

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.

IN our day the subject of personality occupies much attention. It has received new emphasis in current philosophy, and educational theorists are insisting that the true aim and end of education is the development of full and effective personality. It will be worth while to recall the Christian view on this subject, especially as we are naturally inclined to hold that Christian personality stands for the educational ideal of full and effective personality.

For the pattern and standard of Christian personality we turn to the example and teaching of Jesus Christ. We believe that He is 'the light of the world,' and that to follow Him is to have, or to put ourselves in the way of having, the 'light of life.'

But it is sometimes said that the principle of imitation, even of the imitation of Christ, is, in the last resort at least, a barrier rather than an aid to the ideal life, to the attainment of highest character, the achievement of true personality. Is not freedom of the essence of personality? Is not a person a voice, not an echo? But the objection has little more than theoretical force. What force it has, it probably owes to the dubious modern conception of personality as personal existence or identity, self-contained and impenetrable.

We need not, however, enter into the problem of personality. We may be content to affirm that

truly to follow Christ is not to hinder in oneself the realization of complete personal life. On the contrary, if we look to those who have asked Christ, in the phrase of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, to set down their names, and have then given themselves wholeheartedly to His service, we may learn of them what an enriching and enlarging experience it is to follow Christ, how it breaks down barriers and hindrances and sweeps the soul into freedom and power, how it enables a man to launch forth joyously into the fullness and depths of personal life, mind and heart and will united in one great allegiance.

What, then, is the Christian ideal of personal life? What is that 'light of life' which Christ holds up to us as a beacon of character and achievement? We might well approach the statement of the Christian ideal by first considering this question—How do Christian men and women reach the experience of religion? For some, religious experience is bound up with faith in Christ as their redeemer and saviour; for others, it is the response of obedience or loyalty to God, in whom the moral ideal is at once fulfilled and guaranteed. Perhaps religion comes to men and women at the present day in the second of these ways more than in the first—as a moral behest, a challenge to moral adventure, a signal and summons flashed from the heights of moral idealism.

Obedience is then one element in the Christian ideal of life, for most of us perhaps the primary and

central element. The very central truth of our religious experience is the hand of God upon us, urging us to rise above all meanness, selfishness, and calculating prudence, above all that divides and distracts our lives, into a life which is unified, integrated, and complete. The Christian is he 'that doeth the will.' Said Christ Himself, 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me.'

But Christ also said, 'I am not alone': 'He that sent me is with me'; and this points to a second element in the Christian ideal, namely, *fellowship with God*. 'All my springs are in thee,' said the Psalmist; and this is a truth to lay hold of as we seek to pursue the way of obedience or loyalty to the Divine will, which is the way of moral enlargement and achievement. It should help us on that way to be in touch with the springs of our life, to lift up our eyes constantly unto the hills whence cometh our help.

The life of fellowship with God may also be regarded as one, not of upgoing towards Him, but of ingoing upon Him. For our God, in the well-known phrase of mystical religion, is the Beyond that is within. Thus it is but to uphold again the ideal of fellowship to lay stress on the need of cultivating spiritual faculty. If anything will secure for us that unification and integration of personality in which our highest life consists, it is the letting of ourselves go, so far as we may, into the infinite life of the eternal, indwelling God.

If one movement of the religious life as it leaves its central level is describable as upgoing towards God, or as ingoing upon Him, there is another movement which may be described as outgoing towards our fellows. Which brings us to the third element of the Christian ideal, namely, *social service*. Obedience, fellowship, service: from these three words taken together we may gain a true and rounded conception of life's ideal. The Christian life may begin as a life of obedience, but sooner or later it must carry itself into the double channel of fellowship and service. Through fellowship with God comes the inspiration of obedience;

through the service of humanity, its true fulfilment.

Surely we must welcome the new emphasis upon service in the modern statement of Christianity. The social ideal of our religion was largely lost sight of between the age of the Apostles and modern times, and only within recent years has it been recovered and freshly interpreted. Well it is that it has been. As men and women in the modern world, in which the social question presses, we should reject a religion that held no message of healing and hope for society, and for national and international life; that looked for no new social order on the earth for which it is our duty to labour. It is largely because the modern Christian Church as an organized institution has failed so far to strike the ethical or social note clearly enough, and to inspire its members with 'the enthusiasm of humanity' and the passion for humanitarian service, that so many spiritually minded men and women have been alienated from its fellowship.

It is then not God and self alone, but God and self and neighbour, that are at the making of true Christian personality. It needed the robbed and wounded Jew to make the Samaritan of the Parable what he is, namely, the Good Samaritan, the pattern for all time of brotherly love and service. He gave himself with his gifts, and he got a truer self back again. The true self is the fuller self. The more we merge our lives in the life and well-being of others, we receive them back again the richer and fuller. It is the grand paradox of personality, and part of the great truth of the social nature of all personal life—a truth to which modern thought has lent new meanings, but whose essential significance was grasped long ago by Him who said, 'He that loseth his life shall find it.'

Wherefore for the sake of the Kingdom of God as well as for the individual's sake we shall emphasize the importance of following the Christian ideal. Personal individuals are the units of the social order. 'It is in individual foci that the common life burns.' And the social order shall be redeemed only as its units reflect the Spirit of God and the

Mind of Christ. In sanctified and consecrated Christian personality lies the world's true hope.

Perhaps the most notable event in the theological world since the War has been the emergence of the Barthian school, whose leading exponents, besides Karl Barth, are Emil Brunner, Friedrich Gogarten, and Eduard Thurneysen. It is marked by a vigorous revival of the theology of the Reformers, expounded by men who are fully abreast of the critical and scientific thought of to-day. Its main points may be briefly indicated. It lays stress on the transcendence of God and the sinfulness and guilt of man. Revelation is God's gracious approach to man, not man's quest for God. Redemption is all of God; man has no power to redeem himself. All depends on faith and faith alone, but this faith becomes the most powerful, indeed the only real, ethical impulse. It should be added that these doctrines are expounded, not in the calm and detached spirit so characteristic of the critical theology of our time, but with a tremendous moral passion which at once arouses interest and carries conviction. To those who wish to make fuller acquaintance with the teachings of the Barthian school no better book can be recommended than *The Theology of Crisis*, by Professor H. Emil BRUNNER (Scribner's; 6s. net). Small in bulk, it is a garner full of the finest wheat. It makes much easier reading than Karl Barth's own work, and reveals BRUNNER as perhaps the best interpreter of the school.

In the introduction a strong plea is made for a return to serious theological thinking. 'Belief is the sap which creates the tree of life, with all its branches, big and little. . . . Among "Christians" and even among Christian theologians there are those who think that there are more urgent and practical tasks than that of theology, though theology has for its very problem the true understanding of human life. These people are like such gardeners as might think the branches of the tree more important than the sap because the branches are visible and the sap invisible.'

There follows some powerful and searching criticism of the theological thought of to-day, both Modernist and Fundamentalist. 'Christianity is either faith in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ or it is nothing. From this faith it derives its name, and has its peculiar content, its claim, its history. With it Christianity stands or falls. In the course of the last two centuries a process of transubstantiation has gone on which has resulted in something utterly distinct from Christian faith and theology. The science which is taught in most of our leading theological schools under the name of Christian theology ought rather to be called the science of religion. For the subject-matter is not the word of God, the revelation in Christ, but something totally different—religion, and perhaps revelation, in general. It seems very old-fashioned and unscientific to take theology in its original sense as the methodical study of the meaning of the word of God.' 'Truly, when the fundamentalists say that the modernists no longer hold the Christian faith, they are not far from telling the truth. . . . Modernism is by no means a newcomer in the realm of theology; it is even older than Christianity itself. It is essentially nothing more nor less than a repristination of later Platonism, either taking its form from the more ethically oriented Stoicism or from the Neoplatonic mysticism.'

The essence of this idealism is that man in the depths of his being is Divine, and that all he needs for salvation is the nurture of the Divine within him. If this be rejected as unchristian, are we driven back on the dilemma of being either scientific or Christian? BRUNNER holds that this dilemma is more apparent than real. 'Neither is the fundamentalist form of theology the same as Christian faith, nor is liberal Christianity truly scientific. Fundamentalism conflicts with science exactly because, and in so far as, it is not truly Christian; and liberal criticism is not truly Christian because, and in so far as, it is not truly critical. A third thesis may be added with propriety, namely, that only a Christian can be truly critical, and only he who is truly critical can be a Christian. The principles of true Christianity

and of true criticism are identical. Fundamentalism is a petrification of Christianity, and modernism is its dissolution.'

Much modern thinking is blind to the fact of human sin and guilt. Liberalism has ever affirmed that the heart of man is *not* evil. Evil merely clings to man's heart, as the barnacles to the ship's hull. Man, therefore, may move upward towards God, and redemption is not really necessary. 'Modernism and fundamentalism are born of the same mother, that is, of the fear of sound critical thinking. But, let me add, this fear belongs to all of us. It is essentially part of the "old man"; nay, it is his very essence. It is the pride of the man who will not stand in the judgment of God, who will not concede that he is, really and wholly, a sinner, whose only salvation is the grace of God. Modernism digs itself in, before this unheard-of demand for confession of sin, behind an easy-going belief in the goodness of man and humanity; fundamentalism finds safety behind its orthodoxy and its ecclesiasticism.' But the truth must be faced. Man is a sinner, guilty before God and powerless to achieve his own salvation. The movement must come from God, and it does come in the Incarnate Word, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Man can but accept in faith the salvation which God has wrought in Christ. 'This apprehension of our helplessness and hopelessness and of the need and desire of deliverance, the New Testament calls repentance. Repentance is despair of self, despairing of self-help in removing the guilt that we have brought upon us. Repentance means a radical turning away from self-reliance to trust in God alone. Yes, to repent means to recognize self-trust to be the heart of sin.'

Does not this emphasis on man's helplessness tend to destroy moral initiative? This is the old ethical objection to the gospel of free grace. It might be sufficient to answer that history repels the objection. 'The times in which men expected nothing of themselves but everything of God were the epochs in which the greatest deeds were done.' Treating the point at more length, how-

ever, BRUNNER advances and defends the thesis that 'the *sola gratia, sola fide, soli deo gloria* of the Christian faith, that is, the Pauline view of faith, is the only solid foundation for ethics.' It is the only conception that goes to the root of the ethical problem. 'For morality is a matter of inner life and not of outward behaviour. All non-Christian ethics viewed from this central point is a sort of behaviourism, since it is more concerned with the action than the actor. To quote again a word of Luther: "It is not good works that make a good man, but a good man who does good works": that is, first the man and then his works; first the stand and power and then the leap; first the pure blood and then the healthy body; first the heart and then the acts.'

'One of the most fatal errors in the history of theology is the identification of the Biblical idea of the Kingdom with the rationalistic evolution and the optimistic theory of progress of the eighteenth century.' What has happened? The spirit of the West has absorbed the Christian faith. 'Instead of standing above the time process and so really dominating it, the Church, forgetting that her conversation is in heaven, has been dragged down into the world and is now driven about with its flotsam, and will ultimately, if this continues, become mere flotsam herself. In this fatal process the Kingdom of God plays a disastrous rôle. In modern theology and preaching it has been given a meaning directly opposite to that of the New Testament. . . . In the New Testament it means exactly that which man cannot do—the miracle by which God *ends* history and fashions His creation in ways and forms beyond imagination, beyond historical analogies, and beyond the reach of ethical attainment. It is a matter of faith and hope, and not of man's doing. Faith and hope, of course, are meant to have practical results—social, world-transforming effects. But they will bring this about only in proportion to the degree of their reality, that is, as they proceed from faith in God and not in man. Faith in God's doing is the salt of the earth which may preserve the world against decay and death. Faith in man is the salt that has lost its savour. It may be produced

in large quantities by methods of social and educational psychology, but it is part of the world, and therefore cannot preserve it. No one will deny that we must have a live Church which has an actual word to speak in our muddled condition. But what is the use of a Church which, in order to be up-to-date, has ceased to be a Church? We are losing the foolishness of the gospel because we are ashamed of it; and we are substituting for it a modern religious ethical programme which seems to be better fitted to our generation, but which, in fact, is only the wisdom of man, has no moving power, and ends in mere fussiness.'

In a very suggestive article in the current *Congregational Quarterly* on 'The Doctrine of the Fallibility of Jesus,' the Rev. A. D. MARTIN deals with a subject of the most vital moment. Was Jesus fallible either religiously or morally? Let us not be in doubt as to the issue. If He is fallible, then the Catholic conception of His person goes, and with it His Divinity and His uniqueness and indeed Christianity as a religion and as we have received it.

Mr. MARTIN quotes Professor Kirsopp Lake, who says that as the infallible Bible has gone, and the infallible Church, so the infallible Jesus must go too, if only because of His apocalyptic (and erroneous) teaching, and His illusory expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God. But the real purpose of Mr. MARTIN's article is to deal with Dr. C. J. Cadoux's recent book on 'Catholicism and Christianity' and the passages in it bearing on the authority of Jesus. Apparently Dr. Cadoux is a believer neither in the religious nor in the moral perfection of Jesus.

Mr. MARTIN takes up Dr. Cadoux's points one by one. Some of these may be omitted as plainly not vital. But there are others that are vital. One is Jesus' prediction that He would return 'on the clouds within the space of one generation.' Mr. MARTIN contends that the language of Jesus here, as elsewhere, was poetic and symbolic. The dream

visions of *Enoch*, brilliantly imaginative descriptions of the heavenly world, can never have been meant to be taken literally. And this may be said of the apocalyptic literature generally. Why then literalize the words and pictures of Jesus? If His words are poetic and symbolic, then we can see also how great a *truth* His apocalyptic utterances contained.

It must be emphasized that if Jesus was mistaken in the main assertion He makes in these passages, then this mistake reveals a judgment that is not at one with the councils of God. 'Let us face facts,' says Mr. MARTIN. 'One of the amazing things to those of us who stand outside the high circles of scholarship, and claim no more than to be students of the New Testament, is the blindness or indifference of some great scholars to the consequences of their doctrines . . . the world will never be won into loyalty for a Lord who is shown to be a deluded enthusiast, however noble His sincerity and final martyrdom.'

Another question on which Dr. Cadoux finds the teaching of Jesus erroneous is that of eschatology, Gehenna fire and eternal punishment. This belief he stigmatizes as 'not only intellectually incredible, but morally outrageous.' Mr. MARTIN rather suggests that Dr. Cadoux is mistaken in thinking that Jesus actually held and taught this doctrine. Possibly. A case can be made out for that view. But even if He did hold it, is there not a great and solemn truth in the doctrine? If a soul clings to its sin, so that the sin becomes part of the fibre and being of the soul, can anything else than 'eternal punishment' describe its destiny? So long as a person holds to his sin, his suffering lasts. Sin and suffering are inseparable, and if a sinner goes on holding to his sin, he goes on suffering inevitably. To assert dogmatically that he must suffer only for a time is to deny any such thing as freedom. We are at liberty to sin, and go on sinning, and therefore eternal punishment is a dread possibility.

Mr. MARTIN turns from religious fallibility to moral imperfection. Dr. Cadoux doubts the sin-

lessness of Jesus. If He was sinless, why did He accept the baptism of repentance at John's hands? And why did He refuse to be called 'good' on the ground that only God can be good? And why did the author of Hebrews say that He 'learned obedience by the things that he suffered'? As to the last, it is surely obvious that the learning in Jesus' case did not imply disobedience. And that such an idea was far from the mind of the writer of Hebrews is clear from his own assertion that Jesus 'was in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin.'

The words of Jesus to the rich young ruler refusing the title 'good' are explained by Mr. MARTIN ingeniously. Jesus said that we have all only one Father—God, and that we are not to call any man father on the earth. If we are to be quite literal, like Dr. Cadoux, this would mean that no one was ever to call his parent 'father' again. But does any one imagine such literalism to be the truth? Surely it means that God is so ideal a Father that by a paradox no one else has the right to the title. The words 'why callest thou me good,' etc., are an exact parallel.

This is very interesting. But may a simpler explanation not suffice? Mr. MARTIN hints at this himself when he speaks of 'the perhaps glib salutation, *Good Master*.' If it was glib and facile, did not Jesus wish to test the spirit of the young man? He often did this: witness His severe words to the would-be disciples in Lk 9—'What do you mean by good?' And why do you call Me 'good'? One is good—God. Why do you use such a term to Me? If Jesus meant to test the youth, is not His language sufficiently explained? As to His acceptance of the Baptism of John, is not this explained by the desire of Jesus to be identified in every way with the sons of men?

But apart from details of this kind, the language of Jesus about Himself is quite incompatible with a sense of sin. He was always severe and exacting about the fulfilment of duty. His standard was very high, His demands very searching. Yet never once was He known to confess any fault

in Himself, or (which is the very characteristic of sainthood) to acknowledge that only by the grace of God was He what He was. Contrast all this with St. Paul. And also remember the claim of Jesus, repeatedly made, that He Himself was to be the final Judge of men. Could such a claim be made by any sane being who knew Himself to be in any degree imperfect?

Mr. MARTIN has a fine passage in summing up the issue. Dr. Cadoux, after all his doubts and denials, would have us regard Jesus as uniquely Divine. But this is mere mental confusion, into which the plain man will refuse to be drawn. The only sense in calling Jesus Divine is to say something of Him which you can say of nobody else. The essence of the Divine is perfect holiness. That is what separates men (all men) from God. And that means an unflinching will and a mind that harbours no unworthy thought. This is what we say of Jesus, that He *always* willed the good, that He enjoyed unclouded fellowship and oneness with the Father because He was one with the good.

There are many things in the Bible we may be disposed to hold as doubtful. We may doubt the historical accuracy of the Gospels in detail. We may even believe that the stories of the Lord's birth are not part of the original Apostolic tradition. But when we lay hands on the sacred ark, the unique, infallible, Divine nature of Jesus Christ, we take away that 'which leaves us poor indeed.' We take away the foundation of any gospel of the grace of God. Such a Saviour as Jesus Christ, the holy, the Divine, 'became us,' because He was 'separate from sinners.' And the giving of such a Saviour is infinitely becoming to God.

The title of a book has something to do with its fate. With an apt or arresting title, it has at least a chance to make its way among those whom it concerns. We are not sure that Mr. Robert J. HUTCHEON was wise in accepting the suggestion of his friends for the title of his book, *Frankness in Religion* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net), instead of

boldly devising one for himself. As he truly says, the title indicates the spirit rather than the contents of the book. But we are sure that he could have improved upon this by the discovery of a title which would have done more justice to the contents and perhaps even to the spirit.

For we hasten to say that this is a first-rate book. It is more than frank—it is courageous, with just the sort of courage that is needed to-day by religious thinkers in view of the new atmosphere created not only by historical criticism—with that we have now been familiar for a good while—but by psychology. The writer believes that ‘the great historical Christian system is in rapid decay’: but while he is critical, he is also constructive. He has helpful suggestions to make at every point of his varied discussion, and they are all the more helpful because he is well aware that the ultimate problems of life cannot be solved by thought alone. The heart has its reasons as well as the head, and in any large estimate of life the one has as good a right to be heard as the other.

A list of a few of the subjects dealt with will show how comprehensive Mr. HUTCHEON’s discussion is—‘The Psychological Origin of Religion,’ ‘Revelation and Inspiration as Moments in the Creative Process,’ ‘Mysticism, its Limits and Present Possibilities,’ ‘Salvation as the Organization of Character,’ ‘What Makes the Bible Unique?’ ‘The Nature and Value of Faith,’ ‘The Person and Work of Jesus Christ,’ ‘The Meaning of God in Modern Thought,’ ‘Morality without Supernatural Sanctions.’ The very titles suggest in some cases the courage and unconventionality of the treatment.

The book is in effect a criticism of the current or traditional conception of religion and a plea for a re-examination and re-expression of it more in accordance with the modern mind. This is a task which the Church for quite intelligible reasons has been reluctant to assume, but such a reluctance, if persisted in, may well alienate some of the noblest minds in the community. ‘It is,’ as Mr. HUTCHEON says, ‘one of the immense calamities of history that the Church has been so conservative, so

wedded to its ancient creeds, so unprogressive in its ethical program.’

Certainly no one will accuse Mr. HUTCHEON of timidity in his criticism or reconstruction. We need, he tells us, not only a new valuation of the Bible, but a new valuation of Jesus; and here are some of the challenging things he says in this connexion. ‘We must make the Cross represent not merely the sacrifice of one heroic spiritual personality but the sacrifices for noble ends of all the spiritual heroes of all races and of all times’ (p. 127). ‘It is historically true that the Cross has concealed Jesus from the world rather than revealed Him’ (p. 241). The Christian theologian ‘has tied up his recognition of the spiritual greatness of Jesus to a theological dogma which has robbed Jesus of His real humanity. Hence, instead of regarding Jesus as the first among many brethren and thus doing justice to the original spiritual element in all noble men, he has made the many brethren too utterly dependent on the one great brother’ (p. 256). Again, ‘Paul’s doctrine of the Cross is not a step in advance of Jesus or the prophets, but a step backward. It is an attempt to interpret the significance of Jesus in the terms of a system of thought which the prophets and Jesus repudiated’ (p. 242); and the interminable theological controversies about the Person of Christ have deflected attention from His supreme value as ‘a living example of the will to righteousness.’

All this is challenging enough, and Mr. HUTCHEON is well aware that any attempt at re-statement will be hotly resented by minds of the traditional sort. Nevertheless he pursues his way through his long argument with a fine sense of perspective and with a profound appreciation of the spiritual values which, in the end, are the things of ultimate importance to the traditionalists themselves. His reverence for Jesus, for example, is not a whit less than theirs. But in his re-statement he concentrates upon the prophetic quality of the Bible and gives short shrift to its ritual and sacerdotal aspects. ‘Refine their [*i.e.* Protestant Fundamentalists] doctrine of the atonement through the blood of Christ as they may, it derives from the cultus and

not from the ethical faith of the prophets.' Mr. HUTCHEON is alive to 'The Values of Worship,' on which he writes an admirable chapter; but in his attitude to essential religion, he resolutely takes his place beside the prophet, not beside the priest.

It is interesting to compare his treatment of Mysticism with that of Professor Rufus M. Jones in his recently published volume on 'Some Exponents of Mysticism,' noticed elsewhere in this number. Mr. HUTCHEON agrees with Professor Morgan that the mystic's profundity is 'a sham profundity.' The mystic is attempting to soar into regions inaccessible to man on his present level of being. The world into which the Bible introduces us is not the world into which we are ushered by the writings of the mystics. 'In attempting to transcend himself and the world the mystic only lands in the abyss.'

The challenges in which this book abounds are all inspired by a thoroughly constructive motive. It is because he has so supreme a regard for the spiritual values represented by religion that Mr. HUTCHEON desires such an intellectual apprehension and expression—he would hardly say formulation—of them as will commend itself to the modern

mind. Nothing, for example, could be more to the point than his salutary and far from unnecessary warning to teachers and students in theological schools. It is possible, he reminds them, to concentrate so severely upon questions of archæology, Biblical criticism, documentary analysis, the Synoptic problem, and so forth, as to leave little or no time for the presentation of the one thing which constitutes, after all, the *raison d'être* of the Bible, namely, 'the religious faith and moral passion which made the prophets and psalmists what they were.'

This is a stimulating and valuable book, especially searching on its psychological side. It will stir the blood of those who desire to play their part in the necessary task of clothing the great inheritance of the past in a modern dress. But far more than new formulations of truth, however admirably adapted to our own age, do we need a new access of life, a new elevation of spirit. Most of us will therefore agree with Mr. HUTCHEON that 'the greatest need among educated circles is not for more knowledge but for more life, more kindling power, more moral drive, more confidence in moral ideals and more mystic fervour in presenting them to others.'

God and Mr. Middleton Murry.

BY CHARLES E. RAVEN, D.D., CANON OF LIVERPOOL AND CHAPLAIN TO THE KING.

EVER since the publication of Mr. William James' Gifford Lectures, the argument from mystic experience has been the refuge of the Christian apologist. The breakdown of the scholastic system with the triumph of the inductive method, the breakdown of Biblical Protestantism under the assaults of historical and critical study, the failure of constructive theologians to popularize the results of their labours, have combined to create bewilderment in the Churches. The reaction against materialism, the distrust of analysis, and of intellectualism, and the need for a restated religion,

have opened the way to interest in the esoteric. In the appeal to a direct and unarguable conviction, such as mysticism claimed to supply, there seemed to be a sanctuary inviolable. A murmur of the word 'numinous,' a reference to Plotinus or St. Theresa, an allusion to the dark night of the soul—and we could dispense with the effort to think out our faith, and could justify any superstition by its power to evoke rapture.

It has long been evident to many of us that this relapse into the anti-rational would be short-lived or else disastrous. Far-sighted theologians, like