "Supernatural." We would agree with Marett in the vagueness of the early strivings but would hardly derive them from a compound of fear, admiration, wonder, and so on. The beginnings must have been simpler than any such compound. Perhaps Otto is more near the truth when he calls it a "hidden pre-disposition of the human spirit, which awakens when aroused by divers excitations."* It is interesting in this connection to note that our own Scriptures occasionally refer to something akin to a religious instinct. Jeremiah for instance, berates the children of Israel for not following it. "The stork," he says, "knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle and the swallow and the crane observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the ordinance of the Lord." (Jer. 8:7). We would recognize in man therefore something that may properly be called a religious instinct. It may, with some, not have full acceptance as an instinct but it is certainly instinctive in its nature and without it there can be no real explanation of the basic things of religion.# It is certainly true that the origin of the fear of God is not to be found in mere common fear but first of all in what we have sought to point out as a religious instinct. This in some of its phases will call up the fear instinct and the two of them working together will give us our fear of God.

Let us notice briefly the interworkings of

# Note: Calvin on ps. 107 also mentions an innate religious instinct in man—brought forth by dreadful experiences, like being lost on the desert, shipwrecked, etc.
these two. We have already pointed out the vague-
ness of the religious feelings, reactions, and at-
tentions in the beginning. At the most we probably
have nothing more than a predisposition to sense
the supernatural and react in the faintest way.
This Supernatural would appear under different forms.
It not only had its milder, kindlier aspects as in
the bestowal of the bounties of nature but also had
its severer, harsher phases when the gods were un-
friendly and life lacked prosperity. In other words
the unseen powers presented themselves in the dual
role of blessing and blighting. Whether these two
roles were assigned to the one power or to two dif-
ferent sets of powers or spirits, for our present
purpose does not matter. It is sufficient for us to
notice that it was the more 'aweful', the fearful
aspect of the Supernatural that came into promi-
nence. Pringle Pattison throws some light on how
this might come about in an illustration taken from
the experience of Doctor Hooker with the Lipchas
of the Himalayas. The Lipchas said they did not
pray to the good spirits. "Why should we?", they
said. "They do us no harm; the evil spirits that
dwell in every grave and rock and mountain, to them
we must pray, for they hurt us."* And so, as Leuba**
points out, it is the evil powers that first attain
to a degree of definiteness and it is the evil
powers with which man first enters into definite re-
lations. Thus it is that fear becomes prominent in
religion and thus it is that the fear instinct is
so often held to be primary and basic in the origin
of all religions. Such a belief has been one of
philosophy's chief contentions from the earliest
times. We have Statius* for instance with his fa-
miliar, "Primus in orbe deos fecit timor." Lucre-
tius* likewise recognized that religion in his day
was based on fear. "You will yourself," he says,
"some day or other seek to fall away from me, over-
borne by the terrific utterances of priests. Aye

---

*Statius
**Hibbert Journal
***Ps. Origin
****Statius
****Statius
****Statius

III 661
XXIV 2
and Nature
Ch. V.
"De Rerum
V 1220ff
Natura"
I 102ff
indeed, how many dreams can they soon invent you, enough to upset the principles of life and to confound all your fortunes with fear." Then in a later day Hobbes* in his Leviathan conceives the commonwealth as a great creature in which sovereignty is the soul, reward and punishment the nerves, etc. Of religion he says, "in these foure things, opinion of ghosts, ignorance of second causes, devotion towards what men fear, and taking of things casuall for prognostiques, consisteth the naturall seeds of religion." And referring to man's fear of the evils the future may bring he tells us, "This perpetuall feare, alwayes accompanying mankind in the ignorance of causes, as it were in the dark, must needs have for object something. And therefore when there is nothing to be seen, there is nothing to accuse, either of their good, or evill fortune, but some Power, or agent Invisible." Following Hobbes, in the next century we have Hume* taking up a similar line of thought, as in these words, "Agitated by hopes and fears....especially the latter, men scrutinise with a trembling curiosity, the course of future causes, and examine the various and contrary events of human life. And in this disordered scene, with eyes still more disordered and astonished, they see the first obscure traces of divinity." And so down through the ages there has been an effort made to find the origin of religion in fear or at least to assign the chief place to fear. But in the light of our previous discussion we can understand how common fear alone could never account for or produce a religion. The religious instinct must have been there to begin with and it was only by virtue of circumstances that the fearful aspect of the Supernatural was emphasized and fear called in. Only as the religious instinct stirred man to the quest and the hungering for God and only as the 'aweful' aspects of God were disclosed in this quest did the

*"Leviathan" p 70, 73

*"Nat'l Hist. of Rel. Sec. II
fear of God become possible. Furthermore it is only because of the religious instinct and its attendant equipment that we can explain the unique tone and colouring previously mentioned as peculiar to the fear of God.

We now proceed to note the development of the fear of God from its cruder to more refined forms. In the beginning we should probably speak of it as the fear of the Supernatural, having in mind a condition when various manifestations bore the markings of some Godly power or at least were so interpreted, before the idea of Him, "that left not himself without witness," had become crystallised. At such a time this fear probably appeared in distinct emotional forms. The primitive man was a creature of the moment and he is generally conceded to have been dominated largely by his emotions. We see the same conditions existing in the childhood of today. If fear of the dark arises in the child we have that fear occurring as a definite emotion, represented by a clinging to an elder, a burying of the face and hands, a decrease in the heart beat, etc. Or if it happens to be the fear of a dog we have a screaming and a running to the mother. And so it was with the fears of early man. They were expressed on the surface as we say. They were distinct emotional affairs. Thus when he experienced fear in his religion we have him wildly gesticulating and beating his tom-tom to drive away the evil spirit, or we have him shivering in his cave before the gods of the loud thunder and the violent storm, or we have him paralysed with fright and even dying before the incantations and spells of the medicine man. In short when the primitive man experienced the fear of God he 'felt' it. It was an emotional experience with him.
Nor would such an experience be limited to a single occasion, but in the cycles of nature and human life the same disturbing phenomena would tend to recur, each bringing a repetition of the same emotion. Just as we in the course of our life are startled over and over again by hearing loud claps of thunder or witnessing dazzling flashes of lightning even though we have been meeting such things all of our life. And the savage man reacting to this with 'godly' fear would experience a similar repetition. Furthermore he would perceive the Supernatural in many happenings so that not only the lightning but sickness, drought, famine, failure in war, and so on would be attributed to the gods or spirits and thus the appearances of the fear element would be many. Moreover with the functioning of memory these experiences would tend to be conserved in the mind so that through frequent repetition and the better conservation of the memory there would be an increasing inclination towards a constant fear attitude. A further agency to abet the development would be the community itself. In it there would be an exchange of experiences, or certain religious "geniuses" or specially "endowed" individuals, the forerunners of the priestly class, might relate the happenings in their life. Others would contribute and there would be a general fund of information and feeling created. This would lead to the rise of tradition and the development of a community atmosphere. A more abiding fear of the Supernatural would be the result and from this would come a system of regular propitiation and sacrifice. Anywhere an orderly continuous provision for sacrifice is to be found we can safely assume that there has been this abiding fear in the background. At this early stage we have what some psychologists would call a simple disposition to fear marked by many emotional outbursts.
With the growth of reason, however, the emotional experiences would tend to pass away or to be restrained. It has long been a matter of observation among students of human nature that as we pass more and more to the ideational level, the more we bring our emotional life under control and the less we are subject to emotional expression, at least in its external manifestations. Jastrow* in this connection tells us that the main difference between an educated and an ignorant person is the extent to which the emotions are controlled by the intellect. This effect of the growth of the mental powers is clearly shown in a comparison of the affection displayed by a child for its parents and that shown by the same child become an adult. There may be an equally great love in the mature man, but there is the lack of the abounding emotional expression of it that goes with childhood. A corresponding difference may be expected in the 'fear' life of the primitive man and his more cultured descendents. If fear in the first was largely emotional in the latter it would appear stripped of this aspect or with the emotional element greatly reduced. Again, man's growing ability to cope with nature and his increasing understanding of the natural powers around him would lead to a general decrease of the fear occasions which heretofore stimulated him to hold the gods in fear. He would take a saner view of the means of averting the famine or combating the disease. Much would still remain to be feared but his approach would be more rationalistic. The fear of the Supernatural as an emotional experience would therefore tend to pass away or at least be restricted. There would still abide the recorded witness of the past, tradition, the experience of an 'endowed' few who would remain, and certain phenomena and mysteries from which life is never free and which are suited to beget fear. But the whole attitude would
be more rational and less emotional. Fear of a subdued sort would still be nourished and a kind of continuing disposition to fear produced. Galloway* gives pointed expression to this when in his work on religious development he says, "the religious emotions, necessarily incoherent and fluctuating on the previous level of culture, now tend to grow into fixed dispositions recognized as having a value of their own. These dispositions are stable compared with the shifting emotions and bursts of excitement which prevail in the crude nature-religions. In fact we have now come to the stage when the sentiments in contrast to the emotions fill a large place in religion and give a constant tone to the religious mind."

The failure to recognize this change in the form of the emotion has led many to altogether deny the existence of fear in the higher forms of religion. In fact the denial includes all the emotions. Ribot* the French psychologist, is perhaps one of the outstanding advocates of this position. He traces the development of religion in three stages. In the first stage "the religious sentiment is composed of the emotion of fear in its different degrees, from profound terror to vague uneasiness, due to the faith in an unknown, mysterious, impalpable Power able to render great service and, more especially, to inflict great injuries." In the second stage love becomes dominant while in the last stage the religious feeling has attained its full height of development and religion tends to become a religious philosophy. At such a point he says, "the religious feeling has attained the height of its development and can henceforth only decline." To Ribot there can be no emotion, no feeling except there also be the organic and physical disturbance accompanying it. He notes the decrease in physiological forces as religion develops and says; "In
consequence, emotion, attacked at its source, flows very scantily; and of the religious feeling properly so called, there remains only a vague respect for the unknowable, the last survival of fear and a certain attraction towards the ideal which is the last remnant of love dominant during the second period. * Ribot thus throws out the possibility of fear or any emotion existing in the highest levels of religion. But it is all due to the failure to realize the change occurring in the emotional life on the ideational level. There is no longer a stirred up state and a violent reaction but the organic and physical manifestations are subdued or suppressed and we have the emotion existing in a more subtle form. The emotional life is not obliterated, it is merely refined and controlled. It is more of a disposition or an attitude. It is in such a form that we must look for fear in the advanced religious life.#

Following this discussion of the progression of the fear emotion, it is necessary that we say something about the place of love. When love appears in religion we encounter a factor commonly set over against fear. Some authorities, as Leuba,*

# Note: In this connection see also G.S. Hall (Amer. J. of Psy. Vol. VIII "A Study of Fears" p 242) who says, "There is no one without fear, and those few who so emphatically disclaim all fear, and the psychologists who tabulate the percentage of fearless people, are thinking of shock or panic or acute fright, or special physical dread, etc., but not of the subtler forms, like fear of God, of dishonor, failure of their highest purpose, for themselves or others."
while admitting fear to be a primary emotion in religion, hold that some other emotion such as love might have been the original emotion. Robertson Smith* is even more emphatic in rejecting fear as the original emotion, putting love in its place. "It is not true," he says, "that the attempt to appease these powers is the foundation of religion. From the earliest times, religion, as distinct from magic or sorcery, addresses itself to kindred and friendly beings, who may indeed be angry with their people for a time, but are always placable except to the enemies of their worshippers or the renegade members of the community. It is not with a vague fear of unknown powers, but with a loving reverence for known gods who are knit to their worshippers by strong bonds of kinship, that religion in the only true sense of the word begins." Such a position as this, however, is difficult to support with actual facts and both Robertson Smith and Leuba would find themselves at a loss to get concrete instances of where love, or the tender emotion, is the dominating emotion in the beginnings of religion. At least what we can find in the most primitive religions today points to just the reverse. At the same time we must believe that love was present in germ or as what Ribot calls a 'dawning tender emotion'* or it may even have been present in considerable strength though overshadowed by a still stronger fear. Galloway* perhaps would favor the latter when he says that "the single emotion of fear is far too meagre to beget the complex result....the being who could fear must also have been able in some rude way to hope and trust....man, either savage or civilized, cannot live on negations." At any rate the actual facts would lead us to conclude that while love was present from the beginning, fear was dominant and love only slowly rose to the ascendency.

* Rel. of Semites p 54.
* Psy. of Emotions p 309.
* Principles of Rel. Devel. p 104.
To some this ascendency of love means the immediate banishment or cessation of fear. These two are held to be directly opposed and irreconcilably antagonistic. But it is one of the questions we shall have to consider whether love does remove fear and whether God having become a God of love to his people does not in some sense continue a God of fear. Do these two, love and fear, have supplementary functions? Even in the highest form of the Christian religion, where love is so much in evidence, is fear still present, if only as a filial fear? Are both essential? These are some of the questions that shall confront us later.

In concluding this chapter on the development of the fear of God, it will be necessary for us to say a word about the excitants of this fear in Christianity. We have already spoken at length about the excitants of common fear and the difference in reference to the fear we study. We have implied that the excitant in the case of religious fear is unlike that of common fear and must be differently perceived. It must find its response in the religious nature of man, and only through that nature can it be recognized as an excitant. Whatever, therefore, will be effective as an excitant will be dependent upon the religious nature to which it must appeal. That nature, it goes without saying, is modifiable. There will be the same religious instinct to start with but even as in the course of generations, a man's hunger may be changed so that it is no longer aroused by the sight of a root or a cocoanut, but only by a roast duck or a mushroom steak, so there will be changes here, and one religion will develop a nature susceptible to certain 'signs' while in another religion it may take cognizance of something entirely different. In Christianity therefore, we shall expect to find the fear of
God nurtured and fed by divers excitations peculiar to itself. None of these may be emotional in their effects, and the reason will be plain after our discussion of the emotions on the higher planes of the religious life. Among the more immediate of such excitants we would note the atmosphere and attitude of the Christian home, the community, congregation, religious leaders, etc. The more fundamental excitants, however, are to be found in the records of the Old and the New Testaments and in the history of the church and her people.

Our purpose later will be to note some of these excitants, or fear-arousing elements which appear in the Scriptures and the experience of the Church and tend to create and nourish the fear attitude or "sentiment." For the present we shall proceed to point out in a more detailed way the features of this fear in its developed form.
CHAPTER II

The Characteristics and Nature of the Fear of God

We have thus far dealt with the instinctive bases underlying the fear of God and have traced out its development as a fact of mental experience. Much has already been said about it as it approaches the higher levels of development. Special attention has been given to its final appearance as a disposition or emotional attitude. It is now our purpose to undertake a more detailed study of its characteristics and its varieties or types in these later stages of development.

Beginning then with its characteristics, we have already seen that in primitive conditions the fear of the Supernatural was invoked by some phenomenon or cataclysm of nature. It was aroused by physical means and attached itself more or less to physical objects: to a holy place, a holy tree, the totem animal and so on. And in our own religion it has at times been incited to a large extent through the physical, as witnessed in the graphic descriptions of hell set forth in the preaching of the Middle Ages, and in the fearful paintings, stained glass windows, and mosaics that adorned the churches of former centuries. Even in our own day, as we have noticed, it may be dependent upon the attitudes of others or upon some other semi-physical means. But in its higher purer form the fear of God is stripped of these physical objectives and
becomes centered around an idea—the idea of God—and by this idea is aroused and called up. This idea in its essence may be the judgment or power of God. It may be the thought of what God has shown himself to be or may become. It may be the outcome of the conception of our inferior self in relation to God. But no matter, it is the idea of God in some of His aspects that forms the excitant and object of attachment in the case of the disposition which constitutes our fear of God. This is quite in agreement with Dreyer's treatment of the emotional side of the ideational level when he tells us that "it is the idea of the object rather than the object itself with which the emotional tendency must be regarded as associated.....thus we have: idea plus emotional tendency." We shall find our fear of God in its more mature development, therefore, attached to and called up by the idea of God and not some occurrence in the physical world.

In the second place we are to note that if the fear of God no longer expresses itself as a distinct emotion it certainly possesses an emotional colouring, as any one can attest who has observed himself in some circumstance where the fear of God has entered as an impelling motive or has been present with special force. He may be aware of the disposition to fear at any time but there are some times when it seems to have a particular appeal. The emotional colouring under such conditions may become quite noticeable.

As to the origin or manner of appearance of such a colouring in the physique it would be difficult to say for it is altogether too subtle to trace. If we hold with Ribot to the James-Lange theory which tells us that "the emotion is the way
the body feels while executing the various internal and expressive movements that occur on such occasions.

then we must with Ribot expect some evidence of organic and physical disturbance peculiar to the fear colouring. Failing to find this we might be led to conclude with Ribot that everything emotional had passed away. But such a conclusion is not in accord with some of the latest research, especially that of Cannon in the psycho-physiological field. For while Cannon by carefully planned experiments with the digestive system, the liver, blood, adrenal glands, and so on proved that there is a great background of organic disturbance accompanying emotion, this disturbance in a large measure seemed common to all strong emotions, and he was unable to show wherein any difference lay organically. In other words there is something about the emotion that gives it its peculiar tone that is not accounted for by the apparent organic disturbances. There is a subtle something that still evades the student of the emotions in the psycho-physiological field. It is not unreasonable to suppose that it is this something that is carried over into the ideational level and becomes the organic background of our emotional colouring when the more apparent disturbances of the emotion drop off and leave us nothing but the emotional disposition.

Whether this be the explanation or not, we must at any rate recognize this emotional colouring which would prevent anybody from thinking that at the full height of religion's development everything emotional had been extracted from it. Leuba has pointed out that the origin of religion embodies the three aspects of mental experience—the cognitive or knowing, the conative or willing, and the affective or emotional. These three continue to exist all through a religion's history and up into its highest development. A true religion requires all
of them and a religion of pure intellectualism does not exist. We therefore acknowledge the emotional colouring of which we have been speaking and guard against any tendency to overlook it on the higher levels.

Again, while the cruder fear of God tends to be a momentary passing thing, it now possesses endurance and is an abiding condition. Ribot# has rightly defined an emotion as "a phenomenon of sudden appearance and limited duration." Galloway# refers to the same characteristic when he speaks of an emotion as being intense and limited to a particular time. And this is exactly what we have in the more primitive conditions as regards religious fear. The savage like the child is a creature of momentary excitement, and fear remains only so long as the exciting object is present. But now this fear being carried to the ideational level becomes more or less permanent, an abiding thing. This is one of the most important characteristics of the new state of fear.

This condition of course must necessarily be fed by occasional stimuli, for it is conceivable that it would weaken and even pass away completely if there were no further manifestations to incite the mind and freshen the memory in such a direction. In the case of God, these additional stimuli are not wanting and as we read his Word or get more and more into the knowledge of Him we are continually encountering that which may feed and freshen our fear. But it is to be understood that the endurance of which we speak is not to be defined in terms of the mere repetition of the fear stimuli. We have rather a real set or attitude of the mind that abides and these incidental stimuli are but freshening factors.
Galloway\# probably refers to something like this when he writes, "the religious emotions, necessarily incoherent and fluctuating on the previous level of culture, now tend to grow into fixed dispositions." These he speaks of as giving "a constant tone to the religious mind." We have then the fear of God existing as an enduring thing. As such it is more or less a latent possession, only coming into concrete being whenever the idea of God occurs, especially under certain aspects of His righteousness, holiness, and justice. As such it becomes a permanent part of our religious make-up, an inherent element in our attitude towards God.

Lastly we would note that the fear of God as a disposition or sentiment may even be attended in some cases with occasional emotional outbursts. This is aside from the fact that it has an emotional colouring. And although we have said that as we leave the cruder and more primitive conditions of life the emotional expression of the fear of God tends to be subdued and suppressed, this suppression is never entirely accomplished. The experiences of the past several centuries offer us more dramatic instances of this perhaps than our own times. Take some of the pages, for instance, out of the life of Jonathan Edwards\# and read of the effects attending some of his preaching. Similar scenes\# though not so extreme, may be found in the life of Finney, to some extent in the life of Wesley, and especially in the work of some of Wesley's followers, Berridge and Hucks. In all these cases there were times when the fear of God was something more than a mere disposition. There was downright fear expressed in forms of an emotional outburst.

Or if we take a personal experience as that of Bunyan's\# we find such as this: "There was I struck..."
into a very great trembling, insomuch that at some times I could, for days together, feel my very body, as well as my mind, to shake and totter under the sense of the dreadful judgment of God, that should fall on those that have sinned that most fearful and unpardonable sin. I felt also such clogging and heat at my stomach, by reason of this my terror, that I was, especially at some times, as if my breast-bone would have split asunder." Nor are we limited to these more distant times for illustrations but instances of the same kind, though generally not so intense, are to be found now. Starbuck, in his quest into religion, received such answers as these to his inquiries, "The terrors of hell were dwelt on at revival until I became so scared I cried", "Had I died I had no hope, only eternal loss", "I feared God's punishment." Fear he found was still a prominent factor in conversion. And were it only known, there is probably many an instance in our religion today, where the fear of God approaches an emotional outburst. But fear is one of those things we hide and keep under cover. It is regarded as a sign of weakness and is consequently not to be displayed. Many of the cases such as we have described above are of course to be considered irrational. Many are those of children whose emotions are easily aroused and subject to little discrimination. Some of them are those of adult minds that have been rightly classed as morbid. But whatever the classification, it is conceivable that there are normal individuals who possess such a vivid sense of sin that at times it may occupy the focus of consciousness and produce little short of an emotional outburst. There comes to the writer's memory the case of a man who, fear haunted and greatly perturbed, came back, fifteen
years after committing a crime to deliver himself to the police and make what worldly amends he might. Thus it is that the fear of God has occasions of working in more vigorous forms than we at times credit it with.

So if we were to summarize the characteristics of the fear of God on the higher levels we should speak of it as a disposition or emotional tendency centering around the idea of God, possessing an emotional colouring, having endurance and under certain circumstances capable of emotional outbursts. In the technical language of the psychologist it would probably be called a simple sentiment.

Now it needs to be noticed that the presence of such a disposition or sentiment in no way precludes the existence of others at the same time. In fact we would observe that a number of them may combine in certain ways to form complex wholes.

#Note: Some psychologists deny the possibility of the existence of such a thing as a fear sentiment. We infer from Shand for instance (Brit. J. of Psy. Vol. 13 p 128) that such a sentiment would end in morbidity. Such may be true in some cases but in reference to God there are deterrent and counteracting attitudes that would prevent any such morbidity. On the other hand Drever (University Lecture, 3rd Term, 1924-25), Stout (Manual of Psy. p 418), and McDougall (Soc. Psy. p 163) recognise what they call a simple sentiment that is much like the thing we have in mind.
McDougall has made one of the best analyses at this point, although as we have seen he is inclined to reduce everything to naturalistic terms. Among the common emotions, for instance, he finds loathing to be a compound of fear and disgust, while hate is a product of anger, fear and disgust. In the religious field where his treatment is particularly stimulating he finds the principal emotions to be admiration, awe, and reverence. Each of these is a complex emotion, admiration being a composition of wonder and subjection; awe coming from wonder, sub­jection, and fear; while reverence is the result of either awe plus gratitude or awe plus the tender emotion. It is difficult to say how far McDougall may be right in his analysis as the matter is an extremely difficult one, yet there is no doubt but that fear does enter into combination with other emotions and sentiments to issue in more complex forms. Certainly there can be no question about its being a prominent element in awe and possibly rever­ence.

However we are not to understand that fear goes out and that these combinations become the sole emotions and sentiments, though they may be the chief in the more refined religious nature. Even McDougall would incline us to believe in a more or less independent existence of some of the simple emotions and sentiments along with the more complex ones. Thus speaking of fear he says, "in almost all religions, fear of divine punishment has con­tinued to play its all-important part in securing observance of social custom and law, and in leading communities to enforce their customs with severe penalties." And the old textbook of Mellone and Drummond while out of date in many respects is not a long ways from the truth when it informs us that
"when particular new feelings combine to give rise
to a new feeling, the new feeling is not only qual-
itatively distinct from its constituents but the
latter may continue to exist alongside the former as
distinguishable states"...Furthermore if fear were
not to have an independent existence, it is a ques-
tion how we could attain to the more refined emotions,
such as awe and reverence. These presume an ac-
quaintance with fear and without this it is difficult
to see how these more complex emotions could be
built up. Beard writing on this says, "The more
careful the analysis, the more true it seems that in
any and all life fear is a preliminary essential to
a development of awe, reverence, and admiration,"
and he further quotes H. M. Stanley as saying, "A
consciousness which has had no common fear stage
could never arrive at awe."

We feel therefore that while the fear of
God as a disposition or a sentiment may enter into
the formation of more complex states, at the same
time it preserves a certain identity and independence
of its own. The translators of the Bible seem to
have sensed some such thing for they retain 'The
fear of God' instead of using the milder 'awe' or
'reverence'. In fact we shall note shortly that
the 'fear of God' as it is often used in the
Scriptures is not only an independent disposition
but at times may even be a complex product itself.

At this point a word may be said in reply
to several objections that might be raised in con-
nection with our analysis. It might for instance
be objected that if the fear of God becomes nothing
but an emotional attitude, disposition, or sentiment
it loses its significance and becomes of little im-
portance in the Christian life. Such is not the
case however and we are much indebted to Shand for showing how great a part the sentiments play in the moulding of the character. They are indeed among the very fundamentals of character. Again some may object that such a state as we have been describing cannot be termed fear. We have shorn fear of its trembling, pallor, and stirred up state in general and it can no longer be called fear. But fear is a condition that is not to be characterised by the intensity of its outward expression. This is rightly noted by Whitney when he refers to the fear of reformed drunkards concerning their return of appetite. He says, "Because such a consciousness does not agitate us profoundly and constantly we may be inclined to call our feeling prudence rather than fear; the name does not matter; whether the feeling be calm or agonizing, it, nevertheless, is fear."

We have now sketched the features of the fear of God on the higher levels; we next proceed to discuss the varieties of such fear. These will be determined largely by the idea of God that is at the center of our fear, and the particular relation we sustain to God. The commonest form we have to deal with and the one best known is what is spoken of as servile fear. This is the fear that the ordinary individual has in mind when he refers to the fear of God. Here God is regarded as the punisher of evil and a Sovereign Being that brings all men to judgment. In the light of our sin and the consideration of His righteousness, justice and holiness there is a fear of Him. He is full of wrath towards all iniquity and no unclean thing will He tolerate. Penalty He will inflict upon the wrong-doer and the guilty soul He will chastise. The counterpart of such a fear in human relations is that which will
exist between master and servant or master and slave. It may range all the way from the cringing, cow­ering fear generally associated with the cruder phases of religion to a simple dread of God's punishment. Such a fear often has connected with it the paroxysms and physical manifestations of fear but not necessarily so and as the religion becomes more re­ fined it may assume the form of the disposition, or sentiment of which we have spoken and in which the central idea is that of a God of righteousness and wrath, a God who will in no wise permit sin to pass unheeded. This type of fear may become prominent in the unredeemed and at times has been strongly appealed to. How far it may continue in the believer is a matter of dispute, and this is one of the questions to be taken up later.

With the entrance of love into religion and the idea of God as a Father, our fear of God is altered. Now there is not so much the fear of punish­ment and a visitation of God's wrath upon us. Instead we find in God a loving Father who is sol­icitous for our welfare and will not be unmindful of the falling of even a sparrow to the ground. With such a Father there is forgiveness of sin, His re­deeming love is apparent. From Him we would never stray but His favor we would always covet and in the light of his countenance we would abide. Whatever fear arises in connection with Him is the fear that we may be separated from Him. There is fear lest we should commit offense or what Thomas Aquinas calls the "fear of fault." This fear is plainly different from the previous fear of servility and to it has been given the name of filial fear. For its counterpart we are referred to the father and son relation, but to give special emphasis to the great difference in quality between the two and the
something inherent, peculiar to the divine-human relation, we would utilise the word 'holy' and always speak of it as a holy filial fear. It would dread to take one step that would in any way break or weaken the bond that unites God and man. It may even gladly endure punishment and tribulation if only it can be assured of the steadfastness of the Father's favor. Such a fear, it will be readily seen, will be little associated with the more violent manifestations that may accompany the other fear we have spoken of. Love will at all times be acting as a restraint yet it is not impossible that even a holy filial fear may give outward expression. At any rate there is nothing to hinder it becoming a settled disposition or sentiment, centering around its own particular idea of God and having the marks of endurance and an emotional colouring. As such it will evidently be a strong element in the redeemed but it may also appear in some degree in the unredeemed, especially at that stage where there is a realization of the Father's grace and a turning to His mercy. Repentance has something more in it than mere servile fear. In this connection a question is raised as to what the relation will be between fear of the filial and of the servile type. Are we to expect the two to continue together or are they exclusive of one another? And may we look for a holy filial fear to always abide in the believer?

In connection with these two forms of fear we would also mention another kind which is not so well known but is referred to sometime as initial fear. It is a term designating that fear of God which may be found in the believer at the time of conversion and is nothing more than a combination of the two foregoing fears. On the one hand there is the dread of punishment urging the individual on, and on the other hand there is a holy filial fear.
lest offense be committed and God turn back and with­
hold His love. Thomas Aquinas in his analysis
has given attention to this variety of fear and
there is no doubt that there is such a fear. But
we do not see the necessity of giving it special
attention inasmuch as it is nothing more than the
result of the two fears we have already mentioned.
However, there is another type of fear we must men­
tion and for want of a better name we shall call it
'numinous' fear, following Otto. It is associated
with the sense of the inscrutable, majestic, over­
whelming power, the supreme authority, moral great­
ness, and mysterious sacredness of God. As McDoug­
all says we feel fear before "the mysterious, the
uncanny, and the supernatural", while G. A. Smith
asks who can escape fear in a universe where so much
is inscrutable and unknown about the Supreme Being.
Otto has carried this idea to its highest devel­
opment when in his monumental work "The Idea of the
Holy" he searches out the non-rational in our re­
ligion and attempts to analyse into its elements,
by analogy, that which in our religious experience
cannot possibly be put into conceptual form or de­
finition. It is well for sake of clearness that we
present Otto's theory in brief at this point as we
shall be referring to it later on. To begin with,
Otto presents us with the idea of the 'Holy' as
being composed of rational and non-rational elements,
the latter being what we might call the over-plus in
the Holy. The rational, he tells us, is expressed
in conceptual terms such as goodness, separateness,
and so on. The non-rational on the other hand can­
ot be expressed in concept or definition but must be
reached solely through the feelings. These feelings
cannot be aroused directly but only indirectly. They
must be induced and incited by means of sympathetic
insight with what passes in another's mind or by
means of a holy situation. Nor can they be described
except by use of analogy. Such are the non-rational elements with which Otto concerns himself and he sets out by analogy and other indirect means to tell us what they are. He speaks of them as the 'numinous in our experience of the Holy. This 'numinous' begets in the worshipper a 'creature feeling' while on its objective side its fundamental characteristic is what he calls the 'mysterium tremendum'. It is this which interests us most in our work, for the attribute of 'tremendum' is especially charged with fear. In one respect it shows itself as 'awesomeness which on the part of the worshipper becomes 'unapproachability.' The recognition of this side of the Divine is so universal that many languages have special words designating it. Its antecedent stage shows itself in primitive conditions as 'daemonic dread'. Otto finds the beginning of all religious development in the emergence of this feeling in the mind of primitive man. It is "the basic factor and the basic impulse underlying the entire process of religious evolution." Nor does it disappear, but even in our highest culture we find this 'daemonic dread' present in modified form. Two other elements found in the 'tremendum' of the 'numinous' are 'majestas' or 'absolute overpoweringness' and 'energy or'urgency', but these are of less interest to us. Then in the analysis of the 'mysterium' we have an attribute which on the part of the worshipper becomes the sense of the 'wholly other' and begets a state which Otto characterizes as 'stupor'-signifying blank wonder, absolute amazement, astonishment that strikes us dumb. A question from Augustine quoted in this connection is enlightening. "What is that which gleams through me and smites my heart without wounding it? I am both a-shudder and a-glow. A-shudder, in so far as I am unlike it, a-glow in so-far as I am like it." It is true perhaps that Otto
in trying to get so far above the conceptual level over reaches himself but at any rate we cannot help but believe that he has opened up a field here which will have general recognition among the spiritually sensitive.

It may be felt, however, that this type of fear will not fit into our scheme of treatment. And it is true that the non-rational and the rational can hardly be dealt with in the same category, at least we can hardly expect to rationalise the non-rational. We shall content ourselves therefore with merely calling attention to this form of fear from time to time as we proceed without attempting to reduce it to the conceptual, or to make it conform to any rational schematisation.

Finally it remains for us to say a word about a certain use of the phrase the fear of God, which is especially characteristic of parts of the Old Testament. In certain instances the Old Testament speaks of a fear which is more than fear as we have been dealing with it. Whitney in an article on fear notes this and speaks of it as an 'Old Testament fear', saying that it is "a thing much larger and more complex" than ordinary fear. Cremer describing the same thing tells us that "it is a comprehensive designation of the religious character as a whole and specially a comprehensive designation of religious life and conduct....it becomes the disposition and bearing of one who in everything is guided by a reference to God." We thus have something that includes more than 'fear' in its makeup. It is a complex product. However, fear may still be said to be the main element or factor in this product.

We have now designated the varieties of the fear of God. Of the number mentioned three—servile, filial, and 'numinous' fear—will be of immediate concern in this study, while fear as a comprehensive

\[\text{Place of Fear Among Motives of Religion—Bibl. Sacr. Vol. 63 p22}\]

\[\Phi\delta\sigma\varsigma \text{ Cremer’s Lexicon p 897.}\]
term will be dealt with only incidentally. These are the outstanding types and the ones presenting the greatest difficulties and we would like in some measure to indicate their role in our religion, their bearing upon the Christian life, their place and utility.
CHAPTER III

The Contribution of the Old Testament to the Fear of God.

Having studied the nature and characteristics of the fear of God and having analysed the elements that enter into it, we now purpose to ascertain the proper and legitimate bases and foundation for such a fear and to examine some of the bona fide excitants of it. In the mind of the Christian there will be no doubt that our search will lead us at once to the Bible. The Bible itself is emphatic on this and repeatedly informs us that the fear of God is to be learned and taught through the Holy Word. "Assemble me the people," it tells us, "and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they live upon the earth, and that they may teach their children." (Dt. 4:10) (See also Dt. 6:2, 31:12-13, Ps. 34:11, Prov. 2:5)

We begin therefore with the Bible and first undertake the study of the Old Testament. At the very outset we are amazed at the wealth of the Hebrew vocabulary in respect to words denoting fear or trembling or states of similar import. At least

---

#Note: The following is a list of such words. The few expressions in parenthesis are from Wilson's Bible Students Guide. Otherwise the meaning is taken
Note cont.:- from the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon. נָפָח—terror, dread. נָפָח—be disturbed, terrified, "struck with terror". נָפִי—startle, terrify, "to fear with great consternation of mind". נָפַי—dread, be afraid of. נָפַי—be anxious, fear, dread, "fear with great anxiety." נָפַי—fear, be afraid, shrink away in fear, hold back. נָפַי—may refer to writhing (in contortions of fear). נָפַי—(Aramaic—be straitened, unable to move for fear and rage) quake, "to be in trepidation, to be constrained to a thing through fear and dread". נָפַי—tremble, be terrified, (as of a mountain or persons under supernatural influence), "includes not only anxiety and solicitude, coupled with fear of some evil, but also such a violent commotion of the mind as agitates the body also". נָפַי—to be broken under divine judgment, dismayed, means fear or terror in many of its derivatives. נָפַי—be afraid, fear, "live in fear of some evil that may befall us". נָפַי—fear, be afraid "put for the whole of a religious character". נָפַי—cause to tremble, tremble, "primary significance seems to have been to quake." נָפַי—dread, be in dread, in awe, (Piel) be in great dread, "implies a fear which is vehement". נָפַי—shudder. נָפַי—be agitated, quiver, quake, "to be moved with any violent emotion as fear". נָפַי—fear. נָפַי—trembling, panic. נָפַי—tremble, quake. נָפַי—quake, shake. נָפַי—bristle (With horror), to have horror, "to shudder from fear". Possibly also נָפַי, נָפַי and נָפַי. It is to be remembered that most of these words we have given are verb roots and that in many cases one word stands for a mass of derivatives of varying shades of meaning and import.
twenty one words of this character may be catalogued. Most of them are root words and their derivatives swell the 'fear' words to great numbers. An examination of these words and their uses leads us to conclude that they all refer to fear of a servile nature. Only one exception might be taken to this and that is in the case of the root \( \text{X} \). This is of special importance being used most of the time where fear occurs in the Old Testament. There is an inclination on the part of some to soften its meaning into reverence or a filial fear but 'fear' here is something more than these. This word refers primarily to fear of a servile nature or a strong dread. Cremer who has made a very intensive study (Lexicon, Art. \( \text{X} \)) of the Old Testament words related in meaning to the Greek \( \text{X} \) tells us that \( \text{X} \) is the most important 'fear' word in the Biblical Hebrew, "as used of the bearing of man towards God, and as standing in a religious sense". Not only, he says, does such a fear, as it indicates, appear as a ruling motive of the moral and religious life, but it may also be a "comprehensive designation of the religious character as a whole...and especially a comprehensive designation of religious life and conduct." He tells us that the word 'reverence' cannot be applied to this complex 'desire' for "in it the fear of God's judgment falls too much out of thought". Furthermore he is touching upon filial fear when he informs us that, "the fear of God, moreover, is in its essence not only fear of His power and judgment...but a dread springing from reverence lest we should sin against Him or displease Him". Whether we consider it, however, as a comprehensive state or as filial fear, he goes on to say that, "the fundamental idea nevertheless remains, which is awe of God's judgment... which qualifies the demeanour throughout, and thus it becomes the disposition and bearing of one who in everything is guided by a reference to God, and it is dignified the fear of God".
Thus it is Cremer’s opinion that the idea of God’s judgment, the servile element, persists in the word even in its more refined states and in taking the same position we would add the following to what already has been said:

1) \(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\) in its primary use means fear, fright, or even terror and flight. In reference to it the Oxford Lexicon gives 'fear' as the preferred translation and even where other meanings are allowable the former is generally given priority. In the case of some of the derivatives, the meaning is even interpreted in such strong words as great fear or terror.

2) The Old Testament indisputably uses this word in the sense contended for above, in reference to natural situations as when Jacob explains his flight from Laban by saying "Because I was afraid (\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\))" (Gn. 31:31), or Jacob and his sons see the money brought back from Egypt and "were afraid (\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\))" (Gn. 42:35), or the men of Israel flee from before Goliath and "were sore afraid (\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\))" (1 Sam. 17:24), etc., etc. Such a use of this word is plainly one of real fear and we would be inclined to expect a similar use elsewhere unless there is reason to the contrary and this we do not have.

3) In fact there are cases where this word/explicitly used in this very sense with reference to God. "I heard thy voice in the garden and I was afraid (\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\)), because I was naked" (Gn. 3:10). "The people feared (\(\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\text{\textit{\textbf{x}}}\)) the Lord" in the face of the destruction of Pharaoh’s army (Ex. 14:31). In these and other cases we certainly have nothing less than 'fear'.

4) It is to be admitted that there are some passages where a holy filial fear or reverence would seem to serve the purpose of translation but there are none of these in which 'fear' cannot be used equally as well and, as noted above, there are
some instances where it is absolutely indispensable. Under such conditions fear of a servile type would seem to be the better all round word. Both the Authorized Version and the Revised Version seem to take this point of view as they retain 'fear' throughout.

5) Lastly we would note that the very manner in which God is presented would beget servile fear rather than the milder 'reverence' or filial fear. In both of these, love and the tender emotion are a dominating element and while we undoubtedly have the love of God Pictured in the Old Testament, the more general presentation is that of His righteousness, justice and holiness. So that the very conception of God exhibited is one that would incline us to expect a servile fear rather than a fear of a milder type. In fact taking all into consideration servile fear is the predominating type of fear in this portion of the Holy Scriptures.

In proceeding now to the study of this fear as set forth in the Old Testament, we are confronted with a choice of three methods. Firstly, we may use the material as it stands and as it impresses itself upon the common mind. There is no doubt 'something to be said for this method, at least in getting at some of the occasional effects found in the religion of the common mind. For if the whole revelation of God is to be considered as one picture with all its parts of equal importance, if the God in the presence of whom Moses must take off his shoes or by whom Uzzah is struck dead is to be put side by side with the God whose fear bringeth salvation, length of days, and mercy, then we may excuse fear when it appears in unseemly ways as manifested in some revivals or in the frequent attempts to capitalize natural catastrophies in the interests of religion. But we are dealing with a higher type of religion than this and so will pass over this first method. A second method that might be used is that of treating our material in its historical order. This would be the ideal way if we were favored with data that was
historically accurate but this we do not have. The facts given to us are the results of generations of oral tradition, compilation, and remodelling. In any such process it is the emotional side that suffers most. The generation that does the writing injects its own feelings into the situations it depicts. The stories it tells and the truths it dwells upon are those that express its own emotional nature, and strike a responsive chord within its own temperament. Thus it is that each generation writes to an end largely determined by its own feelings and coloured by its own emotions. Under the circumstances therefore we shall reject the strictly historical order and follow one that will be chronological as regards the time of the writing. This we feel, will more nearly express the fear contemporaneous with the successive generations of writers.

We begin then with the records written preceding "J" or before 850 B.C. These we find extremely fragmentary and the instances in them where motives or cases of fear may be deduced are still more fragmentary. Even the placing of the material in this period is a matter of question since the date cannot be fixed with certainty. However, we shall trust Kautzsch* to guide us generally, and first in order we shall note the Decalogue (Ex. 20) which has the weight of several authorities as being the earliest. In two cases here we have a threat of punishment but both of these are supposed to be later additions. The general tenor of the commandments however, is that the "Lord thy God" by virtue of being God is to be obeyed. Thus while we have no direct appeal to fear the background is certainly tinged with it. Following this we come to the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5) where God is represented as terrible to His enemies but "let them that love Him be as the sun that goeth forth in his might." The next important passage is the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20:23). The descriptive part of this dealing
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with the trembling of the people before the theophany of God on Sinai, is assigned generally to a much later period. In the remaining part, however, idolatry, disobedience, and irreverence are to be punished, the "wrath of God" will wax hot upon the oppressor of the weak, and his "terror" will go before Israel to defeat her enemies. There may also be included in this same period three short passages placed here by Bewer* the Song of Miriam in which God is pictured as a victorious man of war, throwing terror and trembling into the enemies of Israel (Ex. 15); the Incantation to the Ark, in which God is again represented as terrible to his enemies but kind to his chosen (Num. 10:35); and the Cultic Decalogue, in which it is implied that the alien nations will fear God for his wonders among His chosen (Ex. 34:10).

In all the foregoing cases we feel that our material is too meagre and indefinite for us to make any trustworthy conclusions. About all we shall be justified in saying is that we have elements tending to stimulate both fear and the tender emotion from the very first. Fear seems to be especially expected on the part of the disobedient or the enemies of God.

Coming now to "J" (850 B.C.) we find a connected narrative that gives us our first real material for the study of fear. Here the fear of God is essentially on a physical plane and is stirred up with physical manifestations. Thus we have the theophany on Sinai (Ex. 19) where the presence of God is indicated in thunders, lightnings, fire, and smoke, while the people tremble and the very mountain quakes. Again Moses standing before the burning bush (Ex. 3:5) is required to show his attitude by a physical act— the removal of his shoes. At times the forms of reaction that accompany the fear of God in this portion of the Bible are very much
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like those of primitive fear. Shand has catalogued
the latter at length and finds some eight different
reactions that may accompany it, among which he
mentions flight, hiding, silence, clinging, shrink­
ing, immobility, and crying for help. Many of these
are plainly expressed in the religious fear we find
in "J", as when Adam and Eve (Gn.3:8) hide in the
garden, or the children of Israel shrink from the
mountain, or Joshua falls upon his face (Josh.5:14),
giving us a certain aspect of immobility. In fact
we even have several instances of fear in this por­
tion of the Scriptures that are little short of ir­
religious and unethical. Thus we have the Lord mak­
ing a covenant with Abram. And after the larger
sacrificial animals have been divided and the half­
es together with the undivided birds are laid over
against one another a deep sleep and the horror of
great darkness falls upon Abram (Gn.15:12). This
scene has been described for us as a "vivid tran­
script of primitive religious experience".*. It is
said that it is "the coming of Yahweh that freezes
him with supernatural dread".** The whole incident
is redolent with the weird and uncanny. Again in an
otherwise peaceful passage pertaining to the removal
of Moses into Egypt (Ex.4:18) we have introduced
such a fearful sentence as this, "And it came to
pass on the way at the lodging place, that the Lord
met him, and sought to kill him". Some would attempt
to lightly explain this on the basis that it was
simply an oriental way of saying that Moses was sick.
But if so there must have been a frightful concep­
tion of Yahweh back of it. We may rightly assume
that everything appearing in our religious records
will subserve a religious or an ethical end but in
these two cases at least it is difficult to see
wherein such an end is ministered to. Otto* it is
true makes a great deal of the second instance we
have mentioned as being an almost pure example of
"the lower stage of numinous consciousness, viz.
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daemonic dread," in which case it would be a residue from a 'pre-god' stage when the 'numinous' was very crudely felt. But in the light of more elevated conceptions it appears devoid of anything religious and ethical. We have tried to find something in the religious customs or conceptions of the Semitic peoples which might throw some light on it or give us some clue as to its origin but we have failed to discover anything, unless we have an inkling in these words from Jastrow*: "The thought whether the deity was justified in exercising his wrath did not trouble him (the worshipper) any more than the investigation of the question whether the punishment was meted out in accordance with the extent of the wrong committed. With such a conception of deity we can understand how it might be possible to think of God as a capricious Being who would kill His creatures without an attempt at a reason. But whatever may be the explanation, it is not easy to see wherein such incidents of fear find a place in the records of our religion.

On the other hand in the writings of this time we do have some splendid illustrations of a primitive 'numinous' fear, largely physical in setting, yet not without a reasonable basis and religious import. For it is in this time that the feeling and the idea of the Holy begin to take form. Moses, for instance, is led to appreciate the unapproachability of God when turning aside to see the burning bush he is told "Draw not high hither", and is caused to sense the unique separateness and 'wholly other'ness of the Holy when he is told to put off his shoes. The same thing is revealed in Israel's experience before Sinai when the people must be purified and their garments washed ere they can survive the visit of the Lord. Neither they nor their seventy elders are permitted to come into His
actual presence, but must worship afar off and are strictly charged not to approach too near under threat of dire consequence. The very animals of the flocks and herds are not permitted to graze before the mount.

In "J" therefore we have unmistakeable evidences of the servile fear of God but as yet this fear is essentially on a physical plane, attended with physical reactions, and dependent upon physical stimulants. Mankind is still at the perceptual level of existence and amenable to his senses... Considering such limitations, nevertheless we have a fear that is exalted and spiritual, especially when compared with the religious fears of other primitive peoples, although, as we have noticed, there are traces in it of a fear that is quite unethical and irreligious.

Now taking up the E (750 B.C.) document we find a considerable transition. The physical is still somewhat in evidence as in Jacob's dream at Bethel (Gn.28:10), Moses' hiding his face (Ex.3:6), and in the Song of Moses (Ex.15), although the last may belong to an earlier period or may be employing a poetical figure when it speaks of the people trembling. In general, however, there is a decrease in the physical aspects of fear, and at the same time an increasing presence of the tender emotion, even to the point of God being a refuge from certain kinds of fear. The latter is particularly evident in God's dealing with the patriarchs, as when He says, "Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield" (Gn.15:1). Here we have the faint grounds for the rising of a Holy filial fear, but the decrease in the physical accompaniments of fear and the presence of the love emotion in this portion of the Scriptures do not warrant us in saying that servile fear is passing away and becoming obsolete. Servile fear is still the type of fear primarily referred to but it tends more to the form of what we have called an abiding disposition and becomes more of an element in the inner life. As such
we find some strong claims made for it. It is re- 
cognized as a mark of piety, as when Abraham at the 
point of sacrificing Isaac is told to withhold his 
hand, for, "now I know that thou fearest God" (Gn. 
22:12), or Joshua among his last words to the chil- 
dren of Israel tells them, "Now therefore fear the 
Lord, and serve Him in sincerity and in truth" (Josh. 
24:14). Again this fear is set forth as a motive 
for righteousness. Abraham distrusts Abimlech 
because he says, "the fear of God is not in this 
place" (Gn.20:11); Joseph releases his brethren from 
prison and lets them return home, saying, "This do 
and live; for I fear God" (Gn.42:18); the midwives 
refuse to carry out the orders of Pharaoh because 
they feared God (Ex.1:17); and the judges of Israel 
are selected with the fear of God as one of their 
chief characteristics (Es.18:21). And along with 
the above evidences of fear we should note that 
God himself is presented in a fearful aspect in 
these portions of Scripture. He is "fearful in 
praises, doing wonders" (Ex.15:11). He is spoken 
of as the "Fear of Isaac" (Gn.31:42,53), being here 
addressed as the object of Isaac's fear, even as at 
a later time he is addressed as the object of love. 
Again he sends forth His wrath (Ex.15;7) and His 
terror (Ex.23:27) as independent agents of fright- 
fulness. They go out to discomfit and consume as 
personified forces, subject to His will and turn 
back only at His bidding. Especially is he fearful 
to His enemies and to the disobedient. The enemy 
are consumed as stubble, terror and dread fall 
upon them, the hornet drives them out (Ex.15,23:27). 
At the same time He flames with anger toward the 
disobedient Israelites for their idolatry (Num.25:3); 
He threatens to consume them (Ex.33:5); His fire 
burns among them for their murmuring (Num.11:1); He 
decends with punishment upon Miriam and Aaron 
for their apostasy (Numbers 12:9) and engulfs Korah
and his associates in complete destruction (Num. 16). Surely such a picture of God must beget fear in all that would contemplate it. Furthermore, before leaving this portion of our study, we must also note that numinous fear is in evidence. One of the finest instances of this is found in the experience of Jacob at Bethel (Gn. 28:10) when he awakens from his dream and "he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven".

This completes our brief review of "E". If we now attempt to gather up our findings we shall say that in "E" while the physical aspects of fear are present to some extent they tend to decrease and the fear of God becomes more ethicized and spiritualized. It is still servile fear however. Henceforth Israel regards this fear of God as a mark of piety and a motive for righteousness. There is at the same time a dawning of holy filial fear and even a possibility that in some instances we have fear used in the broader sense to which we referred in the previous chapter when it becomes a comprehensive designation of the religious character with 'fear' as a central element. Examples of numinous fear are also found.

In regard to the remainder of the Old Testament an attempt to go into a minute study of each book or division will lead to too much detail so that we shall note only the broader features, in one or two cases pointing out special characteristics bearing upon our subject. In our discussion we shall omit the Wisdom Literature and the Psalms until the last for reasons given later.

To begin with, it is to be noticed that two of the main claims for the fear of God continue
to be, first, that it is a deterrent from evil and a motive for righteousness, and, second, what might be considered the positive side of the first, that it serves as a mark of piety and faithfulness. In such capacities it appears throughout all works of the priestly editors and the prophets. In reference to fear inducing righteousness for instance, we have such as this, "Oh that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always" (Dt.5:29), or this, "all the people shall hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously" (Dt.17:13), or again, "Now therefore let the fear of the Lord be upon you: take heed and do it" (II Chr. 19:7). (See also Lev.19:14, 19:32, 25:36, 25:43; Dt.5:29, 6:2, 6:24, 10:20, 17:13, 17:19, 25:18; I Sam. 12:14, 23:3; I K. 8:40; II Chr. 19:9; Neh. 5:9, 5:15; Jer.5:22, 32:40, 44:10; Ez. 30:13) Then as examples of the fear of God being the test of a man's piety we find that Obadiah "feared the Lord greatly" (I K.18:3), the husband of the widow befriended by Elisha "did fear the Lord" (II K.4:1), and Hananiah "was a faithful man, and feared God above many" (Neh.7:2). (See also Dt.6:13, 10:12, 13:3,4; I Sam. 12:24; I K.18:12; Neh.1:11; Is.11:2,3, 66:5; Jer. 32:39, 40; Hos.5:5; Jon.1:9; Hg.1:12; Mal.3:5, 3:16) All of which refer primarily to a servile fear. We also find strong evidences of a numinous fear continuing throughout this portion of the Bible. Gideon and Manoah experience fear at the manifestation of the Lord. (Jd.6:22, 13:6, 13:2:) The sixth chapter of Isaiah is a masterpiece on the subject. It is charged with the 'numinous'. "Woe is me! for I am undone", cries the prophet in the grip of his vision. Ezekiel is likewise full of the same feeling (Ez.1:28 3:23,9:8), while from Daniel we get this description "the men that were with me saw not the vision; but a great quaking fell upon them, and they fled to hide themselves" (Dan.10:7). (See also I Chr.21:30 and Jer.5:22).
In this connection it is advantageous for us to glance briefly at the backgrounds of thought furnished by the leading schools of this era, having a bearing on the fear of God. Speaking of the Deuteronomists, we find their two leading principles to be the unity of God and the unity or centralization of His worship. There is no place for minor heathen gods or for secondary shrines of worship in their system, and the God of Israel is presented with such magnitude and His worship conducted on such a scale that it has a significance for the fear of Him and gives added point to such a passage as Dt. 10:17 "the Lord your God, he is God of gods, and Lord of lords, the great God, the mighty, and the terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward". Then in contrast with this we have the Priestly Editors emphasizing the idea of ritual holiness and ceremonial cleanness. God demands special observances on the part of those who worship Him nor can He be approached lightly. He is still the unapproachable into whose most holy presence only the high priest may come once a year and then only after due preparation. At other times He must be worshipped at a distance and only by those ceremonially clean and following the prescribed rites. Those who attempt to try anything different than that which is prescribed suffer death (Lev. 10:1-7). The whole life of the people is bound round with the most minute regulations, even to a classification of food into the clean and unclean. Such a regulation of life, we are told, was designed to discipline the people to a constant remembrance of Yahweh. But in the conception of such an exacting God, a God who becomes a gigantic martinet, there is certainly the basis for a thoroughgoing fear, even an unhealthy fear, such as we shall find later appearing in the earlier life of Luther.

As for the prophets, we find them filled with references that stir up fear. If we attempt to
piece together the fearful lines appearing in them we have a God who exhibits fury (Is. 63:6; Jer. 7:19, 21:5; 25:15; Ez. 9:8, 30:15; Mic. 5:15; Nah. 1:6). See also Lev. 26:28), anger (Is. 13:9; Jer. 4:26, 7:19; Mic. 5:15; Nah. 1:6). See also Num. 11:1, 12:9, 25:3), and wrath (Is. 9:19, 13:9; Jer. 21:5, 10:10. See also Num. 16:46; Dt. 29:20; II K. 22:13; II Chr. 34:25). He is to be feared because of the punishment He inflict or holds out toward the enemy and the disobedient (Is. 19:16; Joel 2:1, 2:11; Jonah 1:16; Zeph. 3:7).

The holy in itself is the preeminent background of all this religious thought and feeling and we would say a word about it here for it is a conception common to the Deuteronomists, the priestly school, and the prophets alike, although each may emphasize different aspects of it. It is a matter worthy of intensive and extensive study in connection with such a subject as religious fear. Such ideas as that of taboo, the ban, the clean and unclean, and so on are bound up with it. Robertson Smith* refers to the wideness of its appeal when he tells us that "Rules of holiness... i.e. a system of restrictions on man's arbitrary use of natural things, enforced by the dread of supernatural penalties, are
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found among all primitive peoples." He further characterizes it very well in its primitive mode when he says, "the mysterious superhuman powers of the god—the powers which we call supernatural—are manifested, according to primitive ideas, in and through his physical life, so that every place and thing which has natural associations with the god is regarded, if I may borrow a metaphor from electricity, as charged with divine energy and ready at any moment to discharge itself to the destruction of the man who presumes to approach it unduly".

This is exactly the conception we have throughout much of the Old Testament and a great array of places and things may be listed as charged with holiness.* Thus there are places set apart as sacred, such as holy ground, the tabernacle and its courts, the temple and its precincts, Jerusalem and its hills, and the heavenly abode; there are things consecrated at these holy places, such as the furniture of the tabernacle, the sacrifices of animals, tithes, the anointing oil of the priest, the incense, shew-bread, the temple treasures, and consecrated things in general; there are persons who are holy by reason of connection with these places, such as the priests and Israel as a nation; there are the times which are consecrated to the temple worship; and finally there are things and persons ceremonially cleansed and so holy to God. The inviolability of such holy places and things and the penalty visited upon those who would approach them unseemly or without due qualification is shown when the men of Beth-shemesh are smitten dead for looking into the ark (I Sam.6:19), when Uzzah meets the same penalty for touching the ark (II Sam.6:6), and when David will not smite the Lord's anointed (I Sam.24:6, 26:9) lest he be laying hands upon that which is holy. But here the question arises—if the things pertaining to God are so imbued with this energy of
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holiness what may we expect of God himself? Surely the very person of God will be infinitely more holy than the objects consecrated by him and under such a conception of God we shall have a cause for fear which if carried to its logical conclusions will be paralysing. The holiness of God taken by itself will be nothing short of terrifying.

We have already noted in previous connections that as we have progressed the physical element in fear has been decreasing. In the portion we are now studying the absence of these physical characteristics is even more pronounced. It is true that David (I Chr.16:30) sings of the earth trembling (See also Is.19:16, 41:5; Jer.10:10; Dan.10:7; Hos. 11:10; Mic.7:17), and that Isaiah talks of the House of Jacob hiding in the rocks (Is.2:10,19) and the inhabitants of the earth fleeing (Is.24:18) but these are mostly cases where the reactions of fear are used in a figurative sense. Even the anthropomorphic presentation of God is suppressed and, although God still acts as a lion (Amos 1:2, 3:8; Jer. 25:38; Hos.11:10; Joel 3:16) and shakes His hand over Egypt (Is.19:16), these are but symbolical expressions and the appeal is more and more to the strictly spiritual. As a consequence the fear of God is becoming largely a disposition as witnessing in Obadiah's words, "I thy servant fear the Lord from my youth" (I K.18:12); and in these words from Deuteronomy, "Oh that there were such a heart in them that they would fear me and keep all my commandments always" (5:29), and again in Joshua (4:24) where an altar is built "that all the people...may fear the Lord your God forever". (See also Dt.31:12, 13; Jer. 32:40 etc.). In all these cases we have a fear that is not a passing outburst of emotion but an abiding thing. Moreover on many occasions this 'fear'
represents the comprehensive state or attitude we have previously mentioned. Thus when we read "Assemble me the people, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me" (Dt. 4:10), or "afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God...and shall come with fear unto the Lord and to his goodness in the latter days" (Hos. 3:5) we feel that we are dealing with something more than mere fear or a fear disposition. Rather it seems to be a term defining the whole religious bearing with fear as a central element.

(See also Dt. 8:6, 31:13; Jon. 1:9; Hag. 1:12; Mal. 3:16) But it is to be borne in mind that such a broad meaning is not general in its application, in fact it is quite limited. It cannot, for instance, be used in such passages as Dt. 17:13 "all the people shall hear, and fear, and do no more presumptuously" and Is. 8:13. "The Lord of Hosts,....let him be your fear, and let him be your dread". The interpretation of these demands 'fear' in a narrower sense, a fear which continues to be servile in its nature. (See also Is. 41:5, 54:14; Jer. 5:22; Amos 3:8; Mic. 7:17; Zeph. 3:7)

But we are not to forget that the picture of God so far resulting from our discussion is only a partial picture. The gathering together in this manner of only the fearful elements gives us an unbalanced conception of God. We need to remember that it requires to be completed with lovelier lines. Alongside the thought of the God of fear is also the God that loves, that has been as a devoted husband to an unfaithful wife, that has wooed His people to do right. If the Old Testament has told us of a God that is to be feared, it has also told us of a God that draws us with the bonds of love.

No other literature save the New Testament has risen to such heights in the presentation of the more
tender side of God. This furnishes us with a great paradox in our religion. On the one hand we are to sanctify the Lord of hosts, and in the same sentence we are told "let him be your fear, and let him be your dread" (Is. 8:13). Or again his right hand is a fiery law and at the same time "he loveth the peoples" (Dt. 33:2,3). (See also Ps. 5:7)

We have reserved the Wisdom Literature and the Psalms for the last, not that they were written last but that they were at least compiled among the last and are a reflex of a later day as well as an earlier one. They embody much material that is very ancient but difficult to separate into its proper strata. It is sufficient for us to note that they appeal to feelings that are universal in time and place— they gather up the fundamentals. The mere fact that they were compiled late is evidence that they found a response in a late day. We are treating them therefore as more or less the last word in fear in the Old Testament. They contain all the strands of fear that we have been following. The two old designations of fear as a motive of righteousness and fear as a mark of piety for instance are very copiously dealt with in this portion of the Scriptures. (For fear as motive of righteousness and deterrent from evil see Ps. 19:9, 25:12, 36:1, 128:1; Provs. 3:7, 8:13, 14:16, 16:6. For fear as a mark of piety and faithfulness see Job. 1:1; Ps. 2:11, 15:4, 31:19, 33:18, 34:7, 66:16, 112:1, 115:11, 115:13, 118:4, 119:38, 119:63, 147:11; Provs. 14:2, 23:17, 24:21, 31:30; Ecc. 5:7, 12:13). And what is true of these is in general true of the others. We still have the more terrible lines of God pictured.

And as regards the numinous, Job is considered by Otto as the great classic on this. It is
true that Job is "not so much concerned with the awefulness of the numen as with its mysteriousness" but we still have the strand of numinous fear in it as is clearly shown in these words from Otto: "in the 38th chapter of Job we have the element of the mysterious displayed in rare purity and completeness, and this chapter may well rank among the most remarkable in the history of religion. Job has been reasoning with his friends against Elohim, and--as far as concerns them--he has been obviously in the right. They are compelled to be dumb before him. And then Elohim Himself appears to conduct His own defence in person. And He conducts it to such effect that Job avows himself to be overpowered, truly and rightly overpowered, not merely silenced by superior strength ...

In the last resort it relies on something quite different from anything that can be exhaustively rendered in rational concepts, namely, on the sheer absolute wondrousness that transcends thought, on the mysterium, presented in its pure, non-rational form." Later referring to the descriptions of the crocodile and hippopotamus introduced into Job, he says, "they, no less than all the previous examples and the whole context, tenor, and sense of the entire passage, do express in masterly fashion the downright stupendousness, the wellnight daemonic and wholly incomprehensible character of the eternal creative power". And alongside the passages cited by Otto we would place another occurring in Job, which is filled with 'numinous' fear and surpassing in its description of that fear. Eliphaz is speaking to Job and tells of his experience. "In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up. It stood still, but I could not discern the appearance thereof; a form was before mine eyes; silence, and I heard a voice,
"Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?" (Job 4:13-17)

In addition to the above we also have several new lines of thought in the Wisdom Literature and the Psalms. Fear is set forth in a number of instances as an element in worship. "In thy fear", the Psalmist says, "will I worship toward thy holy temple" (Ps. 5:7). Again it is said, "Ye that fear the Lord praise him". (Ps. 22:23). (See also Ps. 96:4, 96:9, 99:1-4, 135:20; Job 15:4) Then great stress is laid on the fact that the God-fearing are subjects of special providence. Thus "the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him" (Ps. 34:7); "there is no want to them that fear him" (Ps. 34:9), and "he hath given meat to them that fear him" (Ps. 111:5). (See also Pss 31:19, 33:18, 61:5, 85:9, 103:11, 103:13, 103:17, 112:1, 118:4, 128:4, 145:19, 147:11; Prov. 1:27, 14:27, 19:23, 22:4, 28:14, 31:30; Ecc. 7:18, 8:12) And lastly we find fear set forth as the beginning of wisdom and as even being fundamental in wisdom. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge", we are told (Prov. 1:7). And again, "What man", it asks, "is he that feareth the Lord? Him shall he instruct in the way that he shall choose" (Ps. 25:12). (See also Ps. 25:14, 111:10; Prov. 1:29, 2:5, 9:10, 15:33; Job. 28:28) No doubt in many of these references 'fear' is something of the designation of a comprehensive attitude or character such as we have already spoken of. Wisdom for instance in the Jewish sense covers the wide fields of ethics, natural science, philosophy, religion, and knowledge in general. The true essential and fundamental requirement to all this is a right attitude or 'fear' of the Lord. At the same time there is as we have noted a real fear occupying a central place in this attitude. Thus it is that "the secret (or counsel) of the Lord is with them that fear him" (Ps. 25:14) and the book of
Ecclesiastes summarises the Preacher's discussion of the illusions of life by telling us that this is "the conclusion of the whole matter: fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man" (Ecc.12:13). In a similar vein the Old Testament closes on a fear note, the concluding chapters of Malachi informing us that "unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings" (ch.4:2) and "a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord" (ch.3:16).

This completes our examination of the elements of fear in the Old Testament. We have noted the richness of the Hebrew tongue in words relating to fear, all of them having a servile bent. We have seen fear appearing in the beginning in cruder forms with physical stimuli and emotional reactions not unlike some cases that might be found among primitive peoples. At times it even approaches the unethical and the irreligious. But these cruder phases gradually pass away and we have fear more and more assuming the form of an abiding disposition or sentiment. Along with this we have called attention to some of the incitements of fear or the objects to which it attaches itself, progressing from the physical in the earlier times to an idea in later times, the idea of the holy being a particular illustration. Again we have noticed the functions performed by this fear or the offices assigned to it. It is a mark of piety, a deterrent from evil, a motive to righteousness, an element in worship, an essential in wisdom, and at times a comprehensive designation of character. All of which pertains to servile fear.

A holy filial fear cannot be absent however for from the very beginning there are traces of a tender emotion. And through all the records there appears increasingly this thought that God is not
only an exacting God, full of wrath and awful power, demanding obedience, and fearful in judgment, but He is also a God of love and mercy and goodness. This as we have seen leads to a filial fear for whenever the love relation is established then fear of separation and offense enter. There is, it is true, no definite recognition of filial fear but we feel that it is there and in some passages especially it seems to be particularly latent, as for instance Psalm 51:19 "Oh how great is thy goodness which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee, for them that put their trust in thee".

As for 'numinous' fear the progression is plain. There are occasions at first that seem to carry us back to the stage of daemonic dread, as Otto calls it. But with the succeeding periods we see this experience divested of crudeness and becoming more and more refined until it is worthy of a place in the saintliest characters and finally comes to its climax in such passages as the sixth chapter of Isaiah and the thirty eighth of Job.
CHAPTER IV

The Element of Fear in the Synoptic Gospels.

Passing now to the New Testament, we shall first direct our attention to an examination of the words with which we shall come in contact. In the previous chapter we pointed out the richness of the Hebrew language with respect to such words. The same quality cannot be attributed to the Greek, for while it is fairly well equipped in this respect, much better than the English in fact, it does not have nearly so large an array of terms to designate the various shades of the fear experience. #

#Note: Words designating some aspect of fear in the Greek of the Bible are: φόβος, εἰκόνως, σέβεσθαι (see following paragraph for treatment); ἤπιερα - to be fearful, in the sense of cowardly or timid (used in all of its forms but five times, II Tim. 1:7, Jn. 14:27, Mt. 8:26, Mk. 4:40, Rev. 21:8); τούτοις - to terrify, (pass.) be terrified, (used just two times Mt. 8:26, Mk. 4:40, Rev. 21:8); τρέμω - to tremble, to fear, be afraid; ὀργαζόμενος - from Homer down, to be rough. (1) to bristle, stiffen, stand up. (2) to shudder, be struck with extreme fear, to be horrified (used only in Jas. 2:19); τρόμος - trembling and quaking with fear, as of one who distrusts his ability but religiously does his utmost; ἀράγοντος - in one sense means to trouble and when so used with
In general there is but one principal word in the New Testament translated by the English 'fear' and that is Λέος (το Τοκω). It is a widely used word and in the New Testament appears over a hundred times in various forms and usages. Its common meaning as a verb from Homer down has been to terrify, frighten, or put to flight by terrifying. Thayer remarks that it is capable of a good interpretation or of an evil one and in connection with its Biblical usage proceeds to give it three meanings: (1) to be put to flight, to flee; (2) to fear, to be afraid; absolute, to be struck with fear, to be seized with alarm;

#Note.Cont.:- τράχα may be translated, to strike one's spirit with fear and dread; Ηέος - fear or awe, more in the sense of apprehension (used only in Heb. 12:28); Θειν - (primarily pertaining to the fear of the gods) of "religious worship, esp. external that which consists in ceremonies," fearing or worshipping God, religious, "applied to one who is careful in the externals of worship"; Θειν - may have the meaning of astonish, terrify, to be amazed (Εκθειν - may mean, to be struck with terror. In RV generally translated 'amazed'); Εκτοφας - "in the O. T. and the N. T. amazement, the state of one who, either owing to the importance or the novelty of an event, is thrown into a state of blended fear and wonder" - Cremer limits this to confusion or bewilderment, the case of a man out of the real of his normal senses; Εκτοφας Thayer says of this, "to be astonished, prop. to be struck with terror, of a sudden and startling alarm; but, like our 'astonish' in popular use, often employed on comparatively slight occasions, and even then with strengthening particles"; θελβαμορια - fear of the gods: (1) in a good sense, reverence for the gods, piety, religion (2) in a bad sense superstition (3) religion in an objective sense. All of the above words are little used in the N. T. in the sense designated and are practically of no importance in this study.
(3) to reverence, venerate, to treat with deference or reverential obedience. He forthwith applies the third meaning to almost every case where \( \phi\theta\varepsilon\sigma\varsigma \) is used in connection with God or the Lord. Such treatment is very arbitrary, however, especially if Luke 18:2 is to be translated as the "judge, which reverence not God, and regarded not man", while the words of the thief in Luke 23:40 are rendered, "dost thou not even fear God." Furthermore, we are to be reminded that the Greek has two milder words that fit the idea of reverence better. One of them, \( \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\varepsilon\zeta\lambda\alpha\alpha \) has in it the thought of caution or discretion, a taking hold carefully or prudently. So that in reference to God it might be translated reverence, veneration, godly fear, piety. Besides this there is the verb \( \sigma\nu\varepsilon\beta\omega \), which appears more often perhaps in some form of the derivative \( \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma \). This word carries with it the idea of piety, devoutness, godliness, and leads Cremer to say that "the proper Greek word for reverential fear of God is indeed \( \sigma\nu\varepsilon\beta\omega \)." If 'reverence' then is to be designated we should expect one of these two words to be used instead of the stronger \( \phi\theta\varepsilon\sigma\varsigma \). For it therefore we would reserve the word 'fear' and so consistently translate it.

---

#Note: Paul has one passage which seems to be unfavorable to our position that \( \phi\theta\varepsilon\sigma\varsigma \) is not to be taken in the sense of reverence. We are referring to Ephesians 5:33, "Let the wife see that she fear her husband." Most commentators take 'fear' here to mean reverence and it was the only instance in which \( \phi\theta\varepsilon\sigma\varsigma \) was so translated in the Authorised Version. Yet the state of the Christian wife depicted in this passage, the love that the husband is charged...
'Fear' for us then as a New Testament word study centers largely around ἐφοβοι and this word we would treat at length. When used in reference to God it is capable of a number of 'fear' meanings and it is our purpose at this time to indicate that it may be used to signify any of the types of fear that we have noted as coming under the fear of God. Thus for instance it has a servile strain in it and may apply to servile fear. The original use of the word as we have noted is in accord with this. Cremer who has made an intensive study of it tells us that "the New Testament ἐφοβοι when by itself, is in many, nay, in most places, a fear of God and His judgment, either evoked by certain events, such as miracles or awakened by what one knows of God and His judgment." Certainly this is a description of servile fear. Again he refers to the foundation of ἐφοβοι as "the fear of judgement and punishment." And still again having dealt with a milder meaning of the word he concludes, "The fundamental idea nevertheless remains which is awe of God's judgement." He even compares it with reverence and says that this word is not adequate as a translation, "because in it fear of God's judgement falls too much out of thought." In all of these cases we feel that nothing short of servile fear is meant.

In contrast with this however there are other uses of ἐφοβοι which have a decidedly filial bent. It has been this strain in the word that probably has disposed many to translate it reverence or at least

#Note cont.:- to bestow, and the general context would lead us to prefer a suggestion for the interpretation of the word in accord with one of its uses elsewhere, viz that it refers to a 'worthy fear' of offending. (See Taylor, II Cor. 7:15)
attempt to subdue the harsher servile aspects. Even Cremer with all his emphasis upon the servile meaning makes provision for the filial too. "The fear of God," he tells us, "is in its essence not only fear of His power and judgment but a dread springing from reverence lest we should sin against Him or displease Him." In a more extended passage, Cremer says is to fear one so as to take care not to have him as an antagonist, or to be afraid of, either because opposition is presupposed, and the person or thing is therefore to be avoided, or because the opposition is impending. This latter sense in which we are interested means to avoid the opposition, to be on one's guard against it. "God is not regarded as an opponent who is to be avoided and withdrawn from...it is the final opposition, and condemnation of God that is shunned," and to this end we desire to please Him and seek His favor. In all of which we see evidences of filial fear.

Again there are times when seems to be more than fear in either of the forms we have mentioned. We have previously alluded to such a 'fear' in connection with the Old Testament when it was set forth as a term used for a general description or the total bearing of character. Cremer has spoken of this very definitely as we have noted and defined it as "a comprehensive designation of the religious character as a whole and specially a comprehensive designation of religious life and conduct." This definition applies equally well to the Hebrew 'fear' in some of its aspects and to the Greek Cremer enlarges upon this in another place by saying that "the desire is to obey, serve, worship him, to pursue his ways, to keep his precepts, may more to believe in him." All these are included in the fear of God." So that we may expect to find our word at times representing this broader meaning of fear in the New Testament.
And then last but not least there are occasions when φόβος seems to have in it nothing short of a downright 'numinous' fear. There may be an accompanying servile or a filial aspect too but, notwithstanding, the dominating element is this other. We shall have more to say about this when we come to the concrete study of cases but for the present it will suffice for us to point out that this has been a type of fear that has escaped the notice of many. They have tried to crowd all fear into one or two patterns and it has not worked satisfactorily. We shall find examples in the New Testament where φόβος will need another interpretation than that of the servile or filial. There are times when nothing but a numinous fear will satisfy the situation.

In φόβος then we have a word which while translated 'fear' may represent any one of a number of different kinds of fear or even a mingling of several at the one time. Such a characteristic of the word may immediately seem to present difficulties as to a rightful interpretation and it does. There are times when we are puzzled as to the particular kind of fear we are dealing with but we must be content to observe the context, the setting and the idea back of our fear, and draw our conclusions.

It is in accord with our discussion in the earlier chapters to also note here that φόβος as servile or filial fear may have the form of a sentiment or abiding disposition. Thus Cremer quotes Passow as saying that φόβος is "fear as a mental state" as contrasted with a "sensation of terror, fear, as a bodily state." Cremer himself seems to miss the point in this and advances a view of his own which amounts to something of the same thing, namely that φόβος tends to be more abiding in contrast with
momentary fright. Again he tells us that the word does "not denote positive acts, but a spiritual bearing." He even speaks of it as qualifying "the demeanour throughout, and thus it becomes the disposition and bearing of one who in everything is guided by a reference to God." So that we have in ἐφόβος a word capable of representing not only a mere occasion of fear but the abiding disposition or sentiment which we have noticed is characteristic of the higher levels of religious culture, and it is largely in this form that we may finally expect to find it in its servile and filial aspects in the New Testament.

Having now finished with the preliminaries and laid our foundation for New Testament study, we shall begin at once the analysis of the elements of fear in this part of the Scriptures. It is very improbable that all of our findings shall have general acceptance, but if we succeed in indicating the broader aspects of the subject in the New Testament we shall have achieved our purpose. We shall first examine the teachings of Christ as presented to us in the Synoptics.

Here we come to a very abrupt change in the matter of fear. The very expression, 'the fear of God,' becomes less common, as indeed it does in the entire New Testament in comparison with the Old. In the case of the faithful especially there is little or no provision for servile fear. We have seen that the Old Testament gave it a place and made it essential. But now it is not considered a factor in the believer's life. Zacharias' prophecy is truly prophetic in this respect, "grant unto us...that we should serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all our days." It is in accord with this that Christ takes occasion to forbid any fear of himself. Such passages as we have in mind.
are those when the disciples are terrified before Jesus walking on the water and His reassuring voice comes to them, "it is I, be not afraid" (Mt. 14:27; Mk. 6:50), and again when the dazed women returning from the tomb after the resurrection meet Him and He tenderly bids them to "fear not" (Mt. 28:10). In both these cases it is plain that the aspect of ϕόβος referred to was a fear that Jesus would not permit an unmanning fear with strong servile elements. There is another passage of this kind where an element of servile fear seems to enter and that is Peter's fears in the presence of the miraculous draught of fishes, when he fell down at Jesus' feet. Here again we have fear forbidden, for Christ says to the overwhelmed Peter, "Fear not" (Lk 5:8). This however, is what we should expect. Jesus, came in the character of the Shepherd and Saviour of men, supremely exemplifying the love of God—the attractive and drawing aspect of the Divine. When He appears in such a capacity there is little room for a fear of Him. Christ, having been received through faith as Mediator and Redeemer is not to be feared.

Nor is God the Father to be an object of servile fear to the believer; rather He becomes a refuge from many fears. We refer here to what may be called the fears of earth. Toward all fears that might arise out of the possible or impending evils of daily life—hungerings, thirstings, lack of clothes, cold, loss of loved ones, loss of wealth, war, desolation, ill health, failures, the designs of enemies, injuries, diseases, panics, droughts, floods, fires, and even death itself—toward all these the sole counsel is to be unafraid. The prohibition of such fears is indicative of the new relation with God which recognises His Fatherhood and Providence. He is the heavenly Father who cares for us. He
watches over the birds of the heaven and the flowers of the field. He will provide for all our needs. We are to trust in Him and not even to be anxious as to what we shall have to eat or drink or wear. (Mt. 6:19ff; Lk. 12:22ff). And when His disciples are sent forth they are warned that they are going out to be imprisoned, scourged, hated, persecuted. But still they are to have no fear, but trust only in God. Not even a sparrow can fall to the ground without the consent of the Heavenly Father. The very hairs of the head are numbered by Him. (Mt. 10; Lk 12) God's providence therefore is sufficient for all the ills of life. The Father in heaven is our refuge and all earthly fears must disappear. (See also Mt. 8:26; Mk 4:39ff; Lk 1:74; 21:9)

---

#Note: Underwood in his work "Conversion, Christian and non-Christian" speaks of the idea of 'refuge' as a factor in conversion. In reference to the Mediterranean world for two or three centuries, before and after the beginning of the Christian Era, he says, "Fear of the assaults of demons and the relentless tyranny of Fate drove men and women into both Christianity and the Mystery Religions. In the case of Early Christianity, the fear of demons was reinforced by the fear of the imminent end of the world, for chiliastic expectations did not cease with the Apostolic Age. Such passages as I Cor. 8:5, 10:20f; Eph. 2:2, 6:12; Col. 2:15; I Jn. 3:8; Heb. 2:14; show that in N. T. times conversion brought a real deliverance from the dread of demonic powers. .....In all these cases the instinctive-motive is fear; and we are pretty safe in inferring that the end-motive was the desire for security."
With such a God and such a Christ we should expect no room for a servile fear in the heart of the true follower. But there may ever remain a holy filial fear, a fear to take one step beyond His favor, to do anything that would incur his displeasure, to give any occasion of offense. It is no longer the fear of the cowering servant but the fear of being separated for a single moment from the One who is life itself. Thus it is that we would approach that troublous passage in Luke 12:5 or (Mt. 10:28) "But I will warn you whom ye shall fear; Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him." There is no question about the servile note here but it is a great subject of dispute as to whether this is to be referred to God. If it is, this passage stands alone among all the teachings of Christ as making such a reference. Furthermore it occurs side by side with the grandest verses of the Bible setting forth God's care of His own, those verses in which the sparrows, selling so cheaply in the market, and the very hairs of the head are forever glorified by His solicitude. If Christ here counsels the servile fear of God in the believer he is denying it in the same breath then. We know that this passage is referred to God rather than the devil on the grounds that we are usually urged to fight the devil instead of fearing him but we are also to remember that fear may sometimes be the occasion of the greatest fight. We are also aware that Otto has tried to offer us another solution by finding here an echo in Jesus of "weird awe and shuddering dread" before the numinous but it seems reasonable to us to simply interpret the verse in the light of its context and let it refer to the devil or the evil one. There will still be servile fear but it will be concerned with the devil and not with God. The whole passage is in fact with respect to God an inducement to holy filial fear.
The most awful thing that could happen to the believer would be not the punishment received in hell but the fact that being in hell means separation from God and the veritable destruction of the soul as far as God is concerned. That is the worse feature of hell and it begets a holy filial fear in him who would contemplate it.

---

#Note: Since the above was written, Professor David Smith's Commentary on the Gospels has appeared and we are gratified to find in it strong confirmation of our position. He devotes nearly two whole pages to the exposition of Matthew 10:28, in part using the same arguments as we have employed and almost the same wording at times. His main points, however, are two. (1) "God is not the Destroyer; He is the Saviour and Preserver of men...It is never said in the New Testament that He destroys the soul nor yet that he destroys the body; for soul and body, as the Christian hope of the Resurrection proclaims, are alike precious to Him...Precisely this, on the Christian view, is the essential difference between God and the Devil—that the latter is the destroyer of soul and body, while God is the Saviour of both." (2) "Our Lord's meaning is determined by St. Luke's report of the saying, as rightly rendered in the margin of the Revised Version (Lk. XII.5): 'Fear him which after he hath killed hath authority to cast into Gehenna.' The significant fact is that, wherever the phrase occurs, it is implied that the authority has been received. It is a delegated authority... God gives authority, He does not receive it; and since it is a delegated authority that is denoted by the phrase "him which hath authority", the reference is not to God. It is the Devil that our Lord means."
However, if servile fear is swept out of the life of the believer in the teachings of Christ, let us not think for one moment that the same is true of the unconverted or disobedient. With them there is a legitimate place for such a fear and here the appeal at times reaches a height and an intensity that the Old Testament never knew. Thus some of the miracles and some of the events in the life of Christ are attended with a φόβος which is a servile fear in the case of the undiscipled, and it goes unrebuked on the part of Jesus. In reference to the Gerasene demoniac for instance, "they came to Jesus and found the man, from whom the devils were gone out, sitting, clothed and in his right mind at the feet of Jesus, and they were afraid... asked him to depart from them; for they were holden with great fear" (Lk. 8:35-37). Then the thief on the cross turns to his companion and reproves him with these words, "Dost thou not even fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation?" (Lk. 23:40). And Pilate when he heard the saying that "he made himself the Son of God... was the more afraid" (Jn. 19:8). In these and other cases (see also Lk. 7:16, 5:26, 1:65, and Mt. 27:54, 28:3-4) we find a servile fear and it is in no sense forbidden.

But the greatest evidence of the place of servile fear in respect to those who are not of the faithful is to be found in the direct appeal which Jesus made to such a fear in His teachings. For it cannot be disputed that He said some very severe and terrible things, the contemplation of which must beget this fear, where in literature may be found a more dreadful array than His parables dealing with the punishment of the wicked and disobedient? He tells the parable of the tares and ends with the instructions to the reapers, "Gather up first
the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn (Mt. 13:24ff). Then he explains these tares (vss 40-43) by saying that "as therefore the tares are gathered up and burned with fire; so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out...them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." In the same connection he compares the kingdom of heaven to a net from which the bad are "cast away"; and here again there is a furnace where there shall be gnashing of teeth (Mt. 13:47ff). It is with a like picture that he concludes his story of the marriage feast (Mt. 22:1ff) when the unwanted guest is bound hand and foot and cast out into outer darkness; the account of the unfaithful servant (Mt. 24:44ff) who is cut asunder and appointed with the hypocrites; the record of the talents, (Mt. 25:14ff) in which the unprofitable servant is deprived of all that he has and is thrown into darkness and torment; and the tale of the master of the house (Lk. 13:25) who has locked his doors and forbids entrance to the workers of iniquity. Then we have the parables of the heartless debtor whose Lord is wroth and delivers him to the tormentors (Mt. 18:23ff), the lord of the vineyard who would come and destroy his murderous husbandmen (Mt. 21:33ff; Mk. 12:1ff; Lk. 20:9ff), the five foolish virgins who are refused recognition by the bridegroom (Mt. 25:1ff), the judged that are told to "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels" (Mt. 25:31ff), the foolish farmer whose soul is demanded in the midst of his ease and plenty (Lk. 12:13ff), and the rich man who in Hades lifts up his eyes in torment and pleads for a touch of cold water (Lk. 16:19ff). Nor is it the parables alone that
would incite fear but the woes pronounced by Christ as well. Where in literature do we find a more fearful arraignment and threatening than in the woes of Christ? He upbraids Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum and declares their doom to be worse than that of Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom (Mt. 11:20ff; Lk. 10:13). He hurls reproach after reproach upon the scribes and Pharisees and asks "how shall ye escape the judgment of hell" (Mt. 23:13ff; Lk. 11:42ff). The rich and the satiated are made the subject of His terrors (Lk. 6:24ff). He pronounces the terrible end of Jerusalem which would not repent (Lk. 13:34ff, 21:5ff; Mt. 23:37ff). And as for the man who would betray Him He says it were better for him that he had not been born (Mt. 26:24). Furthermore the fearful elements in Christ's preaching and teaching are not confined to His parables and the woes He pronounced but the very injunctions He laid down for His Kingdom become fearful in some of their aspects. They are certainly far more exacting than the similar precepts of the Old Testament. No longer is a man to be judged by what he does but judgment is to be based on his inmost thoughts and feelings. Formerly he was in danger of judgment if he committed murder, now mere anger is sufficient to incur the same penalty (Mt. 5:21ff). In the Old Dispensation adultery meant the commitment of the act, now the mere lust in the heart brings full guilt. So drastic is the new code that, if the eye causes stumbling, it it to be picked out or, of the hand is at fault, it is to be cut off, rather than that the whole body should be cast into hell (Mt. 5:27ff, 18:8). And over and above all this there is the further pronouncement that the gate leading into this new life is narrow and the way straitened and "few be they that find it" (Mt. 7:13, 14). Surely Jesus Christ appeals to the servile fears of men and we dare not ignore this aspect of His teaching if we are to possess the whole Gospel.
Finally we would dwell upon the evidences of "numinous" fear in the Synoptics. Much needs to be said about this fear for it is one of the most important types of fear in connection with Christ's ministry and yet is very apt to be overlooked. It is certainly difficult to set it apart and separate it from the others but many times when we have sought out the servile element or the filial in a situation we have had the feeling that these do not explain all, that there is still something more of fear. This comes out especially strong in the stilling of the storm when Christ rebukes the disciples for their fear (δειλίας) --that is he puts away one kind of fear--but at the same time they are seized by a still greater fear (φόβος) of another order which is something different than mere servile fear. "And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him" (Mk. 4:39ff; Lk. 8:25). We feel the presence of a strong "numinous" quality here. We have an instance of such a fear in connection with most of the miracles for while there is undoubtedly a servile strain apparent in many cases, yet one of the direct results was to produce another fear--the fear that arises out of the sense of an overwhelming or supernatural power, a "something other" than we have previously known. Thus when the paralytic was cured we are told that the multitudes were afraid (Mt. 9:8) or as Luke puts it, "they were filled with fear, saying, we have seen strange things today" (5:26). Likewise we are told that when the son of the widow of Nain was brought back to life, "fear took hold on all and they glorified God" (Lk. 7:16). This same kind of fear is also aroused with the sense of the supernatural that attends many of the manifestations of God in the New Testament, as instanced in the almost uncanny.
fear of the centurion at the cross (Mt. 27:54), or the crowd returning from the crucifixion smiting their breasts, "when they beheld the things that were done" (Lk. 23:48). In fact wherever this supernatural makes its appearance we find fear present so that a reassuring "fear not" becomes necessary at times. Witness the scenes surrounding the tomb when "the watchers did quake and became as dead men" and the women even after being reassured "departed quickly from the tomb with fear" (Mt. 28:3ff; Mk. 16:8; Lk. 24:4ff) (See also such as Lk. 1:30 and Lk. 24:36). At times there is even a strong numinous fear that arises about the person of Christ. It is true that this results largely from His miracles, as with the woman having the issue of blood who came forward fearing and trembling (Mk. 5:33; Lk. 8:7) or with Simon Peter falling down before Him (Lk. 5:8) or with the Gerasenes begging Him to leave their borders (Mk. 5:17; Lk. 8:37). But there are other times when the very person of Christ seems saturated with some numinous quality of a fear begetting nature. The most prominent example of this of course is in the transfiguration when in the indescribable Presence of the Lord the disciples "became sore afraid" (Mk. 9:2-8; Mt. 17:1-8; Lk. 9:28-36). But there are other occasions. The Gospel according to Mark for instance, speaking of the disciples, tells that "they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them; and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid" (Mk. 10:32). Here there were no miracles to stir up fear and the disciples, according to Luke (18:31-34), did not understand the significance of the step they were taking, but the very personality of Christ seems to have possessed a supernatural property and radiated a strange awesome power as He made
His last great decision and took the final journey towards the cross.

This completes our study of the Synoptics. We have seen in them a transition in the matter of fear. Servile fear has been seemingly taken out of the life of the faithful. At least it is no longer appealed to as an impelling motive in thought and action. Instead love has come in as the great incentive and whatever fear remains in the believer is of a holy filial nature. The fatherhood of God and the redeeming grace of Christ occupy his mind. On the other hand there is still a strong appeal to servile fear in the case of the disobedient and impenitent. Christ himself with all his tenderness and compassion had another side to his gospel which is dreadful to view and servile fear must ensue in those who behold it. And then finally there is a 'numinous' fear. This is one of the chief results whenever Divinity is manifested or the Supernatural revealed. God is not to be heeded indifferently but when He moves or speaks, when His peculiar presence is come to earth, man can do no other than be filled with such a fear. #

Note: In our study of Φοβος we noted that sometimes the word has a wider meaning and stands for a general designation of the religious character as a whole. There are but two instances in the Synoptics where this might be true. One is the Magnificat, "And his mercy is unto generations and generations on them that fear him", which reminds us of some of the expressions we found in the Old Testament. The other is in the parable of Christ (Lk. 18:1-3) in which he speaks of the judge "which feared not God, and regarded not man." Here Jesus may be recognising a fear which is a "comprehensive designation of a man's attitude to God."
CHAPTER V

The Fear of God in the Apostolic Church.

Following the completion of Christ's earthly ministry there is a considerable reference to the fear of God, though not nearly so large as in the Old Testament, as has already been said. Fear still presents itself in all its aspects and in many cases we are at a loss to know which type of fear is meant. One cardinal thought should be kept in mind, however, and that is that throughout the New Testament the grace of God and the redeeming love of Christ dominate. These must be retained at all costs and when doubt as to the proper interpretation arises they must be the decisive factors.

In treating our material now the time element is not so important as in the Old Testament where the appearance of the different writings often occurred at intervals of many generations. The New Testament is a literature which was produced within a span of fifty years or so and for our purpose its parts may be considered contemporaneous. Yet we shall notice that in the case of John's writings the fact that they come towards the last is important. In general, however, we shall ignore the time element in this portion of our study and shall be concerned with the appearances of the fear of God, the attitudes towards it, and the use that is generally made of it by the different writers.
Beginning then with the Book of Acts we have the physician Luke writing a simple historical narrative of the life of the early church. No effort is made in this to hide the presence of fear or to conceal it as an unworthy element in the religious life of the day. On the other hand it is presented as the natural result of the workings of God and the outpourings of His Holy Spirit upon man. These were days when God was working mightily upon the earth and eye had never seen and ear had never heard such marvels and a great fear fell on all the land. Thus following the Pentecostal baptism and the birth of the Church we are told that "fear came upon every soul" and many ancient authorities further strengthen the statement by adding that "great fear was upon all" (Acts 2:43). Then when Ananias fell down dead with the conviction of his lie upon him, it says that "great fear came upon all that heard it." While the same thing is put in even stronger language in connection with his wife's death, occurring a few hours afterwards, when it tells us that "great fear came upon the whole church and upon all that heard these things" (Acts 5:5,11). Another incident with similar effect is that of the overpowering of the sons of Sceva. When the news of their rout became "known to both Jews and Greeks," dwelling at Ephesus, "fear fell upon them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified" (Acts 19:17). \( \phi \sigma \beta \sigma s \) is used for all these cases and in our discussion of the word we pointed out that it might designate any one of the different kinds of fear. Here we feel that all of them are represented to some extent. "Numinous" fear, however, is dominating in each situation. It is fear in the presence of the Supernatural. It becomes a dreadful awe before the manifestation of God's awful power. It is the creature overcome before the Creator. Believer and unbeliever alike enter into this experience and none are so bold as to gainsay it. At the same time
we feel that there are present in a lesser way both servile and filial fear. Thus on the part of the multitudes and the undiscipled in general there is a servile fear. The divine grace is still unknown to them and when such occurrences are unrelieved by an understanding of the love of God there can be but one result and that is servile fear. At the same time in the disciples and the believing, a fear arises in connection with such events which will tend towards a holy filial fear. The goodness of God is with his own and love and grace underlie all that He does. There is an attitude which will be concerned with the dread of doing anything that will transgress or violate that love or incur its opposition. So that we here deal with instances where the word 'fear' may indicate at one and the same time fears of the numinous, filial, and servile types, the last two especially depending upon the subject's relation to and knowledge of God. "Numinous" fear is preeminent, however.

And it is this fear that entered largely into the conversions of that first century. Just how far we can attribute to it the widespread turning to the Lord that took place in those days we are not able to say but we cannot read the account of the early church without feeling that in the background was a great element of this type of fear. Thus we have it present in connection with the many conversions occurring at Pentecost and likewise following the Ananias incident and the attendant "signs and wonders" when "believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes of both men and women" (Acts 5:12). An even more marked reference is that to the sons of Sceva. Here having said that "fear fell upon them all," the account immediately proceeds to relate that "many also of them that had believed came, confessing, and declaring their deeds" (Acts 19:18).
Nor are we confined to such general cases but we note individual examples of a connection between "numinous" fear and conversion. We feel that the case of the Philippian jailer who "trembling for fear, fell down before Paul and Silas" (Acts 16:29) had a large background of this fear, although there was probably considerable of the servile also. And the same "numinous" element is discernible in the conversion of Paul himself when he and those with him "were all fallen to earth" (Acts 26:14).

It must be said, however, that the 'fear' of Acts is not always tinged with the "numinous". There are times when the servile type alone appears or is appealed to. Paul, for instance, addressing the Athenians holds out before them a day of judgment, saying of God, "he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained" (Acts 17:31). Again he reasons before Felix of this same "righteousness" and "temperance and the judgment to come" so that Felix is terrified (Acts 24:25). In such cases it is solely a servile fear that is in evidence.

Furthermore in the Book of Acts we have a number of references which have given rise to a term the "Godfearers" used to refer to a class of adherents to Judaism which were commonly encountered by the apostles in their audiences throughout the Dispersion. These seem to have been Gentiles who while embracing the God of the Jews and attending the worship of the synagogue were unwilling to go the whole way to the extent of being circumcised. It is significant that they should be designated those that feared God for it indicates the importance assigned to fear in the Jewish Church, seemingly being the essential qualification for a Gentile adherent. We
would not of course understand this fear in a narrow sense. Rather we feel that we are here dealing with the comprehensive designation of character to which we have referred before. So that when Paul addresses the congregation at Antioch in Pisidia, "Men of Israel and ye that fear God" and again "Brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and those among you that fear God" (Acts 13:16,26), he is not referring to just servile or even filial fear. Neither of these alone could have been a sufficient motive force for proper conduct or a test of acceptability even in the Jewish Church. At the same time the dominant servile strain in this 'fear' of God is apparent, being even more clearly seen in the reference to Cornelius, the exemplary Roman centurion and one of the first Gentiles to be baptized, who is described as a devout man and righteous and "one that feared God with all his house" (Acts 10:1,2). And again it is seen in the words spoken by Peter in the same house when he declares that he perceives that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him" (Acts 10:34,35). This same use of the term 'fear' very likely passed over into the early church and it is probably such a comprehensive designation of the religious life and character that is meant when following the cessation of Saul's persecution, the church throughout all Judea, Samaria, and Galilee being blessed with peace and multiplying is described as walking in the fear of the Lord (Acts 9:31). Here, however, we should expect the dominant strain to be a holy filial fear.

We now turn to a survey of the letters of Paul. Here we find the theology of the New Dispensation worked out in the light of the life and death of Christ Jesus, Paul's Hebrew training, and the
current Greek thought; and all done with a practical bearing upon the active daily life of the church. For our own purpose it is sufficient for us to notice that one of Paul's main concerns was to impress his congregations with the necessity of redemption by blood. It is through the blood of Christ that we have our redemption (Eph. 1:7; Rom. 3:25, 5:9). This results in Paul's setting forth an elaborate theory of the atonement in Romans. His conception requires on the Godward side a God who is not only love but a God of righteousness and justice. He cannot be profaned and will not tolerate sin. Before Him the slightest infraction breaks the whole law and makes the transgressor a fit subject for death; the smallest offense begets His judgment. We are all condemned in His sight and nothing but the blood of Christ will secure His pardon. Thus Paul arrives at his conception of the necessity and magnitude of the atonement by depicting the greatness of God to whom that atonement must be made, even as on the other hand he portrays the depravity of unredeemed man with the same purpose. If we at this point examine in more detail this presentation of God we find that the resulting picture is one to incite servile fear in him who is not in the estate of grace. God is full of wrath toward all the ungodly and unrighteous. "The wrath of God," we are told, "is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold down the truth in unrighteousness." (Rom. 1:18). This wrath may be treasured up for the impenitent and revealed in the day of God's righteous judgment when He renders to every man according to his works (Rom. 2:5). It is even necessary to His judgment (Rom. 3:5). Upon the disobedient and evil it comes without pity. "Unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth but obey unrighteousness," Paul says, "shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish,
upon every soul of man that worketh evil" (Rom. 2:8; See also Eph. 5:6; Col. 3:5). Even the exercising of vengeance is at times attributed to the Lord as in these two strong passages: "vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense saith the Lord" (Rom. 12:19) and this, referring to the appearance of the Lord, "in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus: who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might" (II Thes. 1:8; See also I Thes. 4:6; and II Cor. 5:10). And a still further characterization of this sterner side of God is found when the unredeemed are spoken of as being "by nature children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3; Rom. 9:22).

On the other hand for the redeemed there is a brighter side to this picture. If God is wrathful toward the evil and ungodly, he is also full of mercy and goodness to those who have believed and have accepted the redemption of Christ. The justified we are told, are saved from the wrath of God, "for God appointed us not unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ" (I Thes. 5:9). Or again if God commended His own love toward us in the death of Christ for us while we were sinners, "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him" (Rom. 5:9). There is no occasion then for a slavish, servile, fear within the Christian. He is to be free of the thought that God will exact every iota of sin and demand retribution for the smallest breach. He is to live in the relation of a son to the Father, a Father of grace and mercy and goodness. "For ye received not the spirit of bondage again unto fear: but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba,
Father. The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God" (Rom. 8:15).

At the same time if this terror and dread of God's judgment and wrath pass away in the believer, there is still a fear that remains in him as numerous instances give evidence. It is the holy filial fear which we have already found occupying a place in the believer. To it Paul assigns a variety of functions. He refers to it as being a safeguard against over-confidence or an over presuming attitude towards God. "Be not highminded but fear," he says writing to the Romans, "for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will he spare thee" (Rom. 11:20). And again corresponding with the Philippians he uses similar language when he says, "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling" (Phil. 2:12). Holy filial fear is thus to serve as a brake or a check upon the Christian's smug confidence and over boldness. It is also presented as the attitude for or a means to perfecting holiness. "Let us cleanse ourselves," we are told, "from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (II Cor. 7:1). Still again we note that this fear is especially emphasised as a motive of right conduct for believers. "Look therefore carefully how ye walk," he says to the Ephesians, "subjecting yourselves one to another in the fear of Christ" (5:15-21). Again the advice to servants is, "Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh; not with eye service, as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord" (Col. 3:22, See also Eph. 6:5). Thus Paul would find a number of uses for fear in the believer and we would interpret it as a holy filial fear. It is true that some commentators have attempted to make this a servile fear (See Massie- New Cent. Bible, (Ref. II Cor. 7:1) and
there are instances where we might be led to believe in the appearance of a servile strain in Paul. Thus in II Corinthians 5:11 where he has just finished talking about the judgment seat he speaks of knowing fear and of that fear being a motive in soul-winning. Again he expresses concern for himself lest he himself should be rejected (I Cor. 9:27). But we feel that consistency with the rest of the Gospel requires in general the interpretation of the believer's fear in Paul's writings as a holy filial fear, a fear qualified by the love of Christ and the fatherhood of God.

Lastly, if we should speak in regard to the 'numinous' element in Paul, we are to remind ourselves that where there has been an extreme rationalising and reduction to the conceptual, as has been the case in his writings, the numinous cannot be so easily detected. And yet turning to Otto again we find considerable space devoted to the discussion of the "numinous" in Paul and much of this partakes of the fearful. The wrath of God he says is not merely the reaction of righteous retribution but "it is permeated with the 'awefulness' of the numinous." This wrath, he tells us, "is potently and vividly present in the grand passage in Romans 1:18ff, where we recognize directly the jealous, passionate Yahweh of the Old Testament, here grown to a God of the Universe of fearful power, who pours out the blazing vials of His wrath over the whole world. In this passage there is an intuition, genuinely non-rational in character, the sublimity of which has an almost horrible quality: that the commission of sin is the angry God's punishment for sin." Otto also finds a great deal of the fearful in Paul's doctrine of predestination, which we are told can be interpreted properly only on a "numinous"
basis. "The true 'predestination'," he writes, "springing directly from religious intuition, has its origin beyond question in St. Paul. But in him it is easily recognized as the 'numinous' feeling in face of the 'mysterium tremendum'. The numen, overpoweringly experienced, becomes the all in all."

We shall next glance briefly at what the Apostle Peter may have to say upon our subject. His position set forth in his first epistle, we find to be much like that of Paul, bearing in mind that Peter was writing primarily to those Jews who were already numbered among the faithful. So that he says nothing about the fear of the unsaved but only about that of the redeemed. To these he says, "if ye call on him as Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to each man's work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear" (I Pet. 1:17). The word 'Father' gives us the key to the interpretation here. Bigg in writing on this passage has this enlightening comment which we are quoting, "Fear of course, means such fear as may be felt towards a good father, not slavish, superstitious dread. It is a lower motive than love, yet it is not to be regarded as merely negative; it is the safeguard of holiness and it prompts obedience in things which we do not understand." Again in summing up some of the duties of the elect, Peter gives these directions: "Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king." Then turning to the servants, he says, "Servants, be in subjection to your masters with all fear," which fear Bigg again refers to God (I Pet. 2:17,18). Bigg also does the same thing in reference to the fear which Peter speaks of as a virtue of a goodly wife. An unredeemed husband, beholding his wife's "chaste behaviour coupled with fear," may be won to God by this wife's manner of life (I Pet. 3:2)."
Finally we have one other instance in Peter that demands our attention: "sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord: being ready always to give answer to every man that asketh you a reason concerning the hope that is in you, yet with meekness and fear" (I Pet. 3:15). Commentators generally (Hart-Expos. Gr. Test., Bennett- New Cent. Bible, Bigg- Inter. Crit. Com., Cremer- Lexicon) assign this to the fear of God and see in it an allusion to Peter's own experience when at the critical time of the denial he feared man but feared not the Lord. This concludes the references that Peter makes to the fear of God and in no single instance do we find a use of it incompatible with a filial interpretation. And while we are taught nothing but what we have already learned about this fear we do find Peter emphasising its place as something to be put side by side with the honour and love of men, a means of curbing over-confidence, an element of good consequence in daily life, and a permanent attitude towards God who is our Father, yet, we are to re­mind ourselves, is separated from us with the immeasurable distance between Creator and creature.

Passing now to the epistle to the Hebrews we find a writer who interprets the New Testament

# Note: In his second epistle Peter has nothing to say about the fear of God although he does make an indirect appeal to it in reminding his readers of the destruction that awaits false teachers, mockers, and the unrighteous (2:1-5; 2:12; 3:7,10-13). He refers to the passing away of the heavens at the judgment with a great noise, the dissolution of the elements with fervent heat and the burning up of the earth and its works. Then he says "Seeing that these things are thus all to be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness."
under the figures of the Old. The Old Covenant in its symbols and requirements was a shadow of the New. The priesthood, temple, sacrifices and so on converge and are found perfected here. This writer thoroughly steeped in Jewish tradition, habit and feeling has an abiding godly fear which finds a prominent place in his Christian life. The result is that in Hebrews we find the paradox of a loving faith and an inciting fear appearing in sharp relief.

On the one hand we are told (4:15,16) that we have a high priest that can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities and one who has known all our temptations. Therefore let us "draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help us..." Again having been sanctified by Christ's offering of himself we are to have boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus (10:19). On the other hand there is a most evident strain of what at times amounts to nothing less than servile fear running through the entire letter. There is the continual dread of not reaching the goal, of being subject to the wrath of God rather than His favor. This warning is sounded repeatedly to those for whom the writer covets a perseverance in the faith. Mark the note of fear here (2:1-3) for instance when we are counselled to give "the more earnest heed to the things that were heard" lest we drift away, for if "every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" The same thing is seen in chapter 3:12 when the brethren are told to take heed "lest haply there shall be in any one of you an evil heart of unbelief," showing itself in a falling away from the living God. And even more pointedly is it put a few verses later (4:1) when it is said "Let us fear therefore, lest haply, a promise being left of entering into his rest, any one of
you should seem to have come short of it." (Simi-
larly in 12:14-15). All of these passages carry
with them a manifest fear that stimulates to greater
zeal and faith and that continues together with the
assurance and boldness we have already noticed.

At the same time there are passages which
give grounds for this fear for in Hebrews are re-
ferences to God and His judgment of a fearful nature
which in some respects surpass anything we have
found even in the Old Testament. God is so pene-
trating in His discernment that every creature is
manifest in His sight and "all things are naked and
laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have
to do" (4:13). As for those who were made partakers
of the Holy Ghost and received of God's gifts and
then fell away, their estate is likened to the land
which "if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is re-
jected and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be
burned." A still more awful passage is that in
chapter 10:26-31. Here we approach the borders of
downright terror and fright, the cup is emptied of
the fearful. Where shall we find words so saturated
with the terrible and so appealing to the fears of
man as these: "For if we sin wilfully after that
we have received the knowledge of the truth, there
remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a cer-
tain fearful expectation of judgment, and a fierce-
ness of fire which shall devour the adversaries. A
man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without
compassion on the word of two or three witnesses:
of how much sorer punishment, think ye, shall he be
judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son
of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant,
wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and
hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we
know him that said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I
will recompense. And again, the Lord shall judge
his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

So that while we have portrayed for us the God to whom we can draw near as the "God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep" (13:20), we also have another presentation in Hebrews. The effects of this paradox in the believer appears in such a verse as 11:7 where Noah is set up as an example of faith and yet is "moved with godly fear." And even though the fear of the Old Testament is not to be found in the New, for (using Moffat's words) "You have not come to... flames of fire, to mist and gloom and stormy blasts, to the blare of a trumpet and to a Voice whose words made those who heard it refuse to hear another syllable- indeed, so awful was the sight that Moses said, I am terrified and aghast" (12:18-21); and even though we "have come to Mount Sion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to myriads of angels in festal gathering, to the assembly of the first-born registered in heaven, to the God of all as judge, to the spirits of just men made perfect, to Jesus who meditates the new covenant" (12:22-24); still we are not to refuse to listen to His voice for how shall we escape if they failed to escape who refused to heed Him speaking from Sinai. "Therefore let us render thanks that we get an unshaken realm; and in this way let us worship God acceptably—but with godly fear and awe, for our God is indeed a consuming fire." (12:28-29). Thus appears a seemingly contradictory attitude in the believer.

But of all fear passages in Hebrews the one that has given the most trouble to Christian minds and the one that has been the subject of greatest dispute is 5:7-8. Here in reference to
Christ we have the following: "who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplica-
tions with strong crying and tears unto him that
was able to save him from death, and having been
heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son yet
learned obedience by the things which he suffered."
The word for fear here is the Greek εὐδοκία and
peculiarly it is used in Hebrews alone (occurring
also in 12:28 - appears in the verb form once in
Heb. 11:7 and once in Acts). We have already re-
ferrred to it as being a milder word than θέαμος but
the translators and commentators have failed to give
us much help in fixing just what is meant here in
calling it "godly fear." Farrar says of it that it
means 'reverent fear' or 'reasonable shrinking' as
opposed to terror and cowardice. Thayer translates
the same word in general "simply reverence towards
God, godly fear, piety" and remarks that many take
such a meaning in reference to this passage. He
however, interprets it as "fear, anxiety, dread," and
then tones this down by saying that "by using this
more select word the writer, skilled as he was in
the Greek tongue, speaks more reverently of the Son
of God, than if he had used θέαμος." Cremer who
gives considerable attention to the word tells us
that "it has been taken to denote fear or terror, in
Heb. 5:7." But having offered objections to this he
concludes that the word "must therefore be taken to
denote a religious bearing, religious solicitude,
the fear of God...not in the sense of horror....
εὐδοκία is as Delitzsch says, the mildest term
that could be used for the fear of God." Probably
the most that we are warranted in saying from the
foregoing is that fear here cannot be interpreted
in terms of servility. Yet there is an evident fear
in it, even that associated with "severe mental
struggle and emotion, agony, anguish." (Thayer).
And it is the only instance in which such fear is
directly mentioned as found in Christ unless we would except Mt. 10:28 (or Lk. 12:5) but this as we have noted is not to be assigned to the fear of God. Hebrews 5:7 therefore stands alone and we would find the key to it in Christ's experience in Gethsemane. There is no incident that it fits so well as His agony in the Garden and the fear arising here would undoubtedly be of a numinous quality. Otto has sensed this and is at his best in the description he gives of it. We quote him at length: "Finally, it is in the light of, and with the background of, this numinous experience, with its mystery and its awe- its 'mysterium tremendum'- that Christ's Agony in the night of Gethsemane must be viewed, if we are to comprehend or realize at all in our own experience what the import of that agony was. What is the cause of this 'sore amazement' and 'heaviness,' this soul shaken to its depths, 'exceeding sorrowful even unto death,' and this sweat that falls to the ground like great drops of blood? Can it be ordinary fear of death in the case of one who had had death before his eyes for weeks past and who had just celebrated with clear intent his death-feast with his disciples? No, there is more here than the fear of death; there is the awe of the creature before the 'mysterium tremendum,' before the shuddering secret of the numen. And the old tales come back into our mind as strangely parallel and, as it were, prophetically significant, the tales of Yahweh who waylaid Moses by night, and of Jacob who wrestled with God 'until the breaking of the day.' 'He had power with God... and prevailed,' with the God of 'Wrath' and 'Fury,' with the numen, which yet is itself 'My Father.' In truth even those who cannot recognize 'the Holy One of Israel' elsewhere in the God of the Gospel must at least discover Him here, if they have eyes to see at all." In Hebrews 5:7 therefore we would find a distinct reference to a numinous fear on the part of Jesus.
Two other passages of Hebrews Otto has conceived as containing a 'numinous' fear, the passage in 10:31 "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" and the one in 12:29 "Our God is a consuming fire," and we feel that he is not wrong in finding a strong element of such a fear in them.

However, if the letter to the Hebrews has not neglected the servile element in fear, even to the point of terror, the next writing we take up—the Revelation of John—is insistent and graphic upon this point. We infer from Dougall and Emmett* that judgment and punishment are chief elements in an apocalyptic writing. Whether this is true or not in all cases, it is undoubtedly true of the Book of Revelation in which we have a large amount of the fearful and not so much of the more tender and attractive. The description of the heavenly Jerusalem (ch. 21), the vision of the martyred and triumphant (ch. 7), and the invitation "Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely" (22:17) represent the drawing aspect of the Divine and the appeal to the tender emotion but such passages are few in Revelation. The work is in fact preeminently devoted to the severer side of the Godhead.

To begin with, it is saturated with the 'numinous'. The very opening chapter (vs. 17) recounts how John falls down as one dead before the glory of the risen Christ reminding us of the fear of the disciples on the Mount of transfiguration, only here the change is witnessed to greater perfection. This mysterious, "something other", incomprehensible, overwhelming, and majestic are present all through the book.

And as for threat, judgment, punishment, and wrath leading to servile fear the book is full
of these. Thus the letters to the seven churches have their fearful elements and the breaking of the seven seals are attended with visions that inspire dread. For instance we note the description of the wild overturning of nature at the breaking of the sixth seal (6:12ff) when the great of the earth hide in the caves and beg the rocks to fall upon them. Again the very Son of God is no longer thought of as having the meekness of the lamb but we have this significant phrase, "the wrath of the lamb." What a paradox it is when the Lamb appears with wrath. Nor does the presentation cease here but the seven trumpets are sounded and catastrophe and plague descend upon the earth beyond the wildest imagination. Then follows a succession of terrible marvels; the sounding of the four voices, the seven plagues, the vision of the destruction of Babylon, and the world resurrection and judgment, in all of which the seer exhausts the vocabulary of his language in an attempt to portray the awful conceptions that come before him. He even puts before us a fearful picture of our Lord. "Out of his mouth proceedeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God" (19:15). Finally he closes his whole work with a threat for the man who would add to or take away from "the words of the book of this prophecy."

It is very evident that the foregoing penalties, plagues, punishments, and so on pertain only to the wicked and disobedient and unbelieving. The question arises does the author of the Apocalypse also hold to a fear for the believer? We have already mentioned that his writing is not without its attractive features. God is not terrible in all His aspects. The new Jerusalem comes from Him as a bride adorned for her husband. His dwelling place
will be among men. They shall be His peoples.

Such statements are assuring. Is there a legitimate fear in the redeemed in spite of them? Until the new day come, we think there is. It is true that we are told that the fearful shall have their part in the "lake that burneth with fire" but 'fearful' here is the Greek δειλία and refers to those who through cowardice denied their Lord under persecution. On the other hand we have this passage where the victorious sing before the throne, "Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy; for all the nations shall come and worship before thee." Again in the thanksgiving over the downfall of Babylon there comes a voice from the throne saying, "Give praise to our God, all ye his servants, ye that fear him, the small and the great" (19:5). In both these instances we have fear commended to the redeemed. It even appears to be preliminary to worship and praise. As for the type of fear that is had in mind we feel that it will meet the requirements of the situation to confine it entirely to a holy filial fear. Servile fear will be an alien spirit in the hearts of the blessed in those great hours.

However, both types of fear may be represented in the same event. We have already dwelt upon this before. One striking passage in Revelation will emphasize it. "And thy wrath came, and the time of the dead to be judged, and the time to give their reward to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, the small and the great; and to destroy them that destroy the earth" (11:18). Here wrath and judgment and destruction are held up for the accursed and with them fear would be expected to partake of a servile nature. On the other hand we have a reward held out to the servants of God, and those fearing his name,
both the small and the great and here we would look for a holy filial fear. So that both fears might arise out of the one occasion depending upon the subjects' relation to God, and ordinarily there is no distinction made in either the English or the original tongue as to which fear is referred to. The same thing might be brought out in another passage in 14:7, where an angel flies in mid heaven with an eternal gospel to proclaim "unto them that dwell on the earth, and unto every nation and tribe and tongue and people." And the angel says with a great voice, "Fear God, and give him glory; for the hour of his judgment is come." Here again we have either a servile or a holy filial fear depending upon the subjects we have in mind.

There still remains in our discussion of the New Testament Literature several writings which shall form a fitting close to this portion of our study, viz. the gospel and epistles of John. We have been emphasizing the fearful element as it has appeared. Here we find words that abound in love. John is concerned with the presentation of a God of love and a life of perfection. In setting forth his case he ignores the severer side of the Godhead. He presents the lovelier and kinder attributes of the Father, the drawing aspects of the Divine. He is writing to the begotten of God and anything tending to incite fear is omitted. For instance the Synoptics treat the death on the cross as attended by darkness, the tearing of the veil, the quaking of the earth, the rending of the rocks, the opening of the tombs, the walking abroad of the dead, and the fear of the soldiers, whereas in the Johannine account the whole is covered simply by the words, "he bowed his head, and gave up his spirit." John does speak of the disciples being 'afraid' when they saw Jesus walking on the water but the deliberate toning
down of his record is very evident when we note the expressive crying out, the troubled souls, and the sore fright described in the other gospels. John even goes to the extreme of avoiding anything that borders upon amazement or wonder lest he might give a suggestion of fear. In the other gospels the resurrection scenes at the tomb are attended with trembling, astonishment, wonderment, fear, amazement, and perplexity. The Fourth Gospel on the contrary studiously shuns the slightest hint at any such state of emotion.

Thus there seems little room for fear in these portions of our Scriptures and the fact that they generally come last in point of time, as we have mentioned, may be significant. The Apostle John may here be deliberately setting himself against a tendency to over-emphasize the fear element in our religion. Fear had held a large place in mankind's experience and was not easily dispensed with even in the presence of the gospel of love. There may have been a considerable movement to revert to it and give it undue emphasis in the days of the early church and it may have been against this that John took his position. At any rate he is set against all fear and is the only one that quotes Christ's words, "Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be fearful" (Jn. 14:27) (where the Greek δειλινός is used for fearful, giving us to understand that a cowardly fear, worldly fear, is referred to). Again in his First Epistle (4:18) he says, "There is no fear in love: but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath punishment; and he that feareth is not made perfect in love." Here John is using φόβος and seemingly eliminates all fear from the Christian consciousness. But it is certainly an injunction applying to only the servile type of fear. Thayer for instance refers the 'fear' of this passage to
that which means "to be struck with fear, to be
seized with alarm," as used of those who fear harm
and injury. Holy filial fear, we have seen however,
is not incompatible with the love of God and John
is not forbidding this nobler kind of fear which
may properly exist in the Father-son relation.
Furthermore he does not discountenance servile fear
in the disobedient and though he has not much to
say about it he does tell us that "He that obeyeth
not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of
God abideth on him" (Jm. 3:36).#

This concludes our study of the Bible.
In this portion of our work we have ascertained that
the fear of God has an important place in the Scrip-
tures and we have examined its appearances and noted
some of its incentives, forms, occasions, and re-
sults. We have discovered it in a multitude of
shades and in a diversity of individuals. If now
we should attempt to summarize our findings we would
say first that the fear of God arises primarily out
of the way God appears or is presented to us. We
have seen that love or the more tender aspect of God
is in evidence from the very beginning and increas-
ingly abounds until it becomes ascendant and over-
flows in the New Testament. At the same time there
is a severer side to God which reveals itself in the

# Note: We have introduced no discussion of James
or Jude. The former has no occasion to deal with
the fear of God except in one incidental reference
(5:9). The latter, although making much appeal to
fear within its short compass (See vss. 5, 5, 7, 11,
15) brings no new light to bear on our problems.
Old Testament in his holiness, righteousness, and wrath toward sin and which is not obliterated by any means in the New Testament, even in Christ's teaching. These two then, the lovable and the fearful aspects of God continue together, giving us such a paradox as we have in Revelation, wherein wrath is set forth as an attribute of the Lamb.

As for the form this fear of God takes we have attempted to point out that in the earlier records of God's dealing with men, mankind is still living on a physical plane of life. He is a creature of the moment and is subject to his physical nature. As a result his fears in the days of 'J' are incited by physical appearances and are expressed physically. But with the growth and dominance of the mental and spiritual life these physical characteristics tend to pass away, so that later we have the fear of God being aroused by the concept of God and existing as a sentiment or a permanent disposition. Even then there are times of distinct emotional outburst and especially in the events attending the institution of the New Covenant there are occasions when the fear of God appears in a highly wrought up state accompanied by trembling and prostration. Those were fearsome days when eternal life hung in the balance for man and God walked again in the gardens of the earth. There could not be otherwise than great fear but this later gave way to a more subdued refined fear so that we afterwards have 'fear' in the New Testament referring to a sentiment or a permanent disposition.

As to the nature of the fear of God in the Bible, we have drawn attention throughout to its classification into servile, filial, and numinous types. Servile and filial fear are largely determined by the prominence of the love element. Pure
servile fear appears in those cases where the more
tender attributes of God are unknown, are ignored,
or are in abeyance. God is thought of as a judge,
a punisher of evil, a being of holiness, and a sov­
eraign of uncompromising righteousness. Such a type
of fear is proper to the unredeemed, the evil, the
disobedient. In the Old Testament especially it ap­
ppears as the dominant note of appeal and the chief
motivating force for the faithful, overshadowing the
more tender and attractive strains in the religious
life. Here it operates as a mark of piety, a re­
straint from evil, an incentive to righteousness, an
element in worship and one of the mainstays of wis­
dom. Later in the New Testament it is appealed to in
connection with the unsaved and unrepentant in an
effort to bring about repentance. Here it generally
figures prominently in conversion.

Servile fear, however, tends to disappear
with the coming of the knowledge of God's love and
grace and the use of the means of salvation. We are
led to believe theoretically that it is entirely
done away with in the child of the New Covenant al­
though in practice there are still strains of the
same fear appearing. In general, however, a holy
filial fear comes in to supplant the servile. The
redeemed has seen God as revealed through Jesus
Christ who loved him and died for him. He has en­
tered into covenant relationship with that God and
has been received as an adopted son. God has become
a loving Father, towards whom he fears to give any
offense and shuns any evil that might enter to mar
the relationship. This fear is present at least in
germ from the very beginning in the Bible but only
reaches its fullness in the New Testament. Here we
find it functioning as a safeguard against overcon­
fidence, a means to perfecting holiness, a motive
of right conduct for believers, an element in wor­
ship and praise, and a factor of good consequence in daily life.

As respects 'numinous' fear, we have noticed how this kind of fear is in evidence from the earliest beginnings of our Scriptural record. It arises out of the sense of the mysteriousness, the supernaturalness, the overwhelming character, the 'something other' that qualifies the Divine. This was but crudely felt at the beginning but more and more assumed a worthier form. It is dependent upon one's ability to sense the Divine and grow with that ability. It can best be appreciated by the religiously inclined and those of spiritual capacity. It is therefore in the New Testament that we find this kind of fear at its truest and best, and here, in the Book of Acts especially, it figures extensively in the many conversions occurring in the early church. Throughout the entire Bible, however, it seems to be prominent as a background of worship. Thus Jacob, after his 'numinous' experience at Bethel, "rose up early in the morning" and worshipped. At the miracle of Nain we are told that "fear took hold on all and they glorified God." The praise and worship of the Book of Revelation is filled with the 'numinous' feature. Such a fear therefore seems to enter into the reverent worshipful attitude and the glorification of God.

However, on many occasions in the New Testament at least, the word 'fear' does not designate any one of these types of fear but may represent all of them, numinous fear, filial fear, and servile fear arising out of the same situation. The first may exist side by side with either of the other two, while in some cases it is conceivable that both a holy filial fear and servile fear may be present to some degree in the same individual. This may be particularly seen when the fear resulting from God's
threatened punishment or wrath combines with the holy filial fear which grows out of the dawning realization of His love. But in general fear will tend to be either the one or the other depending upon whether the grace of God has been experienced or not. Again we have found that these two kinds of fear appear frequently only as an element, a chief element though, in a comprehensive designation of character or an attitude and bearing towards God, which is called 'the 'fear' of God. This particular usage is especially prominent in the Old Testament and passes over to some extent into the New.
Chapter VI

The Fear of God in the Roman Catholic System.

It was the original intention of the writer to undertake a survey of the fear of God in the history of our religion, for the fear of God has always been more or less in appearance. At times it has been but faintly discernible while at other times it has burst into prominence as the dominating factor and ruling motive. An account of its manifestations in history would therefore furnish an interesting commentary upon the discussion of our previous chapters. It would certainly be of great value in illustrating the various types of fear. It would also furnish an opportunity for gauging the effectiveness and the importance of the fear of God in Christianity. However, it is very apparent that such a study to be adequate must go into considerable detail for we need to get at the setting, the incentives, and the reactions connected with each occasion. And to cover in this manner the whole range of church history, rich in materials pertaining to the fear of God, would result in such a work as could not be properly comprehended within the limits of this study. It is with regret therefore that we turn aside from Marcion who, in one of the most noted and influential heresies of the second century, failed to reconcile love and fear as attitudes towards the same God and was led to deny the unity of God, accordingly proposing the existence of two gods, a just one to be feared and a good one to be loved. In the same way

#Harnack Vol. I p.271 and Dict. of Christian Biog.
we are compelled to leave Lactantius* and his "De Ira Dei" which though written in the early fourth century still occupies a prominent place among the classics on the subject. Likewise it is with the golden mouthed* Chrysostom, turning an occasion of widespread terror into the conversion of Antioch and writing homilies on the inconceivable in God filled with direful passages and cited by Otto as pure expressions of the "numinous". These and many others interesting from our point of view, we shall be compelled to pass over. Instead, we shall undertake to discuss the fear of God as developed under the Roman Catholic System in contrast with what we find in the Protestant. Here we have a difference subtle but not unreal and certainly of large significance.

Dealing then in this chapter with the Roman Catholic System we find within it a treatment of the subject not unlike that which is to be found under the Protestant. In fact the two have much the same ideas about the matter. A Protestant for instance can read with a great deal of profit the analysis of fear by that great theologian of the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas, a product of an undivided Christendom though acclaimed by the Roman Catholic Church as her own. In his Summa Theologica he devotes an entire section (Pt.II-II-XIX) to the fear of God and his presentation in many respects has not been improved upon to this day. Using his characteristic question and answer method he discusses God as the object of fear. He finds at least four kinds of fear directly or indirectly related to God: worldly or human fear wherein man withdraws from God on account of the evil he fears, servile fear or the fear of punishment whereby we turn to God, filial fear or the fear as of a child towards a father, and initial fear or a combination of the last two. He distinguishes in detail between servile and filial

*Library of Fathers
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fear and wants to know whether servile fear is good. He decides that it is "substantially good but its servility is evil." He asks whether it remains with the love of God and informs us that fear considered as servile does not remain with the love of God but the "substance of servile fear" can remain just as self-love in a sense remains with God-love. As regards its servility however it decreases as the love of God increases until it is entirely cast out. He even carries the discussion into the future life and inquires whether fear remains in heaven. He gives answer to this that servile fear will by no means remain but filial fear will there reach its perfection though it "will not have quite the same act as it has now." In all of which we do not discover much that is out of accord with the views of the Protestant world and the same may be said of the beliefs of the Roman Church in general on this score. The two systems are not so far apart in what they directly teach on the subject but it is in their practices and the train of consequences that follow some of their beliefs wherein the great difference is to be found. For while the Roman Catholic System does not unduly favor and promote servile fear in so many words, it is adapted to develop and immoderately emphasise such a fear and the burden of this chapter will be to point out several of the means that bring this about.

At the very outset we would pause before its doctrine of salvation. Salvation is held to be the completed condition of one who has become righteous and fully acceptable to God. This condition is to be reached upon justification and justification is not an immediate result but a continuous process wherein faith and works combine to secure righteousness in the sight of God. In truth justification proceeds hand in hand with sanctification and at no time does the believer attain righteousness but becomes "juster" and "juster." Thus one's complete
and final justification, on which salvation depends, is an uncertain matter and never has the believer grounds of confidence. He may have hope but there is no provision for his assurance. The element of faith mentioned above will not give it inasmuch as faith is considered principally an intellectual assent and lacks the note of deep trust and warm certitude. Thus Cardinal Bellarmine says of it that: "Justifying faith is not trust, but solely the firm and assured assent to all those things which God has promised to man for belief". While Sir Thomas Moore enlarges the definition by declaring that faith signifies "the belief and firm credence given not only to such things as God promiseth but also to every truth that he tell- eth his church". At the same time he tells us that the heretical Lutherans "abuse the word faith altogether turning it slyly from belief into trust, confidence, and hope". Such a faith it must be evident can furnish no assurance and the same is true of the other element in justification, works. Man by nature is never satisfied with his works; always he feels he might have accomplished more. At the best there are mistakes, blunders, errors; a falling short. Perfection is ever beyond him. The more he does the more he sees to do. When he has done all in the end he can only say that he is an unprofitable servant. The very act of doing only brings to light additional tasks, additional shortcomings, and he is caught in the endless circle of desiring to perfect his salvation and yet never being fully able to perfect his works which are the 'conditio sine qua non'. The logical outcome of all this is that in the Catholic System the ground of assurance is cut away. Neither faith nor works will supply it and the result can only be a certain anxiety in the soul which in many serious minded followers will take the form of nothing less than fear. Take away confidence and leave in its place misgivings about salvation and there must be fear. And it will not be a filial or milder
form of fear either but a servile fear that arises when the opposite of one's justification presents itself. We are aware that a complaint has been made by Grisar against Luther that he reduced Catholicism to a state of fear; and the same might also be said of Calvin, for he charged the Roman Church with making it a principal article of faith, "that believers ought to be perpetually in suspense and uncertainty as to their interest in the divine favour". But we can find no alternative. When a doctrine which takes away the assurance of salvation is carried to its logical conclusion we can see no other outcome but fear, at least the grounds for it are there.

Furthermore the confessional and the elaborate sacrament of penance set up and promulgated by the Church will bear investigation in this same connection, for of all devices this afforded the greatest inducement to servile fear. Instead of the simple assuring "come unto me", and a free access to a throne of grace, and a comforting peace-filled forgiveness there were substituted the artifices of a man-made creature, that demand that confession be made to a priest, the prescriptions of a priest, atonement for sin through the rendering of satisfaction, and in the end priestly absolution as a requisite to salvation. The very thought behind the whole practice was conducive to anxiety and even fear. Many of life's sins are totally beyond our capacities to confess. Either memory fails us and we omit, or knowledge is inadequate and we are ignorant, or judgment is partial and we err. As Calvin declared, "it has been experimentally found by those who have made the trial seriously,...that it is not possible thus to confess even a hundredth part of our sins". What too shall be said of those deeper pleadings of the soul and those inner acknowledgments...
of unworthiness which only the Spirit can interpret before the throne of God. At the most our "sin" cannot be covered with a confession of any particular sin or sins even though "venial" sins be excluded, and to the earnest soul the entire sacrament is rife with fearful possibilities, for when have the full requirements been truly met? It was just this that led Calvin to refer to the whole usage as an "pestilent law, because, if wretched souls are affected with the fear of God, it precipitates them into despair; or if they are in a state of careless security it soothes them with vain flatteries, and renders them still more insensible". It is "absolutely impracticable...it can only destroy, condemn, confound, and precipitates into ruin and despair". Believers have reason to find themselves overwhelmed by their examination of themselves and the inadequacy of confessing all their sins, They can find no mode of extricating themselves. "They tremble, therefore, before that Judge, whose knowledge far exceeds our apprehension."

Nor is it only in the confession of sin that we find the sacrament of penance being a source of fear, but we are mindful of the satisfaction to be rendered as a part of the same sacrament; for in demanding that works of penance be offered as satisfaction for sin the Church again laid a torturous snare for sensitive souls. If penitential works must be performed and treasured up against the day of reckoning we are back again at the old round of winning our salvation by our works. Who can be certain that the payment rendered will prove sufficient in the presence of the great Judge? When after all has one rendered full satisfaction for his sins? Is there not the feeling that they are "too great" for me and anything I may do will be insufficient? Are they not ever before me in spite of all that I may do by way of making amends? What deed of penance will in anyways be adequate? Calvin has well said
in respect to this that the sinner* "will always doubt whether God be propitious to him, he will always be in a state of fluctuation and terror". So that we feel that both here as well as in the confessional act the sacrament of penance is admirably adapted to stimulate and nourish fear—a servile fear.

In fact we would go still further and say that the sacrament puts a premium upon such a fear in its initial demands upon the believer. An acceptable repentance has always been regarded as containing a large element of grief and hatred of sin together with a recognition of the mercy of God and a turning to God. Contrition in other words has held a prominent place. But with the Roman Catholic sacrament of penance, attrition, which is simply the fear of the punishment of sin, is accepted and any sinner so coming to the confessional is accorded the full benefits of the sacrament. But what becomes of the "broken and contrite heart" under such circumstances except to render it a matter of indifference or an unnecessary adjunct. There is thus an elevation of servile fear to an equality with or even to the exclusion of the chief elements that enter into a true repentance and when so great a bounty is made to depend upon it we may expect an undue emphasis to be given to it. It certainly affords the easiest course to repentance—easiest for the priest to stimulate and easiest for the sinner to accept. The consequence of the whole matter is that the dread of hell and punishment oftentimes becomes the main if not the sole motive leading to the confession resulting in what the Germans call a "Galgenreue" or gallows repentance. Thus from beginning to end the sacrament of penance has within it the element of servile fear and this element is inclined to be prominent, sometimes being the sole motive. The sacrament is approached in fear, the confession made
under its influence and satisfaction finally rendered with it hanging over.

The ultimate difficulty of rendering full satisfaction we have already pointed out. This difficulty is taken care of in the Roman Catholic System in its doctrine of the future life and here we arrive at an additional source of fear. For it is taught that there are three places of abode in the hereafter: hell, purgatory, and heaven. Purgatory or the intermediate state is designed as a place of purgation to which all members of the church must go upon death and where they must be cleansed of the residue of sin after the sacrament of penance and extreme unction have been received. Only martyrs and canonized saints are exempt. All others must pass an indefinite period in this state rendering satisfaction for their sin by suffering punishment. This punishment is variously represented but the preponderance of belief is that among other things flames play upon the victims—flames such as "when I was within, I would have thrown myself into boiling glass to cool me."* These and other forms of torment occupy the stay in this land of purification while demons either inflict torture or stand and look on the indescribable sufferings of the unfortunates. Altogether it is not a happy picture and one that might well give the ordinary man cause for great alarm. The worst feature is that there is no certainty about the duration of the stay in purgatory. The victim himself can do nothing to shorten it after he gets there but is entirely dependent upon the prayers, alms, masses and works of merit of the living done in his behalf. Truly not a very bright outlook when it is considered that five centuries after the death of Pope Innocent III Cardinal Bellarmine writing of the matter declared that it was not known at that day whether the Pope had been released

*Dante—Purgatory, Canto XXVII
from purgatory or not. Well might Bellarmine say that this case "fills me with real fright every time I think of it."* Well might any individual view the prospect with fright.

The servility of the fear aroused by the Catholic doctrine of the future life is furthermore intensified by the physical manner in which that life is pictured. We have already referred to the fires of purgatory. They are but a single element in an elaborate conception whose parts are essentially of the same nature. It was under the Roman Catholic System that Dante wrote his Divine Comedy with its Inferno of screaming damned and its Purgatory of lesser cursed, agonizing beyond the description of words. It was under the same System that the terrible pictures of the hereafter and the last judgment were portrayed on the walls of the churches by the famous painters or set into the stained glass windows by the great artisans of the Middle Ages. It was the missionaries of the same Church who to further their work among the natives on the St. Lawrence sent home "for life-like pictures of 'souls in perdition' and of devils tormenting them with serpents, tearing them with pincers and holding them by the hair of their head, while they showed misery, rage and desperation on their faces".* And it is within an order of the same Church, the Jesuit, that the following exercise is found for the preparation of novices. This exercise is styled a contemplation concerning hell and is characteristic of the general methods. We read, "The first prelude is...the forming the place, which is to set before the eyes of the imagination the length, breadth, and depth of hell. The second consists in asking for an intimate perception of punishments which the damned undergo; that if at any time I should be forgetful of the love of God at least the fear of punishment may restrain me from sins.

*Schaff, Our Fathers Faith and Ours P.416
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The first point is, to see by the imagination the vast fires of hell, and the souls inclosed in certain fiery bodies, as it were in dungeons. The second is to hear, in imagination, the lamentations, the howlings, the exclamations, and the blasphemies against Christ and his Saints, thence breaking forth. The third is to perceive by smell also of the imagination, the smoke, the brimstone, and the stench of a kind of sink, or filth, and of putrefaction. The fourth is, to taste in like manner those most bitter things, as the tears, the rottenness, and the worm of conscience. The fifth, to touch in a manner those fires, by the touch of which the souls themselves are burnt. In observance of the prescribed order of going through with the Exercises, this descent into hell, occupying one hour, would be made late in the evening— the hours before supper".* In all the foregoing the low nature of the appeal is evident. The spiritual element is reduced; it is the physical man that is aimed at and we look for the results upon a physical plane. There has always been a question as to how far an appeal on the basis of the physical will carry over into and influence the spiritual. Whatever may be the connection between the two it is certain that the efforts here fall short of what we might call a spiritualized fear, a wholesome form of fear, and beget in many cases a cringing servile fear and even downright terror.

Finally we shall mention the sponsoring of mariolatry and saint worship as tending to develop the fear of God within the Roman Catholic System. For it is here that we have Mary, mother of Jesus, and the saints pictured as pouring out compassion while the Lord is the dispenser of justice and God is presented as the austere righteous One. The believer was taught that access to Christ and forgiveness of sin were best had through the Virgin and the
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saints. God and Christ were set aloof and shorn of their more tender aspects. The penitent was forbidden that direct approach so that fear came between him and his Lord. The extent of this fear increased as the place taken by Mary assumed great proportions. David S. Schaff in his late work, "Our Fathers Faith and Ours", has given a splendid resume of this from which we are freely drawing in this paragraph. Mary is looked to as the queen of mercy while Christ is the king of justice. She is the queen of heaven, the spouse of the Holy Spirit, the mother of God. Her prayers are so effective that the chief prayer of the Roman Catholic is the Ave Maria, this prayer exceeding the Lord's Prayer many times on the rosary. She is the "all powerful advocate of sinners at the throne of God". "Her intercession has well-nigh omnipotent efficacy". In the Middle Ages Damiani called her the door of heaven and the window of paradise. Anselm described her as "the vestibule of universal propitiation". St. Bernard declared that "if you are terrified by the thunders of heaven, go to Jesus and, if you fear Jesus, then run to Mary. She will show her breasts to the Son and win his compassion". And Bonaventura in his Greater Psalter speaks of God as the Lord of Vengeance while Mary is the mother of compassion. But of all the tributes and eulogies of Mary those of Alphonso de Liguori, the "Glories of Mary" written in the 18th century, are the most extravagant. The love of Mary he says is a "sure pledge of paradise". Her help to sinners is almost omnipotent. She is queen of mercy solely intent upon compassion and pardon. She is the peacemaker between God and man. The hope and advocacy of sinners on earth and the dead in purgatory lies with her. Alphonso describes a vision of two ladders reaching to heaven. Christ stands at the head of the red one and from it sinners fall back. Mary
stands at the head of the other, the white one, and on its rounds the climber succeeds, for the hand of Mary is there to help. Even in more recent times such excessive regard has not abated. In the encyclical of Pius IX, 1849, it is asserted that "our salvation is founded on the Holy Virgin, since the Lord deposited in her the plenitude of all good, so that if there be in us any hope, any grace, any salvation, we must find it solely in her". Still later we find Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) calling her "the immaculate queen of heaven and our propitiator with God", and affirming that Mary's intercession is "the safest way to reach the gracious hand of God". She is "placed on the highest summit of eternal power and glory", and "is to be sought that by her intercession her divine son may be appeased and softened". She is described by both Leo and Cardinal Mercier of Belgium as being the door of salvation and it is almost impossible to have access to Christ except through her. "Of all the splendid treasures of grace brought to us by our Lord Jesus Christ, not one fragment can be allotted to us in the divine plan without the mediation of Mary".

Thus it seems that no language is too extravagant or too far fetched to be applied to the Virgin Mary. She is assigned an office and set on an eminence that beggars description while the believer's relations with God accordingly suffer. The Father and the Redeemer are set at a distance. There is no longer that free and easy approach for penitent sinners. Rather there is a fear of God. His love and mercy and gentleness have gone. There is no longer the invitation to "come unto me". Mary has taken this place. She is the mediator, the dispenser of comfort while between the penitent and God there stands fear. And the same thing is to be said in respect to the worship of the saints, though to
a lesser degree. For when the saints are made favorites of God and intercessors with Him, when it becomes necessary or at least expedient to seek their good graces, then fear dominates the believer's relations with God. Thus the thousands of saints appearing on the Roman calendar and the special days set aside for the invoking of their intercession are but each an incentive to the fear of God.

We have now looked at some of the elements in the Roman Catholic System that lead to fear or tend to incite it—the doctrine of salvation, the sacrament of penance, the manner of belief in the future life, and the interjection of the worship of Mary and the saints. In all these cases a fear of God is engendered or at least is latent, which is not a filial or milder form of fear but the fear of wrath and punishment—servile fear. Such a fear in a proper form at times may exert a wholesome effect but with the constant and undue emphasis given it under this system the consequence cannot be for the best. No better way of estimating this presents itself than to observe the actual working of this fear and its concrete effects in the life of the believer. Before doing so we are to remind ourselves that all individuals will not be affected in the same way. Calvin has already been mentioned in connection with the confessional as drawing a distinction between those who moved with the fear of God were driven into despair and those who in a state of careless security were soothed with vain flatteries; and it is certain that there have been many less sober minded persons who have never been influenced to any great degree by these threatening doctrines of the church. Others have found shelter with the Virgin and the Saints or in other mitigating features. But notwithstanding there have been those who in their lives carried the 'fearful' doctrines to their logical conclusions and the results were not bene-
Prominent among such individuals was none other than Luther himself and we would discuss his experience in the Catholic Church.

In his boyhood and youth Luther received the teachings of the church with the believing simplicity of a young mind plus a very realistic imagination. The result was disastrous. His soul was beaten down, overcome, filled with a dread from which he never completely recovered even in later life. Christ to him was not a Mediator or a Saviour but an implacable judge waiting for the last day when he should sit on the judgment seat and exact satisfaction for every sin. No one could escape Him. The common type of sermon, the art of the day, the widespread teaching about penance, hell, and purgatory are all said to have reinforced the idea. The very name of Christ brought terror. So that in spite of whatever ameliorating means the Church possessed we have Luther dominated by a servile fear that left him cowering and saying, "I did not believe in Christ but regarded him as a stern and terrible judge, as he appeared in paintings sitting on a rainbow. When I beheld Him upon the cross he appeared to me like a flash of lightning; when his name was mentioned, I would rather have heard the Devil's name pronounced; I shrank back in terror when I saw his picture, closed my eyes and would rather have seen the Devil."

Such then was the state of soul of young Luther when in his twenty second year he came to a crisis. In that year a friend of his met sudden death either through assassination or storm and Luther himself, caught in a terrible storm near Erfurt, was struck down with a blinding flash of lightning. The experience naturally brought its own terrors and taken in conjunction with his already fearful condition, precipitated a decisive moment. To Luther the whole thing was nothing less than a manifestation of
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the wrath and judgment of God and in his terror he vowed then and there to seek refuge in a monastery that in monkish austerities he might achieve works of merit to appease this God. This he did and all his contemporaries bear witness that as a monk none excelled him in the performance of the most minute regulations of the order. Few if any ever gave themselves more completely to the doing of meritorious works that they might win the confidence of salvation. But it was of no avail. With his attention constantly directed to rendering satisfaction for sin the monk Luther found himself fighting a losing battle. How could it be possible for him to do enough to wipe out the sin that was felt by his delicate conscience? However hard he might try he could not reach the goal. So that these days in the monastery were a veritable hell. "He felt as if he was contending with all the powers of darkness, and as if, instead of being in the society of angels in the convent, he was among devils."* Even after making his profession at the convent he said he found no power in it to sustain him. "For when even a small temptation came from death or sin", he tells us, "I succumbed, and found there was neither baptism nor monkery that could help me; thus I had now long lost Christ and His baptism. I was then the most miserable man on earth; day and night there was nothing but wailing and despair, so that no one could keep me under restraint...God be praised that I did not sweat myself to death, otherwise I should have been long ago in the depths of hell with my monk's baptism. For what I knew of Christ was nothing more than that He was a stern judge, from whom I would have fled, and yet could not escape".* The very system of penance drove him to this conception of Christ for "if I sin, it behooves me to make satisfaction. Thus I lose Christ, the Saviour and Consoler, and make of Him the jailer and hangman of my poor soul".** Such words as 'just...
and 'justice' he describes as a thunderbolt in his conscience for they simply meant punishment to him. Men could have no hope before absolute justice. The 'Righteousness' he found in the Psalms meant a strict judgment and a strict judgment meant that he was eternally lost. So great in fact were the effects of these conceptions upon Luther in his monastery days and so vividly did he sense the implications that at times he uttered cries of agony and on one occasion during the reading of the Scripture (Mt. 17) about the man possessed with a demon fell down in the choir and raved like one possessed. We even note that the celebration of the mass upon which he had depended as an opportunity for a work of great merit turned out to be a great terror. The performance demanded the observance of a multitude of details of which not a single one could be omitted without grave sin. It was a very serious occasion demanding great worthiness and Luther says he almost died. "In administering this awfully holy ordinance, he realised in his soul but an increased sense of responsibility and a deeper sense of guilt. How should he, himself, impure, worthily administer it? He was overwhelmed with terror, when he for the first time undertook to present the offering before God".*

All in all Luther's early life was not a peaceful or happy experience. He himself reminds us that he had the Virgin Mother, St. George, St. Barbara, and other saints to go to as mediators but they were of little avail when his soul was overwhelmed with terror before God the Righteous and Christ the Judge. This is the period of Luther's life that might very well be designated the period of servile fear, when he was possessed by a religious fear that was detrimental, unmanning, blasting. There was almost a total absence of any dependence upon the love, mercy, and grace of God, and there was little opportunity for the operation of a true
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faith and trust. The desire to perform works of merit and render satisfaction for sin was the chief thing, and the mainspring to it all was fear, a debasing servile fear. Perhaps no finer illustration than Luther can be found in the history of the church, of the lengths to which such a fear may lead the individual. Carried to its conclusions in any life it becomes utterly paralysing and destructive of all that is born of hope and assurance.

In having taken Luther we are aware that we shall be accused of using one of the most extreme examples of the point at issue. So much so, that Grisar and other hostile critics would endeavor to explain away the whole matter on the basis of an abnormal personality, a diseased mentality, a morbid temperament, or a nervous imagination. But such explanations do not prove enough in the light of subsequent events and furthermore that which appeared so glaringly in Luther appeared in others in varying degrees. In fact among the many questions in the background of the Reformation was the question as to whether the soul should continue in servile fear before God and whether man should be held in cowering bondage by the beliefs and practices of the accepted priestly order. The answer of the Roman Catholic Church was given in the Council of Trent (1545) and it is to the Decrees and Canons of that Council that we now turn. These are interesting to us in that they are the pronouncements of the last great council of that church on some of the questions we have been considering and so are authoritative today.

Glancing then at these decrees and canons we find throughout an emphasis upon the importance of works as well as faith as a means to salvation. Canon XIX informs us that "If any one saith, that
nothing besides faith is commanded in the Gospel; that other things are indifferent, neither commanded nor prohibited, but free;...let him be anathema."

And at the Sixth Session there were four dissentients on the understanding of the words of St. Paul, "justified by faith." These four maintained that one is justified by faith, "in as much as he is justified when he firmly believes that pardon will be granted him through the merits of Christ." But they were overruled and the decision of the council was given in a definition that made justification depend upon both works and faith. And throughout the findings of the Council few things receive more attention than the merit that is obtained through works. Thus Chapter XVI tells us that life eternal is to be proposed as a reward which is according to the promise of God to be faithfully rendered to good works and merits. And in Canon XXIV a curse is pronounced upon any one who says that "the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works." And in Canon XXXII likewise sets forth works as meriting "increase of grace, eternal life, and...also an increase of glory." Thus one's works must still be looked to as a means to salvation but a dependence upon such, as we have seen, can only result in a servile fear actually or potentially. As for such a thing as an assurance of faith or salvation the Council is set firmly against it and declares that to advocate it is the boasting of heretics. We are told (Ch. IX) that "no one can know with a certainty of faith, which cannot be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God." And "if any one saith, that he will for certain, of an absolute and infallible certainty, have that great gift of perseverance unto the end, unless he have learned this by special revelation; let him be anathema" (Canon XVI). (See also Canons XIII and XV). And what is true of the doctrine of salvation is just as true of the Council's handling of the worship of Mary and the Saints and the use of the sacrament of penance. In retaining the confessional for instance the demand was made for the confession of all mortal sins (Ch.V) and the rendering of satisfactions
(Ch.VIII, Ch.XIV, Canon XII). Special pains are taken to retain attrition as an effective means of pardon (Session XIV-Ch. IV, Canon V). The Council denies the fear element in the sacrament and yet is unable to give consolation through it except that "sometimes, in persons who are pious and who receive this sacrament with devotion," it is "wont to be followed by peace and serenity of conscience, with exceeding consolation of spirit" (Ch.III). Then finally after all has been done-baptism received, confession made, satisfaction rendered, absolution secured—the only thing the Council can hold out is purgatory (Session 25th). The escape from this is to be made through the suffrages of the living—"masses, prayers, alms and other works of piety" for the dead together with the "acceptable sacrifice of the altar." Truly an uncertain outlook, lacking in comfort, carrying servile fear even to the gates of death.

Such was the reply of official Catholicism to the Reformers and such has been her attitude through the succeeding years. In all fairness, however, we would say that this has not been the sole thing known within her gates. There has always been an element of purer devotion on the part of some of her constituents and no finer spirit of Christian love and piety breathe than are found in some of her hymns. At the same time her Roman hierarchy has consistently upheld the other aspect of the religious life and every now and then has risen up to take issue with those that would teach otherwise. An outstanding example is that of Francois de Fenelon (1651-1715), archbishop of Cambrai, and brilliant scholar of the church. Drawn by the trend of his own thinking and bent of his mystical nature and possibly influenced by that great mystic Madame Guyon, Fenelon arrived at a higher state of spiritual living.
Here a pure and overflowing love was the sole motive. Everything of the nature of fear was cast out. His views were set forth in the Maxims of the Saints, a series of articles dealing with the higher states of the religious life. Fenelon recognised an inferior state largely occupied by the great body of Christians, especially those in the early stages of religious experience, in which motives of fear and hope exercised the greatest influence.* But this inferior state was not to be dwelt in and the Christian should advance to a higher state of pure love in which all lesser motives were discarded. Such a doctrine directly opposed to the traditional and expressed teachings of the church was not long without an opponent. None other than Bossuet, bishop of Meaux and famous pulpit orator, a second Chrysostom, rose to champion the orthodox order. In the conflict that followed with his former friend, Bossuet's deliverances on the subject filled six volumes in addition to some six hundred and forty six letters relating to Quietism. Fenelon's own side was born up just as voluminously. The prominent rank of the two men and the intensity of the controversy make it one of the outstanding disputes of the church. In the end a detailed examination of Fenelon's Maxims was made by the consultors and cardinals of the Holy Office at Rome lasting over two years and employing one hundred and thirty two sessions. The outcome was that Fenelon was silenced. "Les Maxims des Saints" were prohibited and condemned in twenty three extracts and the point made in Proposition I of the condemnation was the "indifference to hope and fear." Fear had again won its day.
CHAPTER VII

The Protestant System and the Fear of God.

In the previous chapter we have attempted to bring out the abiding disposition to servile fear that is developed and nourished under the Roman Catholic System. In this chapter we are interested in observing the place and emphasis given to such fear in the Protestant System and the possibilities of its existence in this System.

Many have been the results good and bad assigned to the Reformation but however it may be appraised its master stroke lay in this that it discovered a new relation to Christ. Buried under the silt of tradition and priestly dogma and practice for years He had become well nigh lost to the common believer. The Reformers in resting their authority entirely upon the Scriptures swept all of this away at a single blow and left the gospel standing in its nakedness. There could be but one outcome and that was a new conception of God and Christ. Christ was seen in all the loveliness and grace with which as the Divine Son he is pictured in the New Testament, while God the Father was found in and interpreted through the Son. God could be no different than His Son and was clearly manifested in Him.

Several corollaries immediately arose from such a position and it was these that wiped
out one by one the sources of fear that we have noted under the Roman Catholic System. There for instance, was the aloofness of Christ and God. The simple portraiture of Christ in the Gospel is not such as to keep the earnest follower aloof. Rather it is the picture of Him who went up and down the highways and byways laying his hand upon the leper, touching the eyes of the blind, mingling with humanity, receiving sinners. It is He who came with the invitation to "come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden". There is no place for the worship of the Saints and the Virgin here. As the Belgic Confession (1561) has put it* "this mediator, whom the Father hath appointed between Him and us, ought in nowise to affright us by His majesty, or cause us to seek another according to our fancy. For there is no creature, in heaven or on earth, who loveth us more than Jesus Christ." And the same is true of the believer's access to God. When God is found in Christ there can be no difficulty of approach. The sincere contrite heart will always find the way open. Thus mariolatry, the worship of the saints, and the aloofness of God pass out of the religious consciousness. Likewise the use of the confessional and all the practices that had grown up around it are abolished. When the sinner may go directly to Christ there is no need of an intermediary confessor. forgiveness with Him is not dependent upon some future action, and as for attrition no one would dare rest a plea for pardon upon it when they are drawn with the cords of His love. So the sacrament of penance with its train of fearful consequences goes out. Moreover, the same thing is seen in the doctrine of purgatory. The two things, purgatory and a redeeming compassionate Christ, do not go together. They are not to be reconciled and the acceptance of the Christ the Reformers saw in the Gospels immediately destroyed the fear laden aspects of the here-
after for the believer. Thus Calvin speaking of Christ says* "The design of the Father in honouring the Son by 'committing all judgment to him' was, that he might relieve the consciences of his people from all fear concerning the judgment".

But chief among all the outgrowths of this new relation to Christ was that of justification through faith. This was designed to have the most far reaching effect, permeating, coloring, possessing, motivating all of the believer's life. Henceforth it was seen that Christ Jesus is able to save to the uttermost and the faith of the believer in Him to do it is the sole basis of salvation. The works of the believer can never take His place and while good works are conjoined with the Christian life they are not the cause of that life but the result of a life that through faith has laid hold upon Christ and in turn has been possessed by him. This plainly overthrows the entire doctrine of works so prominent in the Roman Catholic System. No longer does the believer depend upon the perfection of his works or upon the perfection of his love as the ground of salvation but he depends upon the perfection of the only perfect One, Jesus Christ. It is not his own righteousness but faith in One who is able to make righteous that now gives him confidence.

And so there came into great importance in the troublous days of the Reformation a phrase that we have learned to know as the assurance of faith or the assurance of salvation. Few words or phrases have had a greater influence upon the subject of our study than this. It represents in brief the confidence, persuasion, conviction of being redeemed by Christ and received into the sonship of God, coming to the believer through his faith in Christ. It is apparent that it stands in direct opposition to the
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Roman Catholics' position. In fact we have already referred to some of their utterances on this score, denials that exaggerate the Protestant position to the point of its being unrecognizable at times. Thus we are told* that "no one can know with a certainty of faith, which cannot be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God". Whereas the Westminster Assembly when it comes to deal with the question* "Can true believers be infallibly assured that they are in the estate of grace, and that they shall persevere therein unto salvation?" gives answer that "Such as truly believe in Christ, and endeavor to walk in all good conscience before him, may, without extraordinary revelation, by faith grounded upon the truth of God's promises, and by the Spirit enabling them to discern in themselves those graces to which the promises of life are made, and bearing witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, be infallibly assured that they are in the estate of grace and shall persevere therein unto salvation". These two positions are as opposite as the poles and while the Protestant acknowledges that there may be various degrees of assurance and times when one's assurance is severely interrupted yet there is never a time when it is truly extinct. "Assurance of grace and salvation", we are told, "not being of the essence of faith, true believers may wait long before they obtain it; and after the enjoyment thereof, may have it weakened and intermitted, through manifold distempers, sins, temptations, and desertions; yet are they never left without such a presence and support of the Spirit of God, as keeps them from sinking into utter despair (Westminster Larger Catechism Q 81)." (See also The Westminster Conf. of Faith Ch. XVIII, IV). Even those who do not experience it at first are to diligently persevere in the means of grace and not to be terrified by the doctrine of reprobation, since a
merciful God has promised that he will not quench the smoking flax, nor break the bruised reed"."

It is evident that such a doctrine carried to its full conclusion and rested in will have a decisive bearing upon the existence of such a state as we have noted under the Roman Catholic System. In short there can be little less than the banishment of servile fear when an assurance of salvation is had. The two things are not compatible; confidence and dread, boldness and servility do not dwell together. If the assurance of salvation is possessed then any fear incident to or pertaining to that salvation must be done away. And this is exactly one of the claims we find made for it. Thus the Belgic Confession* in referring to justification by faith informs us that "This is sufficient to cover all our iniquities, and to give us confidence in approaching to God; freeing the conscience of fear, terror, and dread, without following the example of our first father, Adam, who, trembling, attempted to cover himself with figleaves".* So it seems at last that
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the fear of God, in its servile aspects, is to be removed from the believer's mind. It is true that there will still be sin creeping in but no longer does it become an occasion of fearing God for believers are freed "from the revenging wrath of God, and that perfectly in this life, that they never fall into condemnation". Whatever sin remains is to be taken care of by the doctrine of sanctification according to which sin is increasingly subdued and the man grows more and more in grace unto the perfect man (West. Larg. Cat. Q.75, Q.77, Q.78; West. Con. of Faith Ch. XIII Par. II, III; Ways of Salvation, Richards, p. 184-5). Thus The Protestant did not rest upon the degree of his sanctification, but based his assurance upon his justification which is immediate and done once and for all. Truly under this system there would seem to be no occasion for servile fear in the heart of the believer. Certainly it stands in marked contrast in this respect with the other system we have noted.

Yet whatever has been said in the preceding paragraph about the removal of servile fear must be modified, for in no sense was its absolute removal accomplished in the mind of the believer. There is no denying that much was done to mitigate its influence but its complete banishment from the believing soul was only an appearance. The roots of fear had gone too deep and there had been too great a subservience to it from the earliest dawning of man's religious consciousness. The Protestant seemed to be afraid to dispense with it now. He was reluctant to press entirely home the results of his position. The consequence is that we find a strain of servile fear still continuing in the believer.

This is seen in the considerable reference to fear throughout the creeds and much of the Protestant writings and while a holy filial fear is
often no doubt the fear referred to, yet the lack of explicit reference, the tendency of the ordinary mind to call fear 'fear', and at times the very context all conspire to further a servile fear. Thus the Second Helvetic Confession defines the chief duties of ministers* and tells us that to perform these effectually "they must live in the fear of God". Marriage it is said "should be contracted in the fear of the Lord"* and "children should be brought up in the fear of the Lord". The Augsburg Confession* speaking of original sin refers to the lack of fear as sin. "After Adam's fall", it says, "all men begotten after the common course of nature are born with sin; that is, without the fear of God..." And in Luther's Small Catechism following each of the Ten Commandments an interpretation is asked and the answer always begins "We should fear and love God..." Likewise in the Anglican Catechism 'fear' appears in such relations as this, "My duty towards God is to believe in him, to fear him, and to love him with all my heart..." and almost identical words are found in the Irish Articles of Religion. So we might continue at length quoting diverse statements in which fear is referred to in an indefinite sort of way.

More positive however, are the not infrequent portraits of a fearful God that are commended to believers for their perusal. Calvin especially is given to such pictures. "Let us", he says, "place that judge before our eyes, not according to the spontaneous imaginations of our minds, but according to the descriptions given of him in the Scripture; which represents him as one whose refugence eclipses the stars, whose power melts the mountains, whose anger shakes the earth, whose wisdom takes the subtle in their own craftiness, whose purity makes all things appear polluted, whose righteousness even the angels
are unable to bear, who acquits not the guilty, whose vengeance, when it is once kindled, penetrates even to the abyss of hell. Let him sit himself, I say, on the tribunal, to examine the actions of men: who will present himself fearless before his throne?"* He would have us understand that the life given to us by the mercy of God will not be received with proper appreciation and gratitude "unless we have been previously terrified and distressed with the fear of the Divine wrath, and the horror of eternal death". For this reason we find in the Scriptures that "irrespective of Christ we may contemplate God as in some measure incensed against us, and his hand armed for our destruction".* As for Luther, we find similar statements in his works. In fact there is almost a dual attitude on his part towards God. Barnack* implies this when in speaking of Luther's doctrine of God he says, "on the one hand there is the awe-inspiring judge, with whom there can be associated nothing but penalty; on the other hand the gracious Father, who has turned his heart toward us". McGiffert* similarly says "God's wrath constituted, not simply the precondition, but the permanent background of his doctrine of divine forgiveness"; at the same time he found in Him the gracious loving Father.

Or if still further evidence of the retention of servile fear in the Protestant System is wanted we would point to the actual assignment of such a fear to the believer. It is true that a great deal is said against the presence of servile fear as when we are told that Christian liberty includes an obedience to God which is not given in slavish fear* or the Old Testament is referred to as a bondage of servile fear in contrast with the New Testament in
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its joyous benefits;* but still there is a strong
servile element woven in, sometimes in the same
paragraph in which an attempt is made to refute it.
For example, referring to Calvin again, we find this
leader saying that the knowledge of God should tend
first of all to teach us fear and reverence, for
"perceiving him to be a just judge, armed with se­
verity for the punishment of crimes, he (the be­
liever) keeps his tribunal always in view, and is
restrained by fear from provoking his wrath". And
although it is added that "he restrains himself from
sin, not merely from a dread of vengeance, but be­
cause he loves and reveres God as his Father, hon­
ours and worships him as his Lord, and, even though
there were no hell, would shudder at the thought of
offending him",* the presence of the servile element
is very evident in the mention of the Judge, the
tribunal, wrath and vengeance. Or again it is ap­
parent when Calvin explains* the fear of the Lord as
the honour of a son for a father and the fear of a
servant for his master. He even makes the sentence,
Hebrews 5:7, Christ, "having been heard for his
godly fear", refer not to 'numinous' fear or rever­
ence or piety but to fear in the servile sense. It
was the fear that He might be swallowed up in death
as a sinner. "He sustained the weight of the Divine
severity; since being 'smitten and afflicted of God'
he experienced from God all the tokens of wrath and
vengeance". There is no justifying the position of
those who contend that "although Christ was afraid
of death, yet he was not afraid of the malediction
and wrath of God". In short Calvin was not alto­
gether in favor of dispensing with servile fear even
in the life of the Lord. In the case of Luther there
was a discrimination between filial fear which he
regarded as holy, akin to reverence, and servile fear
which he regarded as dread, akin to horror. The for­
mer he considered mingled, even in the case of the
righteous in so far as they are not perfect, with the latter.* This mingling appears quite plainly in Luther's treatment when he deals with a fear that purports to be filial, remaining side by side with faith and love. Here it stands "just as in God's holiness and punitive justice stand, side by side with love and mercy; or as the law, which rebukes and warns against sin yet remaining or again threatening to assert its power, stands side by side with the Gospel". In short we are given to understand that thoughts of the divine promises are to be cherished side by side with "thoughts of the threatenings and penalties of the divine law".*

So we are introduced once more to that old paradox of trying to provide a habitation within the same heart for fear and love, dread and assurance, anxiety and faith. Once again we are face to face with a God who "at once strikes down the sinner and yet also forgives him, and reconciles him to Himself by His own act". He is One who "takes away our self-confidence, and yet creates within us an invincible courage; He destroys our joy in life, and yet makes us blessed; He slays us, and yet makes alive".* The Reformers themselves sensed this problem vividly and attempted to deal with it in various ways. Calvin devotes a section of his Institutes to reconciling fear with the assurance of faith.* Having referred to the inquietude and distressing terrors that sometimes beset believers' minds, he says, "We must therefore solve this difficulty, if we mean to support the doctrine we have advanced. When we inculcate, that faith ought to be certain and secure, we conceive not of a certainty attended with no doubt, or of a security interrupted by no anxiety; but we rather affirm, that believers have a perpetual conflict with their own diffidence, and are far from placing their consciences in a placid calm, never
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disturbed by any storm. Yet, on the other hand, we deny, however they may be afflicted, that they ever fall and depart from that certain confidence which they have conceived in the Divine mercy. He cites the example of David, whose soul is filled with turbulent emotions and in whose life appear innumerable complaints. "And yet, wonderful as it is, amidst these concussions, faith sustains the hearts of the pious and truly resembles the palm-tree rising with vigour undiminished by any burdens which may be laid upon it, but which can never retard its growth."

The solution of the matter he then tells us in the next section (XVIII) is to be found in the division of the flesh and the spirit. The pious heart perceiving this is affected with varying moods some of which tend to fear and some to the reverse. "This variation happens through the imperfection of faith; since we are never so happy, during the present life, as to be cured of all diffidence, and entirely filled and possessed by faith."

So it is with the shortcomings of faith that Calvin rests his case and faith always having its lack we may expect a certain amount of fear to continue with one's assurance of salvation but this assurance will always be in the ascendant in the believer. (See also Sect. XXIII where Calvin treats more definitely of filial fear yet not without servile implications. This fear he seems to assign a definite place in the plans of God for the training of His people.) Luther tackles the same problem, though in a different way. In arriving at his doctrine of the assurance of salvation he makes provision for fear within the doctrine itself. And while we feel that in general a holy filial fear suits the description yet there is also a decided strain of servile fear, so much so that we are led to believe that he has somewhat of both in mind. To him self-confidence or anything that smacked of it was bordering upon hypocrisy. The Christian if any-
thing must be self-distrustful. This must ever be kept in the forefront, and so far is this pressed that it almost seems to be its own undoing at times. Assurance in particular does not do away with all fear or anxiety about one's salvation. In fact "fear, anxiety because of innate sinfulness is the indispensable mark of the believer's life". The very reason God leaves us in sin is that "He may keep us in the fear of Himself and in humility, so that we may always recur to His grace, always be fearful lest we sin... Yea we sin in the very fact that we do not fear."* In this same connection Professor McKinnon speaks of Luther's assurance maintaining itself even in the face of the fearful doctrine of predestination. "Those who fear and tremble about their election", he says, "have the best token (signum) of it... For in despairing of themselves the Word of God which produces this fear does its own work... Wherefore if anyone fears and is greatly tried concerning his election, let him give thanks to God for such fear, let him rejoice that he fears, since he knows assuredly (suit fiducia) that God cannot lie who says the sacrifice of God is a broken spirit, and a broken and contrite heart Thou wilt not despise". Thus Luther not only attempts to reconcile assurance of salvation and fear but would have us understand that fear may be a ground of assurance.#

However, if we still find traces of servile fear remaining in the Protestant System it is necessary to distinguish here between this and the Roman

*McKinnon Luther and the Reform p. 197-9.

# Note: The paradox appearing in the foregoing paragraph is one of the chief among the many paradoxes in the theology of Karl Barth.
Catholic System. In the latter we have seen how servile fear is nourished and developed and how it becomes an abiding attitude so that such a fear tends to be a prominent constituent in the believer's life. In the Protestant however, while fear may enter it is no longer a dominating element. The believer's life is now regulated and motivated by faith and inherent in it is the assurance of salvation. Love is emphasized rather than fear towards God. It is true that fear of a servile nature will still enter occasionally but it is only a starting point and a background from which to press on to something better. As with Luther the "wish to stay in the despair of remorse and in fear because of sin is an abuse of that fear... the man who uses fear and regret unwisely only increases them and remains in them, as though he would purify himself from his sins by doing so; but nothing comes of it". Thus the Protestant System provided for a more joyous, hopeful, buoyant life. It tasted of a liberty and fearlessness that the other never knew. The heart forgot its dread of God, the terrible Judge, in looking on Christ. It learned to live in the warm light of God's grace and mercy. All of which is very apparent in Luther himself. We have already noted the effects of the other system upon him in his early days. Now we have him a changed man. The old cringing fear had gone and instead there was faith and love. "His whole being obtained stability and firmness, nay, even a personal certainty and joy, such as no mediaeval man had ever possessed."*Harnak There were still occasional returns of his old dread but it was incidental. Peace had come to his soul and whatever fear remained tended to a holy filial nature.

So far all that has been said in this chapter has had to do with the removal or subduing of
servile fear in the believer. If we consider the unbeliever, just as much cannot be claimed for here the appeal to fear was deemed proper and at times there seemed to be no limit to which it might be taken. In truth the Protestant System in many cases may be accused of carrying fear to an extreme length and making an undue use of it in the case of the unbeliever. At times it almost seemed to forget the gospel of love and depend upon fright to turn the unsaved to Christ. An example is had in the insistence upon the infinite duration of punishment. This was one of the points of attack in arousing fear and every creed made good use of it, unless it was that of the Anabaptists and these were condemned for their position in the Augsburg Confession.* "Eternal" was a sweet word for the orthodox in those days when it came to frightening the unbelieving.

Note the changes rung upon the word in the Westminster Catechism (Q. 29) in answer to the question "What are the punishments of sin in the world to come?" "The punishments of sin in the world to come are, everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission, in hell fire forever."

Or again listen to the words of a famous preacher of a somewhat later generation (Jonathan Edwards, "The Fearfulness Which Will Hereafter Surprise Sinners in Zion, Represented and Improved") as he deals with the same subject. "But if the thought of suffering this devouring fire for one minute would be enough to fill one with such surprising fearfulness, what fearfulness will seize them, when they shall know that they are to bear it, not for one minute, nor for one day, nor for one year, nor for one age, nor for two ages, nor for a hundred ages, nor for ten thousand or a million ages, one after another, but forever and ever, without any end at all, and never, never, to be delivered." This was the day

*Part I, Art. XVII.
when unending punishment was considered necessary to Christian belief and morality.

And it was not just the eternity of the punishment that was dwelt upon, but there were times when every fearful aspect of the hereafter and of religion in general was brought into play. During the 18th century in particular there was a great era of 'fearful' preaching. Such discourses were the fashion of the day. They were the kind that the popular favor demanded and the results achieved sometimes compete with some of the deliverances of the Roman Church on the same subject. The preaching of Jeremy Taylor, referred to as the Shakespeare of preachers, certain phases of the Wesley revival in England, the Kentucky revival of 1796-1815 under McGready when hell was portrayed "so vividly that persons would grasp the seats to prevent falling into the burning abyss which they saw yawning at their feet", *all exhibit this attempt to frighten the unbelieving into the kingdom of God. Possibly the most outstanding example, or at least the best remembered in America was that of Jonathan Edwards from whom we have quoted above. With a powerful conception of the sovereignty of God and a correspondingly awful conception of the destiny of the natural man Edwards ran through the whole gamut of fear in an attempt to make his hearers understand their lost condition. Man by his own wickedness is suited to be nothing but a "firebrand of hell". He walks over the pit of hell on a rotten covering, the covering in many places is so weak that it will not bear his weight and the places are not seen. He hangs by a slender thread and the flames of divine wrath are flashing about it, ready every moment to singe it and burn it apart. The only reason he has not fallen under the curse of God's wrath long ago is that God's
forbearance and omnipotence has held mankind in check
but He is just waiting the moment when he lets go
his hold and "precipitates the quivering mass of
angry, boiling hatred into the glowing fires of an
endless hell". We can hardly read Edwards with ease
today as he gives way to his imagination and pictures
all of this in its detail. "What will it signify
for a worm," he asks, "which is about to be pressed
under the weight of some great rock, to be let fall
with its whole weight upon it, to collect its
strength, to set itself to bear up the weight of the
rock, and to preserve itself from being crushed by
it? Much more in vain will it be for a poor damned
soul, to endeavor to support itself under the weight
of the wrath of Almighty God".* Or again in the
same sermon he says, "imagine therefore with your­selves, what a poor hand you would make at fighting
with the flames, if you were in the midst of so great
and fierce a fire. You have often seen a spider or
some other noisome insect, when thrown into the midst
of a fierce fire, and have observed how immediately
it yields to the force of the flames. There is no
long struggle, no fighting against the fire, no
strength exerted to oppose the heat, or to fly from
it; but it immediately stretches forth itself and
yields; and the fire takes possession of it, and at
once it becomes full of fire, and is burned into a
bright coal".

He describes the terror of the condemned.
Their faces look pale; death will sit upon their
countenances; there will be dolorous cries, shrieks,
groans, a trembling and wringing of hands, a gnash­ing of teeth. Even those of stoutest heart who were
afraid of neither God nor man will "appear with
amazement in their countenances; every joint in them
will tremble; all their bones will shake; and their
knees will smite one against another; nor will they
be able to refrain from crying out with fear and rending the air with the most dismal shrieks". He invites us in this connection to "imagine to ourselves the dreadful fear with which a lamb or kid falls into the paws of a wolf, which lays hold of it with open mouth; or if we imagine to ourselves the feeling of a little child, that hath been pursued by a lion, when it is taken hold of, and sees the terrible creature open his devouring jaws to tear it in pieces... I say, if we could have a perfect idea of that terror and astonishment which a little child has in such a case, yet we should have but a faint idea of what is felt in the departing soul of a sinner; when it falls into the hands of those cruel devils, those roaring lions, which then lay hold of it!"* To all of such suffering the saints will be callous. They will look on without flinching, their happiness in fact will be the greater because of the contrast with their own state. "Those who are saved will then be thinking, not of man, but of God... Even fathers and mothers will then rejoice and praise God as they witness eternal justice poured out upon their own offspring."*

The effects of such preaching, especially when supported by a vigorous personality and deep conviction may easily be realized. The fear of God was no longer a placid disposition or a quiet sentiment. It became actual fright, marked with crying, groans, and a prostration by a terrified congregation. The account is given of one sermon preached at the village of Enfield in 1741 which New England has never forgotten. The congregation had assembled as usual when Edwards began to preach on the subject of "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God". The assembly became convulsed with agony and distress. As the preacher proceeded there were faintings and outcries. The congregation lost all control of itself

and again and again the sermon was interrupted while the preacher stopped to ask his hearers to be quiet and permit him to go on. Such effects were not unusual in that day, in fact suicide was an outcome of the first preaching of Edwards at Northampton and in the Great Awakening which followed a revival movement spread all over the country which was commonly attended with bodily manifestations, such as cries, faintings, and convulsions. To these bodily effects Edwards attached no value but he would not admit that the preaching of terror to a people already in terror was an abuse. He himself is represented to us as being at his best in portraying the divine love and the glories of the heavenly life and the most of his sermons are of this type, full of tenderness, charity and pleading. But if Edwards balanced off his own fearful preaching with the lovelier gentler aspects of religion there was a danger that the balance would not be maintained, if it were a balance at all. And this is just the weakness in the movement he launched. It got beyond his control and there followed an era of 'fearful' preaching in which bodily effects were looked to as the measure of success and which New England remembers with repulsion to this day.

Thus if we should summarize the Protestant position in respect to servile fear, we should say that while it made provision for the banishment of such a fear in its doctrine of assurance, it never carried this doctrine to its logical conclusions, and servile fear was only reduced and subdued. Traces of it still remained in the believer who was unwilling to dispense with it. At the same time he enjoyed a prevailing peace and satisfaction in his faith and the accompanying confidence of salvation. In the case of the unbeliever, however, the Protestant was
not loathe to employ incentives of servile fear and at times he carried the practice to an extreme where he seemed to be more willing to drive with the lash of fear than to draw with the cords of love.

So far we have said little about the existence of a holy filial fear in the Roman and the Protestant Systems and it will hardly be necessary to dwell upon it here. Both systems undoubtedly give place to it. And yet just in proportion as the Roman emphasized and developed servile fear in its adherents, it left less opportunity for the cultivation of a filial fear. On the other hand the Protestant, giving less place to servile fear and filled with a greater trust in the love, mercy, and fatherly pardon of God, became a better subject for filial fear. These two systems then are to be distinguished by the place that servile fear holds in their policies and scheme of thought, and the resulting character that is produced in their respective adherents may be supposed to exhibit corresponding qualities. On the whole it can be said that the Protestant System has produced a more aggressive, optimistic, liberty loving type than the Roman and the lesser appeal to servile fear has in no small measure accounted for it.

As for 'numinous' fear it is interesting to notice that there is evidence of it in both systems. The two great leaders of the Protestant world, Calvin and Luther, both sense it. Calvin near the opening of his Institutes* gives an extended paragraph which is diffused with this type of fear and we are quoting it at length as a splendid description of such a fear. Elevating our thoughts to God, he says, results in our seeing how insignificant and worthless we are. "Hence that horror and amazement with which the Scripture always represents the saints

* Bk. I Ch. I, Sect. III.
to have been impressed and disturbed, on every discov­ery of the presence of God. For when we see those, who before his appearance stood secure and firm, so astonished and affrighted at the mani­fes­tation of his glory, as to faint and almost expire through fear, we must infer that man is never suf­ficiently affected with a knowledge of his own weak­ness, till he has compared himself with the Divine Majesty. Of this consternation we have frequent ex­pression among the Lord's people—'We shall die, be­cause we have seen God'. Therefore the history of Job, to humble men with a consciousness of their pollution, impotence, and folly derives its prin­cipal argument from a description of Divine purity, power, and wisdom. And not without reason. For we see how Abraham, the nearer he approached to behold the glory of the Lord, the more fully acknowledged himself to be but 'dust and ashes'; and how Elias could not bear his approach without covering his face, his appearance is so formidable. And what can man do, all vile and corrupt, when fear constrains even the cherubim themselves to veil their faces."

This same strain runs through much of Luther. Otto* has covered the field well here. He tells us that the numinous aspect of Luther's religion "was later tacitly expunged, and is today readily dismissed as, 'not the authentic Luther'; but it is really "the mysterious background of his religious life, obscure and 'uncanny'" and it is impossible to understand Luther without it. This numinous makes its appear­ance in Luther in all its moments or phases, and in his expressions before the 'tremendum' especially we see fear very much in evidence. It is true that he knows God as a God of trust who "overbrims with pure goodness" but he also knows "depths and abysses in the Godhead that make his heart despond, from which he flees for refuge to the 'Word', like a

'hare to his cleft in the rocks'". Then lest we mistake this for common servile fear we are told emphatically that "that before which his soul quails again and again in awe is not merely the stern Judge demanding righteousness... but rather at the same time God in His 'unrevealedness', in the awful majesty of His very Godhead; He before whom trembles not simply the transgressor of the law, but the creature, as such, in his 'uncovered' creaturehood. All this Otto illustrates with a reference to some of Luther's writings. In particular he says that "to understand the well nigh daemonic character of this numinous feeling the reader should particularly note the effect of the following passage from Luther's sermon on Exodus XX. The preacher leaves no means untried to bring out effectively the element of numinous horror in his text:

"Yea, for the world it seemeth as though God were a mere silly yawner, with mouth ever agape, or a cuckold, who lets another lie with his wife and feigneth that he sees it not."

But 'He assaileth a man, and hath such a delight therein that He is of His Jealousy and Wrath impelled to consume the wicked'.

'Then shall we learn how that God is a consuming fire'. 'That is then the consuming, devouring fire'. 'Wilt thou sin? Then will He devour thee up'. 'For God is a fire, that consumeth, devoureth, rageth; verily He is your undoing, as fire consumeth a house and maketh it dust and ashes'.

And in another place:

"Yea, He is more terrible and frightful than the devil. For He dealeth with us and bringeth
us to ruin with power, smiteth and hammereth us and payeth no heed to us'. 'In His majesty He is a consuming fire'. 'For therefrom can no man refrain: if he thinketh on God aright, his heart in his body is struck with terror... Yea, as soon as he heareth God named, he is filled with trepidation and fear'.

In respect to the worship of the two churches Otto gives us the impression that he finds more of the 'numinous' in the Catholic than in the Protestant.* The use of Latin in the mass is felt by the Catholic to be something especially holy; likewise any "half-revealed, half-concealed elements", or the 'uncomprehended' are apt to beget a feeling of the 'mysterious' which is one of the elements in the 'numinous'. Then there is the 'numinous' moment in the Mass- "the moment of transubstantiation" - when the Mass music sinks into stillness. It is "no mere momentary pause, but an absolute cessation of sound long enough for us to 'hear the Silence' itself". The very style of architecture associated with great centers of Catholic Worship have tended to the same end. So if the Protestant System can show great preachers and great theologians who were possessed of a 'numinous' fear the Catholic can point to the same element developed in his worship.#

*Note: We feel that Otto has rendered great service in reminding the church of this element in the Christian conception of God. Likewise we are greatly indebted to Karl Barth and his followers for a similar strain that runs through their theology.
CHAPTER VIII

The Fear of God in Our Day.

There is in our day a general movement to eliminate fear of all kinds. This is brought forcibly home to us in Wallas' *The Great Society* where the shedding of fear is spoken of as a light thing. Affection for one's family, public spirit, religion, and the "reasonable expectation of personal happiness are presented as sufficient. Likewise Boyd, a prominent Glasgow educator informs us that the fear impulse in the child is injurious and needs to be subdued. Leuba also writing on the same subject has little praise for it. Among modern physicians, he says, fear is the Great Sin. It is another name for Satan. He quotes from one prominent physician, "When all is said that can be said about the uses of fear, we come to the conclusion that on the whole the sense of danger is a nuisance. Fear is out of date." Thus on many sides we hear that fear must be banished. Nor is concrete evidence lacking that efforts to this end are actually being put forth. Witness for instance the demands that are being made for the abolition of the death penalty and the general modification of the penal laws of the state, on the grounds that they make their chief appeal to fear, and again the protests against corporal punishment in the schools for the same cause.
The reasons given for this antagonism are many. We are told that fear represents a low motive of conduct. It is admitted that it might prove a deterrent from some undesirable action but other higher motives such as love of the right will achieve the same end and the higher should always be followed in preference to the lower. Again fear is said to be very ineffective. It may restrain but can never produce anything positive. It may prohibit but cannot furnish incentives to that which is good. It is really a "fruitful cause of mischief" and attended with "most serious ill effects." There was a day when it served a useful purpose; In the early history of the race it was a protective instinct that guarded the welfare of man and furnished the first bond that bound men together. But now its days are past. We have come to a higher level of culture where love reigns. Fear is but the "first primer of the race" and we betray our high destiny to fall back upon it. In fact to do so is fatal to progress and destructive of our great inheritance. It is altogether irrational and Mosso even speaks of it as "a disease to be cured." Thus we are told to look upon fear as something without reason and utility. As Fletcher is quoted saying, "it is to be placed in the category of harmful, unnecessary, and therefore not respectable things."

This attitude which is so wide-spread and deep-seated is not without considerable justification. Much of it has been the result of the advances of science, particularly medical and mental science, or psychiatry seeking to combine the two. Freudian psychology especially, with its search into the hidden motives and the uncovering of irrational fears through psycho-analysis, has had a large part in this. The war itself with its thousands of shell-shock victims
gave a special impetus to such a line of study. It is now apparent that many fears are actually irrational and need to be driven out; but the reproach has fallen upon all fears, and whether rational or irrational, all have been put under the ban. Man has come to feel that fears as a whole are to be shunned. Physical science also has done much to support such a position by boldly delving into the things that formerly made men afraid and by showing how groundless were their fears. The glow of the comet in the sky and the roll of the thunder no longer lead to superstitious dread, and the eclipse has lost its terrors. Furthermore the very ease, comfort, and safety of our modern life have given a confidence destructive of fear. Fear undoubtedly played an active role in the life of the early inhabitants of North America with the danger of an Indian massacre hanging continually over their heads and the rigorous demands of an untamed wilderness meeting them at every step. And we can suppose that it was natural for all of our forefathers to place a bigger value upon their fears by virtue of the very circumstances in which they lived. There can be little question but that men in other days were ruled more by their fears, but now with the growth of confidence there is this general movement to discredit and discard fear. Thus whether we account for it on the basis of an increase in general knowledge, science, prosperity, or something else; general fear is decreasing.

This movement away from 'fear' has not confined simply to the ordinary physical life. It has had a reaction upon other phases of our existence. Religion particularly has felt its effect so that the avoidance of such an idea as the fear of God is especially apparent in our day. McDougall notes this and throws out a question regarding it. "To
what extent", he asks, "is the lapse from orthodox observances, so remarkable and widespread among the more civilised peoples at the present time, due to the general softening of religious teachings, to the lapse of the doctrine of divine retribution to a very secondary position, and to the discredit into which the flames of hell have fallen?" Such statements as this, either denying the validity of fear in religion or noting its decline, are common. The fear of God is becoming a tabooed subject. This is very noticeable in the modern preaching. During the course of this research the author had occasion to examine hundreds of sermons preached within the last twenty-five or thirty years. But a very small fraction of them were found dealing with the fear of God or arousing the fear motive. Those that did consider the matter often began with an apology as when Kellogg in a sermon on the wrath of God states that the "minister dislikes" to preach about it, and G. W. Watkin commences a sermon on "Eternal Punishment" by saying that "It is not entirely of my own notion that I take up the dread subject of eternal punishment, but at the wish of some present here." Thus anything savoring of fear is looked at askance, and the fear of God along with the other fears of this world is discredited and considered unnecessary and unreasonable.

But apart from the above mentioned general influences that have had their effect upon religion there have also been special tendencies operating in the case of the fear of God. These we would like to examine more at length and, to reduce them to their most concrete form, we shall consider them as they appear in relation to the doctrine of hell. This in one sense may not be considered the fear of God; in another sense it goes back indirectly to such
a fear; and in any sense it affords an index to the same fear, for the fear of God in its servile aspects at least will be bound up with the doctrine of hell.

Speaking then of the doctrine of hell we find it in disrepute today. Its fires have been extinguished. The preacher no longer calls up its licking flames and roaring furnace. The old fashioned abode of the wicked does not even smoulder but is dead ash and no congregation would tolerate its being revived. Patterson even intimates that about the only use hell has today is to give point to a grim joke. Such a change of attitude from that of bygone times when countless lives were "touched to abiding seriousness, and imbued with the deepest sense of moral responsibility" is not to be accounted for in any superficial way. There are far reaching causes and tendencies that affect our whole 'fear' life involved here. We would note several of them.

First and foremost we would say that a more exacting interpretation of Scripture has done much to shatter the foundations of the old hell. The old hell was largely a mixture of Greek and Hebrew, as well as oriental doctrines of the after life, transferred to Christianity and exaggerated by men's imaginations. And as long as men were willing to accept these traditional beliefs nothing need be said. The interests of the church were being served and to have shaken off such ideas would have been considered folly. But in modern times there has been more and more a demand to prove and test everything. Origins have been investigated and the springs of our faith uncovered. Men have been especially unwilling to accept anything that would
not conform with the results of a thorough critical study of the Bible. It must be evident that in the light of this atmosphere the old conceptions of hell could not last. Where for instance would one go to find justification for the statement that the luxurious and the lovers of pleasure shall be bathed in burning pitch and stinking brimstone, and the envious, like mad dogs, shall howl for very grief?"

Or again where shall we find grounds for believing that God dangles the sinner over the flames of hell as one would toast a spider over a pit? In short there was little foundation for such conceptions as the modern world interprets the Scriptures. Perhaps this is even more strikingly brought out in relation to certain terms that were once considered indispensable in setting forth the doctrine of the lost. "Damnation" is a word in point. The way the old King James' Version rang the changes on this fearful word contrasts strongly with its entire absence in the Revised Version. Or again we may take the word "eternal" as an example. Through long ages the idea of eternal punishment has been held over the head of a cowering mankind. A temporary punishment was not enough. It must be eternal. For a single sin it must be eternal. The Bible insisted on it. Morality and Christian belief demanded that it be so; otherwise the restraints upon the one and the incentives to the other would be weakened. Justin Martyr even cited the idea of eternal punishment as an indication that Christianity was superior to Platonism. To him such a conception was the more effective deterrent from evil. We have already referred to the use of it made by the Westminster Catechism, when in a single sentence three references are made to the everlastingness of punishment. There is certainly no doubt where our forefathers placed the emphasis. But now much of
this has been changed. For one thing there has been a tendency to put a milder interpretation upon the word 'eternal' than that of 'time' which goes to infinity. The Greek άλλωτριά from which the word is derived in its classical use and in the Septuagint may denote not only "the (unending) duration of time in general, both future and past, according to the context" but also "the duration of a definite space of time." This latter meaning, which has largely been taken over from its initial usage when it signified the duration of life, a human generation, or a term of life, thus involves the thought of unending, unintermittent, enduring progression within a certain space of time rather than that which may be called infinite. In such a sense it may be interpreted as an 'age' or a 'certain space of time' in contrast with 'eternity' in the old sense. It is this milder interpretation which has a tendency to be favored in some quarters, whether it is altogether justifiable or not. But it represents a part of the general inclination to mollify the severity of the old word. Weymouth, although his reason is somewhat different, exhibits this leaning. In his translation of the New Testament he renders άλλωτριά in the seventy passages in which it occurs as referring to 'the ages' so that the 'eternal fire' becomes the 'fire of the ages' and 'eternal punishment' becomes 'punishment of the ages.'

In justifying his action he tells us, speaking of άλλωτριά, that, "Etymologically this adjective, like others similarly formed, does not signify 'duri\[-ing,' but 'belonging to' the aeons or ages. Whether usage gives it a different sense is another question. That the word sometimes means 'everlasting' in the strongest sense of that word, cannot reasonably be doubted. Let the reader judge for himself in every case." 'Eternal' then no longer means eternal for many. It still harbors the idea of something

See note Mt. 18:8
'unending' but only in respect to a particular space of time. Furthermore this conception having been reached it has been an easy step to another position that grows out of it and still further extracts the sting of the old eternity, namely the thought that even hell will work to the good of man and "in the end God will be all in all." It is pointed out to us for instance that the rich man in hell showed improvement. Thus hell is robbed of its eternity and holds within it the opportunity for betterment.

But if a more thorough and critical understanding of the Scriptures has done much to undermine the old ideas of hell a still more potent influence has been human nature itself. There is that in sorrowing humanity grieving over the loss of its loved ones that cries against the doctrine of an abode where there shall be torture without end. For himself the individual may not care but there is something within him that rebels against any thought of unending punishment for those he holds dear. The extremes in fact to which these teachings on the after life were carried in other days were beyond the powers of a mourning mankind to endure. Before the awful pictures of the estates of the dead that once flourished in the name of art, before the frightful scenes of a Dante's Inferno, before the terrible preaching of a ministry often measured by its powers to affright, human nature broke. The revolt was especially strong over the doctrine that said the punishment must be eternal and over consigning young innocent children to the everlasting flames of a nether world. This last was something that particularly gave offense in the preaching of Jonathan Edwards. A biographer says that one of the things remembered against Mr. Edwards to this day is a sentence in which he said that "As innocent as young children seem to be to us, yet, if they are out of

\[\text{Patterson-Nat. of Rel. p 480.}\]

\[\text{Lk. 16:27}\]
Christ, they are not so in God's sight, but are young vipers, and infinitely more hateful than vipers, and are in a most miserable condition..." It is not to be wondered at in the face of such conceptions as these that the old doctrine of punishment after death was renounced so that Patterson can say that few ministers today have the courage to preach an everlasting hell. Human kind could not stand it and mitigating doctrines were eagerly sought. One writer has even raised the question as to whether much of the reaction that has arisen against Christianity has not been because of its sponsorship of such ideas as that of an eternal hell of fire and brimstone.

But if certain doctrines of alleviation have offered consolation for sympathetic humanity in the face of its fears of the future another refuge has been found in science, discovery, and the general spread of knowledge. We have already referred to the part played by science in eliminating fear in general. Upon the doctrine of hell, however, it has had an even more direct bearing. The old conceptions of hell were largely wrapped up in physical terms, arising largely out of man's ignorance of the world in which he lived and the unknown terrors that always lay in the region of the unexplored. But there is no unexplored today, at least as it used to be conceived. Man has sent his ships over every water and has set his foot upon every land. He has scaled the heights and descended into the depths. He has visited the poles of the earth and has gone round its circumference. He has sunk his wells into its bowels and has swung his telescopes through its heavens. And if anything still remains unknown he has been bold to predicate its existence and its laws from what he has already known.
Altogether man has come to feel that he knows the universe and the result has been destructive to hell as it was formerly pictured. No longer can we speak of a heaven above, a hell beneath, and an earth in the middle. No longer can the preacher hold the attention of his congregation by talking of an abode for the lost "thirty seven" miles underground. No longer can he picture the home of eternal terrors as just beyond the horizon. And furthermore these inroads of science and knowledge have done something more than merely demolish the crude beliefs in an after punishment. They have furnished to some a refuge from belief in any punishment, through the tendency to accept only that which is subject to law and investigation, to decry anything savoring of the supernatural or that which is beyond the powers of research. The result has been that some have felt themselves without the bounds of any of the concepts of hell. They have not even been affected by any of its more spiritual terrors by virtue of the very attitude taken toward the things of faith. This mechanistic understanding of life has offered a doctrine of alleviation for the fears of eternity and it is a question as to how far the popularity of our present naturalism is due to a desire, unconscious perhaps, to escape this sterner side of religion.

This position taken by the scientist and scholar has been paralleled by an indifference towards the after life on the part of the common man. This may have been the result of the former's attitude or at least have been influenced by it. At any rate the popular mind has ceased to regard the after life as a factor in the present life. Different philosophies of the street are offered in support of this, all tending to subdue or neutralise the severer thoughts of hell. We are told for instance
that not enough is known about the future, that if a man takes care of the present properly the future can be trusted to take care of itself. Again the existence of such a thing as a future hell and its punishment is decried. Hell is within we are told. A man's conscience, his remorse and the sting of guilt within his own soul are his hell. Or if that will not carry weight there is the idea that a man will find his hell in the curses and failures of today. The wicked will not prosper and today will bring its own hell. Thus the popular mind throws out the after life as an element to be reasoned with and so escapes the dread of an infernal existence.

Still another cause that has led to an abandonment of the old idea of hell has been the development of a new system of ethics. We are not concerned here with the idea as to whether our ethical standards are higher than those of a previous age. We are simply noting that the ethics of our day whatever their excellence have not been conducive to the existence of the old doctrine of hell. The doctrine of hell for instance was designed to turn men from evil and to make them better and yet we are challenged to produce a single case where an individual became better through it or "sinned one sin less because of it." On the contrary it has had the opposite effect. By its appeal to the gross and monstrous it has rendered man callous and hardhearted. It has been the nurse of the inquisition and the mother of occasions in the church's history too awful to believe. And as if its record in this respect is not bad enough then much of the hideous and damnable superstitions of past generations are laid at its door. Furthermore the very fundamental principle upon which it rested was a machination of the devil. It was wrong at the very base when it proceeded on the assumption that action could be regulated by the offer of a reward or the threat of punishment.
Such would furnish a low motive of conduct and a life lived under its stimulus would be but a form of self-seeking, something ignoble and contemptible. Again it is charged with being the means by which a great church filled its coffers with money received in penances or through masses for the dead. This in itself is abominable but when the rich are able to secure privileges not open to the poor then the abomination is doubled. And last but not least it is said that if purgatory was unethical Protestants did not better matters when they swept it away and adopted a simple heaven or hell destination in the after life. For then, there was a complete lack of any graded system and to consign everyone to one of two places would be utter folly. Individuals are not equally bad or equally good and cannot be so sharply divided into two distinct levels. Thus before the bar of our modern ethical standards the old conception of hell is found wanting.

Finally in these later times there has come about a humanising of God Himself which has had a reaction upon our doctrine of hell. One of the demands heard in some quarters is that God Himself cannot be anything less than he requires man to be. And if he commands man to forgive seventy times seven can he be expected to do less Himself? In other words this is an argument in our theology tending to qualify the idea of hell and soften the austerity so frequently attributed to the Divine. Our day for instance has little sympathy with such a description of God as given by Robert South, a well known preacher of the seventeenth century. He says, "A physician has a servant: while this servant lives honestly with him he is fit to be used and to be employed in his occasions; but if this servant should commit a felony and for that be condemned, he can then be actively serviceable to him no longer; he is fit only for him to dissect, and make an object upon which
to show the experiments of his skill. So while man was yet innocent he was fit to be used by God in a way of active obedience; but now having sinned, and being sentenced by the law to death as a malefactor, he is a fit matter only for God to torment and show the wonders of His vindictive justice." Van Dyke quoting this passage calls such a God "a nightmare, horror of moral monstrosity," and his words fairly well voice the sentiment of the age. For we have come to a day when we demand a humane God and such a conception as the foregoing does not find acceptance.

These then are some of the reasons that have served to bring hell into disrepute. And as we have intimated, when hell goes, the fear of God goes with it. This of course applies only to fear in its servile aspects. A holy filial fear might still be expected to continue even though all thoughts of hell are gone and God is mostly beheld in His love, mercy, and forgiveness. Yet the lack of discrimination that has accompanied the whole question at this point and the uncertainty that has attended the interpretation of fear in its milder forms has resulted in such a confusion of thought that many attitudes are discernible. Thus a survey of the present status of the subject reveals the following positions in particular: (1) A great many of our preachers and teachers are averse to all kinds of fear. Fear in any of its forms is reprehensible to them. The very word is to be avoided. "God is love" and "love casteth out fear." To fear God is to be untrue to one's calling. Love is supreme and there can be no place for fear of any kind. (2) Along with these there is a considerable number who would teach a filial fear in the Christian believer. Such a fear exists by virtue of our relation to the Father-God, but is not accessible to the unredeemed.
For these a fear of the servile type is considered proper. It is said that they have reason to fear punishment and should be told about it. It is useless, however, after it has done its initial work and is utterly uncalled for in the true Christian. He errs in clinging to it. (3) In contrast with this attitude there are those who would tolerate a little servile fear even in the believer. It has a restraining, disciplinary value they say, and fills a place of utility. Fear and love are not irreconcilable. (4) Then there are others who in their effort to bring the idea of fear into agreement with the positive elements of religion, a religion motivated by love, so tone down and modify the meaning of fear that it is entirely unrecognisable as such. (5) Finally we would mention a group who take no particular position at all but present the fear of God or the love of God or both according as the text seems to read or the mood strikes them. Thus all in all the 'fear of God' is greatly lessened and what we mean by it when we do appeal to it is vague. The whole subject is in such a confused state that we are bewildered in any attempt to gain an understanding through what is to be heard or read in our day.
CHAPTER IX

The Fear of God in Its Place.

In our two opening chapters we essayed to show the bases, development, nature, and characteristics of the fear of God from the psychical standpoint. Then we made a study of the Old and the New Testaments searching out the elements and factors that would tend to instil this fear or throw light upon it. Following this we directed our attention to the development and use of such fear in the Roman Catholic System in contrast with the Protestant. Finally we entered into a brief discussion of the status of the same fear in our own time. In this last chapter it is our purpose to set forth what we feel are some inevitable conclusions to be drawn concerning the fear of God. There is nothing new about these for they have always been more or less recognised and the writer does not claim any originality in presenting them. But in giving them in a more definite and comprehensive way we hope that the fear of God will receive the attention it deserves and that the subject will be clarified in the midst of the generally confused thought relating to it today. Certainly our deductions taken together furnish us with a conception of the utility, necessity, and place of this fear which cannot be passed over.
First let us say that "FEAR IS STILL INDISPENSABLE IN LIFE AND RELIGION." In saying this we speak of fear in the course of natural events and of fear relating to God. Fear filled a place of need in earlier times. We maintain that it is still necessary to life, contrary to those who tell us that it is outgrown, not to be tolerated, not to be justified. In taking this position we are aware that there must be discrimination between fears that are proper and those which are improper. There are many fears in life which have no foundation, which are entirely unjustifiable and work untold harm. It is such fears that are referred to when fear is spoken of as the cause of one half our mental diseases and at the bottom of one half our moral weakness. Likewise when the psycho-analyst discovers the hidden fears that shackle a soul, robbing it of its peace and confidence and keeping it in a perfect nightmare of dread, he is dealing with fears that cannot be excused. For all fears of this kind no one would raise a word of defense. But we contend that there are other fears that are altogether wholesome and necessary. And if, as Walla, an opponent of all fear, maintains, there is a blank left when fear is dispelled and that this blank must be filled with Alpine climbing, roly-coasters, voyages of discovery or some other adventures that partake of a dare-devil nature and minister to our capacity for fear and dread, then we have the strongest argument for our position. If there is a capacity for fear in man, then that capacity needs to be utilised in a wholesome, effective manner rather than occupied with the extraordinary, uncommon or merely frivolous. However, there is not such a complete blank as we might infer and, despite the pretensions of science, discovery, and knowledge in general, fear has not been banished. Its reach
has merely been widened and rationalised. If science
for instance has taught us to scoff at the idea of
demons being the origin of plague and disease and
has put an end to the exercising of the evil spirits
in the case of sickness, it has not removed fear.
It has merely substituted germs for ghosts and given
us death dealing microbes rather than formidable
spirits. What person cannot have a worthy fear of
placing the drinking cup of a tubercular patient
to his lips or of entering a home where diphtheria
exists? Or again if science has been effective in
dispelling such fears as smote the hearts of the
ancients when they witnessed the lightnings and the
thunder of the sky and saw in it the threatenings of
awful powers, it has but told us that it was all due
to electricity and then has proceeded to place that
same electricity at a thousand points around us and
warn us of dangling wires and bare insulation. In
truth science has not done away with fear but as the
boundaries of our knowledge have been enlarged, the
area of our fears has been extended and at every
point a multitude of new fears have arisen to beset
us. These of course are of a more wholesome type
but they are fear nevertheless.

We deem it entirely without reason there­
fore to speak of fear being banishable from life or
even being dispensable in life. A host of fears
always confront us. In a sense we never cross the
street without a certain fear as we look this way
and that for dangerous traffic. We prefer therefore
to see things as they are and, instead of explaining
fear away, to realise that fear does exist and occu­
pies a necessary place in society. We would not re­
pel it or seek to overcome it as something base and
mean. We would rise to meet it, to welcome it. We
would utilize it as a safeguard from many of the
dangers that surround us, a protective from many of life's ills, and as a restraint from many an unworthy act. We would find truth in the dictum of Aeschylus that "it is good that fear sit as a guardian of the soul, forcing it into wisdom,—good that men should carry a threatening shadow in their hearts, even under full sunshine; else, how shall they learn to revere the right?"

At the same time we would recognize that two things must ever be held in mind in regard to a particular fear: first, it must ever subsist an ethical and moral purpose and second, it must be properly directed. The first simply means that fear must at all times have a worthy end. Whenever punishment is held out it must not be vindictive but with a view to propitiation and reconciliation. And whenever fear is possessed, it must not be a fear that will be had for fear's sake but a fear that will incite, buttress, and promote the good and the right. Then our second statement implies that fear should be rightly grounded, that is be rational. There can be no justification for filling a young child with terrors of the dark, goblins, and other bogeys with which some prey upon innocent young minds with the hope of begetting goodness and obedience. Such action is criminal. There are enough sane fears in life which may be inculcated upon the child without appealing to any of the false, afterwards forcing the child to change his whole system of ethics when he discovers the truth for himself. Fear above all the elements of man's emotional life is capable of great abuse and extreme care should be exercised to ground it rightly and keep it within proper limits. All of which finds strong support in the words of G. S. Hall, "There is no one without fear, and those few who so emphatically disclaim all fear; and the psychologists

\[\text{Amer. J. of Psy. Vol. VIII p 242.}\]
who tabulate the percentages of fearless people are thinking of shock or panic or acute fright, or special physical dread, etc., but not of the subtler forms, like fear of God, of dishonor, failure of their highest purposes, for themselves or others. Not only does everyone fear, but all should fear. The pedagogic problem is not to eliminate fear, but to gauge it to the power of proper reaction."

We have thus far in this chapter been dealing with the common fears of life but we have found throughout our study that the fear of God has been equally insistent in the experience of the race. Not only was it present in the dim beginnings but it abounded throughout the entire Scriptures and has continued in our religion down through the ages. And now just as we have recognised ordinary fear as indispensable so we would consider religious fear indispensable. Truly it has a distinctive nature of its own yet it operates much after the same manner as the other and what will apply to one will largely apply to the other. So the fear of God will take its place with the rational fears of life and as these fears have a wholesome place likewise it will be with this fear. We will therefore not be ashamed or hesitant about recognising it in our religion and we would be in thorough accord with those who would appeal to it (see Denney, War and the Fear of God). We would not think of it as something to be laid aside or superseded but to be retained if religion is to be preserved. In short we are convinced that the fear of God has a proper place in religion and when it is not given this, harm is done. W. P. Patterson says "The character of the Scottish people has owed much more than it is willing to own to the indoctrination with the fear of God and a recognition of divine laws, which formed a useful counteractive to native tendencies that
made somewhat strongly for sensuality and sordidness. And what is true of this people in respect to the fear of God is probably true to a more or less degree of other peoples. The fear of God is a good thing and we would decry any attempt to ignore it or neglect it. We would abide in it and withal be stronger because of it. Nor would we for a moment consider such an attitude that of a hireling, moved by consideration of profit. We do not fear God or incite others to fear Him merely as a means to personal salvation but primarily that He might be served the better. Nor is it ever to be the sole motive but over and above all is the love of God which must never be lost sight of.

In addition we would note that the fear of God must continue in a specially unique and imperative way in the Christian religion, for we have found that reverence and awe claim it as one of their constituents. And we doubt if these can be attained without some previous experience of this fear. We would agree with Beard when he says that "fear is a preliminary essential to a development of awe, reverence, and admiration." And if it is so necessary to these as we believe, then its continuance should be assured, for without the qualities of reverence and awe the Christian religion cannot truly thrive or be worthy of its name. This is generally recognised and such men ad Leuba have little support when they say that "In the highest civilisation of today, fear, awe, and to a considerable degree, even reverence have been displaced by the tender emotion, which rules supreme," or even more strongly assert that "Love has not only cast out fear but also reverence, veneration and respect." Reverence and awe are qualities that cannot be done away with and the religion that is divorced from them will not be worth much. We would therefore be loathe...
to part with the fear of God in our religion, lest we should also be parting with reverence and awe. Fear is needful in religion as well as life.

This brings us to a consideration of the rightful grounds of fear in our religion. There are two of these that are prominent with the more manifest forms of fear at least and we proceed with the first, namely, HELL AND PUNISHMENT STILL EXIST. We have seen that the old physical hell with its crude grotesque portrayals has been gotten rid of. It now appears to have been the wanderings of a wild imagination. It has lost its appeal. Men no longer take stock in it. But notwithstanding the disappearance of these old conceptions there is still a hell to face. Our very consciences within us cry out for a hell. There is that in human nature which expects a place where sin will be atoned for and wrongs requited. It is to be questioned whether any transgressor, in his sober moments at least, ever feels that his past is done for or can ever be done for on this earth. Some of Starbuck's results are very apropos in this regard. He found during his religious investigations that the fear of eternal punishment occasionally appeared in persons ignorant of the doctrine on the subject. In these Starbuck says that "the point for us is that the fear of death and hell is not the direct result of the religious doctrine". There is this tendency to believe in a hell, bred into the very fibre of man's moral nature. Furthermore the justice of the world requires a hell, especially a hell other than that which this life may offer. For whatever may be said about punishment coming to the transgressor now and whatever occasions may be instanced in which a man's misdeeds have 'come back' to him here, it is an undoubted fact that the punitive rewards of
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sin are woefully lacking in this life. We certainly cannot say that one's punishment is received in the lack of prosperity and the failure to fare well in this earth's goods. From the very earliest time there has been the cry that the wicked prosper. And we have confirmed it in our own experience that the unscrupulous and unrighteous are often blessed and live long to enjoy the fruits of their vice. Nor again are we able to say that if a man doesn't meet hell in the above way he will meet it in his own remorse and sense of guilt. On the contrary the frequent result is that the conscience is so hardened by the very contact with iniquity that it entirely fails to have those pains and grievances we might expect. It may even lose itself almost completely in the pursuit of the world's pleasures and drown the sharpest pangs and bitterest memories. We would say then that it is an utter fallacy to think that the present punishment of the world is adequate for life's sinning. The idea that today is hell, that one's hell is made and reaped now is flatly contradicted. There must be a balance struck somewhere in another life—in a hell somewhere.

As for the question of the necessary duration of such a hell we have seen that there has been an open revolt against the doctrine of an eternal hell. But we feel that the word eternal need not be pressed. It is not indispensable to the idea. We will even concede that hell may be temporary and this position even the more radical would hardly gainsay us. We do feel with Lactantius (De Ira Dei) that "Because God is eternal his anger also remains to eternity," and that only "he who ceases to sin renders the anger of God mortal." In other words we can rightly expect that hell will remain for an individual as long as sin remains and if sin
is eternal with him, hell will be eternal. But whether hell is temporary or eternal is secondary in our consideration. The fact that we are concerned with is that there is a hell where a man can expect to give full measure for his iniquity and if as W. P. Patterson says "it is probable that more effect would be produced if the Church gave warning of a temporary hell which the worldly-minded and carnally-minded have every reason to expect" then we shall preach a temporary hell. But the real point will be that there is a hell—a hell where every man may expect to face the consequences of his own unrepented, unatoned for sin.

This hell as we have intimated can no longer be set forth in the old physical terms. Such a hell has been exploded and its elements are now seen to be but a figment of the imagination. But hell is still a reality though its features must no longer partake of the coarser forms of former days. We must learn that in dealing with the realm of the spirit we deal with 'spiritual' things and any attempt to set forth hell must be in such terms. Immediately we hear it said that such a hell will lack weight or appeal. It will not be comprehended by the common mind. No one will pay attention to it. And yet in the few cases where we have encountered an attempt to present a hell of spiritual significance the result has been gripping. Let us note for instance a rather lengthy quotation from a sermon by Bishop Lightfoot on the "The Wrath of the Lamb," Rev. 6:16. It is difficult to get the spirit of the context without the whole but we are quoting enough to show the possibilities of such a presentation. "It is not physical agony, if we read the interpretation aright; it is the beauty of holiness, it is the splendour of purity, it is the majesty of
truth, it is tenderness of love, which shall be the chief instrument of retribution. It is the blessing spurned and the opportunity lost, which shall start up from the oblivion of the past and confront us as God's angel of vengeance. It is the glory and the goodness, in which we yearn to slake our burning thirst, and lo! the cup is dashed away from our lips....so our highest capacities become our fiercest tormentors...."We may forget or drown the past, "but what if hereafter the veil should be suddenly plucked away? What, if the scales should fall again from the eyes? What if the avenger should start on his feet once more, and exact the debt, swollen with the arrears of a long oblivion?" "Then we are told that this virtue or goodness which we shall contemplate and which shall be so torturing to our stricken souls will be none other than the Person of Christ, the absolute love and goodness. "One sad reproachful look wrung from an apostle bitter tears of remorseful shame. And how shall we bear that same look intensified a thousand fold and resting upon us--we who have denied Him, we who have pierced Him, we who have crucified Him afresh."# Such words as these are

#Note: Also see David Smith's Commentary of Matt. 13:42 "The furnace of fire...figuratively signifies...the destiny of such as by obdurate impenitence have sinned away the very possibility of amendment and made themselves nothing else than moral refuse. Their misery lies in their recognition, too late, of the blessedness which might have been theirs but which they are now incapable of attaining....This is no theological imagination but a grim truth which moralists have, often terribly, enforced. 'The very Substance of the Soul,' as Addison has it, 'is
fearful in their appeal and indicate the possibilities of a spiritual portrayal of hell. So that whatever may be said about the shortcomings of the old doctrine, we cannot afford to forget that there is truth in it—hell and punishment do exist. It is a question of presenting them in the proper manner.

Again closely related to what we have been discussing there is this second ground of fear that cannot be ignored, namely, THE AWESOMENESS AND AUSTERITY OF GOD ARE NOT TO BE EXPLAINED AWAY. This sterner side of God has been commonly recognised the world over among religions of the most diverse types. Both the Greeks and the Egyptians perceived it and took steps accordingly. The primitive worshipper and the savage devotee sensed it and in their crude way sought to appease it. In fact as we have seen it was this aspect of God that seems to have come chiefly into prominence in the early stages of all religions and many of them never rose above it. In respect to our own religion, we have already studied the presence of this severer strain in our conception of God. The very character of God presented

#Note cont.:- fester'd with them, the Gangrene is gone too far to be ever cured; the Inflammation will rage to all Eternity. In this therefore (say the Platonists) consists the Punishment of a voluptuous Man after Death: He is tormented with Desires which it is impossible for him to gratify, solicited by a Passion that has neither Objects nor Organs adapted to it: He lives in a State of invincible Desire and Impotence, and always burns in the Pursuit of what he always despairs to possess."
in the Old Testament demands that we attribute wrath and indignation to Him. And if in the New Testament there is an overwhelming love, the austere note of the Old is still detectable, even as the love of the New is to be discovered in the wrath of the Old. As Brent indicates, "the almightiness, the justice, and the austerity of the God of power as made known in the Old Testament are not minimised or superseded by the revelation of the God of love as made known in Jesus Christ. They are interpreted and transfigured." Whether we want it or not therefore a full treatment of God and due respect to the revelation of Him in the Scriptures must exhibit His wrath. This has not been without recognition from the earliest times of our era. In fact it was the thought of this that led Lactantius to write his "De Ira Dei" in opposition to those who would ignore it. And in our own times we have occasional touches of the same thing in such strong passages as this by Van Dyke, "It is inconceivable that this holy wrath should be perfectly comprehended or explained by us. It is equally inconceivable that it should be doubted or denied. A righteous judge incapable of indignation against crime would be unfit to sit in the seat of justice. A holy God incapable of wrath against sin would be disqualified to rule the world." God is a God who knows depths of displeasure, who is capable of wrath and indignation, who will not compromise his righteousness and justice, who will preserve his holiness, and who while not vindictive will yet exact punishment for sin. He will require obedience from his creatures. He is almighty and unsearchable in His ways. Thus He presents Himself with a grave and austere aspect and looked at in this light the result will be the production of fear in those who contemplate Him.
Such a fear will be entirely wholesome when it is kept within proper bounds and especially when it is recognised as the handmaid of love and kept subordinate to such a love. For one thing it will render impossible the soft sentimental attitude towards God which is common in some circles of theology. Without this element of fear we approach God as a kind hearted, effeminate being whose good nature can never be aroused to a point of indignation. His grace lulls us into a vain security. His goodness pampers us. He holds out a universal salvation. As Brent puts it, the New Testament is represented "as portraying an effeminized God whose gentleness is mere amiability and whose meekness is nothing but weakness." This becomes very apparent in much of the current treatment of the fatherhood of God. For while this thought of God is greatly dwelt upon it is often divorced from these more sobering lines so that it lacks the deeper meanings and attitudes that should attend it. It is an emasculated fatherhood unworthy of the Subject with which we associate it. This has led to a growing realisation, especially among the German schools of philosophy, that in seeking to exalt and emphasise the love of God we have gone to too great an extreme and that the pendulum must swing back to balance and stabilise our views. In other words our theology of today is needing more of the austere and graver elements of the Godhead.

The practical bearing of this is evident for it is just at this point that reverence towards God breaks down. Irreverence begins where there is an inappreciation of the awesome and the fearful in God and the failings of the present day in this respect are very disturbing. We hear the younger generation reproached for such a lack and any observer will find
much to take exception to in the adult. Our age swaggers into God's presence as easily and familiarly as into the office of some ordinary acquaintance. His Word is handled with profane hands and with impunity robbed of everything divine. Sacred traditions are trampled under foot without regard. The very word 'holy' has come to carry little significance. W. P. Patterson notes the trend of this among his own people. "As touching God Himself," he says, "it will hardly be disputed that there has been a general weakening of the sense of the presence and rule of the Almighty which was a characteristic note of the religion of earlier days, and that few draw near to Him with the reverence and godly fear that besem the finite and sinful creature in making approach to an infinite and all-holy God." The same thing can be said of other peoples and especially of our United States. Worship in particular has deteriorated for in it reverence# borne of a wholesome fear of God must ever have a large place. It is a deplorable fact that among many there is little conception of the meaning of worship or of the spirit essential to it, and the writer doubts seriously if any amount of preaching solely on the theme of the love of God will ever inculcate such a spirit. It certainly cannot be done through the sentimental prayers that are frequently heard and which play continually on the goodness and the love of God without a thought to His wrath at sin and an appreciation of His holiness. The contrast in this respect with the prayers of some former generations is very marked. And what is true of our prayers is also true of many

#Note: See Tennyson's introduction to "In Memoriam"—"We mock thee when we do not fear."
of our hymns. There has probably never been a time that has seen so many weakly enamoured, insipid hymns in such wide circulation. In truth the whole trend of our religious life impresses us as lacking something that is to be supplied only by a return to a truer conception of God—a conception which draws in the lines of the fearful as well as those of love.

But a more repulsive result of this emphasis upon the tender and benevolent in God appears in the abominable theory of a new psychology in which we are given to understand that all religion has had its origin in sex love. Schroeder, for instance, is cited by Selbie as arguing that "all religion in its beginning is a mere misinterpretation of sexual ecstasy, and the religion of today is only the essentially unchanged evolutionary product of psycho-sexual perversion." He likewise quotes Swisher as saying that "Since the sex-instinct is the strongest of all instincts, the one upon which the perpetuation of the race depends, it is to be expected that religion should be full of idealized sex emotion.... It is extremely likely that all religion has a phallic origin." Such theories as these are offensive. They represent a glaring neglect of some of the fundamentals of religion. To the spiritually minded they must be nothing less than a perversion of some of the noblest religious elements. We have repeatedly noticed the essential place occupied by fear in all religions and especially in those of the primitive type and yet these theories go directly in the face of this and run counter to the best authorities of all time. In fact we can only imagine ideas of this kind finding currency in an age such as ours when the love of God has been carried to an extreme where His fear is being forgotten.
But having presented the legitimate grounds for the fear of God and matters incidental to them we turn to consider this fear in operation. The fear of God being in the heart we have found that it may assume different forms but in any case will tend towards a permanent disposition or sentiment and will vary in type according to the individual's relation to God. In general this relation falls into two classes, that of the unsaved and that of the saved. Dealing with these classes separately we would say first that WITH THE UNSAVED THE APPEAL TO SERVILE FEAR IS LEGITIMATE. The charge may sometimes be brought that its use has been an injury and a recourse to a low motive but the truth remains that the unsaved need to hear it. They require to be brought face to face with the facts of their condition and be told of the pains and the distress of the lost as well as the bliss of the redeemed. It has ever been one of the preacher's functions to warn as well as to beckon and persuade and the appeal to the fear of God must ever be a powerful stimulus to conversion which he dare not slight and be faithful to his calling. Many a Christian life has had its beginnings in it. Some of the outstanding names in the history of the church have acknowledged their personal indebtedness to it and employed it in their own persuasion of men. Starbuck in his research found that the motives and forces leading to conversion fell into eight different groups of which fear was the leading group. The hope of heaven was nearly absent, fears being about fifteen times more prominent.

But the great justification of the use of fear in appealing to the unconverted is to be found in the practice of Christ Himself. We have already mentioned the emphasis that He gave this motive in
His preaching, and we cannot ignore it in our own appeals. The joy of sin may be more attractive to the sinner than any bliss of redemption we can present but the final and certain consequences of his sin must make him pause. Christ referred continually to the need of obedience, loyalty, and love towards God but He did not disdain to speak also of those things which would appeal to men's fears. The unsaved therefore are to hear the story not only of a God of love but a God of fear, not only of a God who forgives and saves but also of a God of wrath and punishment. The unsaved need to know such a God. Fear must ever be a legitimate motive in their case and the pulpit need make no apology for using it so long as it is kept on a rational basis and held within wholesome limits. Today it is the pulpit in fact which alone scorns to use the fear motive. The medical profession preaches it continually; the lawyer daily holds up the threat of the law; the scientist is persistently setting up new sign boards on which he has written 'thou shalt not'; and the historian busies himself revealing the principles of conduct which nations and individuals may not violate without dire consequences. But the preacher shuts his eyes to the fear appeal and talks of love and mercy and grace. Just as though fear had no function or place in life's economy. And yet as Van Dyke reminds us, "The wholesome fear which makes a burnt child dread the fire is no more trust-worthy than the salutary fear which makes a sinful man dread the divine indignation. Both are premonitions of an actual peril, safeguards against a real danger. But the latter if Christians knew the truth, is far more needful, far more terrible." There is a place for a wholesome fear of God in the unsaved. Love should be in evidence too but fear has a rightful place in the attitude of every unforgiven man towards God.
We have so far spoken about fear in the unsaved and have said little about the believer. With the believer our problem shifts and becomes more complicated but this fact emerges very plainly, namely, THERE IS RIGHTLY A FEAR OF GOD IN THE BELIEVER. It is no longer the fear we saw in the unsaved but a fear modified by the surpassing love of God. The individual has experienced mercy and forgiveness and has entered into the relationship of a son to the heavenly Father. Henceforth there is not such a fear as the unsaved know. Hell and wrath and punishment have fallen into the background. Instead there is a filial fear—a fear that would hate to incur the slightest displeasure of the One in whose goodness we bask. In this case however the fear is magnified beyond the proportions we might experience in an earthly filial relation for the simple reason that the gap between the finite and the infinite, the imperfect and the perfect is so great. It is a holy filial fear. The very continuance of sin, though forgiven, tends to stimulate such fear. For the Christian soul becomes more and more impressed with sin’s heinousness and more sensitive to its enormity so that while Paul at the beginning could call himself a Pharisee of the Pharisees at the end he styled himself the chief of sinners. The Westminster Confession gives voice to this thought of sin when it declares that remnants of sin abide in every part of the believer, and perpetual lustings of the flesh against the spirit: "whereby they are often foilèd with temptations, and fall into many vices, are hindered in all their spiritual services, and their best works are imperfect and defiled in the sight of God." It is such sin remaining in the believer that ever incites to fear for "it is not possible to feel sin without fear," and the age that knows no fear is an age that takes sin too lightly.
But this fear we are to be reminded again is now a holy filial fear. It is such as this that G. A. Smith is expressing when in a sermon on Psalm 39:9 he tells us that there is a fear "which is true, inevitable, salutary, and enduring...Nor even when the full light of religion and morality is introduced, and we come to know God better in His Righteousness and Mercy, does it seem possible or even desirable for us to outgrow Fear and replace it by other religious emotions. For there is always the sense of guilt, which grows as conscience grows and the heart becomes more refined; there is always and in an increasing degree, the sense of the stupendousness of the moral ideal and obligation; and even when we recognise God as love, there is the increase of our sensitiveness and responsibilities towards a Being, who deals with us in such Patience and such Grace."

Furthermore we wonder if after all the Fathers of the Reformation were so far wrong in still retaining a hold upon servile fear as a part of the believer's spiritual consciousness. Actively, servile fear may be and should be banished from life, for God is no longer to be feared as a judge and punisher of our souls. But may not such a fear still exist potentially in our lives, for there is with us the knowledge of the sterner side of God, the remembrance of our own depths of iniquity, the observation of our shortcomings, the perception of sin and the darker side of life about us? The very conception of what God may become under certain circumstances would rightly stir up such a fear. It must have been considerations like these that led Thomas Aquinas to say that servile fear may still remain "in substance" in the believer just as self-love may remain in substance with the love of God. The very fact that we love God is not incompatible with a
certain love of self and so it is with servile fear. Certainly this fear is not far removed from any of us and any believer may call up motives that rise out of it. There may even be moments when the best Christian will need to be "afraid" of God for as Snowden reminds us, "There are two ways of controlling ourselves and moving men to action; the negative way of checks and fears, and the positive way of active impulses and hopes." Both of these are proper and should be used. But at any rate we would err and do ourselves injury to abide in servile fear. Rather having fear it is our duty to press on into the realm of positive living where love increasingly motivates.

There still remains for us to say a word in this last chapter respecting another type of fear, namely 'numinous' fear. Throughout our discussion we have treated 'numinous' fear more or less apart simply because it is apart and occupies a realm of its own, being essentially non-rational. Nor have we at any point sought to go into a detailed treatment of it, preferring rather to refer to the masterly presentation of it in Otto's "Idea of the Holy." In this place however we wish to make one general statement bearing upon this fear in relation to our subject, namely, THE 'NUMINOUS' ELEMENT IN THE FEAR OF GOD SHOULD BE INCREASINGLY FELT IN THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIOUSNESS. That such a fear exists can hardly be denied. Otto has shown us that there are abundant evidences of it in the most primitive religions and that it persists in the redeemed in Christ. In fact it is in the Christian consciousness that it will attain its truest and noblest expression. The very nature of God begets it and the more we experience the "Mysterium" and the "Tremendum" the more we are filled with the fear of the "Holy."
However, the important question for the Christian leader in this connection is how the 'numinous' feeling or 'numinous' fear in particular may be incited, for as we have said it is non-rational and cannot be perceived or aroused by ordinary methods. It differs from ordinary fear in quality rather than in degree or intensity and is entirely outside the experience of the natural man. It is of consequence therefore that we know how this 'numinous' fear may be aroused or imparted and for this we turn to Otto. Speaking of the 'numinous' feeling, he tells us that "There is no transmission of it in the proper sense of the word; it cannot be 'taught', it must be 'awakened' from the spirit." It can only be induced and thus incited and aroused. As in the transmission of all feelings so in this, there must be on the part of the observer the use of "a penetrative imaginative sympathy with what passes in the other person's mind." More can be accomplished by means of reverent attitude, gesture, tone of voice, demeanour, and a solemn assembly than all phrases or nomenclature. "Far the best means are actual 'holy' situations or their representation in description." Above all, we are told, the Spirit must be present in the heart of the hearer and then a small stimulus will suffice. Thus 'numinous' fear may be transmitted and possessed by him and thus it may be felt as the non-rational element in the fear of God.

In conclusion let us note again that the love of God is not discredited or diminished by anything we have said or any position we have taken. If His Power, Wrath, and the 'Mysterium Tremendum' occasion fear and repel us; on the other hand His Love, Mercy, and the 'Fasciicans' occasion love and attract us and the two aspects are combined in the
One and Incomprehensible God. This is a great paradox which we can trace throughout the ages in man's relations with God. From Lactantius and Acquinas down to Otto, men have beheld Christ as a Lamb and behold there was wrath in the Lamb. Thus there has been the fear of God and the love of God together.

These two can never be treated apart. The love of God by itself leads to an indulgent good natured Father who yields to every whim of His spoiled children and never exacts a measure of discipline. On the other hand the fear of God apart from His love either becomes ineffective in itself or else leads us astray to a God that grinds and crushes and offers no hope or promise but that of wrath and terror.

"The dark passages of the New Testament would be paralysing but for the Incarnation." So that the love of God alone is not enough, and the fear of God alone is not enough, but he who with his love can also fear, that is the approach to a perfect Christian.
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