

Missionary Methods – St. Paul’s or Ours?

Roland Allen

Eerdmans, 2003 – originally written in 1912

Original – 173 Pages

Summary – 21 pages

Disclaimer – While this summary contains quotes and some small re-produced portions of the original book, this summary is not the work of the author of the book summarized. It contains only my carefully chosen selections of what I personally deem to be the most important and significant aspects of the book. This summary is not meant to replace or re-produce the book in any way, and should not be considered a full substitute for the book.

What a great book. That’s all I can say. It’s a tough read though, which is why unless you are a fanatic, you’ll be glad I read it and wrote this summary. The book is such a deep read that I had to do the summaries at the end of each chapter. I was afraid the points would get lost on me...even though I create my summaries through notes and hi-lights done in the course of reading. The book is a difficult read for one because it was written in 1912, and retains that style of the English language. It’s also a challenge because Roland Allen was obviously a freaky smart guy with a gift for putting together complex sentences that are not just complex, but full of meaning. There were many sentences and paragraphs that required multiple passes, just to get out everything that was in them. That being said, there is a lot of detail in this book that is not necessary if one is simply trying to get the big picture. So, with no further ado:

PART ONE: Antecedent Conditions

Three questions that will be addressed in the following sections:

- strategic points: how far was St. Paul’s success due to the position or character of the places in which he preached to establish churches?
- class – was his success due to the existence of a special class of people to which he made his appeal?
- moral and social condition – was the moral, social, or religious condition of the places he preached so unlike anything known in modern times as to render comparison between St. Paul’s work and our futile?

Chapter 1 – Introduction

In little more than 10 years St. Paul established the Church in 4 provinces of the Empire, Galatia, Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia. Before AD 47 there were no churches in these provinces; in AD 57 Paul could speak as if his work there was done, and could plan extensive tours in to the west without anxiety lest the churches he had founded might perish in his absence for want of guidance and support.

This is truly an astonishing fact. That churches should be founded so rapidly, so securely, seems to us today, accustomed to the difficulties, the uncertainties, the failures, the disastrous relapses of our own missionary work, almost incredible. **We have long accustomed ourselves to accept it as an axiom of missionary work that converts in a new country must be submitted to a very long probation and training, extending over generations before they can be expected to be able to stand alone. This was not Paul’s expectation, and his practice did not reflect it either.**

But it is argued that as a matter of fact Paul was an exceptional man living in exceptional times, preaching under exceptional circumstances. To this I must answer: (1) that Paul was not the only missionary who went about establishing churches in those early days. Even outside the Christian church Paul's methods have been used by reformers, religious, political, social, in every age and under diverse circumstances. (2) that we possess today an advantage of inestimable importance in that we have the printing press and the whole of the New Testament where Paul had only the OT in Greek. (3) either we must drag down Paul from his pedestal as the great missionary, or else we must acknowledge that there is in his work that quality of universality.

Every unworthy, idle, and slipshod method of missionary work has been fathered upon the Apostle. Men have wandered the world "preaching the Word", laying no solid foundation, establishing nothing permanent, leaving no instructed society behind, and have claimed Paul's authority for their absurdities. Almost every intolerable abuse that has ever been known in the mission field has claimed some sentence or act of Paul's as its original.

Missionaries have trusted native helpers with the management of mission funds and these helpers have misused them, but Paul did not do this. He had no funds with which to entrust anyone. These people have committed funds in trust to individual natives and have been deceived, but Paul left the churches to manage their own finances.

In addition, Paul's methods are not in harmony with the modern western spirit of restless activity and boundless self-confidence. We do things ourselves, find our own way, and naturally tend to be impatient with those who are not, and do not. And we naturally expect converts to adopt our spiritual beliefs and our practical modes of operation (our laws and customs). **But Paul preferred persuasion to authority. He grasped fundamental principles with an unhesitating faith in the power of the Holy Spirit to apply them to his hearers and to work out the appropriate external expressions in them. The mere fact that some of Paul's methods appear to have no method at all make us, "the apostles of order", suspicious.**

Chapter 2 - Strategic Points

I conclude that Paul did not deliberately plan his missionary tours, but there are facts that demand our attention.

- 1) - Paul seemed to focus on entire provinces as a whole rather than on individual cities. He speaks more of provinces being reached than of cities being reached.
- 2) - Paul seemed to prefer certain provinces more than others.
- 3) - within the provinces - he seemed to prefer cities to rural areas. - however, with one condition. For this preference to hold valid, we must have the expectation that the city will be a point of diffusion for the gospel, not a container of it. Paul did not ignore rural areas because he did not care about them. He expected them to be reached through the establishment of a church in a provincial city. And by establishing a church in 2-3 centers, Paul claimed he had evangelized the whole province.
- 4) focus on areas of Roman military/political rule.
- 5) focus on areas of Greek cultural influence and language
- 6) focus on areas of Jewish influence
- 7) focus on areas of world commerce

We must not however, allow ourselves to lay over-much stress on these characteristics of the places in which Paul established churches. He was led of the Spirit, and when we speak of his strategic centers we must recognize that they were natural centers, but we must also recognize that for missionary work they were strategic because he made them such. They were not centers at which he MUST stop, but centers from which he might begin, not centers into which life drained, but centers from which it spread abroad.

Concentrated missions at strategic centers, if they are to win the province, must be centers of evangelistic life. In great cities are great prisons as well as great railway stations. Concentrated missions may mean concentrated control or concentrated liberty. It may be a prison or a market; a safe where the best intellect of the day is locked up, or a mint from which the coin is put into circulation.

Paul's centers were centers indeed. He seized strategic points because he had a strategy. The foundation of churches in them was part of a campaign. But they were this not only because they were naturally fitted for this purpose, but because his method of work was so designed that centers of intellectual and commercial activity became centers of Christian activity. Paul was less dependent on these natural advantages than we generally suppose. He was led as God opened the door, but wherever he was led he always found a center and seizing upon that center, he made it a center of Christian life. How he did this we will see later.

Chapter 3 - Class

Paul did not seek particularly to attract the scholars, the officials, or the philosophers. He certainly did not address himself to them. If he did so once at Athens, he deliberately refused to take that course at Corinth. This conclusion is supported by his reference to the deep poverty of the churches in Macedonia, and Luke by his careful note of the conversion of "chief women" at Thessalonica, and of "women of honorable estate" at Beroea, seems to suggest that people of rank and importance were the exception, rather than the rule. Moreover, the frequent addresses to slaves in the letters of Paul seem to indicate that many of the believers belonged to that class. **I would conclude then that the majority of his converts were of lower commercial and working classes, laborers, freed-men and slaves, but that he did not deliberately aim at any class.**

Chapter 4 - Moral and Social Condition

We are sometimes apt to think that the social condition of those to whom Paul preached may account for his success and the answer comes with irresistible force that the majority of his converts were born and bred in an atmosphere certainly not better, and in some respects worse than that which we have to deal with today in India or China.

I cannot here attempt to depict the moral and social conditions of the provinces that Paul preached in, but to a right understanding of Paul's work, it is essential that we remember 4 elements in the life of the people:

1) The first is the prevalence of belief in demons, and the consequences of that belief were then what they are today - physical and psychical disease, cruelty, bondage, and vice. Educated men believed that any enemy could practice in secret upon their lives by means of incantations. Paul's

preaching did not deny this belief, but rather provided people with invincible weapons wherewith to meet the armies of evil. Deliverance came not by denial but by conquest. **Incidentally, I should like to remark that in heathen lands it might still perhaps be the wiser counsel to preach constantly the supremacy of Christ over all things spiritual and material, than to deny or deride the very notion of evil spirits. By preaching Christ's supremacy we give them a real antidote, we take them to a real Savior who helps them in their dark hours.**

2) The temples in Ephesus and Corinth were no more homes of virtue than the temples in cities around the world today. The religious conditions for belief in Christ were no better in Paul's day than in our day. People were just as steeped in superstition and un-cleanliness as they are today.

There are however, 2 vices in Paul's day which are largely absent in our modern era: slavery and the amphitheatre. – *SUMMARY NOTE – I disagree with this point because it was written in 1912 – we may not see slavery to the same extent, but the amphitheatre had become magnified with technology. – But, I can see how in 1912, he would have felt this way and made this conclusion.*

3) The amphitheatre – These bloody shows had 2 disastrous results: 1 – they kept before peoples minds the division of humans into 2 classes, men with rights and men with none, and 2) this amusement made all other forms seem tame. It increases the vulgarity of all other entertainment as competition for sensationalism increased.

4) Finally there was slavery, and it was very different in Paul's day and not for the better. The slaves were of the same color and often the same race, and education as their masters. They were slaves today, and tomorrow, if set free, they might take their place with perfect propriety and ease in the society of their master. There was no great barrier of blood, social habit, thought or cultivation between slaves and masters.

PART TWO: The Presentation of the Gospel

Three more questions to address:

- miracles: how far was Paul's success due to his possession of miraculous powers?
- finance: how far was his success due to financial arrangements?
- substance of his preaching – how far was his success due to his method of preaching?

Chapter 5 – Miracles

This is one of the grounds on which is based the argument that his methods can have little or no bearing upon our work in the present day. It is necessary that we should examine carefully the nature and extent of Paul's miracles and the use that he himself made of them. Miracles are recorded of Paul in 5 towns, in 4 provinces. It would appear that the importance of miracles in this work of Paul can be easily exaggerated. They were not a necessary part of his mission preaching; not was their influence in attracting converts as great as we often suppose.

But, on the other hand, at Paphos a miracle led to the conversion of an important man; at Iconium signs and wonders were a witness to the truth of the Gospel; at Lystra a miracle introduced a great opportunity for expounding the doctrine; at Ephesus miracles were the means by which a great spiritual victory was won. Luke speaks of them as through they were a natural and proper part of

Paul's ministry. He certainly does not relate all of Paul's miracles, by merely tells of some as typical as many.

Paul did not attempt to convert people by working miracles upon them. He did not attract people to Christianity by offering them healing. He did not heal on condition that they attended to his teaching. We know of no cases in which Christians desired to win or actually did win adherents by means of the charities that they dispensed.

I cannot help thinking that this is a principle we cannot be too careful to observe. But we still offer secular education, or medial treatment, or food, as an inducement to people to submit themselves under our religious instruction or influence. We should consider the offering of any material inducement as contrary to sound doctrine.

But, if Paul did not use his powers of healing as an inducement of people to receive his teaching, the use of miracles did yet greatly help him in his preaching. And in three ways:

1) His miracles attracted hearers.

2) Miracles were universally accepted as proofs of Divine approval of the message and the work of him through whom they were wrought. For Christian, Jew, and pagan alike the evidence from miracles was irresistible. Given the miracle, the approval of the god in whose name the miracle was done followed as a necessary consequence.

3) Miracles were illustrations of the character of the new religion. They set forth in unmistakable terms two of the fundamental doctrines; the doctrine of charity and the doctrine of salvation, of release from the bondage of sin and the power of the devil.

a) Charity is love for men expressed in deed and word, as taught by Christ and His apostles, and as practiced by them, as something quite new in the history of the world. Heathen magicians, for a great price, exercised their powers, but Paul, because he was grieved at the bitter bondage of the oppressed or because he welcomed with insight the sympathy of the first signs of faith that could respond to the power of the Lord.

b) Paul's miracles illustrated the doctrine of release, of salvation. In the world to which the apostles preached their new message, religion had not been the solace of the weary, the medicine of the sick, the strength of the sin-laden, the enlightenment of the ignorant: it was the privilege of the healthy and the instructed. The sick and the ignorant were excluded. They were under the bondage of evil demons. It was a constant marvel to the heathen that the Christians called the sick and the sinful.

Such powers were highly valued in the church and greatly coveted by the faithful. But their importance can be easily overrated and it is manifest that Paul saw this danger and combated it. He does not give the gift of miracles the highest place among the gifts of the Spirit. He does not speak as if the best of his workers possessed it. **Miraculous power was only one of the many manifestations of the Spirit; above all, best of all, is the spirit of charity. Everyday we see how it is not the possession of great powers but rather the spirit in which any power is used which attracts, which moves, which converts.**

Chapter 6 – Finance

This might very well be the most important chapter in this book. It is true at least up to this point. Because while the other discrepancies we see between Paul's methods and those in our own day are scattered about; meaning we see one present in one mission work, but not another, the issues related to finances in our methods and the problems ensuing there from, are practically universal in both form and presence. To find a mission society following the methods of Paul laid out below, would be a kin to finding \$100 in the shoes you use every day. You are excited to see it, only half-believe it could be true, and wonder how in the world it could have ever happened. For that purpose the most important sections of this section, are not in bolded...because they would all be bolded.

The primary importance of missionary finance lies in the fact that financial arrangements very seriously affect the relations between the missionary and those whom he approaches. It is strange how often Paul refers to it, what anxiety he shows that his position should not be misunderstood; but he speaks as if its importance lay wholly in the way in which it might affect those to whom he preached, never as though it made any personal difference to him. There seem to have been three rules that guided his financial practice:

1) He did not seek financial help for himself from those he preached to.

Among the heathen there was a large class of teachers who wandered from town to town, collecting money from those who attended their lectures. For these men philosophy and religion was a trade. Paul would not be accounted as one of them. He refused to receive anything from those who listened to him. Heathen religion, the Jewish law, and Christ's directions, all alike insisted on the right of the minister to receive support. But Paul did not receive it, and hew as careful to explain his reason. He saw that it would be a hindrance to his work.

a) He was anxious to show his fatherly care for his disciples by refusing to burden them with his maintenance.

b) He was anxious to set them an example of quiet work.

c) He was anxious to avoid any appearance of covetousness.

1 Cor 9:12 1 Thess 2:5-9 2 Thess 3:7-8 2 Cor chapters 11-12 Phil 4:16

Yet, Paul did receive gifts from his converts. He does not seem to have felt any unwillingness to receive help; he rather welcomed it. He was not an ascetic. In this our modern practice is precisely the same. Most missionaries receive their supplies from home, and cannot possibly be thought to seek financial support from their converts.

2) He gave no financial help to those he preached to.

Every province and every church was financially independent. The Galatians are exhorted to support their teachers; Gal 6:6. Each church was instructed to maintain its poor. That one church should depend upon another for the supply of its ordinary expenses as a church, or even for a part of them, would have seemed incredible in the provinces during Paul's day.

From this practice we are now as far removed in action as we are in time. We have indeed established here and there churches which support their own financial burdens, but for the most part our missions look to us for very substantial support, and it is commonly taken for granted that every new station must do so at any rate for some considerable time. Our modern practice in founding a church is to begin by securing land and buildings in the place we wish to propagate the

gospel. And we take it for granted that the acquirement of these things by the foreign missionary or society is a step of first importance. Since it is obviously impossible that the natives should supply all of these things, even if they are anxious to receive our instruction, it naturally follows that we must supply them.

This habit of taking supplies with us is due chiefly to two causes: the first, the amazing wealth of the church at home and secondly, the prevalence of the idea that the stability of the church in some way depends upon the permanence of its buildings. So the externals of religion precede the inculcation of its principles. We must have the material establishment before we build the spiritual house.

Thus the foundation of a new mission is primarily a financial operation. But it ought not properly to be a financial operation, and the moment it is allowed to appear as such, that moment very false and dangerous elements are introduced into our work.

a) by our eagerness to secure property for the church we often succeed in raising up many difficulties in the way of our preaching, and sometimes we arouse the opposition of local authorities who do not desire to give foreigners permanent holdings in their midst.

b) we load our missionaries with secular business, contract negotiations, super-intendance of works, the management of an establishment, to which is often added anxiety about the supply of funds for providing and maintaining the establishment. In this way their attention is distracted from their proper spiritual work, their energy and power is dissipated, and their first contact with the people whom they desire to evangelize is connected with contracts and other purely secular concerns. They become the financial agents of the mission.

c) but in creating these missionary establishments we not only over burden the missionaries with secular business, we misrepresent our purpose in coming to the place. It is important that our outward actions should correspond with our inward intentions and rightly express them. In ignorance, we may take unsuitable outward actions that do not represent our real purpose for being in a place. But, the moment we are aware of an unsuitable expression, we must no longer use it. Offering the left hand, for example, in India even if intended in goodwill, will not be taken as such...so the practice of offering the left hand in India must be abandoned, as it is a misrepresentation....unless of course you intend to offend. If we are persuaded that the material vehicle misrepresents the spirit that we intend to express, and yet continue to use it, it checks our spirit. Moreover, because we cannot express ourselves, cannot manifest our real purpose in them, the use of wrong materials repels those whom we might draw to us. All men everywhere judge the inward by the outward, and are either attracted or repelled by it. They are apt to be much influenced by the first glance. If then, the material form really does not express the true spirit, we cannot be surprised if they are hindered. I think it is now almost universally admitted that the permanence of foreign rule in the church ought not to be our object in advancing the Gospel. But by taking large supplies with us to provide for our establishment we do in fact build up that which we should be most eager to destroy. Moreover, we do not want to produce the impression that we design to introduce an institution, even if it is understood that the institution is to be naturalized. Christianity is not an institution, but a principle of life. By importing an institution we tend to obscure the truly spiritual nature of our work. We take the externals first and make it easy for new converts to put the external in place of the internal. We are not the preachers of a Western Religion, and anything that tends to create or support that misunderstanding is a thing rather to be avoided than encouraged.

d) by importing and using and supplying to the natives buildings and ornaments which they cannot procure for themselves, we tend to pauperize the converts. They cannot supply what

they think to be needful, and so they learn to accept the position of passive recipients. By supplying what they cannot supply we check them in the proper impulse to supply what they CAN supply. Foreign subsidies produce abroad all the ill effects of endowments at home, with the additional disadvantage that they are foreign. The converts learn to rely upon them instead of making every effort to supply their own needs.

e) It is often said that these financial bonds help maintain unity. Native congregations have before now been held to their allegiance by threats of the withdrawal of pecuniary support. But unity so maintained is not Christian unity at all. It is simply submission for the sake of secular advantage and it will fail the moment that any other and stronger motive urges in the direction of separation. Spiritual forces are more powerful than external bonds, and external bonds have never preserved and never will preserve, unity. The only unity worth preserving is that of the Spirit.

f) by the establishment of great institutions, we tie our missionaries to one place. They cease to be movable evangelists and become local pastors. Even if some new opening of larger importance is before them, they cannot enter into it without serious and difficult financial adjustments.

g) furthermore, our establishments make it very difficult for any native to succeed to the place of a missionary. But native Christians, if left to themselves, would have never created such a post and are likely to abolish it sooner or later. Thus, by establishing such posts we are creating serious difficulties for ourselves. We say we hope the day is not far off when natives will take our places and carry on the work. But we ourselves are putting that day off by our institutions. The creation of mission stations with parsonages and churches is far more of a serious difficulty than the establishment of schools and hospitals. Schools and hospitals can be separate from the church and are not bound up with the daily life of the church. The greatest difficulties by far are those establishments directly related to church life.

h) of all sources of strife, material possessions are the most prolific.

3) He did not administrate the local funds of local churches, but expected that each church would handle that itself. If money collected for local uses is administered under the direction of a foreigner, he feels responsible for it's proper use, and requires a careful account of it, and himself renders an account of its use to his society at home.

Is it possible for human ingenuity to devise a scheme better calculated to check the free flow of native liberality, to create misunderstandings, and to undermine the independence of the church, and to accentuate racial distinctions?

This modern practice is partially based on our mistrust of native honesty. But that ought not to exist and has nothing to do with the case. If they administer their own funds, they will do so in their own way, and will be responsible to those who supplied them. They may not administer them to our satisfaction, but I fail to see what our satisfaction has to do with the matter. It is not our business, if it is not our money. By making it our business, we merely deprive our converts of one of the most powerful agencies for creating mutual responsibility. We load ourselves with a vast burden which we are ill able, and often ill fitted, to bear.

Chapter 7 – The Substance of Paul’s Preaching

We have 3 examples of Paul’s preaching in Acts 13: 16-41, 14:15-17, and 17:22-31
We have 5 references to its substances Acts 16:17, 17:2-3, 17:18, 19:37, 20:21

We also have an account of him preaching at Corinth 1 Cor 2:2

These accounts can be naturally divided into two classes: the preaching in the synagogue, and the preaching to the Gentiles.

In Paul's preaching in the synagogue, we can see 5 elements and 4 characteristics:

The 5 elements:

1) an appeal to the past. Common belief creates a natural bond of union. It ensures that the speaker starts with the agreement and approval of his hearers. It also prepares the ground for the new seed.

2) there is a statement of facts, of things which can be understood, apprehended, accepted, disputed, or proved. Facts about the injustice of rules, the fluctuating passions of the crowd, the resurrection. He tells the story.

3) There is the answer to the inevitable objection. There is a careful presentment of the proof, the evidence of trustworthy men, the agreement of the new truth with the old which has already been acknowledged.

4) There is the appeal to the spiritual needs of men, to the craving for pardon, and the comforting assurance that in the new teaching may be found peace and confidence.

5) Finally, there is a grave warning. The rejection of God's message involves serious danger. The way of salvation may be refused, and it commonly refused, but not without peril.

The characteristics:

1) conciliatoriness and sympathy with the condition of his hearers, readiness to recognize all that is good in them and in their doctrine, sympathy with their difficulties, and care to make the way for them as plain and simple as possible.

2) courage in the open acknowledgement of difficulties which cannot be avoided, and in the direction assertion of unpalatable truth. There is no attempt to keep the door open by partial statements, no concealment of the real issue and all that it involves, no timid fear of giving offense, no suggestion of possible compromise, no attempt to make things really difficult appear easy.

3) respect. There is a careful presentation of suitable evidence, there is an appeal to the highest faculties in man. Paul speaks to men as naturally religious persons, and appeals to them as living souls conscious of spiritual powers and spiritual needs.

4) there is an unhesitating confidence in the truth of his message, and in its power to meet and satisfy the spiritual needs of men.

The four characteristics of Paul's preaching, we shall find in all his preaching, the elements however, are not always the same. However, the supreme subjects of Paul's preaching was The Cross, Repentance, and Faith.

In First Thessalonians we get an extraordinarily clear and coherent scheme of simple mission preaching, not only implied but definitely expressed.

1) there is one living and true God 1:9

2) Idolatry is sinful and must be forsaken 1:9

3) the wrath of God is ready to be revealed against the heathen for their impurity (4:6) and against the Jews for their rejection of Christ and their opposition to the gospel (2:15-16)

4) The judgment will come suddenly and unexpectedly (5:2-3)

5) Jesus the Son of God (1:10) given over to death (5:10) raised from the dead (4:14) is the saviour from the wrath of God (1:10)

6) the kingdom of Jesus is now set up and all men are invited to enter it (2:12)

7) Those who believe and turn to God are now expecting the coming of the Savior who will return from heaven to receive them (1:10; 4:15-17)

8) Meanwhile their life must be pure (4:1-8), useful (4:11-12), and watchful (5:4-8)

9) To that end God has given them His Holy Spirit (4:8, 5:19)

- To those who were seeking some unity in the world of nature and thought, Paul brought a doctrine at once simple and provide of one personal God, living and true, Creator of all.
- To men who sought for some intelligent account of the world, Paul revealed a moral purpose in the light of which all the perplexities, uncertainties, and apparent contradictions, resolved themselves into a divine harmony.
- To men of high moral instants, Paul offered assurance of a moral judgment. To men oppressed by the sense of sin he brought the assurance of pardon and release.
- To the downtrodden, sad, and hopeless, he opened the door into a kingdom of light and liberty.
- To those who were terrified by the fear of spirits he revealed a Spirit benignant, all powerful and able at a word to banish the power of darkness.
- To men dissatisfied with the worship of idols he taught the pure service of one true God.
- To people who's imaginations were overwhelmed by the terrors and darkness of the grave he gave the assurance of a future beyond the grave.
- To the weak, he brought the promise of an indwelling Spirit of power.
- To the lonely he offered the friendly warmth of a society of love and warmth of fellow believers.

Paul did not preach an easy doctrine of evangelization. The preaching of an easy doctrine of evangelization has been made more tempting for us today by the fact that we have lost two of the most prominent elements of Paul's Gospel: the doctrine of judgment at hand, and the doctrine of God's wrath. Paul did not preach that in times past men had lived under the stern dominion of the law and that with the Gospel had come a day of toleration; he preached that in times past God had been longsuffering and now was calling men to repent, because judgment was at hand. He did not preach that the mission of the Gospel was to reveal the true beauty of heathen religions, but that it was an open door of salvation to those who would flee from the wrath to come.

Another note: Paul expected his hearers to be moved. He so believed in his preaching that he knew that it was the power of God unto salvation. This expectation is a very real part of the presentation of the Gospel. It is a form of faith. A mere preaching that is not accompanied by the expectation of faith is not a true preaching of the Gospel, because faith is a part of the Gospel. Simply to scatter the seed, with some vague hope that some if it may come up somewhere, somehow, is not preaching the Gospel.

Further, Paul always contrived to bring his hearers to a point. There was none of the indeterminate, inconclusive talking, which we are apt to describe as "sowing the seed" Paul did not scatter seeds, he planted. He so dealt with his hearers that he brought them speedily and directly to a point of decision, and then he demanded of them that they should make a choice and act on their choice. When once he had brought them to a point where decision was clear, he demanded that they should make their choice. If they rejected him, he rejected them. The

“shaking of the lap” the “shaking of the dust from the feet”, the refusal to teach those who refused to act on the teaching was a vital part of the Pauline presentation of the Gospel.

It is a question which needs serious consideration whether we ought to plant ourselves in a town or village and continue for years teaching people who deliberately refuse to give us moral hearing. We are afraid to take the responsibility that morally rests upon us of shaking the lap. We have forgotten that the same Lord who gave us the command to go, gave us the command to shake the dust from our feet.

In conclusion, Paul’s preaching ever appealed to and demanding the exercise of the two highest and deepest convictions of men, their sense of individual responsibility and their sense of communion with their fellows. Repentance and faith are keynotes of his preaching. He strove always to bring men to make that act of spiritual surrender by which they renounce the past and turn to Christ. In repentance they confess their past wrongdoing; in faith they find forgiveness as members of His body. In repentance they recognize their weakness; in faith they find strength by the administration of the Spirit of Christ. In repentance they confess the way in which they have walked is a way of death; in faith they find in the kingdom of God, the way of life. In repentance they break with a sinful world; in faith they enter the Church.

PART THREE: The Training of Converts

Two more questions here:

How far was Paul’s success due to the teaching he gave his converts?

How far was his success due to his method of preparing converts for baptism and ordination?

Chapter 8 - The Teaching

Paul did not go about as a missionary preacher merely to convert individuals: he went to establish churches from which the light might radiate through the whole country around. It is the training of the first converts that will set the tone for the future. If they are taught to depend on the missionary the infant community learns to rest passively upon the man from whom they receive their first insight into the Gospel. The people wait for him to move, and the longer they do so, the more incapable they become of any independent action. Thus the leader is confirmed in the habit of gathering all authority into his own hands, and of despising the powers of his people, until he makes their inactivity an excuse for denying their capacity. He actually robs them of the strength that they naturally possess and would naturally use. The more independent spirits among them, can find no opportunity for exercising their gifts. Thus the community is robbed of its strength. It’s own forces are weakened while it depends on the most uncertain of props and the most unnatural. In the result the missionary is left to deplore the sad condition of a Christian Church which seems in danger of falling apart the moment he leaves it.

We can gather converts, often in great numbers, but we cannot train them to maintain their own spiritual life. We cannot establish the church on a self-supporting basis. Our converts often display great virtues, but they remain, often for generations, dependent on us. We need to strive to understand the method of Paul in this area, for he succeeded exactly where we fail. He set up no organization intermediate between his preaching and the establishment of a fully organized indigenous church. He preached in a place for 5-6 months, and left behind a church, not indeed free from the need of guidance, but capable of growth and expansion. 1 Thess 1:1 & 2:14

The question is how he could so train his converts as to be able to leave them after so short a time with any security that they would be able to stand and grow. What could he have taught them in 5 or 6 months? If any one today were to propose to ordain men within six months of their conversion from idolatry, he would be deemed rash to the verge of madness.

I have no doubt that Paul was in constant communication with them by one means or another. But there is an immense difference between dealing with an organized church through letters and messengers and occasional visits, and exercising direct personal government. Visits paid at long intervals, occasional letters, even constant communication by means of deputies is not at all the same thing as sending teachers to stay and instruct converts for a generation while they depend upon the missionary for the ministrations for the sacraments. Nothing can alter or disguise the fact that St. Paul did leave behind him at his first visit complete churches. He succeeded in so training his converts that men who came to him absolutely ignorant in the Gospel were able to maintain their position with the help of occasional letters and visits at crises of special difficulty.

I have already tried to set forth the elements of the simple Gospel preached by Paul. That Gospel involves a doctrine of God the Father, the Creator; a doctrine of Jesus, the Son, the Redeemer, the Savior; a doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the indwelling source of strength; but these in the simplest and most practical forms. Paul also emphasized communion and the resurrection as points of emphasis. Further, Paul accepted and delivered to his converts as an inspired book the Jewish Old Testament. He taught his converts to read it and to read it in a mystic sense as applying to Gentile Christians. It does not seem to us the most convenient text-book to put into the hands of new believers. We wonder that Paul could have taught the common people, the laborers, to use such a book in 6 months, if they could even read when they came to him.

Paul lectured, mainly using the OT as his text. The more intelligent speedily caught his method of reading and interpreting it. The meetings of the church were gatherings for mutual instruction. Anyone who had been reading the book and had discovered a passage which seemed to point to Christ, or an exhortation which seemed applicable to the circumstances of their life, or a promise that brought encouragement with hope, produced it and explained it for the benefit of all.

Finally, he taught them the form of administration and the meaning of the 2 sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Thus, Paul seems to have left his newly-founded churches with a simple system of Gospel teaching, 2 sacraments, a tradition of the main facts of the death and resurrection, and the Old Testament. There was apparently no form of service, except of course pertaining to the sacraments, no form of prayer, unless he taught the Lord's prayer. There is no evidence of the existence of a written gospel or a formal creed. This seems to us remarkable little. We can hardly believe that a church could be founded on so light a basis. And yet it is possible that it was precisely the simplicity and the brevity of the teaching that constituted its strength. There is a very grave danger in importing complete systems of worship and theology.

By beginning with simplicity and brevity, he ran grave risks. It is characteristic of Paul that he had such faith in Christ and the Holy Spirit that he did not shrink from risks. How great those risks were is illustrated by the controversy in Galatia and Corinth. On a most serious point of doctrine, and in moral practice, two of his churches fell into great error. It has been suggested that this catastrophe was due to the fact that Paul, in his first missionary journey had not yet learnt the

necessity of laying a deep foundation, that he had not appreciated the danger or trusting the future of the church to ill-instructed converts. I do not think this argument is tenable. There is no sign of repentance in all of Paul's dealing with the Galatians. On the contrary, his letter is full of the most earnest insistence upon the necessity of preserving their freedom. From beginning to end it implies that he desires for them more freedom, not less, and that he regrets not having given them more.

At Corinth we find the astonishing fact that the whole church could tolerate the grossest immorality of life and the most disgraceful conduct at the Lord's table. There is no question that Paul was horrified. We should naturally have expected that if Paul had stayed only a month or two with his converts, if they had learnt anything at all, it would have been how to conduct the Lord's supper properly. If any missionary church today fell into the same sin, we would write his methods off as hopeless. Yet the fact remains that Paul was one of the most successful church planters the world has ever seen.

As paradoxical as it may seem, I think it is quite possible that the shortness of his stay may have conduced in no small measure to his success. There is something in the presence of a great teacher that sometimes tends to prevent smaller men from realizing themselves. They more readily they feel their responsibility, exert their powers, and come forward for duty. By leaving them quickly Paul gave local leaders opportunity to take their proper place, and forced the church to learn they could not depend on him, but must depend on its own resources. We have already seen how he did this in matters of finance, but by retiring early we see how he did it in matters of government and education.

One other effect of Paul's training is clear. His converts became missionaries. The reason of our failure is, I believe, largely due to the fact that we quench that Spirit. We educate our converts to think, as we, accustomed to a long-established and highly organized church, naturally think, that none but duly appointed ministers may preach. We dread the possible mistakes of individual zeal. The result is that our converts hesitate to speak of religion to others. They throw the responsibility upon the license evangelist and 'the mission'. They do not feel any responsibility themselves to evangelize the world. Their mouths are closed. Here and there of course, we find a man so full of the Spirit of the Lord that he cannot hold his peace, but he is a comparatively rare exception.

We need to begin again to teach ourselves, and our people what Spirit we are of, and to give liberty that the word of the Lord may have free course. When we do that, the church will again reveal itself in its true character and become self-propagating.

Chapter 9 - The Training of Candidates for Baptism and Ordination

We have tried to discover what teaching Paul gave to his converts. This teaching followed, it did not precede, baptism. For baptism, apparently very little knowledge of Christian truth was required as an indispensable condition. Apparently anyone who was prepared to confess his sins and acknowledge Jesus as Lord might be baptized. Even if we suppose that many of Paul's converts were baptized without much teaching, it does not follow that the rite was carelessly and indiscriminately administered.

On the other hand, there is nothing in the evidence before us to support the somewhat stiff practice where a definite and very long period of probation in the classes or hearers and catechumens is prescribed. We have adopted this practice in some form or other, more or less rigid, in order that the reality and sincerity of converts may be thoroughly tested. By this means we have undoubtedly restricted the number of our converts, and it is not certain that we have succeeded in attaining an exceptionally high standard of morals and education either.

We have taught them that the one great need of men is Christ, and that without Christ, men cannot attain to righteousness, and then that they must attain to righteousness by themselves in order to receive Christ. In Paul's teaching, the requirements for holy baptism were repentance and faith. The moment a man showed he had repentance and faith, he was baptized into Christ, in order that Christ in him might perfect that repentance and faith. The question of difficulty is, who is to decide whether a candidate is honest in his confession of repentance and faith.

It seems to me irresistible that Paul and his fellow workers admitted first only a few people of known reputation, who showed unmistakable signs of faith, and thereafter left the duty of accepting or refusing candidates mostly to these men. I cannot help thinking that we find here a very important element of his success. By leaving the church to decide who should be admitted, he established firmly the principle of mutual responsibility. The church was brotherhood, and the brethren suffered if any improper person was admitted to the society. They knew the candidates intimately. They were in the best position to judge who was fit and proper. They might make mistakes, and they did, but if they made mistakes they were to their own peril and they certainly made less than a foreigner would have in judging their own people.

As with the admission of converts for baptism, so with the appointment of elders. There is no doubt that he did appoint elders, and it seems to be equally clear that he did not appoint simply on his own initiative, acting on his own private judgment. This is borne out by the constant emphasis laid upon the term "of good report".

Furthermore, this principle was maintained by the fact that Paul ordained as elder members of the church to which they belonged. He did not establish a provincial school to which all candidates for ordination must go, and from which they might be sent to minister to congregations in any part of the area, at the bidding of some central committee. The elders were really of the church to which they belonged and ministered in. They were at home. They were known members of the flock. If they received support, they received it from men who supported them because they knew them and believed they felt the need for undivided and uninterrupted care. Thus the bond between elder and church was extremely close.

Where a superior order exists of mostly foreigners the result is often deplorable. The teachers, the deacons, the priests, so sent out, are wholly independent of the one authority which they really understand, native public opinion, and they are solely dependant upon the one authority which they seldom can understand, i.e. the foreign missionary.

The elders so appointed were not young. They were apparently selected because they were men of high moral character, sober, grave, men of weight and reputation. They were not necessarily highly education men, they cannot have had any profound knowledge of Christian doctrine. The qualifications were primarily moral. If they added to moral qualifications intellectual qualifications (the men applying) so much the better, but high intellectual qualification were not

deemed necessary. Their duty was to look after and care for the well being of the body, and to administer the sacraments. I take it for granted that they could not be administered by any convert.

It seems to be irresistible to conclude that the elders appointed by Paul were appointed with the power to appoint others and to add to their number and thus to secure to new churches the proper order.

Finally, Paul was not content with ordaining one elder for each church. In all places, he ordained several, thus ensuring that all authority should not be concentrated in the hands of one man.

We cannot say that there is no place for the foreign educated teacher. He may be said to resemble in some respects the young ministers who Paul educated on his own by constant association with himself. Carefully selected and diligently trained, these men might go about as preachers and teachers of deeper truths and higher knowledge, the messengers of, and fellow-workers with, the white missionary, who relieved of the overwhelming burden of personal ministrations to numbers of small congregations over a vast area, could constantly be in touch with these churches, and yet have opportunity to open up new centers of work. It is absolutely essential that the founder of churches should keep in contact with the communities he has established, so that he may at any moment intervene in a crisis or serious difficulty that may arise.

Four things, then, we see Paul deemed necessary for establishing churches, and only four. 1) a tradition or elementary creed, 2) the sacraments of baptism and Communion, 3) orders, 4) the Scriptures. He trained his converts in the simplest and most practical form. He delivered these to them. He exercised them as a body in the understanding and practice of them, and he left them to work them out for themselves as a body while he himself went on with his own special work. He was ready at any moment to encourage or direct them by messengers, by letters, or by personal visits, as they needed direction or encouragement; but he neither desired or attempted to stay with them, or to establish himself among them. To do for them what he was determined they do for themselves. He knew the essential elements, and he trained his converts in those and those alone, and he trained them by teaching them to use what he gave them.

PART FOUR: Paul's Method of Dealing with Organized Churches

Two Questions:

How far was Paul's success due to his manner of exercising authority and discipline?

How did he succeed in maintaining unity?

Chapter 10 – Authority and Discipline

AUTHORITY

With the appointment of elders the churches were complete. They were no longer dependent upon the Apostle but they were neither independent of him. When there was the occasion he did not hesitate to assert authority over the churches that he had founded and to claim that he had received that authority directly from the Lord. With regard to these assertions of apostolic authority, it is important to observe that they all occur in the epistles to one church and that they

were called forth for the most part by the outrageous conduct of unreasonable and unruly men. They certainly do not represent Paul's general attitude toward the churches.

It is important that we should examine these cases carefully, because they give us a most valuable insight into the method of the Apostle and greatly help us to understand that secret of his success. The most important questions that came before him were those of personal purity, litigation, and the eating of things offered to idols.

1) fornication

How did Paul deal with this serious difficulty? There is not in his letters one word of law: there is not a hint that the Jerusalem Council had issued any decree on the subject: there is not a suggestion that he desires a code of rules or a table of penalties. He does not threaten with punishment. He does not say he will take steps to procure their correction. He beseeches and exhorts in the Lord people to whom the Holy Spirit has been given to surrender themselves to the guidance of that Holy Spirit, to recognize that He is given to them that they may be hold in body and soul, and that uncleanness necessarily involves the rejection of the Holy Spirit and incurs the wrath of God. He reminds his readers of his personal teaching when he was with them. He reminds them that God's will for them is sanctification. He warns them that the Lord is the avenger of such misdeeds. He reiterates the truth that the purpose and will of God in calling them was to make them holy. Finally, he warns them that the rejection of his teaching on this subject is the rejection of the Holy Spirit. All very firm, but persuasive, not commanding.

It is strange that Paul should not even hint at the fact that this sin had been condemned in the Council at Jerusalem. Surely it is strange that in speaking of fornication in close connection with a flagrant case of incest he should not even suggest that it is a breach of the 10 commandments. **His gospel was not a gospel of law, but of the spirit. Again and again he expresses his firm conviction that the church knows the will of God and will surrender itself to the guidance of the Spirit.**

2) litigation

Some of the Corinthian believers had been prosecuting their brethren in the heathen law courts. This was an offence likely to bring the Name into disrepute. The simplest way to deal with it would have been to forbid it by decree, and to threaten offenders with punishment. But that is not how Paul does it. He reasons with the body and sets before them an argument, and leaves the matter at that. It is, he says, unworthy of men who are called to be judges of angels and the world to drag their brethren before an unbelieving judge. He urges upon them that it would be better to suffer injury and defraud than to publish the immorality of the church. **He does not suggest that he will take any action if they refuse, as some certainly would, to listen to his arguments.**

3) eating things offered to idols

Again at the Jerusalem Council it had been decreed that Gentile Christians should abstain from this. There were some in Corinth who were not only eating them, but also participating in the feasts at the idol temples; a far larger offense which would bring many others in it's train. Paul makes no reference to any law on the subject, or the decree from Jerusalem. He does not only not quote it, but he himself does not live by it 100%. 1 Cor 6:1-11, chapter 8, and 10: 14-22 . Paul appeals rather to the highest Christian virtue and contrasts love and knowledge. He argues that love must come first, and that if acts based upon knowledge (like eating meat that has been

offered to an idol because you understand it is just meat, and good for food) injure and mislead the weak, they are not only not praiseworthy, they are sinful.

A digression – in our dealings with natives we habitually appeal to law. We attempt to administer a code which is alien to the people we are working with and for which they may have no precedent. We quote decisions of people they do not understand, nor the reasons behind the decisions. Without satisfying their minds or winning their consent, we settle all questions with outside words. They learn to expect law and to delight in the exact fulfillment of precise and minute directions. By this method we make it difficult to stir the consciences of our converts when it is most important that they be stirred.

Paul cannot have believed that by his appeal to love the question would be settled. He must have foreseen strife and division. He must have deliberately preferred strife and division, heart burnings, and distresses, and failures, to laying down a law. He saw that it was better that his converts should win their way to security by many falls than that he should make a short cut for them. He valued a single act of willing self-surrender, for the sake of the Gospel, above the external peace of a sullen or unintelligent acceptance of a rule.

4) marriage and divorce

It may be said that there is one subject of the first importance upon which Paul does very distinctly lay down the law (1 Cor 7) At least it appears that way at first. But as we look closely we see that Paul is here extremely careful to distinguish between the command of the Lord and his own judgment. He avoids in every possible way making clear-cut legal demands that must be obeyed in the letter. He rather suggests principles and trusts to the Spirit that dwells in the church to apply them.

DISCIPLINE

Nevertheless, when individuals broke through all bounds and committed flagrant offences he did not hesitate to insist upon the need of discipline. There is a point at which the conscience of the whole church ought to be stirred to protest, when for the church to pass over an offence in silence is to deny her claim to be a moral society. **It is in just such cases that the church is often slow to act. Comparatively small offences are sometimes visited with stern severity, while horrible crimes that shock the whole congregation dare no one to move.**

In the case at Corinth we see Paul's principle of mutual responsibility again enforced, and he enforces it by staying away from Corinth until the church has realized and executed its duty, and had cleared itself of complicity in the crime of this offender. The difficulty with us is that we cannot appreciate this doctrine of mutual responsibility. If a member of a church commits a serious offence we cannot hold the church responsible for his action. We are so individualistic that we cannot understand the practical meaning of Paul's doctrine of the body and its members. Mystically we accept it, but when it is a question of a single man's crimes we ourselves cannot realize it, and we cannot bring home to others, their real unity. To punish society for the offence of the one would seem unjust. However, eastern people understand this much better.

By throwing the responsibility on the majority Paul stirred and educated the conscience of the whole church. If he had sent a letter of excommunication to the elders and the elders would have read it in the church, none of the effects would have followed. This, his exercise of discipline was

in exact accord with his exercise of authority. In discipline he showed them the right way, but left them to discover how to walk it. He told them what they ought to do, but not in detail. In the last resort, he threatened to intervene, if they refused to do their duty, but it was only after he had exercised all his powers to make his intervention unnecessary.

Therefore, he succeeded through failure where we often fail through succeeding. We exercise discipline and leave the church undisciplined. He disciplined the church; we discipline individuals. He left the church, and it stood, tottering on its feet, but still standing. We leave the church without any power of standing on its own at all.

Dependence does not train for independence, as slavery does not education men for freedom. Moreover, they have the Holy Ghost to strengthen and guide them. It is not question merely of our faith in them; it is still more a question of our faith in the Holy Spirit. We look too much at our converts as they are by nature. Paul looked at his converts as they were by grace.

Chapter 11 - Unity

Unity might be maintained in 2 ways.

- 1) The church in Jerusalem might be regarded as the original Church, established and organized by the Apostles. New member churches must accept the rules and regulations if they want to join. The authorities in Jerusalem must be regarded as the final court, and there must be a highly centralized organization.
- 2) On the other hand, new churches might be regarded equally with the first as parts of a still incomplete whole. New additions would at once be recognized as members of a Spirit bearing body, equally enjoying the inspiration of the Spirit with the older members. The rules and regulations could not then be regarded as final and of universal obligation. The first had the customs natural to its own habit, the last might equally have its own customs natural to its own habit. Unity would not consist in outward conformity to the practice of the earlier members, but in incorporation into the body.

It was the second of these two policies that Paul adopted.

- a) He refused to transplant the law and the customs of the church in Judea into the Provinces.
- b) He refused to set up any central administrative authority from which the whole Church was to receive directions. Once, and only once, he supported an appeal to the Council in Jerusalem to settle a question which arose in another province (Acts 15:2)
- c) He declined to establish a test of orthodoxy. We who are eager for such tests, who always want to have it clearly defined before hand what a church may or may not do, what it may or may not put aside on pain of ceasing to be of the Church, seek earnestly in the records of the apostolic acts for such a test...and we fail to find it.

d) He refused to allow the universal application of precedents. What was vital in Syria would have been artificial in Achaia. It would not have been a precedent to the Corinthians or Thessalonians. It would have been an arbitrary ruling.

The only thing that mattered was the spiritual unity; outward unity that did not express an inward unity was an empty husk. But inward unity was the only thing that mattered, because inward unity that did not express itself in outward unity was the negation of unity. Hence, Paul laid great stress on unity by:

a) Teaching unity by taking it for granted. He taught his converts that every baptized Christian was a brother. He constantly recalled to their minds their common difficulties and sufferings. He taught them to practice hospitality to one another.

b) Using to the full his position as an intermediary between Jew and Greek. He was a Pharisee with a Greek education. He used this ability to appeal and fit to both sides.

c) Maintaining unity by initiating and encouraging mutual acts of charity.

d) Encouraging the constant movement of communication between the different churches.

In contrast, today unity is maintained in our missions by a very different means. We have had a long and very bitter experience of schism at home, and all our missions have been planted and organized with the fear of schism ever before our eyes.

The unity therefore that we maintain is practically uniformity of custom. It is essentially legal in its habit. When questions arise they are settled by the missionaries, and the missionaries have but one test and that test is agreement with Western Practice. If a precedent be found, it settles the question. If a rule is found, it must be followed. If no law or precedent seems applicable, one will be established which is in most harmony with the genius and history of the Western Church.

By this means it must be admitted we have succeeded in maintaining a kind of unity. Schism and heresy are almost unknown in our missions. But at what a price we have succeeded! If there has been no heresy, there has been no prophetic zeal. If there has been no schism, there has been no self-realization. If there has been no heresiarch, there has been no Church Father. If there have been no schismatics, there have been no apostles. If there has been no heresy, there has been no local theology. If there has been no schism, there has been no outburst of life.

PART FIVE: Conclusions

Chapter 12 - Principles and Spirit

If we look out over the mission field today we see that we have made most amazing progress, and that our labors have been more than abundantly blessed. Nevertheless, there are everywhere 3 very disquieting symptoms:

1) Everywhere Christianity is still exotic. Generally speaking it still remains true that Christianity in the lands of our missions is still a foreign religion. It has not yet really taken root in the country.

2) Everywhere our missions are dependent. They look to use for leaders, for instructors, for rulers. They have as yet shown little sign of being able to supply their own needs. Day by day and year by year there comes to us an unceasing appeal for men and money for the same missions to which we have been supplying men and money for the last 150 years.

3) Everywhere we see the same types. If we read the history of a mission in China we have only to change a few names and the same history will serve for Zululand. There has been no new revelation, no new discovery, no new aspects of the Gospel, and no new forms of Christian life unfolding.

The causes of those failures are not far to seek:

a) We have allowed racial and religious pride to direct our attitude towards those whom we have been wont to call 'poor heathen'. We have approached them as superior beings, moved by charity to impart of our wealth to destitute and perishing souls. **Consequently we have preached the gospel from the point of view of the wealthy man who casts a mite into the lap of a beggar, rather than from the point of view of the farmer who casts his seed into the earth, knowing that his own life and the lives of all connected with him depend upon the crop that will result from his labor. Approaching them in that spirit of superiority, we have desired to help them. We have been anxious to do something for them. And we have done much. We have done everything for them. We have taught them, baptized them, pastured them, managed their funds, led their services, built their churches, provided their teachers, nursed them, fed them, and doctored them.**

b) Want of faith has made us fear and distrust native independence. We have imagined ourselves to be, and we have acted so as to become, indispensable. In everything we have taught our converts to turn to us, to accept our guidance. We have asked nothing from them but obedience. We have educated our converts to put us in the place of Christ. We believe that it is the Holy Spirit which inspires and guides us; we cannot believe that the same Spirit will guide and inspire them. We believe that the Spirit has taught us and is teaching us true conceptions of morality, doctrine, ritual; we cannot believe the same Spirit will teach them. It would be better, far better, that they should make many mistakes, and fall into many errors, and commit many offences, than that their sense of responsibility should be undermined. The Holy Spirit is given to Christians to guide them, and that they may learn His power to guide them, not that they may be stupidly obedient to the voice of authority.

We are like teachers who cannot resist telling their pupils the answers the moment a difficulty arises. There is no stage in which converts cannot do anything for themselves. They are not as incapable as we suppose.

The principles which seem to underlie all of Paul's practice were two:

1) He was a preacher of the Gospel, not of law. He did not come merely to teach a higher truth or a finer morality than those who preceded him. He came to administer a spirit. **Before St. Paul**

many teachers had inculcated lofty principles of conduct and had expounded profound doctrines. Men did not need another. They needed life. Christ came to give that life, and Paul came as a minister of Christ, to lead men to Christ who is the life, that in Him they might find life.

2) He practiced retirement to give place to Christ. He gave freely and then retired (left) so that they might exercise the powers which they possessed in Christ. He warned them of dangers, but he did not provide an elaborate machinery to prevent them from succumbing to the dangers. To do this required great faith; and this faith is the spiritual power in which Paul won his victory. We have not to do with mere men; we have to do with the Holy Ghost. What systems, forms, safeguards of every kind cannot do, He can do.

Chapter 13 - Application Chapter 14 - Epilogue - A present day contrast

These last two chapters in the book are very well written, however, because they are basically a summary to all the points that are contained in detail in the rest of the book, I have forgone a summary of the summary. The Application is a rehash of the main points and suggestions for implementation; implementation that I take for granted is fairly obvious in the rest of his writings. The final chapter is excellent, but too long to reproduce and pointless to summarize. It is basically a story form contrasting a modern day missionary with a modern day approach, and a modern day missionary taking the approach of Paul. EXCELLENT...let me say that every chapter in this book is worth the whole purchase price of the book. That's not a good advertisement for my summary, but in this rare case, it's true.