

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

secret police agent clearly explains his later development.

In our passage in Job, the rover says in parallel words that 'he comes from roving in the earth, and from walking in it.' It is probable that the corresponding word *Mithallech*, 'walking,' had a development similar to that of the word Satan. In Accadian, the language of the Assyrians and Babylonians, which is very nearly related to Hebrew, the same term *muttaliku*, the 'walker,' is used in several ways. It is the attribute of the 'evil eye' which travels about to harm people and in the expression 'the street walker' it denotes especially two demons, a male and a female demon. Is it that the idea of a secret officer, the evil angel of God, can already be found at the basis of this conception of

the male and female demon who travels about? In the Bible, too, the 'walker' or 'traveller' is spoken of as an official: Pr 6<sup>11</sup> and 24<sup>34</sup>, 'So shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth.' 'The one that travelleth' is generally considered to be the warrior. Is it not more correct, however, to see in this term the roving police officer and not the warrior generally?

Satan came to this world as a secret political officer who does his duty, imposed upon him by His Lord. It was only later development that turned Satan into the opposing spirit that does not act as ordered by the Lord, but creates evil in opposition to His will.

HARRY TORCZYNER.

*Hebrew University,  
Jerusalem.*

---

## Entre Nous.

### The Second World Conference on Faith and Order.

The thought that the world has become a closer and more organic unity through ease and rapidity of communication has been so often expressed as to be a commonplace, but it has received a fresh interpretation and a deeper significance through the meetings of the Second Conference on Faith and Order, held in Edinburgh in the early days of August.

The danger of such a Conference is that what it gains in breadth, it may lose in depth, and that discussions should become so general, and so excessively considerate, as to be more theoretical than practical. But we think that danger was almost altogether avoided. There was a note of deep seriousness, a clear awareness of the difficulties to be overcome, an acute consciousness of the need of the world, with a fresh realization of the power of the gospel of Christ to meet that need; above all, a determination to treat the obstacles to unity as obstacles and not as barriers; and, finally, a resolve that, if possible, a message should go forth to the Churches which would enlighten their peoples, and spread amongst their ecclesiastical leaders the contagion of an unquiet conscience.

The need of the world 'of a society which has lost its moorings' was indeed felt most urgently, and

was perhaps most poignantly expressed in the appeal of the Bishop of Dornakal, a representative of the Younger Churches. 'We want you,' he said, 'to take us seriously when we say that the problem of union is one of life and death with us. Do not—we plead with you—do not give us your aid to keep us separate, but lead us to union.'

But the need of the world may be vividly realized, and yet all that may arise out of this may be a discussion of plans which are born of merely human wisdom. A deeper note than this was struck at the very beginning of the Conference. The emphasis was laid not so much upon the need as upon the sufficiency of the gospel to meet it. 'The heart of the Christian message,' said Dr. Leiper, 'is not merely relevant to the need of the world, but is that which alone can help and heal'—heal a world which is crying out for brotherhood and community, if only the Churches would remember effectively that 'a divided Church is a caricature of the gospel.' The same idea was stressed over and over again by the Archbishop of York, especially in his deeply impressive opening sermon in St. Giles'. For him, the unity of the Church is already existent, a gift of God to the world, in the heart of Christ and mediated by the Holy Spirit. 'The unity of the Church of God is a perpetual fact, our task is not to create it, but to exhibit it. . . . The Christian faith

and life are not a discovery or invention of men, they are not an emergent phase of the historical process, they are the gift of God.'

This emphasis upon the objectivity of the Christian message was the dominant idea in the opening days of the Conference. Perhaps it is permissible to trace in this the influence—the better influence—of a current tendency in theology, a more healthful aspect of that aversion to humanism which is characteristic of much thinking at the present day. But be that as it may, the question immediately arises about the form of the expression in the past and the present of this objective fact of the coming of Christ to the world of space and time. How is the mystical Church, hid in the heart of God and become incarnate in Christ, to embody itself? Is the institutional Church to be regarded as a close approximation to, and adequate embodiment of, the mystical Church? One of the most interesting aspects of the expression of opinion in the Conference was the absence of rigidity in this matter on the part of even the representatives of the Orthodox Church. They seemed prepared to introduce a certain judgment of value, to allow of the constant superiority of the mystical Church to any institutional form of expression. Whenever such value-judgment is permitted even in the slightest degree, there are immediately grounds for hope that forms which keep Churches apart may not be regarded as sacrosanct for all time, but may be considered as modes of the expression of the purpose of God which are moving onward to ever greater adequacy and comprehensiveness. It all comes back to our conception of God and His working in the world. Is His revelation static or dynamic? Has the spirit of the Christ, the Son of God, been revealed only in the past, or are we still under His divine guidance? The suggestion was made that there was hope of a solution in a combination of objectivity and subjectivity, in Barthianism modified by Bergsonianism, or, more generally, in a humanism purified and redeemed by a stronger emphasis upon the fundamental implications of the Incarnation of Christ. The controversy is always breaking out anew between the 'institutional' and the 'gathered' Churches, between those which emphasize tradition and those which lay stress on voluntary association at the present time. But may it not be that God's revelation is *both* objective and subjective, both institutional and also—just as importantly—in the current collective aspirations of men? God is not without a witness in any age, even in this present age. There can be no sheer humanism in a world which the com-

ing of Christ has made sacramental. The transcendent and the immanent are reconciled in the Incarnation of Christ, and the cause of Church unity may be helped forward by a fuller appreciation of this conception.

It seemed to be a general opinion at the Conference that a mere federation of Churches was not the goal to be aimed at. The Bishop of Dornakal made an earnest plea for organic union as the only ideal which was worthy of our prayers and sacrifices, and could prove to the world the reality and power of the Christian faith—'one visible Church, possessing a common life, a common ministry, and common sacraments.' The possibility of this is the crux of the whole situation. Is it reasonable or even logical that men should confess that we are divided simply because we are not wholly possessed by the spirit of Christ, and at the same time feel that they are constrained to 'maintain barriers against completeness of union at the Table of the Lord.' Is there any justification for placing inter-communication far away as the goal of progress towards union instead of regarding it as the primary manifestation of the spirit which makes the desire for union possible? The Archbishop of York stated his position at the beginning of the Conference in a manner which must command the deepest respect even if we cannot agree to the necessity of the position itself. The words quoted above are from his opening sermon, and he continues, 'I believe from my heart that we of that tradition [the tradition of the Churches which maintain barriers] are trustees for an element of truth concerning the nature of the Church which requires that exclusiveness as a consequence, until this element of truth be incorporated with others into a fuller and worthier conception of the Church than any of us hold to-day.' Yet he describes this division as 'the greatest of all scandals in the face of the world,' and he holds that only if it is a source to us of spiritual pain can those who maintain the exclusiveness be absolved from 'the guilt of unfaithfulness to the unity of the gospel and of God Himself.' No one present at the Conference could question the absolute sincerity with which Dr. Temple expressed this conviction, but at the same time we may perhaps ask whether the position is altogether a consistent one. If, as the Archbishop suggests, we ought all of us to reach forward to a fuller and worthier conception of the Church than we at present possess, and if the sacrament of Holy Communion has that central importance in the objective expression of the Holy Spirit which is the Church, surely mutual participation in Holy

Communion would be one of the most powerful factors in helping us to arrive at the fuller conception of the Church which we so earnestly desire. Is the attitude taken up not a little like inviting us to enter a door and yet withholding from us the key of the door?

Further, if the exclusiveness is wrong, if it is a scandal 'in the face of the world'—to use the Archbishop's own language—then ought we not to put the matter right without delay? The spiritual pain which is felt by those who feel constrained to exclusiveness cannot justify indefinite postponement if postponement is wrong. A subjective emotion cannot justify an objective wrong.

We cannot have the matter both ways; the exclusiveness is right or it is wrong. If it is right, then surely it is a mistake to feel spiritual pain in regard to it. If it is wrong, then surely abandonment of it is a first form of obligatory activity rather than an ultimate goal.

But it may be said that this is an over-simplification of a complicated situation, and perhaps it is, otherwise there would not be so much hesitancy on the part of sincere advocates of unity, including the Archbishop himself. But still we think that the members of the Anglican Episcopate who attended the Communion Service in St. Giles', held under Church of Scotland auspices, did very much by their example to help forward practically the cause of unity.

If we are called upon to save a person from drowning, and can do it because we possess the power of swimming vigorously, no amount of subjective regret can excuse us if we delay our efforts. If as a Church we are called to save the world from perishing, and can do it through the presentation of the gospel in an undivided Church, possessing the gift of God, no amount of spiritual pain will justify delay. There is still truth in the Kantian principle that 'ought' implies 'can,' and perhaps the reversed form of the statement is also true for the Christian Church that 'can' implies 'ought.' May we be saved from dependence upon an indefinite future, and remember that eternity is even now in time, that the eternal love of God in Christ is a present gift and not merely a future possibility!

W. S. URQUHART.

*Torphins.*

#### A Confederacy of the Churches.

Another contribution has been received on this great question of the reunion of the Churches—a

question so much in our minds at present. The writer has been turning over in his mind the Archbishop of York's remark that the division between the Churches is 'the greatest of all scandals in the face of the world,' and he has also been reading the new edition of *Towards Reunion: What the Churches Stand For* (S.C.M.; 1s. net), a volume edited by Mr. Hugh Martin and in which six well-known and representative men—Dr. S. C. Carpenter, Dr. Townley Lord, Dr. W. D. Niven, Dr. H. G. Wood, Mr. B. L. Manning, and Professor Victor Murray—state what their Churches 'stand for.'

This is what our contributor says: One of the commonest things we hear from insiders and outsiders alike is that the divisions of the Churches are a 'scandal.' But are they? We do not say that unity is undesirable, but we do say that uniformity is. Two things may be said in justification of the variety of Christian denominations. We are different, and think differently. And therefore one man's mind leads him to prefer one form of Church polity, and his neighbour prefers another. And so some men prefer episcopacy, others a presbyterian form, others an individualist form. Where is the scandal in this?

Besides, nationality, history, and environment, and even climate, have something to do with deciding the preponderant tendency of people towards one or other form of Church government. It is equally difficult to suppose that we can reach agreement in the matter of belief. The real scandal of our divisions is different. First of all, it is often to be found in the attitude of Churches to one another, and, as has been said, an undogmatic Christianity is a contradiction in terms, and is the real source of a feeling of bitterness which dispels all prospect of unity.

But further, there is the 'shameful waste of men and money,' which is perpetuated by divisions which exist without any counterbalancing co-operation. Every one can point to parishes where there are three or four or more Christian Churches in a community which would be amply served by one. The three or four are all struggling along with insufficient means, with ministers whose souls are seared by the discouraging conditions and the unholy competition. And there are new housing areas all over the land with clamant needs of men and money which are being squandered in districts that have no need of them. How can the Church hold its ground when its resources are frittered away in unnecessary enterprises?

But there is a third charge which is made against

the Church by outsiders which is regarded by many thoughtful and not unsympathetic people as a real scandal. It is the apparent inability of church people to value at their real worth the big things that should unite them, and the other things which at the best are secondary. The outsider says frankly, 'Why should I join a Church when the Churches don't seem to feel the greatness of the truth they preach enough to let them work together for the welfare of society?' He often puts it much more strongly, and most unfairly, when he says, 'Why should I come into a Church where they are all squabbling about matters that don't seem to me to matter?' The real criticism here, and it is a valid one, is that the Churches do not make sufficient of the great unifying truths of the gospel to lead them to co-operate closely in their divine task. After all, we have a gospel. Why does it not bring us together at least in fellowship and service?

Well, what of the future? What are the great conferences going to do for us? There are two things on which we may fix our minds with some optimism. One is the growing desire to at least understand one another.

The other hope is surely in the coming of a confederation or council of the Churches which will preserve their real and justifiable differences, emphasize their real oneness and secure their active and effective co-operation in the service of mankind. It is essential that the Churches should realize, assert, and embody their real unity. Why, therefore, should there not be a great body which will include all the non-Roman Churches in the world, which will give a definite witness to the world, which will cordially recognize the place and worth and standing of each of its component parts, which will exert a powerful influence on national and international questions, which will realize Christ's prayer 'that they all may be one,' and show to the world that we are one, which will set forth the Big Things of the Christian faith and life as the one essential matter for all the Churches?

#### Harvest.

'To-day I went to church unintentionally, by which I mean that I put aside the church-going clothes when I got up, and put on the others intending not to go. Then after breakfast I changed my mind, though not my clothes, and went and enjoyed it. It was harvest thanksgiving: the church was decorated with chrysanthemums and oats, and an occasional beetroot or carrot; and we

had four harvest hymns. Do you remember the touching simplicity of harvest hymns? They make me wriggle and purr with enjoyment:

And keep us in His grace,  
And guide us when perplexed,  
And save us from all ills  
In this world and the next.

The simplicity gave me such a *douce attendrissement* that I felt as if I could kiss the whole choir for singing it. But they missed out one verse of 'We plough the fields and scatter,' and I nearly made a fuss and interrupted the service then. We had, too, the 118th Psalm and a fine chant for it: do you know that psalm? It is splendid and buoyant and says things two or three or four times over because it is so glad.<sup>1</sup>

#### Hymn Society.

A Society has been formed for the study of hymns. The Hon. President is the Archbishop of York, and the Hon. Secretaries are the Rev. G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D., and the Rev. F. Sanderson, M.A. Any one interested can obtain full particulars from the Secretaries (30 Ambrose Avenue, London, N.W.11). The membership fee is 2s. 6d.

#### THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 1937-1938.

Varied articles are being arranged for the next months. One series will deal with aspects of Worship, covering The Basis of Worship, The Ordering of Worship, Worship and Sacraments, The Place of the Sermon in Worship, Fellowship in Worship, Worship and Service.

A number of recent social experiments will be described under the general title of 'Christianity in Action.' Expository articles—'Great Texts Retranslated'—will consist of studies based on modern translations. Amongst important single articles we shall publish in October 'The Basic Forms of Theological Thought,' by Professor Karl Barth.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. Trevelyan, *Grey of Fallodon*, 156.