

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.

If religious men are to serve God with their minds as well as with their hearts, they must be prepared to relate their religious convictions to the intellectual problems of their time. In our time those problems are to be found in the fields of literary and historical criticism, of philosophy, and very particularly of science. It is pre-eminently on this last field that the great battle is being fought which is raging over a very extended front, and any Church which is tempted to discourage the study of science on the part of students who are preparing for her ministry is blind to one of the most vital issues of the day.

For, as Archbishop D'ARCY truly remarks in his *Providence and the World-Order* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), 'Atheism is a real force in the world of our time. It has its prophets in every land; and its appeal is always to science.' And one of the objects of this reassuring book is to show that there is much in the most recent phases of science that points in the direction of a theistic solution of the riddle of the universe. Many of the great leaders of scientific thought are openly stating their conviction that the story of creation is capable of ultimate explanation only on theistic principles.

A generation ago it was not so. Then a mechanistic conception of the universe prevailed, which issued in materialism and practical atheism, which reduced man to an automaton and free will to a pious fiction, which explained mind as an epiphenomenon and emptied of all meaning such an

appeal as 'Choose ye this day whom ye will serve,' and which was practically destructive of all faith in any spiritual or moral order.

But in the intervening years a radical change has come over most, though not perhaps all, of the distinguished representatives of science. There is less dogmatism, and more humility and reverence. The universe is seen to be not quite so simple an affair after all, and not to be quite completely explained in the terms of any comprehensive formula. And this change has been brought about not simply by humbly bowing before the inexplicable, but by keener and subtler investigation of the phenomena themselves.

Scientists are now so far from accepting determinism as the secret of the universe that they have learned to speak of a 'fundamental indeterminacy' in the working of Nature. The electron, we are now told, is incalculable, and introduces an element of indeterminacy into the fundamental structure of matter; and if, as Sir Arthur Eddington remarks, the atom is indeterminate, 'we can scarcely accept a theory that makes out the mind to be more mechanistic than the atom.'

But this only raises another problem. There seems in that case to be chaos at the heart of what we once thought to be cosmos. Can we still believe in a cosmos, or are we only deluding ourselves by cherishing such a belief? To this there can be

but one answer. The whole of our activity rests on the assumption of the dependableness of the universe. If we could not trust it, and trust it implicitly, we could not only make no progress at all, we could neither plan nor arrange anything with any sort of confidence. But we do so plan and arrange—which is our implicit tribute to the reliability of the so-called natural order. God 'abideth faithful, He cannot deny Himself.'

How, then, is this apparent antinomy to be resolved? Thus, says the Archbishop: 'There is an apparent inconsistency between the action and character of the minute element and the action and character of the greater things which are formed by these minute elements. The explanation of this strange antinomy is that the electrons and the atoms which they help to form are in such incalculable multitudes that their inconsistencies cancel one another. The mathematical law of averages comes into operation.' Elsewhere he offers the happy analogy of an insurance office dealing with the expectation of life. If attention is concentrated on the individual life, there can be no certainty at all, but if the number of persons included in the calculations is sufficiently great, the tables work out with astonishing accuracy.

Man can transform his world by the manipulation of its material. He is not the helpless resultant of natural forces; he conquers by understanding and obeying the laws of the universe. The mere fact that the universe, so far as it has been explored by science, is intelligible, is surely convincing proof that it is pervaded by purpose. Behind it is infinite Mind. And are we to deny to this Mind the power to use and manipulate material in accordance with some great progressive purpose—the power which we claim and are obviously justified in claiming for ourselves? Is God to be shut up within the walls of the world which His own fingers framed?

In a passage whose interest will justify its quotation in full, Dr. D'ARCY shows that even an insect, to say nothing of a man, is more than an automaton or animated mechanism. It is pos-

sessed of an intelligence which can grasp a situation as a whole and adjust its behaviour to that situation. He tells of an experience in the Italian Alps, when his attention 'was arrested by the strange movement of a chicken-bone which had fallen to the ground. The bone was roughly rectangular in shape, perhaps two inches long by one inch and a quarter wide. In amazement we'—his wife and he—'watched as the bone moved steadily on; and then we observed that it was carried on the backs of two beetles which were quite invisible from above. Other beetles, we noticed, were following.'

'After a slow progression over some rough ground the procession approached a hole in the face of a small projecting bank and tried to enter. But the bone was too large for the opening. Then began much pushing, without effect, until other beetles climbed to the top, and began working at the opening and pulling with all their might. Finally the opening was sufficiently enlarged, and the procession, with its treasure, disappeared from view.'

'It was very fascinating to watch this difficult job carried through with, apparently, intelligent apprehension of all the circumstances, and adaptation and direction of effort, so as to achieve a successful result in the face of unexpected difficulty. We might have been watching a number of labourers dealing with a heavy log in a timber yard, who, having overcome all obstacles, succeeded in getting it at last into its proper place.'

If beetles can thus determine their action, so surely can men, and still more surely can God. The whole book, which deals in successive chapters with the physical, biological, psychical, historical, and moral order, is essentially a plea for the spiritual and providential order, which is set forth in the two concluding chapters. It is written with full knowledge and appreciation of the work of the scientific and philosophic thinkers of our time—of Einstein, Jeans, Whitehead, Eddington, Lloyd Morgan, Alexander, and Smuts, whose 'Holism and Evolution' Dr. D'ARCY admires, while maintaining that it does not tell us anything of the true nature of the activity which is at work in the universe.

Above all, it is written with the conviction that, in his own words, the scientific account of the successive phases of the creative process is revealing, and will more and more reveal, spiritual principles which will inspire with fresh meaning the faiths which have nourished man's higher life in the past.

'What the world, both West and East,' he says, 'needs, more than anything to-day, is a new spiritual outlook on human things, on history and on life, an outlook which will discern divine purpose, divine providence, divine over-ruling, in the whole universal process. We need a new vision of God.' His own book will help us to that vision.

In the translator's Preface to Professor NYGREN'S *Agape and Eros* there is an attempt to estimate some of the main theological bearings of the ideas represented by these words. FR. A. G. HEBERT is the translator, and the first point he would make is that the distinction between 'love' in the New Testament and 'love' in Greek philosophy corresponds to the distinction between Grace and Nature.

Agape belongs to the sphere of Divine grace. The 'love' of the Christian for his neighbour, which is the basic principle of the Christian morality, is shown by St. Paul to be simply God's own love active in the human heart, or, in other words, the presence of the Holy Spirit. It is not, therefore, a psychological thing, susceptible of psychological analysis. What can be psychologically analysed is the *result* of the Holy Spirit's presence and activity, and St. Paul himself does this frequently, showing the new shape taken by the soul when dominated by Agape.

Eros, on the other hand, is describable in psychological terms. Plato distinguishes two meanings of 'love'—the love which is sensual desire, and the love which is the movement of the soul towards the satisfaction of its spiritual needs. The first is the 'vulgar Eros,' the second the 'heavenly Eros.' But the two are both psychological things, belonging to the natural sphere.

The second point that Fr. HEBERT would make is that the confusion of Agape and Eros lies at the root of much of our present-day theological confusion. It is to confuse things that belong to different levels of thought, namely, those of the supernatural and the natural respectively. Christianity is not a pursuit of individual holiness nor an endeavour to realize moral ideals and social betterment. This is to interpret Christianity from the side of the natural. Christianity is primarily a faith in something that God has done, faith in the Divine Redemption. The Gospel of Agape should not be stated in terms of Eros.

This fatal confusion is found among Catholics and Protestants alike. St. Thomas Aquinas conceives of salvation as 'the movement of the rational creature towards God,' and this conception colours modern Catholic piety. But it is a conception which belongs to the Eros-tradition, and it stands in conflict, in the Catholic system, with the witness of the Sacraments to the Divine Gift, that is, to Agape. There is a parallel confusion on the Protestant side of Christendom. Along with the Evangelical witness to the reality of the Divine work of redemption at the Cross there is a tendency to lay emphasis on the development of personality. The Ritschlian theology shows this tendency, which also belongs to the Eros-tradition.

FR. HEBERT'S third point is that Agape and Eros represent two elements which must be united in Christian theology. There is a tendency on the part of Humanists of all kinds to emphasize the goodness of the ordinary life of the world, and they are apt to miss the meaning of God's act of redemption at Calvary. That is to say, they recognize that Nature is created by God, but they miss the meaning of Grace, tending to interpret Agape as if it were a species of Eros. This is seen in the Liberal tradition. But there is an equally strong tendency on the other side to neglect or deny the truth which Humanism expresses and to regard the gospel of the Divine Agape as the whole heart and centre of Christianity. It was exemplified by Marcion in the early Church, for whom the God of Creation was a lesser god than the God of Redemption. It is also

exemplified, if not by any means so extremely, in the important movement of reaction against the Humanism of the Ritschlian school, which is now being led by Barth and Brunner.

There never has been nor can be a final theological synthesis of the ideas of Agape and Eros ; but a practical reconciliation between the two tendencies they represent is a necessity of life. ' May we not look forward in faith and hope to a future Catholicity which shall embrace both the largeness of Humanism and the depth and intensity of the true Evangelicalism ? '

This is confessedly the day of the expert. The tree of knowledge has grown to be so vast and its branches are so diversified that it is obviously impossible for any individual to attain to mastery in all. This limitation is for the most part scrupulously observed so that the expert in one subject will carefully refrain from trespassing on alien ground, or if he does he will not fail to explain, out of respect for his own reputation, that here he is no expert but a mere layman.

In the sphere of religion alone the authority of the expert is discounted. Here is a theme on which all are equally free to expatiate and where one man's opinion is counted as good as another's. Hence we may see a whole community, without any sense of absurdity, receiving its religious teaching from the anthropologist, the mathematician, the journalist, and the cinema star. Surely it ought to be realized that, as in other realms of thought and life, so in religion supremely there is such a thing as specialized knowledge and experience which goes to constitute the religious expert.

This topic is suggestively dealt with by Bishop Francis J. McCONNELL in a short course of lectures on *Aids to Christian Belief* (Abingdon Press ; \$1.00). Treating first of all of the growth of ideas, he shows that life does not always move along by logical rules, and that the growth of ideas, religious ideas included, does not, except in a general way, resemble the workings of strict reason. Emotional waves

break over the reasoning ; the will is subconsciously at work determining the choice of alternatives ; the whole man is involved in every act of perception and of judgment. We are told to keep the heart with all diligence for out of it are the issues of life, and the psychology of to-day would endorse this with emphasis. ' Was it not William James who said that our thinking is steeped in the juices of the emotions ? Some try to squeeze out all their emotional juice to get at pure thoughts, only to discover that they have squeezed out all that gives their thought its higher value.' All this is pre-eminently true of religious knowledge, which is attained not by close reasoning or abstract logic, not by any purely intellectual process, but by an experience of Divine reality flooding in upon the whole soul.

Who is the religious expert ? ' By this title we mean merely the man entitled to respect for the special knowledge of, or seizure of, religious truth and for his ability in the practice of religious principle.' There is a sense, of course, in which all true Christians may be called religious experts. ' Expertness, to our modern notion, always implies a degree of trained technical skill, but the lack of technique in this specific meaning is no reason for failing to see that the Christian expert is one who has attained success—peace in his own life and helpfulness toward others—in the sphere of Christian living.' The long life lived in dependence on, and practice of, the Christian ideal is the mark of the religious expert.

At the same time that is not to deny the value of specialized training in religion. ' We need whatever technique may be available for our own development and the development of those whom we may be trying to help. In fact, the closer we get to the lives of those who impress us as knowing most about Christian living, the more we observe that such persons have rules of one order or another which they are careful to follow with what seems at times foolishly minute exactness. The world smiles a little when it hears that Gandhi will not break his day of silence till the clock strikes the exact hour which marks the end of the silent period,

but that same quality of exactness has been discernible in the practice of those in all ages who have given themselves to religious exercises.'

There is no reason why religious training should not be taken as seriously as training in any other department of life. It is a mistake to suppose that in the religious realm all that we need is simply the good spirit and a willingness to express ourselves in any way we think best. 'There is no drifting into any excellence by self-expression that never knows any self-discipline whatsoever. . . . If one would be an artist, one must give oneself to a discipline which at times is almost maddening. Take the mastery of a musical instrument—like a piano. . . . Self-expression through a piano would, apart from discipline, mean a merely mechanical pounding of the keys. True self-expression has to recognise that the only way to get the self out in piano-playing is almost to make a new set of muscles and nerves by patient practice; and when the self gets out it is more than self.' Religion, too, is in a real sense an art, and as such it calls for the volume of practice which success in any other art requires. By this is meant, not that religion is a thing apart requiring hours of seclusion for its exercise, but that it is the steadfast attempt to bring the whole of life under the control of Christian principle, a task requiring constant practice.

A big element in every man's religion is that which has reference to his fellow-men. It is a narrow and mistaken view to represent religion as a man's own affair, or what he does with his solitariness. 'For nineteen centuries we have had before us the command that we are to love God with all there is of us, and our neighbour as ourselves. Religious teaching has persisted in getting almost all the stress on the upward look, and not on the look outward and around. Tear the two commandments apart and we do harm to both, yet that is done.' Many there are who cannot see what human service has to do with the vision of God, yet the only worship that is Christian involves somehow the regard for our fellow-men. Now everything that thus involves our fellow-men has to be carefully thought out. 'If religion is, indeed, almost wholly

concerned with our own inner experiences we may look upon those experiences as peculiarly our own and confine ourselves to them without much regard to anything outside. If, however, we are seeking to guide others, especially in the art of living together in a world like ours, we need at least the largest information and the soundest thinking possible. To this degree, in any event, we need a religious technique.'

The question is insistently raised to-day as to the value of the Church in the training of men to religious expertness. It is widely maintained that the average moral tone outside the Church is as high as that within. How far that moral level is maintained through the indirect influence of the Church is less often pondered. However, 'without averring that all experts in religious life must draw their nourishment from the churches, we do say that it is difficult to see how expertness in any line can be developed without institutional help. An institution is merely an agency for the creation of a community of persons of like-minded interests and purposes. A university is essentially a community of persons seeking knowledge. There is such a possibility as that of absorbing knowledge from an educational institution apart from the direct instruction of classroom. We say that in university centres intellectual quickening is in the air. I think it can be maintained that the churches to-day are doing their part at the creation of their own type of community life as well as are other institutions.'

As the outcome of religious experience can we have at last the type of person we can call expert? Why not? There are conditions for the attainment of religious knowledge, like prayer and meditation and study, which are similar to exercises in the realm of knowledge and of art; and without laying down mechanical rules we do not see how a believer can become at all expert in the religious realm without by one means or another keeping himself in constant practice as men do in intellectual and artistic pursuits. 'When the religious expert is finally developed, he has the same marks as those of experts in other realms. There is a veritable

weight of authority about what he says. Those who believe in an expert in any field expect him to deliver judgment without always assigning reasons. Perhaps his assigning reasons is impossible.' That simply means that the expert has so practised his knowledge into his entire nature that in the presence of a problem he can count on a revealing reaction of his whole mind. 'Now, religious expertness is not quite of this scientific type, but it is akin to it. The religious expert attains to an awareness of some factors in life which the untrained religious mind may miss altogether. Just as a fine sense of propriety may be the highest flower of moral insight, so this perception of higher values by a religious expert may be the surest

indication of his expertness.' For this reason the religious expert may be wise in practical concerns though he may seem to live in an exalted moral sphere, and he may have deep discernment in regard to larger social questions though he may be unskilled in practical politics. 'No amount of detailed knowledge is as important as to see sharply and straight the human essentials involved in any modern industrial, or racial, or militarist movement which threatens the welfare of men. The highest expertness is that of a mind that can see problems steadily and see them whole. The power of a Christian view of men to conduce to such steadiness and wholeness is an indication of the soundness of the view.'



Mohenjo-daro: The Indus Valley Civilization, circa 3000 B.C.

BY PROFESSOR W. FULTON, D.D., THE UNIVERSITY, GLASGOW.

IN recent years remarkable discoveries, little known to the ordinary reader, have been made in the Indus valley, principally at Mohenjo-daro. The result would appear to be that our knowledge of Indian civilization has been carried back at a single bound no less than three thousand years, and that we have gained new light upon the obscure question of the origins of Hinduism. It is even claimed that the culture of the Indus valley *circa* 3000 B.C. was as advanced as, if not indeed in some respects more advanced than, the culture of Mesopotamia or Egypt; also that the religion of the pre-Aryan peoples of the Indus valley *circa* 3000 B.C. is perpetuated, in some of its leading features, in the living Hinduism of the Indo-Aryans of to-day.

What is the problem of the origins of Hinduism? It may be stated, at least partially, by putting the question in more definite form. How did it come to pass that Vishnu and Siva, figures of but secondary rank in the Vedic hymns, have gained precedence in Hinduism over Indra, Varuna, Agni, and the other old Vedic deities? If Vishnu and Siva were originally Aryan deities, the question seems unanswerable. If they were originally pre-Aryan deities and were taken over by the Indo-Aryans,

then the question seems answerable in the light of the new discoveries in the Indus valley. For these discoveries reveal the Dravidian and other pre-Aryan inhabitants of India as capable of supplying their conquerors with religions of as advanced a type as Vishnuism and Sivaism. Indeed, the evidence yielded by Mohenjo-daro leads to the well-founded conjecture that Siva actually has his prototype among the gods of the older pre-Aryan stocks, whose civilization in the second or third millennium before Christ—that is, before the Aryan invasion or immigration—so far from being primitive and barbaric, is at least worthy of being compared with the contemporary civilizations of Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Crete.

Siva is usually identified with the old Vedic god Rudra. But, contrary to the old Vedic tradition and the Brahman law, he possesses (like Vishnu) temples, images, and temple priesthods. May not the unbrahmanical character of his worship be accounted for most naturally by the fact that the pre-Aryan peoples of India worshipped him, if under another name, and imposed their religion upon the Aryan invaders and immigrants?

But let us hear on this point the words of the