

APPENDIX A TO CHAPTER IV

BY much the best recent review known to me, of the matters contained in this chapter, is that in Professor John Baillie's volume on *The Interpretation of Religion*, pp. 256-380, where the argument is traced in masterly fashion from Kant through Fichte, Lotze, Ritschl and Herrmann. I have found Professor Baillie's own analysis of the implications of moral obligation in this volume and, in more summary form, in his inaugural address on induction to the chair of Theology in Union Seminary,¹ New York, very illuminating, and am much indebted to them in the statement given in the text. I agree with him as to the central importance of the moral consciousness in any reasoned modern statement of Theism, and accept his definition of elementary faith as a "moral trust in Reality," but think there is more in the religious consciousness than can be contained within the moral awareness of the Divine. We have to take full account of man's intuitive trust in the gods whom he has worshipped, as well as of his sense of obligation and responsibility to them.

¹ Published in brochure form.

APPENDIX B TO CHAPTER VII

THE whole type of argument for the spiritual and purposive character of the world developed in the earlier part of this volume is so radically countered by Professor Barth, the most prominent representative of the Dialectical school of theology, that some reference to that theology seemed necessary in the text.

Except, however, to those who are acquainted with the peculiar situation in Germany, Barth's criticisms of "natural theology" are hardly intelligible to readers in this country. When we think of "natural theology" in English-speaking lands we think of the inferences which must be drawn from the physical character of the natural world, or, to use the term less appropriately, of the implications of universal moral human experience.

But in Germany to-day there has suddenly arisen a "natural religion" and a "natural theology" of a different type, which believes that it finds a true revelation of God in the national genius and history of the Germanic races, and which seeks to accommodate the revelation of God in Christ to this other revelation. Owing to historical accidents this racial mysticism has been able to gain a dominant political and educational position, and has put all the Christian Churches in a position of acute danger.

The Dialectical theology which is in the main to be understood as a vehement *émeute* against the secularising tendencies of modern thought which have for long been tending to reduce the Biblical revelation from its claim to absoluteness and finality, has found its most prominent spokesman in Karl Barth. He has, however, taken up so extreme a position in opposition to this racial mysticism that the Dialectical theologians can no longer be regarded as a united school, his friend and former ally, Emil Brunner of Zurich, being now one of his sharpest critics.

Barth repudiates altogether every form of "natural theology," holding that sin has destroyed the image of God in man, and so prevented man from gaining any real knowledge of God either from His works in Nature, or His voice in conscience. Nor can there be any real knowledge of God apart from the Bible revelation in any human being. The saints and prophets of heathendom, Socrates, Gautama, Plato, were unvisited by any revelation of Him or His message. Nor can the true missionary recognise any real point of contact in the noblest representative of heathen religion to whom he comes. As there is in such a man no real knowledge of God there can be no real point of contact.

It is much easier to understand how in the heart of a great struggle with a threatened national apostasy from Christian faith a prophetic spirit like Barth's should have reached such a position, than to justify it. There does not seem to be any adequate ground for it in Scripture, and it is plainly against the Logos teaching of the Johannine

writings. The prevailing tone of the New Testament missionaries seems to be expressed in the Pauline saying, "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you." Much of our weightiest and most efficient modern missionary testimony is against it, and would rather sympathise with the saying of a very successful and much honoured missionary, "I never yet preached the Gospel to a heathen audience but I found that the Spirit of God had been there before me."

It surely gives a most dreary view of human history that in all the countless ages before the Old Testament revelation began, and in all the immense populations of the unevangelised world, the Universal Father never spoke to anyone of the ruined human race and showed him something of Himself. Finally, if the Divine Image is utterly destroyed in every unconverted human being, does not Bishop Talbot's penetrating question (footnote, page 181) go to the very heart of the matter? Can any true and final revelation be recognised as such that does not corroborate something that is there before? Can there be revelation that is not corroboration? If we have no glimmerings within us of the knowledge of God, how can we recognise His Son as the fulness of His glory? Can the Divine Image in man really be destroyed without the destruction of the essential personality? To answer these questions rightly will carry us far into the real meaning both of Faith and Resolution.