

## Thomas F. Torrance's Criticism of Natural Theology

- 1] God has acted/spoken in Jesus Christ. Compared to this, natural theology makes as much sense as comparing a candle with the sun.
  - a] the splendour of the sun eclipses the puniness of the candle.
  - b] the sun is the *source* of all heat and light in the universe. Therefore the candle owes its heat and light to the sun.

- 2] The "God" of natural theology (e.g., unmoved mover) has nothing to do with the concrete, living, acting God of Jesus Christ.

- 3] Natural theology arises historically in eras of cosmological and epistemological dualism: body and soul, time and eternity, history and truth – e.g., in the Middle Ages or the Age of Reason.

In these eras natural theology is valued for two purposes:

- a] mediating (Isn't this the role of the Holy Spirit?)
- b] apologetic (What is the nature of apologetics?)

All such natural theology

- a] is inferential (this contradicts the logic of scripture)
- b] attempts to reach and teach a knowledge of God apart from God's interaction with the world.
- c] fails to realize that there is no logical bridge between contingent and necessary being.
- d] " " that there is no logical bridge between concepts and experience.

- 4] The content of our knowledge of God as revealed undermines natural theology.

- 5] There remains a place for arguing for a complex of rational structures arising **in our actual** knowledge of God. Here "natural theology" isn't natural w.r.t. the creation (nature) but natural, rather, to theology's proper object; viz., God in his self-revealing interaction with us.

NOTE: IN ALL FORMS OF NATURAL THEOLOGY THE CROSS AS **THE** REVELATION OF GOD THAT CORRECTS OUR DYSFUNCTIONAL REASON (W.R.T. GOD) IS LOST.

Professor V. Shepherd