

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

those who have little strength in a thousand small ways. We needn't make a parade of it, but when we see an opportunity of backing some one up, or of lending a helping hand, or of giving a good lead, we should slip in quietly and use the strength God gave us.

Do you know that about eleven-twelfths of the people in the world are weak people—not bad people? They are people who need a strong leader. They are excellent followers if some one

shows them the way. The other twelfth are the leaders, the strong men, those who bear the burdens, those who are the foundation-stones on which others build.

If God has made you one of the rare twelfth, use the strength He has given you to serve your fellow-men. So doing you will serve Him, and make yourself one with Him. For He came to earth two thousand years ago just that He might help the fallen and be strength to the weak.

Christianity the World Religion.

BY THE REV. SYDNEY CAVE, D.D., HENLEAZE.

I.

It has become a commonplace to say that the War has made the world seem a very small place. We are compelled to-day to think on the world scale and to seek a world polity. Is that possible without a common moral ideal, and can there be a common moral ideal without a common religion? Is there such a religion? Can Christianity, for instance, rightly claim to be of final and so of universal value?

I.

To some, such a question suggests a sort of spiritual Prussianism. The rights of religions, as of nations, should be respected, and each religion allowed its full and free development, without interference of any kind. Thus in India, where the contact between East and West has been most intimate, no attitude is commoner than that of Rāmakṛishṇa's, that every man should follow his own religion, for all religions are pathways to the truth. A Christian should follow Christianity, a Muḥammadan Muḥammadanism, and so forth: and for the Hindus, the ancient path of the Aryan Rishis is the best. That God is one and that He receives all honest worship to whomsoever it is addressed, we would almost all agree, but is such catholicity as Rāmakṛishṇa's true to fact? Can religion be thus independent of its objects? Thus Rāmakṛishṇa himself worshipped an image of Kālī as the Mother of the Universe and believed, in his enthusiasm, that it took food from his hand. When later he desired to experience the ecstasy of

Kṛishṇa's love, he put on woman's clothes, lived in the women's part of the house, spoke in a woman's voice, until at last as Rādhā, Kṛishṇa's paramour, in a trance he saw standing before him the Kṛishṇa that he so passionately loved. Surely we cannot say that it makes no difference whether men see God in the dreaded Kālī or in the holy Christ. A devotion to Kṛishṇa which is the ecstasy of human passion in its moment of breathless abandonment, is not the same as that quiet, constant faith in Christ, which means repentance, forgiveness, and a new moral ideal and power. The truly religious man will recognize and appreciate in other religions sincerity and zeal, but, when we remember how diverse religions are, to say that all religions are alike true, is impossible unless we hold that all religions are alike false, or regard God as so unknown that it simply does not matter how we think of Him. Truth after all is not a mere question of geography. Humanity is one. In religion *svādesheism* is out of place. We may try to ignore religion, but its problems will not be evaded. We have to-day a common world life. Religions have met, and we are forced back again to the question, Is there any religion of final value? Can Christianity, for instance, claim to be the world religion, and, if so, in what sense?

II.

As we turn to the books of the New Testament this much at least seems clear. From its inception, Christianity was proclaimed as a religion of uni-

versal significance. Christ, indeed, restricted His work almost entirely to the Jews, but He proclaimed God as the universal King and the common Father of men; and even those who, like von Harnack, deny that Christ bade His disciples preach the gospel to the Gentiles admit that 'by His universal religion, which at the same time was the religion of the Son,'¹ Christ bids men come unto Him as unto one who has a perfect and certain knowledge of the Father. He presents Himself to men, and has from the first been preached by His disciples, as the sole sufficient Saviour.

Can such a claim be substantiated? Certainly many of the old arguments have by now to be abandoned. Thus the old proof from miracle would be to-day as ludicrously inappropriate as it was in the Roman Empire. Every religion has its 'miracles,' and in such a land as India, for instance, even to ask the meaning of the name of a hill or village will often mean to hear of miracles so portentous that the Gospel miracles seem but ordinary events; and college students in India have told me, with obvious sincerity, of miracles they have themselves seen worked by holy men. And there is to-day a general recognition that no proof of religion can be given with an entirely objective certainty. Our answers to the perennial questions of philosophy and religion depend less on our mental alertness than on our moral choice, and our judgments are inevitably judgments of 'value'; indications of what we regard as good. Modern Theology has attempted in this way to indicate the truth of Christianity. The moral self—the 'practical reason' of Kant's philosophy—demands for its highest good a faith in God and an ideal in life at once personal and social, and this highest good we cannot find in the world-life around us. So by the 'inner dialectic of faith'² we are led to look for this good in history, and we find just what we are seeking in the Kingdom of God—that spiritual realm into which Christ calls men, where we may know God as Father, and strive to do His will in the world with the obedience of subjects and the glad freedom of children. Suggestive as this apologetic is, it cannot be said to be conclusive. It is certainly right in abandoning any attempt to 'prove' Christianity intellect-

ually, but is it right in assuming that by the moral self a common ideal can be realized? Thus in India, ethics has always seemed inferior in importance to metaphysics, and in the most influential philosophy the highest good is regarded not as moral activity but as absorption into the infinite. Only if its moral ideal is recreated, will India see in Christ's proclamation of the Kingdom its highest good. Yet the apologetic is so far true and useful. If Christianity is the final religion, then it must be able not only to reveal new moral needs but to satisfy all worthy aspiration in itself. History, if it cannot prove, can disprove. The claim of Christianity to be the final religion cannot be proved by the history of religion, but, if true, it will be congruous with its data.

III.

To bring to the test of history the claim of Christianity to be the absolute religion may well seem a counsel of despair. Christianity claims to be religion—the full and perfect satisfaction of the needs of man. The history of religions shows at once that, whether Christianity be thus religion or not, it is at any rate in the first place a religion, one among the many religions of the world. Nor has it lived its life solitary and unaffected. It is not only on the periphery of interest that ethnic words and conceptions have entered into Christianity. Even to express its central doctrines, the Church has utilized from the first the categories of an alien philosophy. It has long been a complaint among Protestants that, after a few centuries of progress, Christianity absorbed from the Roman world pagan thoughts and customs, and that Catholicism, as we know it, is an amalgam of Christian and pagan ideas. The complaint is true, but it can be brought against Protestantism also. As soon as it began its Gentile mission, Christianity came to be influenced in its form by Greek philosophy and religion, Roman conceptions of law and legislature, and possibly even pagan cults and mysteries. This was inevitable. The definition of biology applies also to religion. Life means response to environment. It is mere foolishness for modern missionaries to imagine that the Christianity that they bring with them from highly industrial nations like Great Britain or America, or from a military state like Germany, is a Christianity pure and uninfluenced by its surroundings.

¹ *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 48.

² The phrase is Julius Kaftan's in his *Die Wahrheit der Religion* (p. 550), the classic statement of this proof.

Mr. Temple's words are applicable to every one of us: 'I am, as I hope, a Christian Englishman, but then I am only an English Christian, and my character is moulded not only by the spirit of Christ but also by the spirit of contemporary England, which are not the same.'¹ The Church not only influences, it is influenced by the society in which it lives. It is only prejudice or ignorance which can claim for any extant form of polity or doctrine a final and universal value.

The scientific study of the history of religions has thus made it impossible to suppose that Christianity is absolute in any of its concrete forms. Does that mean, then, that we must abandon our belief in the finality of the gospel and with it the missionary enterprise? It does not follow. Missions have been hindered much, and helped little, by the schemings of ecclesiastics. Their impulse has come from the desire to share a gift, not to propagate a system. However it may be with other men, religion means for the Christian communion with God. God has shown us Him-

¹ *Foundations*, 355, 356.

self in Jesus Christ. We know that He is the holy Father; we know that we are called to lives of trust and service. And we are sure that this knowledge of God is a true knowledge and a certain possession. Our communion with Him depends on what we know Him to be. Doubtless all men may draw near to God and come into intercourse with Him, but intercourse is not communion. Communion is possible only with those we really know, the few whose lives we are permitted to share. Such a communion we may have with God in Jesus Christ. Our certainty of the finality of Christianity—which is only another way of saying, our recognition of its missionary nature—depends on the experience of our Christian faith. It is a conviction, not based on proof or capable of it. It is unreasoned but it need not be irrational. It cannot be proved but it can be tested. Christianity, as the religion of true communion with God, claims to be religion. If so, it must be adequate to the religious needs of the race as expressed in the great religions. If true, the history of religions, though it cannot prove, should support its claim.

Contributions and Comments.

'Carry on!' (Luke xix. 13).

AMONG the many excellent things in the January number is the note on this text. We are not told whether the young soldier who quoted from the text knew Greek or not. If he did not, then, as you truly say—'only a touch of spiritual genius could have suggested that almost perfect paraphrase—"Carry on till I come."' And the best of it is that the lad's rendering is *more* than a paraphrase; it is absolutely correct and literal. The verb is *πραγματεύσασθε*, which just means *Carry on business*. 'Occupy' does not seem adequate—'Occupy till I come' being liable to be misunderstood as meaning simply *keep possession till I come*.

And, if *πραγματεύσασθε* (v.¹³) means *Carry on*, so, perhaps, the best rendering of the compound verb *διεπραγματεύσαντο* (v.¹⁶) will be—*Carried through*—the verb not at all suggesting the thought of mere *material* gain or profit. What is wanted to be known in *τί διεπραγματεύσαντο* is simply the

result. And the answer that would satisfy the nobleman, in the parable, would satisfy the young soldier too—namely this—losing or gaining *nothing*!; faithfulness and diligence *everything*!—Give us the wages of carrying *on*, and of carrying *through*.

P. THOMSON.

Dunning.

The Septuagint Version of Leviticus.

It has frequently been observed that the Septuagint does not always faithfully reproduce the Hebrew text which lay before it. Sometimes the translators, under the influence of the theology of their time, have taken offence at the cruder teaching of an earlier time and have altered expressions which suggested unworthy ideas of God's nature or of Israel's worship. Sometimes they seem to have noted difficulties, which have formed part of the argument for our modern critical position, and to