

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 *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXIV

1942



LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE, 1, CENTRAL BUILDINGS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

The Rev. S. Runsie Craig Memorial, 1942.

In accordance with the terms of the Trust the Council have selected for the 1942 Memorial the paper on "The Christian World-View" read before the Institute on April 27th, 1942, by the Very Rev. Professor Daniel Lamont, D.D., as being strongly confirmatory of the Christian Faith.

848TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN ROOM 19, LIVINGSTONE HOUSE, BROADWAY, S.W.1,
ON MONDAY, APRIL 27TH, 1942, AT 6 P.M.

THE REV. F. CAWLEY, B.A., B.D., PH.D., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Prof. Daniel Lamont, D.D., to read his paper entitled "The Christian World-View."

The meeting was later thrown open to discussion, in which Mr. W. E. Leslie, Mr. Robert Laidlaw, and Dr. Cawley took part.

Written communications were received from Mr. T. Fitzgerald, Colonel A. H. van Straubenzee and Principal Curr.

The following elections have been made:—Rev. J. O. Kinnaman, A.M., Ph.D., D.D., a Fellow; Rev. R. J. B. Eddison, M.A., a Member; Rev. F. Martin Argyle, M.A., a Member; Henry Chadwick, Esq., B.A., an Associate; Peter Swinbank, Esq., B.A., an Associate.

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD-VIEW.

By the Very Rev. Professor DANIEL LAMONT, D.D.

WHEN we speak of a world-view we must not take the word "view" too literally. We cannot possibly get a picture of the world for the simple reason that we can never see a picture unless we stand a little way back from it. But no human being can stand away from the world in order to observe it, for he himself is part of the world and by no means an inconsiderable part of it. This makes all scientific pictures of the world inadequate. Edward Caird was fond of saying that science begins by leaving out half of the facts, and I take the liberty of adding that it leaves out the more important half. The scientist looks away from his own personality with its wonderful powers in order to investigate his object. He is compelled to do that if he is to serve his science. But *he* does all the objectifying and therefore, as objectifier, or subject, he cannot himself be objectified. He leaves himself and very much else out of the picture. He leaves out all the non-

objectifiable elements of the world and these are very many and indeed all-important. The result is that his "view" is of only one aspect of the world, such as the nature of the *physical* world. The artist is interested in another aspect of the world, namely its *beauty*, with which the scientist is not concerned. The world has many aspects and it is well to remember that even if we were provided with accurate pictures of all these aspects we would still be far from ascertaining the meaning of the whole. Much of modern philosophy is satisfied with attempting a synthesis of all the sciences. In this way philosophy abdicates its real function. Philosophy must indeed reckon with all the sciences, but its historic task is to think things together including those things with which science is incompetent to deal.

Nevertheless, let us adhere to our title, "The Christian World-View," remembering that "view" means "interpretation" and not "picture." Even so, it is still true that every view depends upon its point of view. The Christian world-view takes for its standpoint the heart and centre of the Christian Revelation, which is the Cross and Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. The adoption of this standpoint is of course condemned by all non-Christian systems of thought, but since the purpose of this paper is to give a brief statement of the Christian world-view I must in the main take the apologetic of the Christian standpoint for granted, in the firm belief that the best apologetic for Christianity is to let it shine in its own light. One relevant remark, however, on the defence of the standpoint ought to be made at once. Christianity claims that from its standpoint in the living Word of God and from no other can a world-view be obtained that is at once coherent and comprehensive. It is easy to be coherent if you avoid being comprehensive. A proposition in Euclid is an ideal of coherence, but the *pons asinorum* achieves this ideal by sacrificing comprehensiveness. On the other hand, it is easy to be comprehensive if you do not mind whether you are coherent or not. A man may take the whole world for his parish and leave his own particular parish untended. It is the Christian claim that from the standpoint of life in Christ there emerges a world-view which combines coherence and comprehensiveness to a degree which is attained by no other system of thought, philosophical or scientific.

Christianity is not a philosophy, but it *has* a philosophy which is peculiarly its own. Standing within the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, the Christian fashions his philosophy. Every

man has some kind of philosophy, some view of the whole, which determines how he will understand any particular within the whole. The Christian has his philosophy, his interpretation of the whole, which is determined, let it not be forgotten, by his special standpoint, which is the Word of God at its living and glowing centre, Jesus Christ the Son of God. When from this standpoint he looks around, with inner eye opened by faith and love, he sees at least three things very clearly.

I—GOD IS THE CREATOR.

The God who creates all is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the living and true God. The Christian knows that God is the Creator, not by the exercise of his own unaided reason, but from Divine Revelation which appeals to him as the highest form of reason. There was in the Old Testament a pre-Christian Revelation which he interprets in the light of the New Testament, the meaning of all being borne in upon him by the testimony of the Holy Spirit.

It is by His sovereign Will that God has created all things, seen and unseen. That is the first affirmation in the Bible and it is the foundation on which the Christian doctrine of the world is built. Almost all other world-views regard the world as derived from its source in some other way. Philosophy on the whole has preferred to hold that the world has come from its source by an inevitable process of emanation. The principle of emanation varies with the system of philosophy. With the Stoics, the emanation is natural; with the Neoplatonists, contemplative; with Spinoza, mathematical; with Hegel, logical. I do not discuss these various and conflicting forms of emanation. The only thing common to all is that the world came from God quite apart from His Will. But the Christian holds, surely with the highest warrant, that God would be less than the living and true God if the world came into existence through no choice of His.

It is an extraordinary perversity on the part of philosophy that it has ransacked the world in order to find some way of avoiding the admission that God is personal and that He created the world by the fiat of His free and sovereign Will. This reluctance to admit the existence of a Divine Will is probably due to the old rationalistic idea that the human intellect is far superior to the human will. That idea arose from the com-

partmental psychology which is now happily abandoned. It segregated thought, feeling and will so strictly from each other that will, acting apart from thought, seemed no better than blind instinct. But, unless man acts like an animal, his will never acts without thought. Will is no more likely to be blind instinct than thought is to be empty imagination. The depreciation of will over against reason is absurd. In any case Christian doctrine is wedded to the faith that He who created the world is perfect in wisdom as in power.

Some philosophers and also some scientists have paid unconscious tribute to the Christian doctrine of Creation by coming to the conclusion that the human will is a miracle. They are driven to this position through overstressing the scientific maxim that every natural event must have a natural cause. The will, which is a spiritual magnitude, is certainly the cause of many a physical effect. They therefore conclude that the will must be a miracle. But, though no one can explain the interaction between mind and matter, I do not dignify the lifting of my arm with the title of miracle, unless we agree that we are all performing miracles all the time. The connection between the spiritual activity of willing and the physical movement of the arm is inexplicable, but it is a very obvious and common fact. That some thinkers can call this a miracle surely suggests that the human will, stripped of all caprice and penetrated with right thought and feeling, is the closest human analogue to the Divine Will. The Creation of all things by the Divine Will is certainly a miracle, and why should we expect to understand how it took place when we cannot understand so mundane an event as the raising of the arm? The analogy between the human and the Divine Will dare not be pressed too far, but the charge of false anthropomorphism, so often brought against the analogy, has been repelled a thousand times and need not detain us now.

The advantage of the Christian doctrine that the world is due to the activity of the Divine Will is both religious and philosophical. For here God is sharply distinguished from the world which He has made. God is God, and world is world. In all naturalistic systems of philosophy God is identified with forces within the world, in which case the origin of the world is an impossibility and we are condemned to the chimera of an infinite regress. Even in idealistic systems, which of course are far more reasonable than the naturalistic, the reluctance to think of God as Personal Will leads to impossible consequences. Here

the human mind is regarded as part of the mind of God, *particula Dei*, and the distinction between God and world is more than blurred. For religion this is fatal, but even as philosophy it is unsound. If the human mind is part of the mind of God, there is a whole realm of empirical facts which cannot be taken seriously, and it is the function of philosophy to take all experience seriously. For example, think of sin. The root of sin is in the mind, but what are we to make of sin if the human mind is really divine? We cannot condemn it. The moral distinctions disappear. The fact is that every consideration, intellectual, moral or religious, insists that God is God and world is world. Between God and the world there is a gulf which neither the thought nor the will of man can bridge. God alone can bridge the gulf and He has done it.

But we must guard against falling into Scylla in the effort to avoid Charybdis. The recognition of the gulf between God and world must not lead us into Deism, which is as hostile as Pantheism to Christianity. God, through His Will which created the world, is active within the world at every moment and in every place. He sustains and governs all by the Word of His Power. It is by His Word that all things cohere. It is not often recognised that the continuance of the world is as wonderful as its creation. It is because we experience the continuance of the world that our minds become blasé about it and we lose the sense of wonder. Modern physics has almost compelled us to conclude that the world is re-created at every moment of time. This is in harmony with the Christian view that God has always been creating and is creating still. His Will is active in holding the world in being. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," said Jesus. God works at every point of natural fact and of human experience. He does not work in the same way at every point, for He is Infinite Wisdom. But He permits nothing to escape from His Power, not even sin. It is in Him that we "live and move and have our being."

II—MAN AS STEWARD OF CREATION.

The second prominent element in the Christian World-View is that God has given to man a pre-eminent place within His Creation. Man was set over the earth to subdue it and to have dominion over the lower creatures. For the fulfilment of this

task, and of a higher task of which I shall speak later, he was made "in the image of God." Here we have the Divine charter of man's effort to understand the world and of his right and duty to serve as steward and subordinate creator in it.

What is meant by the image of God in man? That is the form which the question takes in theology. In philosophy it takes the form: "What is the differentia of man in relation to the rest of the world?" Many answers have been given to this question, such as the gift of reason, moral perception, æsthetic appreciation, or the ability to unify experience. These are all partial answers, but without discussing them I simply state the Christian position. The uniqueness of man has to be understood from his *responsibility to God*. Man is steward of the Creation, always responsible to the Creator. This definition of man's differentia may seem to savour too much of feudalism, but it takes on a different complexion when it is filled with its proper content. Here as everywhere we interpret the Old Testament by the New. The supreme general affirmation about God in the New Testament is that He is *Love*. Love is His essence. He is Love in Himself, even apart from His relation to what He has created. Incidentally, this confirms the Christian doctrine of God as Triune. God's Love had no beginning. Within the Trinity it has existed from all eternity. But my point at the moment is that since God is essentially Love, He created the world in love. He therefore created man in love, but man's differentia from the rest of the creatures is that God created him not only *in* love but also *for* love. Man alone is capable of making a loving response to his Creator. But love cannot be forced; it can only be given in free response. "We love, because He first loved us." Hence man's responsibility to God is responsibility-in-love, which is the same as response-in-love, which again is the same as communion with God. This is the only true life, eternal life.

To the statement that reason or freedom or creative capacity is man's differentia, the Christian reply is that these are only instrumental and therefore secondary. They are great and good gifts, bestowed on man in order that he may be equipped to make his free and intelligent response of love. Responsibility to God is man's primary characteristic and when he responds in love to God, that answering love becomes the very texture of his being. Spontaneously he loves his neighbour as himself. Our love to God and our love to man belong together.

III—THE FALL OF MAN.

The third element in the Christian World-View is the acknowledgment that man has fallen away from his Origin and become a sinner against God. The Christian sees, from his standpoint in the Gospel, that sin is the negative presupposition of redemption. Redemption brings out sin in its tragic colours. Sin is precisely that which ought not to be in God's world. In its essence it is apostasy from God, the assertion of a false independence, the steward setting himself up as owner and lord. All particular sins, like theft or falsehood, are but symptoms of this root-sin of rebellion against God. How such rebellion could get a beginning is as far beyond our understanding as the Creation itself. The Bible tells us that it began earlier than the story of man. It was the serpent, which the New Testament interprets as Satan, that beguiled our first parents. But that does not *explain* the origin of sin; it only pushes the question farther back into a region which the human mind cannot enter.

No final explanation of sin is possible. To explain it would be to explain it away. It is the irreducible surd in God's Creation. Explanation means reduction to order and reason, and sin is precisely that which cannot be so reduced. The New Testament is hardly interested at all in the origin of sin, but it is intensely interested in the one fact which can shed light upon this darkest of all problems, the fact that through God's grace sin can be forgiven. Forgiveness does not solve the intellectual problem, but it solves the vital problem. As to the origin of sin in this world, nothing more profound will ever be said about that than what stands written at the beginning of the Bible. God set our first parents in Eden with liberty to eat of all the trees of the garden *save one*. That one forbidden tree is impressively described as "the tree of the Knowledge of good and evil" and as situated "in the midst of the garden." It is the symbol of God's inalienable sovereignty over His Creation. To encroach upon it would be to set oneself up as sovereign in place of God, and so to inaugurate the age of sin and death. Note the form of the temptation. God had said: "If ye eat of the forbidden tree, ye shall surely die." But the serpent said to the woman: "Ye shall not surely die; ye shall be as gods." It was the suggestion of becoming like gods that clinched the matter and brought about the Fall of Man. Rebellion against God was the root of the first sin and it is the root of all sins unto the

present hour. Nietzsche is the true representative of fallen and unredeemed man. He wrote: "If there were gods, who would not be one?"

One of the hardest problems for theology is how to hold together the two apparently opposing truths that man cannot help sinning and that yet he is responsible to God for his sin. All I can say here on this question is that the Bible shows and Christian experience confirms that both of these must be resolutely held and that the tension between them must remain so long as sin endures. Very frequently in theology one is emphasized at the expense of the other. The Bible never makes that mistake. It gives equal emphasis to the *inevitability* of sin and to the *guilt* of sin, without asking whether the two can be intellectually reconciled. I am satisfied, however, that this, like other apparent contradictions in Christianity, is in reality no contradiction at all, but a paradox which need not offend the mind which thinks from the standpoint of the Revelation in Christ.

THE DIMENSIONAL VIEW OF THE WORLD.

The reference to paradox, as distinguished from contradiction, leads on to the dimensional view of the world. This seems to me to provide the best thought-form yet devised for an adequate world-view. The first group of dimensions, and the simplest because most familiar, are the three dimensions of *space*. All physical objects, including our own bodies, stand in this group. Next, there is the dimension of *time*, in which all mundane things stand, whether physical or spiritual. When a physical object is interpreted as standing in the spatial group, independently of any other dimension, you get one definite description of it. When it is interpreted in the four-dimensional continuum of space-time, you get another description of it. The two descriptions are remarkably different, though each may be correct from its own dimensional frame of reference. The relation between the two is likely to be paradoxical. This principle may probably shed light on the apparent contradictions which have recently confronted physicists, such as Heisenberg's "principle of uncertainty" or the discovery that the corpuscular theory of light has as much to say for itself as the undulatory theory, even though a particle and a wave seem to be mutually contradictory concepts. Here I believe we have no contradiction, but only paradox, arising from the different standards of reference. It is

significant that the recent barriers which have brought physicists to a stand have all appeared since time has been taken seriously as a fourth dimension.

However that may be, it can be proved that whenever you pass from a simpler group of dimensions to a richer and more complicated group, you keep meeting with paradox. Consider the case of man. As body, he may usefully be described from the spatial frame of reference, but as person, he cannot be described from the point of view either of space or of space-time. When the spiritual aspect of man is taken into the reckoning a new dimension is introduced in addition to those in which the body stands. Here you are sure to have paradox. As illustration, I again take the case of the lifting of the arm. The biologist who is foolish enough to interpret the whole man mechanically is brought to a stand by this every-day occurrence. He says *either* that the will is a miracle, *or*, more likely, that the will has no existence at all, that it is an illusion, that when I raise my arm the whole operation can be explained as the result of conditioned reflexes. But, ignoring both of these absurdities, it ought to be clear by this time that when the spiritual dimension in the form of will is introduced we have paradox, in this case the paradox of a physical event not being caused by a preceding physical event, but ultimately by a spiritual decision, my decision to raise my arm.

Man's highest dimension is, as I have already said in other words, his relation to God. He may not know it; he may deny or even defy God; but that makes no difference to the inexorable fact of his relation to God. God has said to him: "Thou art mine," and his reply is: "No, I am not thine; I am master of my own fate." But he is still responsible to God. Nor is neutrality possible in the supreme campaign of human life. A man may *decide* to be neutral, but this decision is disobedience to God equally with the decision to say "No." Indeed there is a sense in which the neutrals are a meaner crowd than the deniers. In Dante's *Inferno* such neutrals are not fit even for hell.

When responsibility to God, which is man's supreme dimension, is taken into the reckoning we have the many paradoxes of Christianity. It is deeply impressive that the Bible never regards these paradoxes as contradictions, but as vital tensions which belong to the very fibre of human life. One example must suffice, the paradox between God's sovereignty and man's

free-will. How can man be free in any real sense of the word if at every point of his life the Will of God is supreme? This question ceases to offend reason as soon as it is confessed with mind and heart that God's Will for man belongs to our ultimate dimension, while our wills, except in their direct response to God, belong to what may be called our penultimate dimension. The paradox appears at the meeting place of the two dimensional levels, and when we give God His rightful place in our lives we find nothing in this paradox to make us stumble, but everything to make us rejoice. The freedom which we have on the lower level of life is merely formal freedom. It is not fulfilled, it is not real freedom, until it is lifted up to the highest level of life. Only when God is acknowledged as Lord are we truly free. "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." "Then are ye free indeed."

What we have seen to be a paradox has appeared to most philosophers as a contradiction. Why? Because they have not seen that the biggest thing in man's life is God's claim upon him. They have discussed the problem in terms of necessity and freedom, have set the two on the same dimensional level and found them contradictory. It is the pre-supposition of these philosophers that is false. The necessity which God lays upon man belongs to a sphere which man's formal free-will can never reach by its own resources. The pathetic history of philosophy on this question is a standing testimony to the confusion which arises when men decline to acknowledge the living God. Unfortunately intellectual confusion cannot be confined to the schools. It filters down to the multitude and brings about the kind of disaster which we see all too plainly in the world of to-day.

While the formal freedom in which all men share is very different from Christian freedom, the former must not be disparaged, still less denied. If unredeemed men had no freedom, they would have no responsibility. But they *are* responsible to God. The most serious opponent of Christianity in our time is scientific determinism, especially in its psychological form. Of course it has no right to be called scientific. It is only the bad philosophy of too many scientists. It holds that so-called freedom is all an illusion, that whatever we do we cannot help doing. It is enough to ask one who holds this most absurd of all doctrines how he can expect us to take him seriously, seeing that *ex hypothesi* he cannot help denying freedom. His assertions

against freedom are not the product of his thought, but only happenings which he cannot help. He will say, if I make assertions on behalf of freedom, that these also are only happenings. Well, my happenings are as inevitable and have as much right to exist as his. Then, why should *he* argue? On his showing, here are two affirmations which are equally valid and which yet contradict each other. All argument for determinism is a breach of the law of non-contradiction. If there is no such thing as freedom, there is no such thing as truth.

It may justifiably be said that this paper has been more about man than about the world as a whole. If that was a mistake on my part, it was an intentional one. It is man who alone tries to interpret the world and in man alone can its interpretation be found. But man is the key to the world only when he has learned that God is the Key to man. To finish on a very practical note, sin is a very important factor in this world, but who can get sufficiently apart from sin to give an accurate assessment of it? Only one Man who ever walked this earth was able to say that sin had no part in Him. Thus He knew the tragedy of sin and thus He alone can save men from its ravages. He does save all who are in Him and they learn to know how dark a thing sin is, in proportion as they enter the gladdening light of redemption. They and they alone can reach a truly perspective conception of the world, because they live in the light of Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

DISCUSSION.

The Chairman (Dr. F. CAWLEY) said: I count it a privilege to chair this session of the Philosophical Society, since I am greatly indebted to Professor Lamont for abiding inspiration during seminar work at Edinburgh University. It is not too much to say that the back-benches of his classes are in the ends of the earth. The teaching of Dr. Lamont was always seminal; truth, as it were, coming to harvest within one's own soul.

The lecture of to-night, you must have felt, is of that order. It has both quickened the intelligence and given grace to the spirit. There are many points on which you will be glad to comment. As Chairman, permit me especially to lay stress on one, viz., that of man's *differentia* from the rest of creation. Professor Lamont suggests that it may be understood in the sense of responsibility

to God ; then, later, as responsibility-in-love to God who is Love. This, to me, is most suggestive. For years I have thought of man's *differentia* as shadowed forth in his felt compulsion to worship. All through the centuries that has marked off man from the animal creation. To-day there is psychological insistence that we must not deny intelligence and purposiveness to the animal, but nowhere is there the evidence that the creature knows how to worship, to erect an altar and build a temple above it. But man has done it as far back as the dawn of history, and presumably, far, far earlier also.

Yet responsibility may be the more inclusive term, with worship as its sacred act. Or, perhaps, Dr. Lamont might consider each as the synonym of the other. This is what I meant when I said that all his work was of a seminal order.

The lecture, then, is now open to discussion, but before we enter upon further remarks I know you would like me to express in your name our warmest thanks to our Lecturer for the inspiration of this evening.

Mr. R. A. LAIDLAW said : In discussing God's sovereignty and man's free will Professor Lamont said, " Only when God is acknowledged as Lord are we truly free." There was one man on earth in the days when our Lord was here who appreciated this fact—the centurion of Capernaum of whom we read in Matthew viii and Luke vii.

What he really said was, " I am subject to the authority of Cæsar in Rome and therefore I exercise the power of Cæsar in Galilee. When I speak, all the power of the Roman Legions is behind me to enforce my commands. I perceive thou also art a man under authority, and because thou art subject to the authority of God, speak and my servant shall be healed for all the power of Heaven will be behind thy command."

To this our Lord said he had not seen such faith no not in Israel. It is fundamental, that just as all sin is the result of our rebellion against the holy will of God so all holiness is the result of our submission to the will of God. It would therefore seem clear that when a man submits his will to the Sovereignty of God he does not give up something but gains everything, for thus keyed to Omnipotence he becomes omnipotent.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : On p. 149 the author argues against determinism, and says with truth, " If unredeemed men had no freedom they would have no responsibility." But on p. 147, line 6 he says " man cannot help sinning." Then in that respect he is not free. But who compels him to sin ? Does the author charge this upon God ? Where does Scripture teach that man " cannot help sinning " ?

On p. 147 Dr. Lamont appears to suggest that " All physical objects, including our own bodies " can be located on the space co-ordinates, but not on the time co-ordinate. But they are of course in the space-time continuum, and can be located on all four co-ordinates. " Next " we are then told " there is the dimension of time, in which all mundane things stand, whether physical or spiritual." Is it suggested that these things do not also exist in space ? Or that they (as distinct from physical objects) exist in time as well as space ? Surely if the locus of anything can be measured along any one of the four co-ordinates it has a position on the other three also. And why are not physical objects " mundane things " ?

On p. 148 we are told that " as a person " man exists apart from the space-time continuum. I believe this is true, although in some mysterious way he functions within it. Herein lies some of the wonder of the Incarnation.

But Dr. Lamont gives us a further difficulty. He says, " When the spiritual aspect of man is taken into the reckoning a new dimension is introduced in addition to those in which the body stands." These latter he has told us are the three space co-ordinates. But he has said spiritual entities exist in time. The spiritual aspect of man, then, exists in two dimensions of a five dimensional continuum. On p. 149, line 6, this fifth dimension seems to be " will." And a little later we have two more dimensions. We may be able to construct a seven dimensional geometry, but surely this cannot be what the author has in mind. Has he not fallen into the mistake of confusing an illustration with the thing illustrated ? It is as though after speaking quite properly of a " sphere " which man's formal free-will can never reach, he had gone on to speak of a " cube " which it could reach ! I submit that the whole section headed " The Dimensional View of the World " breaks down.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. THOMAS FITZGERALD wrote : Professor Lamont's paper is a valuable contribution to the consideration of those subjects which are among the principal objects for which the Victoria Institute was founded.

When the trend of modern thought is to deny a place for God in His world, it constitutes a challenge to the Christian World-View, which this Society does not hesitate to take up.

The lecturer rightly points out that the world has many aspects, but I wish he had given a clear definition as in what sense he uses the word. It is true, later on, he says that his paper has more about man than about the world as a whole, but is there not the world of mankind apart from the universe, which is often loosely called the world ? Even man himself may be thought of as a world in miniature. Archbishop Trench pointed out in his Hulsean Lecture, that in the Bible God seems more concerned about man than about recording His own marvellous creative works which reveal His Power and Wisdom.

Therefore, whilst the philosopher and the scientist may bend their utmost powers to the study of material things, the study of man surpasses all other studies, and we are in harmony with the thoughts of God when we do so, for it is revealed that " God so loved the world (mankind) that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

I would, therefore, distinguish between this planet (the earth or world) and the *κόσμος*, or the scheme of things which man is responsible for, as constituting his manner of life on the earth apart from the claims of God, and even running counter to the laws of his Creator. It is in this sense that the Christian is exhorted to love not the world (1 John ii, 15-17).

In N. T. Greek *κόσμος* is invariably used in this sense, whilst *αἰών* (an age) is used to indicate a particular period in man's scheme of things marked by special features of evil, and God's dealings with man in relation to that period. The translators of the A.V. failed to distinguish the difference, and have often translated *αἰών* as world.

Accepting the lecturer's views on the whole, that God is Creator, and that to Adam was committed the dominion over the Paradisaic earth, also that Adam fell from his high estate, I would like to submit

a few points for the lecturer's consideration, following the order in his paper.

1. *God is the Creator.* Under this head the lecturer is right in sharply distinguishing God the Creator from the world which he created, and although "world" is here used, no doubt "the universe" is intended. There is a danger of taking the narrow view that this earth is the only part of creation worth considering. "The works of God are great, sought out of all them that take pleasure therein."

Further, it must be firmly held that God, the Creator, stands apart and above man, the creature, although profoundly concerned as to man's highest interests. It follows, therefore, that man is responsible to God for the use of privileges and faculties with which he was endowed at his creation. This fact leaves no room for the theory of so-called Evolution in the Christian World-View.

I cannot, however, agree with the lecturer when he states that the world is re-created at every moment of time, and that God has always been creating and still is. This is not "according to the Scriptures" for we read, "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made" (Genesis ii, 1, 2). The lecturer's quotation from John does not contradict Genesis, and it is here where the failure to distinguish the material world from the world of mankind causes confusion. Our Lord, when He said "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" (John v, 17), was engaged in the beneficent work of healing the sick, an act of Divine intervention on behalf of suffering mankind. This Divine intervention is found throughout man's history as recorded in the Old Testament. Thus the Father was working in the past, and now the Son works as present on the earth among men.

2. *Man as Steward of Creation.* Under this head the lecturer rightly insists that man is responsible to the Creator. He was placed in the position of Headship, and upon faithfulness to his trust depended the welfare of all put under his dominion. Not only was he made "in the image of God," so as to represent God to those over whom he ruled, he was constituted also by this unique place on earth, a figure or type "of Him that was to come"

(Romans v, 14), whose Headship was to be over the New Creation. Hence it may be assumed that the creation of man had in view the incarnation of the Son of God, the second man, the Last Adam (1 Cor. xv, 45-49).

That God was prompted by love in creating man may be reasonably affirmed, but I question whether it can be rightly said, as stated by the lecturer, that he created the world in love. Then as regards Love being His essence, I submit that the statements in the New Testament that "God is *Light*" signifies His *essence*, that "God is *Love*" signifies His *nature*, that in His *character* He is *holy and righteous* and *wisdom* marks His *ways*.

3. *The Fall of Man.* There can be no question, as the lecturer affirms, that in the Christian World-View man has fallen away from his original high estate and become a sinner against God. Man's whole history confirms this, and never more so than in these terrible and blasting days of war. Man revolted from God, and mankind is still in revolt against the laws and claims of God, to say nothing of his hostile attitude to the Gospel of the Grace of God.

Man was placed originally in surroundings of utmost beauty and provided with all that love could bestow. Everything was done to call forth the responsive love of the creature to the Creator, but in spite of such a favourable environment, with only one prohibition put upon them, our first parents fell and sinned against the God who had so richly blessed them.

The social reformer can never offer his fellows such a favourable environment, nor can he hope by his schemes to save man from his sins. Repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, will not only save man from his sins, but he will receive a new power by which he will quickly change his environment and manner of life. The evidence of this covers nearly 2000 years, and is exhibited in countless lives of all nationalities in the present day. These facts belong to the Christian World-View, which the lecturer has so clearly set forth in his paper.

The lecturer closes his paper with some remarks on the Dimensional View of the World, but it seems to me, while all very interesting in the study of astronomical space and light-years, the Scriptures relate man's history on earth to the ages of God's eternal purposes. Man was made, not for space-time but for eternity, where all thought

of time is lost. This view leads to the solemn issue of man's responsibility as to *where* he will spend Eternity.

Rev. Principal H. S. CURR wrote : Professor Lamont's paper makes refreshing reading in these days when the historic doctrines, sponsored by Christianity, with regard to the origin and meaning of the world tend to be superseded in the judgment of so many thinkers as inadequate. The Institute has thus been placed under a deep debt of obligation by such a clear and cogent statement of certain problems with which philosophy and science must reckon, and whose answer is only furnished by Christianity.

Three random reflections are suggested by Dr. Lamont's essay. One is based on an observation of Wellhausen, the mighty protagonist of the modern critical view of the Old Testament. He says that the Biblical cosmology made science possible by drawing a sharp distinction between God and the created universe. If I understand him aright, not only is morality undermined by atheism or pantheism in their multitudinous shapes and forms, but scientific knowledge as well. Until the material world was objectified in this way, scientific investigation was an impossibility. That admits of pragmatic proof inasmuch as Hinduism and Buddhism, these great pantheistic systems, have done nothing towards originating anything worthy of the name of science. On the other hand, Christianity may fairly claim to be the fountain of all scientific investigation. At the expense of being extravagant and ridiculous, may I call attention to the fact that some of our most distinguished scientists at the present day are not Christians but Jews, a significant fact when we remember that the New Testament assumes the Old Testament cosmogony.

A second reflection is that in Christianity the centre of gravity in all being and becoming is not man as in other religions and philosophies but God. To put it very simply, there is a world of truth in the old Greek maxim that man is the measure of all things, as Professor Lamont proves in his opening paragraphs, but that is not the whole truth as he proceeds to show. The aphorism should run " God is the measure of all things " or, even better, " The Son of Man is the measure of all things." He is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation. In Him were all things created,

in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things have been created through Him, and unto Him. And He is before all things, and in Him all things consist. (Colossians i, 15-17.) The Bible begins and ends with God. There is an old saying that well begun is half done. It applies with as much force to theology, and philosophy, and science as to everything else.

Yet a third reflection is concerned with the place of the Bible in a discussion of the world-view. Man cannot do better than approach the vast question from the same standpoint, in the same spirit, and armed with the same categories as the writers of Holy Scripture. Without their books mankind would never have heard of the Christian World-View for that is based on history and not on philosophy unless we accept the old definition of history as philosophy teaching by example. The foundation of the Christian World-View consists in what God did rather than in what God taught, although, in the last analysis, the two are inseparable, like the two sides of a coin.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am indebted to all those members of the Institute who have commented upon my paper. My thanks are specially due to the Chairman, Dr. Cawley, not only for the warmth of his appreciation but also for his discriminating remarks on the subject itself. Principal Curr has also made a contribution of value to the discussion, while others have spoken or written in a manner which exhibits a lively interest in the theme of the paper. I take it, however, that my reply ought to direct itself to questions and criticisms and to these I turn without further delay.

Mr. FITZGERALD wishes that I had given a clear definition of the sense in which I used the word "aspects." It is an important word in dimensional philosophy, but it explains itself. A table is a thing of three dimensions; its top is of two dimensions. The top is an aspect of the table. An aspect is always one dimension lower than that of which it is an aspect. The table is "part" of the furniture of a room, but it is inaccurate to speak of the top as being part of the table. You can take the table out of the room, but the room is still there; if there were no top to the table it would be a table no longer.

Similarly, the physical world is an aspect (not a part) of the world as a whole. The physical world is by no means the whole world, but if it were removed the whole world would be an entirely different thing. The use of "part" instead of "aspect" has led to much confusion of thought. Thus, when it is said that the body is part of the man, the suggestion is that body and soul are stuck together like two bricks. But body and soul differ dimensionally from each other, while each differs dimensionally from the whole person. Body and soul are different aspects of the person.

Mr. Fitzgerald takes exception to the idea that God re-creates the world at each moment of time. But by "re-creation" I did not mean "creation all over again." The original creation of the world is unrepeatable. It was a once-and-for-all event. Yet the world is not static. It is changing moment by moment. A new element is continuously emerging. Man's will contributes something to this "emergent," something which mars the whole unless it is obedient to the Will of God. For God is the great Worker, not only in continuing the world, but also in changing it. Mr. Fitzgerald's theory, logically carried out, is Deism. His thesis that the Divine activity in the world was an intervention on behalf of suffering humanity is true so far as it goes, but it does not go nearly far enough, and it does not save him from the deistic error that God made the world and then left it to go on itself except for occasional divine interventions. The Bible is against all forms of Deism. God keeps His Hand all the time on the helm of both nature and history.

Mr. LESLIE is incensed at the statement that man cannot help sinning. Perhaps he takes the statement to mean that when a man commits a particular sin he was bound to commit that sin. But that is far from the meaning. The statement means that man cannot help being a sinner. Sin is a second nature with him, a *damnosa hæreditas*, and he needs forgiveness right on to the end of his earthly career. He cannot be perfectly free in this world. If he were perfectly free, he would never think, say or do anything contrary to the Will of God. That is the Christian Hope but it cannot be completely realised here below. Of course we must strive towards perfect freedom and through God's grace come ever nearer to it. Sanctification must go on in the Christian life. Perhaps the best reply to Mr. Leslie is to remind him that the nearer a man

comes to perfect harmony with the Will of God, the more sensitively alive he is to the fact that he is a sinner. To the question whether I charge the inevitability of sin upon God, the answer is: "No, I charge it upon man and the devil between them." To the question as to where Scripture teaches that man cannot help sinning, the answer is: "From beginning to end Scripture teaches that man must sin so long as he is a sinner and that he will remain a sinner in deep need of Divine pardon until he stands complete at last in glory."

As to Mr. Leslie's dissatisfaction with the dimensional theory of the world, a dissatisfaction shared by Mr. Fitzgerald, I feel that this is not so serious a matter. The vindication of the view that the world stands in "dimensions" and not in "parts" would demand a volume. I had the idea that a bare outline of this view might be of use to those members who were unfamiliar with it. I can only add here that it is well to understand a position before accepting or even rejecting it. Of course it might be rejected after it is understood, but in that case we can agree to differ. After all, it is only an intellectual construction which does not enter into the substance of the Christian faith.

SUBSEQUENTLY RECEIVED.

DR. J. BARCROFT ANDERSON wrote: I am convinced that of all writings on this earth the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures alone cannot be improved.

The word "Christian" occurs nowhere in those parts of Scripture written by the only Apostle to us Gentiles. To that Apostle alone, was given a revelation additional to that of Roman i, 20, and ii, 15. Through him came the "secret upon which silence had been kept since times eternal, but now made known through prophetic writings" (Romans xvi, 25). Those prophetic writings were those of Paul to saints at Colossae and at Ephesus. "You hath He reconciled (literally-changed-away-under) . . . to present you . . . unreprouvable before Him" (Col. i, 22). "The secret . . . in which are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hid away" (Col. ii, 2).

Is the word "world" in this paper the word Kosmos of 1 Jno. v, 19?

Why does this paper give a different representation of the Creator, from Colossians i, 16, and I think John viii, 25, as rendered by the Vulgate?—to my mind the only correct rendering of the Greek.

The origin of sin is given in Ezekiel xxviii, 16, and 1 Timothy iii, 6, resulting in the Devil's assuming a position independent of his Creator, and trying to subject the whole Earth to himself. The alternative reading in Ezekiel xxviii, 18, may be correct: "I have turned thee to ashes upon **THY** earth."

The word Satan first appears in Job. In Zechariah iii, 1, the corresponding verb is rendered "Adversary." I would render that passage: "The self-exalter stand on his right hand to self-exalt."

His attempt to fool his Creator is recorded in Matt. iv and Luke iv, but not in Mark, which represents "Jesus Christ" as being the Jehovah of Isaiah xl, 3, and not in John, who represents him as the speaker of the spoken word of Jehovah, in Jeremiah i, 9. Verse 4 commences, "And was existing, Word Jehovah, to me to say." Verse 9, "and Jehovah was extending his hand and he was touching my mouth, and Jehovah was saying to me."

The Devil, in terms of the Lord's words: "No one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father" (Luke x, 22) could not know that it was his Creator whose support he was endeavouring to obtain in the testing in the wilderness (Luke iv, 6-7).

Later, the Devil, as stated in Psalm xli, 8, said: "Now that he lieth down he shall not cause to rise up again." He did not believe the words of John x, 18, "I lay down my soul that I may take it again . . . I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."