

# 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

guides the selection of past happenings? Further, what is our degree of assurance as to any past event? Again, human personality is deeply concerned in those happenings with which the historiographer deals; and human personality is a complicated theme. Is history deterministic or does it record actions for which the actors were in some real sense responsible? On such problems we have an excellent treatise, *History and the Self*, by Miss Hilda D. Oakeley, M.A., D.Litt. (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net). It is not always easy reading, but take it leisurely and thoughtfully and you will find it suggestive and satisfying.

'It is a crime to despair of the Republic,' and frankly we are disappointed to find the Rev. S. Tetley, M.A., Vicar of Wortley de Leeds, entitling his book, *Has the Christian Church a Future?* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net). After reading the work we are not quite sure how the Vicar answers his own question. The Church, we gather, has a rather bad record. She has often and often stood in the way of progress. As to Science in particular

she has opposed every advance that was made. There is, however, hope for her if she does three things, or rather surrenders three things that explain her intransigent attitude to progress. These are the Miltonic interpretation or interpolation of the anthropology of Genesis, the baneful Augustinian view of man as infected with original sin and utterly incapable of doing anything towards self-improvement, and that other-worldliness which refused to believe that Christians need be greatly concerned with the conditions of the life which men and women have to live on this planet. There are many passages in which Mr. Tetley will have the hearty agreement of all thinking Church members. In other places he irritates rather than stimulates. His criticism of Augustinianism, for instance, is facile but merely shallow; and surely the day is past when Christians need to be admonished against a Miltonic cosmogony or anthropology. As to other-worldliness too, Mr. Tetley fails to do justice to the Church's awakening to social problems within the last forty years. If the awakening in any quarter is not yet thorough, this book may serve towards it.

---

## Letters to Women on the Christian Faith.

### Abailard and Héloïse.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., NEW YORK.

AFTER the tragic break in their romance and marriage, Abailard and his Héloïse (as Louise was then called in France) took up life again, he at the abbey of St. Denys, to begin with, she at the convent of Argenteuil. Scandal at the Argenteuil nunnery broke out, however, and by 1129 Abailard had to settle her in cleaner quarters. These he found in the convent of the Paraclete, which she supervised with zeal. For the first time she was in a position of authority. The sphere suited her abilities and developed her character. During these years she had to consult Abailard frequently on practical affairs and also on religion; for the young abbess went on with her studies, endeavouring to train her nuns in the study of the Bible, among other things. Abailard would preach at the Paraclete, and in his absence Héloïse would seek his advice on problems which arose in her work, as she strove to keep nuns or novices mentally alive and morally respectable.

Out of this intercourse sprang two literary works. Like Marcella,<sup>1</sup> Héloïse prompted her teacher to undertake a book. She had found difficulties in the story of Genesis, and her persistent appeals to Abailard were the cause of his work on the *Hexaëmeron*; or, *The Six Days of Creation*. 'Experts hold that there are three specially difficult portions of the Old Testament,' he writes, 'first the Book of Genesis, then the Song of Solomon, and thirdly the prophecy of Ezekiel, especially the opening vision of the animals and the wheels, and the closing vision of the building on the mount.' He had already annoyed Anselm at Laon by lecturing on Ezekiel. Now, in response to the queries of 'sister Héloïse, once dear in the world, now most dear in Christ,' he composes his commentary on the opening

<sup>1</sup> The precedent of Jerome and Marcella is noted by Abailard more than once, e.g. in the ninth epistle (to the nuns at the Paraclete), exhorting them to study the Bible.

of Genesis. But, again like Marcella, she continued to send notes to her teacher on several points of exegesis, and these, with Abailard's replies, are extant in the *Problemata*. Probably<sup>1</sup> both the *Hexaëmeron* and the *Problemata* are later than the *Sic et Non*, which was composed before 1125. The significance of the correspondence lies in its revelation of the interests created by a woman's study of the Bible in twelfth-century France. Héloïse in her day was no doubt as exceptional a lady as Marcella had been in the fourth century, combining brains and beauty. She was a fascinating creature.

Love seldom haunts the breast where learning lies,  
And Venus sets ere Mercury can rise.

But Héloïse was both attractive and intelligent. The queries which she put to her teacher are often more acute than the answers. She knew her classics, especially the Latin poets. Whether she knew much Greek or any Hebrew, it is impossible to say, but the quick-witted Héloïse studied the Bible on her own account. She was also responsible for the training of her nuns. Apparently there were some like-minded sisters at the Paraclete who felt interested in higher things than amusements, gossiping, and self-indulgence, and they got a lead from their eager, clever abbess.

On forty-two points she consulted her friend. She appeals to him for help in matters where she and her sisters found themselves puzzled. He would discover that they were more receptive than these pigs of monks at St. Gildas, to whom he was casting pearls! Will not the great and busy Abailard spare time to instruct her and her companions, as Jerome taught Marcella and the other ladies long ago, especially as they have small skill in the sacred tongues? Abailard consents. He takes up her difficulties one by one, in no special order, but with care, once or twice at considerable length.

Her Old Testament difficulties are not numerous. In Gn 2<sup>20</sup> she wondered why Adam named only the fowl of the air and the cattle, leaving out reptiles and fish (xl). But surely this was fitting, her teacher observes, for birds mean members of the Church who rise on wings of desire to heaven (*i.e.* celibates), and beasts, who indeed set foot on earth,

<sup>1</sup> Recent investigations by J. G. Sikes in *Peter Abailard* (pp. 26 f., 258 f.) and J. Cottiaux at the beginning of his study of 'La conception de la théologie chez Abélard' (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, xxviii. 247 f., 533 f., 788 f.). The 'Problemata' are printed in *Migne*, clxxviii. 677-730.

are folk honestly married, whereas reptiles that crawl on the land or, without wings or feet, swim in the sea, correspond to the base worldlings. Héloïse further asked (xli) if Moses predicted his own death at the close of his fifth book, or if some one else added the passage to the Book of Deuteronomy? It is an editorial addition of Ezra, Abailard replies, appealing to the authority of the Venerable Bede. The one book of the Old Testament which seems to have roused real perplexity was the First Book of Samuel, especially the opening chapters, on which a series of seven queries is propounded (xxx-xxxvi). On 1 S 1<sup>15</sup> Abailard proceeds to read the nuns a timely lesson upon temperance (xxx1).<sup>2</sup> If Hannah preferred water to drink, as she sought the fruit of her womb, how much more should Christ's virgins, who desire nobler fruit, abstain from intoxicating liquor? Besides, her protest, 'Count not thy servant a daughter of Belial,' refers to the same evil, for what are daughters of Belial but Bacchantes, the abandoned votaries of the wine-god?

In the New Testament Héloïse came upon two general difficulties which, as it happens, had been already raised by Marcella. One related to the unpardonable sin (xiii), the other to the story of the appearances of Jesus to the women after the Resurrection (v). She had pertinent questions to put, especially on the second point, which Abailard frankly allows to be serious. Héloïse minutely compared the three accounts in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, with the Johannine record, and the discrepancies which she indicated can only be explained, her teacher thinks, by supposing that John singled out Mary Magdalene for her exceptional faith. He identifies Jn 20<sup>1</sup> with Mt 28<sup>1</sup>. The harmonizing is not very convincing, it must be confessed.

A third general point is the meaning of 'thou sayest' in the Gospels (iii). This is a problem which has engaged critics of later ages, who have argued

<sup>2</sup> In her fifth epistle to Abailard, Héloïse had stated one of her disciplinary difficulties. She did not wish to be too strict with her nuns, who demanded wines at table; Héloïse argues that women are less likely to get drunk than men, though she deplores the drunkenness she has seen in the cloister. But what does Abailard think? Is total abstinence to be enforced? Her own view was much more temperate and sane on this ethical detail than Abailard's, as it was upon the sex question. In this respect she showed a better judgment than Marcella. Héloïse had excellent sense as well as genuine religion, and understood human nature better than any narrow ascetic ever could.

over the exact sense of the Greek idiom in *σὺ εἶπας* (Mt 26<sup>25</sup> 26<sup>64</sup>) or *σὺ λέγεις* (27<sup>11</sup>, Jn 18<sup>37</sup>). Abailard simply deals with the Vulgate text. In the reply to Judas, Jesus practically means by 'thou sayest' an affirmative; to the high priest, the words mean that 'he had often confessed this as he read the Law and the Prophets'; Pilate, indeed, as a pagan had never read the Law and the Prophets, so that 'thou sayest' or 'thou hast said it' refers to his implicit confession of Jesus as King. The whole problem, Abailard agrees, is difficult, indeed insoluble. Had he known Greek with any mastery, he would surely have referred to the original here; but there is not a trace of any acquaintance on his part any more than on that of Héloïse, with the text underneath the Latin version.

Her queries about the Epistles are curiously few. What does Eph 3<sup>18, 19</sup> mean (xxix)? The answer exhibits again Abailard's predilection for allegorizing. He explains that 'the breadth' refers to the enlargement of heart produced by love; the 'length' is longsuffering, the quality of the love that is patient under the strain of life; 'the height and the depth' denote the height to which the humble are raised by their Christian merits. So much, Abailard observes, for the words as referring to the Church or Body of Christ. But they also refer to His Cross, in its 'breadth' of charity, shown in the arms extended in love to embrace His foes on the left and His friends on the right; 'the length' alludes to the whole body of Christ as extended on the Cross, and therefore to the finished work, in which He was obedient unto death; 'the height' is the title on the top of the Cross, with the name of Jesus, the name higher than all other names (Ph 2<sup>9</sup>), and also the reward of the saints, bestowed upon them beyond their merits. As for 'the depth,' it indicates the humiliation of the Crucifixion, and so far as the saints are concerned, the virtue of humility, which supports all their higher attainments safely.

Apart from a somewhat casual discussion of Ja 2<sup>10, 11</sup> (ii),<sup>1</sup> the only two other matters in the Epistles are connected with First Thessalonians,

<sup>1</sup> She had raised this point in her fifth epistle to Abailard. The young abbess reluctantly found that as the Paraclete became popular, the pressure of fashionable society made it almost impossible to exclude outsiders, men as well as women, from dinner-parties, as the strict Benedictine Rule required. Well, Héloïse asks, if we cannot fulfil the entire Rule, and yield on this one point, are we not in danger of what St. James declared, 'whosoever keeps the whole law and yet offends in one point, he is guilty of all'?

where 'spirit, soul, and body' (in 1 Th 5<sup>23</sup>) are explained (xxviii) as 'reason in perfection' and 'will' (as in Mt 10<sup>39</sup>), *i.e.* the human will completely identified with the divine, whereas the perfected 'body' means the senses purified from all illicit gratifications.

The bulk of the problems which Héloïse and her fellow-students encountered were in the study of the Gospels. Why is Isaiah cited, in Mk 1<sup>2</sup>, when part of the quotation from the Old Testament is due to the prophet Malachi? Perhaps, Abailard suggests (xxxvii), the writer used the phrase for the sake of brevity; perhaps also Mark considered Isaiah as a greater prophet than Malachi, just as Matthew quotes Zechariah as Jeremiah in 27<sup>9</sup>. As for (xxvi) the cursing of the fig tree in 11<sup>13, 14</sup>, the tree is impenitent Judæa which had not known the time of its visitation, so that the time was not a time of spiritual fruit for it. The Gospel of John also provided only two queries, one (viii) being on 8<sup>7</sup>, 'Why does Jesus seem to interdict all human beings from exercising punishment by saying, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her? That would rule out all authorities, for does not Scripture declare that no one is clean (Job 14<sup>4</sup>)?'<sup>2</sup> Ah, but the Lord threw the first stone at her when He moved her to penitence! Besides, Vengeance is mine, the Lord affirms. Even when we have to punish, it is the Lord punishing through us, for 'by His precepts He causes us to kill the guilty and spare the innocent. Man is forbidden to kill, not God in man. Man kills, and not God in him, when he inflicts death out of his own malignity, and not in accordance with the orders of God.' This ethical point is so important that Abailard refers his correspondent further to Augustine's argument in the *De Civitate Dei* (i. 88) and in his *Questions on Exodus* (89) and his *Questions on Leviticus* (90). Even short of death, penalties had to be inflicted on disobedient and unruly folk, as both Héloïse and himself were aware, in dealing with their subordinates. There is an under-current of personal experience in this answer, for the scoundrels who had been responsible for mutilating Abailard had been summarily dealt with, and Canon Fulbert himself, as the ringleader, had been prosecuted by Abailard.

Five more or less points are raised in connexion with the Gospel of Luke.

For example, 'Give to every one that asks, and of him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not

<sup>2</sup> This, by the way, discloses Héloïse's knowledge of the Septuagint, for she cites the verse from Job evidently in memory of the Greek version.

again' (6<sup>30</sup>), was a precept that puzzled Héloïse. But (xxiii) she must not take this literally. Observe that Jesus does not say what is asked; if nothing material is given, at least we must not allow the beggar to leave without a kindly word. 'A pleasant or apt answer is a sort of favour.' And the 'religious' may indeed claim or ask back his goods, provided that he does not do so for selfish ends, but for the better service of God, *i.e.* to put them to a better use than the spoiler of his goods could achieve. 'Ask them not again,' as if they belonged to yourself. That is what Jesus means. As for the saying about joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth (15<sup>7</sup>) being greater than that over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance, this (xi) simply refers to the truth that we are less anxious about good folk than about others. 'We are assured that the righteous will persevere, and are therefore less concerned about them than about the conversion of a sinner, which seems more difficult.' We, I say, for 'in heaven' means in the Church. Abailard has an ingenious explanation or application of the two cups in the account of the Lord's Supper (22<sup>14f.</sup>). The first, which is given to be divided among the disciples, refers to the Passion, which all true followers (see Mt 20<sup>22</sup>) must share in their own different ways; the second cup denotes the unique sacrifice of the Lord. Thus the two cups bring out the double sense of the sacrament (vii). 'Rightly does He offer the cup of imitation of the Passion before the cup of the sacrament, since only those are worthy to partake of the Lord's table who are prepared to imitate His Passion and to carry His cross.' This interpretation is at least less superficial than some of his other attempts at exegesis.

The sisters at the Paraclete plainly had been reading Matthew's Gospel with special care, and no doubt the choice of it was due to Abailard himself, who guided their studies. It was his favourite Gospel. We know how he preferred the Matthæan version of the Lord's Prayer, for example, to the Lucan, on the ground that Matthew the apostle heard the Prayer as originally given on the Mount, whereas Luke only received it at second-hand. Abailard's choice of the Matthæan version for his monks was indeed one of the items in his ecclesiastical practice which irritated Bernard at a later stage. At any rate, whether inspired by Abailard's example or directed by him, Héloïse went over this Gospel with such care that she selected fifteen points for further inquiry, and of these fifteen seven belong to the Sermon on the Mount (xiv-xx).

The Beatitudes puzzled the abbess and her circle. But Abailard's lengthy explanation (xiv) of them has much more unction than intelligence. The first three are referred to the monastic life, poverty being taken literally. The two that follow ('Blessed are they that hunger and thirst for righteousness,' 'Blessed are the merciful') denote the vocation of authorities, ecclesiastical and secular, who ought to cherish a passion for justice and a care for mercy in ruling their subordinates. The last two are meant, Abailard explains, for married folk, since purity of heart is the special virtue of those who strive against the lusts of the flesh in the sexual relation, whilst 'the peacemakers' (*pacifici*) are men and women who seek peace with God by subduing carnal appetites. Héloïse had wondered why the Lord who uttered 5<sup>17</sup> could have also said the words of Jn 5<sup>18</sup>. Are not these statements contradictory? No, she is told; in abrogating the ceremonial, the Lord fulfilled the moral essence of the Law. Neither must she imagine that when He said, 'Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven,' He was altering His position as stated in the words, 'This do, and thou shalt live' (Lk 10<sup>28</sup>), for the perfection of the Law, love to God and to one's neighbour, was not possible before the advent of Christ (xvi). No one is really our neighbour more than Christ, he adds, and so in loving Him we are at last able to love our neighbour truly. He explains to her (xvii) that in the prohibition of swearing (5<sup>34f.</sup>) 'God's throne' means the soul of Christ, 'earth' the humanity of the Lord, 'Jerusalem' the Church, and 'the head' Christ Himself. Not all oaths are forbidden (see He 6<sup>16</sup>), but only irreverent and lavish adjurations. Again, Héloïse imagined that there was something inconsistent in Jesus breaking the Law by touching a leper, and obeying it by bidding the man go to the priest, to carry out the prescribed ritual (8<sup>2</sup>). But note, Abailard remarks, that the former was an action of pity, whilst the latter recognized the temporary validity of the Law (as in Lk 16<sup>16</sup>). In the twenty-sixth chapter the abbess found three difficulties. Why does a prophecy about a false prophet come to be applied to the Lord, in verse 31? Because it refers to good as well as to bad shepherds (xxxviii). Then what of the discrepancies about the number and the time of Peter's denials? How could verse 34 be reconciled with the accounts in Mark and John? Abailard had already touched this point in *Sic et Non* (xcvi), but he falls back here (xxxix) upon the familiar

harmonizing which had been propounded by St. Augustine in the *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, explaining that any one who denies Christ does it from one or other of three reasons: from error, from cowardice, or from greed. The third problem in the chapter was started by the story of the Last Supper (vi), especially verses 26-29. The subject is handled elsewhere, in connexion with the Lucan account, but here Abailard takes occasion to explain why Jesus said 'this is my body' and 'this is my blood of the new covenant.' Héloïse had wondered whether such phrasing did not imply that the blood was somehow more important than the body. But she is told that the words 'of the new covenant' are specially applicable to the blood, since a will or covenant requires a death, and that the death of the Lord, marked by the shedding of His blood, denotes the consummation of the salvation which His incarnation had initiated.

Such are the forty-one problems, none of them directly related to personal religion. The forty-second is a general query; can one ever sin in a matter permitted or enjoined by the Lord? Abailard takes this as a text for discoursing upon what always lay near to his heart, matrimony and the sex question. He handles it at length, and not too delicately. The conclusion of the whole matter is that 'whether born of lawful wedlock or

of adultery, human nature is the work of God. Were it evil, it would not be generated at all; had it not evil, it would not have to be regenerated.'

It is clear, from the *Problemata*, that Héloïse was much more interested in exegesis than he was. A study of their correspondence confirms the impression that, as a recent writer puts it, 'l'exégèse comme telle occupe d'ailleurs très peu de place dans sa théologie. . . . Son exégèse est essentiellement opportuniste.'<sup>1</sup> He had not emancipated himself from the mediæval attitude towards the Bible, and quite frankly admits, in the *Sic et Non* (1341 D.), that when one meets any difficulty in Scripture, it is the dutiful and humble course for a critic to suppose that there must be some transcriptional error in the text, or that the translation is imperfect, or that the reader himself may be in error. Héloïse had more of the 'lay' mind. She was not satisfied to extract a pious meaning from the text, as her distinguished teacher was, lacking, as he did, the precise scholarship required for dealing with exegetical difficulties. If Abailard was not a Jerome, if his learning on Biblical details reveals the limitations rather than the powers of his mind, certainly Héloïse was a true sister-soul to Marcella of old.

<sup>1</sup> Cottiaux, *op. cit.* p. 800.

---

## Certain Contrasts Between Fundamental Ideas in Hinduism and Christianity.

BY THE REVEREND F. W. DILLISTONE, M.A., B.D., ST. ANDREW'S VICARAGE, OXFORD.

IN his valuable article in a recent number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Dr. Macnicol speaks of revising 'our conception of the place of foreign missions in the life of the Church and of the authority of Christianity as over against the other religions'; and of how, if we are to do so, any conclusion must be 'based upon a reasoned and careful study of the characteristics of the religions and the value of their influence.' This article does not in any way attempt more than a very small contribution to such a study. It simply singles out one of the great religions of the world—Hinduism—and seeks to contrast certain fundamental doctrines of Hinduism with the corresponding doctrines of Christianity.

It would be generally agreed that the character of a man's whole life and outlook is bound to be determined largely by his thought concerning God. It will therefore, perhaps, be most convenient to consider the chief differences between the two faiths simply as the differences in their presentation of God. We propose to do so by considering in turn the differences in the conception of God under the headings: (1) Personality, (2) Purpose, (3) Character, (4) Revelation, and (5) Redemption.

1. A study of the development of religious thought in Hinduism in the millennium preceding the Christian era makes it clear that from an early polytheism there emerged a tendency to identify the gods with one another; this tendency cul-