

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is a trying experience for any man to be anticipated. Captain Scott and his companions had it, and felt it. Dr. C. J. BALL has had it, and doubtless feels it too. For many years he has been occupied in the preparation of a Commentary on *The Book of Job*. Last year a great Commentary on the same Book came from two distinguished scholars, Driver and Buchanan Gray. Only now has Dr. BALL been able to publish his book (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 25s. net).

It must be a trying experience. But, unlike Scott and his companions, Dr. BALL will survive it. His Commentary is a scholar's work and independent. In one respect it is alone. Dr. BALL has a knowledge of the languages cognate to Hebrew which (as Dr. BURNEY in the Preface assures us) is unique both in breadth and in depth; and on that knowledge he draws freely. The result is (to quote Dr. BURNEY again) that 'Dr. Ball's volume is not merely a commentary on the text of Job. It is a storehouse of material for the enrichment of the Hebrew Lexicon. This results, in the main, from his profound knowledge of the Babylonian language—a knowledge which is essential to progress in Hebrew studies, but in which the great majority of our professed Old Testament students are unfortunately lacking. In the present work the supreme value of such know-

ledge is illustrated by the writer's masterly translation and discussion of the text of "the Babylonian Job."

We turn at once to the great testing passage in the nineteenth chapter. Dr. BALL traces the hope of resurrection in the three famous verses, 25-27, to the Latin translation of St. Jerome. He quotes that translation. The first two lines are:

Scio enim quod Redemptor meus vivit,
Et in novissimo die de terra surrecturus sum.

The momentous line is the second. Where did St. Jerome get it? Dr. BALL does not think that he got it from a different Hebrew text. He considers it probable that the *first person* was a guess of his own, based on the fact that the following lines are all in the first person except the last, and that then he emended the text and brought it into agreement.

Dr. BALL finds no thought of a resurrection, personal or national, in the poem. One thing he finds and one only—Job's certainty that he shall yet 'see God.' For he must see God, in order that the friends' unfriendly charges may be refuted. But when does he wish to see Him? Not in the hereafter. That is not in all his thoughts. Here, now, on the earth, sooner or later—that is his assurance.

And he had his desire. When at last God interfered it was that Job might see Him and that his friends might be confounded. '*Iahvah answered Eyob* (we accept Dr. BALL'S spelling) *out of the storm-wind*—an immediate physical manifestation. We are left in no doubt about it by Eyob's own words, which surely were not written without intentional reference to the present passage: *I had heard of Thee by hearsay; But now my own eye hath seen Thee!*'

'Eyob's prophecy, then, finds its fulfilment within the limits of the poem itself. He is not represented as looking forward to the establishment of his innocence after he had passed out of the body into the dim world of the dead ("after death, apart from the flesh"); much less is he anticipating his own resurrection from the dead at the Last Day. He simply declares his unalterable conviction that Iahvah, the God of righteous Retribution, will appear to right his lamentable wrongs in the present life, before his disease has run its fatal course.'

When Dr. BALL has corrected the text this is the translation:

For I, I know my Avenger;
And at last He will rise up on earth;
I shall see, while I yet live, El's revenges,
And in my flesh I shall gaze on Eloah!
I shall behold Him and not Another,
And mine eyes will look on Him, and not a
strange god!
My kidneys are wasted with my waiting
(Until my hope shall come).

How is it that a phrase so characteristic of the Gospels as 'the Kingdom of God' has found no place in our modern speech? Is it because the idea is difficult to grasp? It is difficult. And yet we are sure that it ought not to be difficult. We come upon it constantly and every time we come upon it we expect to understand it. But every time it escapes us.

Is it the translation that is at fault? Other translations have been tried. A recent writer on the Kingdom of God used 'the Realm of God' throughout his book. That word may meet the republican objection to kings and kingdoms, but it does not make the phrase more intelligible.

Dr. H. St. John THACKERAY has a hint in his Schweich Lectures. The Schweich Lectures for 1920 dealt with *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Humphrey Milford; 6s. net). In the course of the lecture on Septuagint Origins, Dr. THACKERAY touches on the titles of the books in the Bible. In English we have four books which we call First and Second Samuel, First and Second Kings. In Hebrew there are but two, Samuel and Kings. In the Septuagint there is but one.

It is the usual Greek word for 'kingdoms.' And so it is usually translated — 'The Book of Kingdoms.' But what kingdoms? The two kingdoms of Judah and Israel is the answer usually given. Dr. THACKERAY does not accept it. If 'Kings' was to the Alexandrian translators an inappropriate title, 'Kingdoms' would have been more inappropriate. For the book is more than half done before the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel come into existence. That is not the meaning of the word.

The meaning of the word is 'Reigns.' It had that meaning in Hellenistic Greek. 'The Book of the Reigns'—that, Dr. THACKERAY believes, is the title given in the Septuagint to our Books of Samuel and Kings. It is a good descriptive title.

Take the word into the New Testament. It is Hellenistic Greek we have to do with there. 'The Reign of God' is at hand — that is intelligible enough. It is true that in St. Matthew's Gospel the phrase is 'the Reign of Heaven.' But that offers no difficulty. We know that in their excessive zeal for the honour of God the Jews refused to pronounce His name, and used such expressions as 'Heaven' or even 'Place' instead of it. In a Gospel

addressed to Jews such a phrase as 'the Reign of Heaven' would be more easily understood and more readily appreciated than 'the Reign of God.'

Let us try 'the Reign of God,' then. Let us try it in the most uncertain of all the places where the phrase occurs—Lk 17²¹. The Revised Version has 'The kingdom of God is within you' in the text, and 'The kingdom of God is in the midst of you' in the margin. Either way it is not easy to understand. How can a kingdom be within us or among us? But the reign of God can be within us, and the reign of God can be in the midst of us.

'It is undeniable that, in reading some passages in the Gospels, such as the concluding sentences of the parables of judgment, or the terrible woes denounced against the Pharisees in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew's Gospel or against the unrepentant cities, or the other references to future judgment and punishment, we feel almost as if the old order of retributive justice were still in force and must have been accepted by Jesus. We read of "the unprofitable servant" being "cast into the outer darkness," where "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. xxv. 30, cp. Luke xix. 27), of "the tares" being "gathered and cast into the fire" (Matt. xiii. 40 ff.), of the servant who was careless and unprepared being "beaten with many stripes" (Luke xii. 47), of the unmerciful servant "being delivered to the tormentors" (Matt. xviii. 34), of the Lord of the vineyard "miserably destroying those wicked men," and letting out the vineyard to others (Matt. xxi. 41), and of the "age-long" punishment which awaits the wicked (Matt. xxv. 46).'

'This severe side of Jesus' teaching, with its insistence on judgment and the suffering that inevitably attends on sin, cannot be set aside or explained away, but must be honestly faced.'

'Perhaps the most striking expression of it, and

the one most difficult to reconcile with the teaching concerning the deeper, more personal justice of love, is the passage in Matt. xxiii. denouncing woes against the Scribes and Pharisees. The words here cut like a Russian knout. There is in them a note of contempt and bitter invective which gives the reader a moral jar as coming from the lips of Him who said "Love your enemies." Words such as "ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves," "ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell?" are, to say the least of it, not altogether easy to harmonise with the general spirit of the teaching or with the central thought of Jesus concerning God and man.'

Those three paragraphs are found in a book on *Christian Justice* (Swarthmore Press; 6s. 6d. net). The very title tells us that it is a modern book. For 'justice' is an attempt to make the old word 'righteousness' acceptable to the modern mind. It is that same modern mind that is disturbed over the 'harsh' sayings of our Lord, and is looking so earnestly for a way round them. The author of this book is a young Presbyterian minister, trained at Westminster College, Cambridge, the Rev. Norman L. ROBINSON, M.A. He is more than disturbed, he is distressed about these sayings. What does he propose to do with them?

He must do something with them. For he has just been demonstrating the unquenchable love of God to men, the unrestricted offer of His favour. Who revealed that love? Who made that offer? The self-same Jesus who called the Pharisees 'offspring of vipers.' But Mr. ROBINSON cannot believe that one and the same Jesus could have said to the adulterous woman, 'Neither do I condemn thee,' and to the righteous Pharisees, 'How shall ye escape the judgment of hell?' He accepts the one set of sayings and endeavours to get rid of the other.

First of all, he recommends a more exact translation. And that at any rate is good recommenda-

tion. But the only example he gives does not carry far. The words usually translated 'Woe unto you!' he says, would be better to be rendered 'Alas for you!'

More serious is the fact, and it is a fact, that 'certain of the harshest passages' do not occur in St. Luke; they occur only in St. Matthew. Now St. Matthew, says Mr. ROBINSON, 'had a strong anti-Pharisaic bias.' He thinks, therefore, that these passages may possibly be the First Evangelist's own. Jesus did not utter them. What He said of Jerusalem, where the Pharisees were, and so by implication of the Pharisees, was this: 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!'

Well, if the harsh passages, or even the harshest of them, are due to an anti-Pharisaic evangelist, the matter is settled. We have simply to leave them out. We have simply to take Jesus without them. But are they?

Mr. ROBINSON does not really believe that they are. He owes the suggestion to a friend, and leaves the responsibility with him. All that he himself will say is that 'the tone of the original utterance has not been quite caught by the First Evangelist.' He looks round for another explanation.

He tries more than one. He refers to the suggestion that 'it is Pharisaism rather than the Pharisees that Jesus is here gibbeting.' He refers to it and passes on.

He notices that, apart from the denunciation of the Pharisees, the severe sayings of Jesus are found in His parables. Now 'many of the parables of judgment have a national rather than an individual reference, as, for example, the parable of the Vineyard, and of the Fig-tree, also the parable

of the Pounds, and of the marriage of the King's son, which clearly refer to the doom impending on the Jewish nation,' Even 'in the case of the woes on the Pharisees, and on the cities of Galilee, and the lament over Jerusalem, judgment is pronounced on a class or a community rather than on individuals. It had become clear to Jesus that God's purpose of the Kingdom could not be realised through the Jewish nation or its leaders, but that He must build the new Israel on individuals devoted to Himself. The references to individual retribution are thus far fewer than is generally supposed.'

But that does not explain everything. The references to individual retribution and even rejection are undoubtedly there.

He finds relief at last in an eschatological suggestion. The rejection is not for ever. It is only for 'the age,' the age then believed to be near its end, that final consummation to which all Jewish thought looked forward. 'Jesus used this traditional material, derived from the Old Testament and from the apocalyptists, in order to express the central truth He wished to bring home to men.'

'That truth was the unspeakable loss and suffering involved in the refusal to accept the rule of God the Father in the heart and in the world. What excluded men from the Kingdom was not sins of impulse, which, bringing with them, as they usually do, a speedy nemesis, leave the heart still open to good, so much as those deeper sins of disposition, impenitence, insincerity, the unforgiving spirit, which imply the closing of the heart against the appeal of truth and love. No language concerning the "outer darkness" or "the unquenchable fire" was too strong to express what was involved in this exclusion, this missing of life's supreme opportunity. It was the ultimate loss, than which there could be none greater. It was the missing of the "life which is life indeed," the refusal of the soul's true destiny. But the exclusion was self-exclusion. The loss was self-inflicted.

It was not the sentence of a judge imposed from without, but the inevitable consequence of shutting the heart to the light. "This is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light."

Well, that is all true and well said. But does it meet the trouble? Does it explain the language of Jesus to the Pharisees? Does it remove the dread of the last awful judgment? If the Pharisees deliberately rejected the truth when they saw it, and sinned openly and ostentatiously against God, they may certainly be said to have loved darkness rather than light, and their exclusion may be called self-exclusion. But the question remains, Is the exclusion, for them or for any one else, final, or is it only for a time?

Mr. ROBINSON believes that it is only for a time. He returns to the teaching of Jesus. For 'though no one has the right dogmatically to deny the possibility of such final rejection of good, yet the teaching of Jesus can only be rightly understood when it is interpreted from a centre, and that centre the Fatherly love of God, as we see it manifested in His own life and Cross. It is hard to believe that such love can be finally defeated, that there are some souls which the Divine Lover, the Hound of Heaven, will never overtake, pursue them how He will. We cannot doubt that Paul was speaking by the spirit of Jesus, when he wrote of love that it "beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," and that "it never faileth." Can we believe that the love, which was also the passion for justice, that went to the Cross and there prayed for the forgiveness of those who nailed Him there, could ever suffer final defeat? Would not such defeat of necessity mean eternal dissatisfaction and pain at the heart of God? If there be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, there must be pain over one sinner who, refusing to repent, is consigned to "the outer darkness."

Is it more than a generous desire? To say 'it

is hard to believe that such love can be finally defeated,' is that to say that no one will finally exclude himself? What of the will? Is the freedom of the will only for a time? Is God at last to work His will in spite of it?

Mr. ROBINSON says He is. The suggestion comes from a friend; but he accepts it. 'There is a sense in which truth may be said to be coercive, in the case where a man, in the course of God's Providential dealing with him, is shut up to only two alternatives, and the issue between light and darkness is so clearly set that there is no evading it. The Prodigal in Christ's parable is a good instance. For a long time he "resisted the truth in unrighteousness," but when he was reduced to extremity, to loneliness, penury, and the swine-trough, then truth laid its irresistible constraint upon him, and he "came to himself," and to his father. Experience brought him to a point where truth would take no denial. There was in a sense only one way left, the way home; and yet it had to be his own choice, he had to say, "I will arise and go." Sooner or later, in this way, by the reduction of alternatives, a man can be brought face to face with truth and love in such a way that he can do naught else but choose the truth.'

'Let him that stole, steal no more.'

But if he is a kleptomaniac? The question is asked by Dr. W. H. R. RIVERS. Dr. RIVERS, Fellow and Prælector in Natural Sciences in St. John's College, Cambridge, is an expert in psychoneurosis. He has issued a second edition of his book on *Instinct and the Unconscious* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 15s. net). The first edition was noticed here, and special attention was directed to the author's remarkable experiments in claustrophobia. To the new edition he has added two appendixes, in one of which he discusses 'the Instinct of Acquisition.' It is in that discussion that he asks the question, what if the thief is a kleptomaniac?

And he is entitled to ask it. For if he is a kleptomaniac he belongs to the company of those who have the instinct of acquisition, and may be no more blameworthy than the bird which secures the half-acre or more of ground for its own possession just before the breeding time. Dr. RIVERS begins with the bird.

‘The earliest phase in the process of mating and breeding in the lapwing, warblers and many other birds is the assumption of a special attitude on the part of the individual male bird. The male takes up a position from which he adopts an aggressive attitude towards any other male of the species which ventures within a region surrounding this position. The size of the territory over which individual ownership is thus assumed varies with different species and under different conditions, but is usually a half to several acres in extent. When the male bird has become master of his territory he is sought out by the female, and mating and breeding take place.’

There is a difference between the acquisitive bird and the kleptomaniac. The bird acquires its territory—just as much as will be necessary to furnish food for its young—at the mating time. After the young are reared the acquisitive instinct disappears. The combative bird is combative no longer. It returns to the peaceful society of its fellows. The kleptomaniac is a kleptomaniac all the year round.

That seems to be due to the fact that kleptomania is not merely an instinct. It is partly a modifiable inheritance. It may even be partly a social habit. Therein lies the hope for the kleptomaniac. Instinct is incurable. Hereditary taint and social disturbance are not.

But what is the Christian preacher to do? St. Paul was a preacher. ‘Steal no more,’ he said. The situation was simple; he dealt with it simply. But it is not so simple now. Psychology has come upon us. We see ourselves as others see

us. And when we see others we recognize instincts and impulses which modify our censure or even arrest our judgment. ‘Let him that stole, steal no more.’ Certainly. But if he cannot help it we must do more than lay commands upon him. We must watch over him and direct him. For kleptomania, the psychologist tells us, is not a sin. It is only a psychosis.

The most curious fact about the instinct of acquisition is that the bird is combative only when alone. When it returns to society it becomes peaceable again. It is the same with man.

Dr. RIVERS is an authority on the Melanese. Now ‘throughout Melanesia we find a peculiar blend of individualistic and communistic behaviour in relation to property. In respect of all kinds of property the whole aspect of individual ownership is far less definite than among ourselves. Though certain objects, such as weapons or utensils which a man has himself made, are regarded by general consent as his individual property, there is far more common use of such individually owned articles than is customary in our society. With other objects, especially those made by the united efforts of the community, such as the canoe, the concept of individual ownership is unknown in many parts of Melanesia. The canoe, for instance, is regarded as the common possession of a social group, it may be a clan or a group of kinsfolk, and there is a striking absence of such disputes concerning the right of use as we might expect from the example of our own individualistic society.’

It is the custom, in some of the Melanesian islands, for a man to take off a portion of uncultivated land, to cultivate it, and then to set it apart for himself and his descendants. In the island of Mota, one of the Banks group, a man clears a piece of land and marks out an area of it for each of his children. After each of his children has received his portion the rest is left for the common use of all. Now, here also, the

curious fact is that many disputes occur over the plots assigned to the different persons, none over the land that is left for the use of all. That is to say, both man and bird get along together as long as they are together. They begin to quarrel as soon as they separate one from another. Bring them together again, let them look one another in the face, and they will live peaceably with one another.

There is that in it. And there is more than that.

Sir Oliver LODGE will be remembered, not for his scientific attainments and not for his spiritualistic adventures, but for the saying which he uttered some years ago, that the modern man is not worrying about his sins. The saying has had a mixed reception. Some have flatly contradicted it. Some have reluctantly admitted the truth of it, adding that it is all the worse for the modern man. But the saying will live. And it will live because, with all its exaggeration, it is substantially true. The modern man is *not* worrying about his sins.

Why is he not worrying? He has not considered why. He has other things to think about. But if he did consider he might say that there are two ways of it. There is the Greek way which takes life as it comes, and there is the Hebrew way which takes life as God gives it. The easier way is the Greek way. The Greek does not worry about his sins.

It is the Hebrew that worries. And if a man is to worry about his sins he must read the Bible. The modern man does not read the Bible. A Departmental Committee was appointed some time ago by the President of the Board of Education to inquire into the position of English in the education of England. The Report has been issued. It contains a section on the reading of the Bible. After referring to the Bible as the grandest thing in English literature, and for five

centuries or more the most influential, it says: 'At the present time the Bible is probably less widely read and less directly influential in our life and literature than it has been at any time since the Reformation.'

If that is true it is easy to understand why the modern man is not worrying about his sins. In order that he may begin again to worry about his sins he must begin again to read the Bible.

But why should he worry about his sins? Because he is a sinner. That is the most certain as it is the most serious fact about him. To cease worrying about his sins is not to cease sinning, as Sir Oliver LODGE seemed to signify. The modern man is a sinner, and one day he will find it out, and find that it is the most serious fact about him. It is not a matter of goodness or of badness. It is a matter of manhood. The best man we know is a sinner. It is quite time in this land of ours that we had rejected the Greek view of life, thrust upon us first by Matthew Arnold and encouraged by Sir Oliver LODGE. It is time that we had returned to the Hebrew view.

The Rev. Reginald Stewart Moxon, B.D., Headmaster of Lincoln School, encourages us to return. He has written a book on *The Doctrine of Sin* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), a great book, a searching, truthful, courageous book. In that book he shows that not since the Reformation only, but throughout the whole history of Christianity, right down to our own day, men have worried about their sins. In the fact of their sins they have seen the most serious fact of their lives. And he shows the reason. It is that men have read the Bible. In reading the Bible they have discovered the other great fact of their lives—a God with whom they have to do. That discovery it is that has made the discovery of their sins so certain. That discovery has made it so distressful.

Mr. Moxon, like the Committee of the President

of the Board of Education, would have modern men return to the reading of the Bible. And he would have them begin reading it at the beginning. That may seem, in the present state of our knowledge, an unwise thing to do. Mr. MOXON believes that we have passed the dangerous places. He believes that we have settled two things, and settled them once for all. The first is, that the early narratives of Genesis are not mere history and were never meant to be. The second is, that we are not under the necessity of accepting St. Paul's conclusions from them.

We are not bound, he says, and we no longer feel bound, to take the narratives of the Creation and the Fall as historically true of any particular person or persons. They are true; they are true historically. But it is universal, not particular history. It is truth that is true of the human race, not of one man and woman's experience only. 'The narrative,' he says, 'in the second and third chapters of Genesis, as might be expected from the age in which it was composed, is not unlike the legendary history of early Greece and Rome, and may be regarded as originally a naïve folk-tale relating the circumstances in which the Golden Age came to an end and the misfortunes brought upon the first men by their presumption, and which was afterwards employed by the compiler of Genesis as the vehicle of instruction as to the nature of sin. Indeed, the substance of these chapters, as distinct from the allegorical and poetical form in which they are clothed, must be considered as representing objective fact, and it is broadly true as an account of human origins. Here we see the naked savage, lisping for his first words new names of beast and bird, innocent in sheer ignorance of evil, becoming dimly conscious of disobedience, of guilt and of shame, twining leaves to cover his nakedness or sewing together the skins of beasts, desperately fighting for existence against thorns and briars, bearing children who murder one another in senseless jealousy. This record seems to be very little removed from the evolutionary view, which says that man has

fought his way up from the very dust of chaos, moving steadily onwards in spite of many setbacks and coming at last to a conception of morality and of God.'

We are not bound to take these narratives as bare historic fact. And we are not bound to draw from them the conclusions which St. Paul drew. For 'it is impossible,' says Mr. MOXON, 'to extract from these chapters anything like the theological inferences of a Fall and of Original Sin. They are entirely devoid of any theological or metaphysical theories of a weakness of will or bias towards evil inherited by the descendants of our first parents. The theological doctrine of the Fall occurs neither in Genesis nor in the rest of the Old Testament; the sole Scriptural authority for it is to be found in the writings of S. Paul. Now, it is no longer possible to feel certain that all the ideas of S. Paul are necessarily identical with those of the Founder of Christianity; on the contrary, there is every reason to believe that he retained much of his antecedent thought when he passed from Moses to Christ, and that Christians are not of necessity bound to accept, as inherently Christian, much that S. Paul taught, not as a Christian but as a learned Jew. Even an Apostle could not change his past. His theology is of Christ, but his anthropology is Jewish. The teaching of Jesus, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, contains not the slightest allusion to an alleged Fall, nor to a hereditary bias towards evil, but this idea was familiar to the Rabbinical teachers of the first century A.D.'

'It is therefore probable that the conception of the Fall and Original Sin as it appears in Rom. v. 12-14 forms no part of the original Gospel, but represents ideas imported by S. Paul into Christianity from the Rabbinical Judaism in which he had been brought up. If, therefore, we wish, according to the modern catch-phrase, to get "back to Christ," we must go behind S. Paul and sweep away the doctrine of the Fall and Original Sin as mere speculations which we are at liberty

to consider for ourselves without being committed to regard them from the standpoint of one whose views were moulded by Jewish antecedents, except in so far as he had consciously remodelled them to fit his new faith.'

Well, it may be so, and it may not. That,

after all, is a matter of interpretation. This is the essential thing, and this Mr. Moxon emphasizes as strongly as man can do, that we have all sinned and come short, and that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. The Bible from the beginning tells us that. And in telling us that the Bible from the beginning is true.

Is the Statement of the One Faith in the Form of a Creed necessary or desirable in the Re-united Church?

BY THE REVEREND F. BERTRAM CLOGG, M.A., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN RICHMOND COLLEGE, SURREY.

It has been my privilege to be present at several gatherings of clergy and ministers in the last few years, and I confess that the divergence of the views expressed would sometimes have made me despair had there not always been felt a spirit of fellowship which was more real than the things which divided us. It is said that there is a point high up in the air where sounds that are discordant below lose their discord and blend in harmony, and we believe that there is one Spirit, who is leading us all upwards along different paths, and that if we are faithful to His guidance we shall find those paths presently converge.

There's a legion that never was listed,
That carries no banner nor crest,
But split in a thousand detachments
Is breaking the road for the rest.

It is something at any rate if any of us can play some little part in 'breaking the road for the rest.' Since this paper is only the prelude to a conference, it is prepared rather with a view to 'breaking the road.' Such conclusions as are reached are tentative, for it is recognized that the conception of the re-united Church is such that, I venture to suggest, none of us can grasp its full significance, or lightly say what is necessary or desirable in regard to it.

To begin with, it is almost impossible to separate this question from others. For it is only after we have settled what degree of unity of faith is necessary in the re-united Church that we can say whether it is necessary or desirable that that one Faith should be formulated in a creed. Further, our estimate of its necessity or desirability depends

largely upon the form of the creed. If, for the sake of argument, the Athanasian creed or some such symbol were suggested, which is, of course, most unlikely, many of us feel to have no creed would be far preferable. And again much depends upon the way in which the creed would be used, whether it is necessary or desirable. If, therefore, this paper touches upon these other questions incidentally, I trust it may not be thought unduly straying from the question which occupies our immediate attention.

Can there be a Church without any formal expression of its Faith in a creed? The existence of some of the so-called Free Churches answers that question in the affirmative. The Church, *e.g.*, which I represent here has no creed in the same sense as the Anglican Church has the Apostles' and Nicene creeds. John Wesley established a society within the Church of England which later became a separate society. There were two conditions of membership—that a man desire to be saved from his sins, and to flee from the wrath to come. It was not till about thirty years ago that the name Society was changed to Church. Need I say the change of name did not constitute the society a Church? It is the fellowship of men and women with one another in Christ which makes a Church, and not a name. Still in a small number of our Churches there is used the Anglican liturgy, for the morning, including, of course, the Apostles' or Nicene creed, but in no case is that confession required for membership. Neither are the ministers of the Church required to confess adherence