

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 *Canadian Journal of Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_canadian-journal.php

Christian Attitudes to Other Religions

R. H. L. SLATER

WHERE is there any likeness between the disciple of Greece and the disciple of heaven? . . . Away with all proposals for a Stoic, a Platonic or a Dialectic Christianity! After Christ Jesus, after the gospel, we want no other creed.¹ Tertullian's classic diatribe expresses an attitude which has persisted throughout Christian history and found new and equally vehement statement in our own day.

In strong contrast, there is Clement of Alexandria's appreciation of pagan wisdom. "It may be, indeed, that philosophy was given to the Greeks directly and primarily, until the Lord should call the Greeks. For philosophy was a 'schoolmaster' to bring the Greek mind to Christ, as the Law brought the Hebrews . . . a preparation, paving the way towards perfection in Christ."² This attitude, too, has persisted throughout Christian history and has its modern exponents, just as emphatic as those who maintain the rival opinion.

The consequent debate has been enlarged and accentuated by a wider reference which includes the beliefs of other religions, especially Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam. It is a debate which vitally concerns the younger churches of Asia, confronted by a resurgence of these great rivals of the Christian faith. In situations complicated by local patriotism and new respect for indigenous cultures and traditions, must the Christian stand alone, apparently antagonistic, obliged to say an uncompromising "No" to every non-Christian belief? Can he not, and should he not, without disloyalty to Christ, say at times a more accommodating "Yes," acknowledging and welcoming basic agreements? From Western academies where theologians debate the premises which may decide the answers to such questions there is only divided counsel. Small wonder if the leaders of the younger churches are sometimes both confused and impatient. "These questions may seem academic to some people," said one of them at a recent conference; "for us they are a matter of life and death."

Others besides the younger churches, it might be said, have cause to regard this question as urgent. It concerns the home-town evangelist here in the West as vitally as the missionary abroad. If scepticism is on the way out, its place is often taken by a relativism encouraged by the greater knowledge of other religions which is a feature of our day. On my desk as I write this article, there is a letter from the rector of a country parish asking me for a book which will enable him to convert some of his parishioners from the belief that Christianity should give place to a new, hybrid religion. It

1. Tertullian, *Apol.* XLIV; *de praescript. haeret.* VII.

2. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1. V. 28.

does not pass unnoticed, in the student world and elsewhere, when a scholar so publicised as Toynbee admits his vacillation between Christianity and Buddhism.

A situation of such general challenge calls for answer. Nor have answers been lacking. Stimulated by catastrophic events, by new prophets among the theologians and consequent controversies on the nature of Revelation, and, in particular perhaps, by the urgent debates of three great missionary conferences, Edinburgh (1910), Jerusalem (1928), and Tambaran (1938), discussion has steadily gained momentum since the turn of the century. It is the purpose of this present article to estimate the direction of this discussion. Who leads today, Tertullian or Clement? What new questions and insights are there, if any?

First reports certainly seem to indicate that it is Tertullian who is now master of the field, with banners flying, though the name is changed to Kraemer, with Barth and Brunner as his commissariat and some unexpected allies.

Earlier in the century it was otherwise. The Alexandrian or liberal spirit was in the ascendant. There were Christian missionaries who went so far as to suggest an 'Old Testament' for converts from Hinduism and Buddhism which would include selections from the Hindu *Bhagavadgita* and the Buddhist *Dhammapada* side by side with selections from the Psalms, the Pentateuch and the Prophets. Christianity was presented as the "fulfilment" of the true aspirations and approximate concepts of the great non-Christian traditions. At the Jerusalem missionary conference values found in other religions were favourably compared with Christian values. "The Confucian literature," it was said, "can nobly supplement the Old Testament in leading its students to Christ," while Dr. Reischauer of Japan remarked that "the more he studied non-Christian systems the more he found in them a reaching out towards the great things of the Gospel."³ Already, however, the pendulum of opinion was moving in the opposite direction. The Tertullians present at the conference vigorously questioned the validity and possible results of this regard for similarities. "We fear," said a German professor, "that the central task of missions is in danger of being lost to view by paralleling real or imaginary spiritual values, attractive though this method is for the professor of comparative religion."⁴

One interesting reflection of these discussions is a typical attempt by Archbishop William Temple to reconcile the two divergent opinions in his comment on the Johannine Prologue. He gives a reference to the Jerusalem report, which was very largely his own work, and virtually quotes it. His comment, as will be seen, begins with a very Alexandrian statement, but ends with a significant qualification.

"All that is noble in the non-Christian systems of thought, or conduct, or worship," says Temple, "is the work of Christ upon them and within them. By the

3. "The Christian Life and Message." *Report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the I.M.C.*, Vol. I. (O.U.P., 1928), p. 81; p. 350.

4. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 354.

word of God—that is to say, by Jesus Christ—Isaiah and Plato, and Zoroaster, and Buddha, and Confucius conceived and uttered such truths as they declared. There is only one divine Light; and every man in his measure is enlightened by it. . . . Yet this light is not recognized for what it is. . . . It has to shine through veils of prejudice and obsession . . . and when it blazes out more fully, men refuse it. *For these reasons it is true both that Christ is indeed the Desire of All Nations, and yet that He is always more and other than men desire until they learn of Him. To come to Him is always an act of self-surrender as well as of self-fulfilment, and must be first experienced as self-surrender.*"⁵

In the decade which followed the Jerusalem conference, the qualification expressed in these last sentences had so developed in emphasis and influence that it dominated discussion at the Tambaran meeting in 1938. One reason for this was the increasing impact of neo-orthodox theology with its insistence on the unique character of the Biblical revelation. Another reason was the change in the whole background of world events. At Jerusalem, Christians were urged not only to recognise the true insights in other religions, but to join hands with them against the rising tide of secular materialism, which was described as the common enemy of all religions. At the Tambaran assembly, such counsel, in the face of the new situation produced by the pseudo-religions of Nazi Socialism and Communism, seemed to many to be the height of unreason. A third major influence was a book written in preparation for Tambaran by Dr. Hendrik Kraemer,—a book commended by Archbishop Temple as "likely to remain for many years the classical treatment of its theme."⁶

II

Time has fully verified the Archbishop's opinion; the influence of Dr. Kraemer's book on all subsequent treatment of this subject has been so extensive that no attempt to estimate the direction of present day thought can be made without a special consideration of Kraemer's position. This is true even if it is allowed that Kraemer does not stand alone but is representative of, and influenced by, that whole school of theological opinion which is generally called Neo-orthodox and might perhaps be more properly called neo-Protestant. Kraemer writes as one who is deeply aware that he lives in a time of transition, in a world under judgment—Divine judgment, including the religious world and Christianity within that world; a judgment made known through the searchlight of a re-discovered Biblical theology.

Essential to his whole approach is what he terms a "Biblical realism" which goes behind the terms of man-made theology, ("our so-called 'Christian' thinking") to the Biblical terms of revelation and its personal apprehension, "radically religious . . . radically theocentric."⁷ This distinction between the language of faith and the language of intellectual interpretation

5. W. Temple, *Readings in St. John's Gospel*, First Series (Macmillan, 1941), Ch. I, pp. 10, 11. Italics mine.

6. H. Kraemer, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (Edinburgh House Press, 1938), Foreword, p. ix.

7. *Ibid.*, Ch. III, p. 63.

is important and has far-reaching consequences both for his approach to other religions and the elucidation of the Christian premises which determine this approach. In words which recall Barth's "strange new world of the Bible" Kraemer speaks of the realities asserted by the Bible: the reality of man confronted by "the Living, eternally-active God . . . the Lord of History"—not the God known to philosophy, or even theology, but known only to faith; a reality which offends man and challenges all his "various endeavours for self-redemption"—"all philosophy, all idealistic religion, all consistent mystical religion, all moralism;" a reality which shows the futility of these endeavours because it reveals not only God but man, man as he really is, in all "his greatness and his misery," man evading God, man "perverted by a radical self-centredness" which "permeates all his achievements."⁸ This is the truth of the human situation made known through the coming of Christ and attested in the Bible, a truth concerning God and a truth concerning man.

Thus Kraemer's approach may be said to start from two polar premises, inter-related, and it is the second premise perhaps which more directly produces the distinctive features of his analysis—the premise concerning man. It is a premise which affirms man's "dialectical condition," his "fundamental and horrid disharmony." There is no denial of man's genuine religious apprehensions. Some of his religious and moral achievements can even be described as sublime. He can develop great cultures and great civilizations. His "possibilities and abilities shine in the lofty religious and ethical systems that he has produced and tried to live by."⁹ Nor is there denial that these achievements may be related to God's "revelatory working."¹⁰ But what the Christian knows in the light of Revelation is that the best that man can do as well as the worst that he can do is subject to Divine judgment because it is vitiated by sin.

Outside the Christian pale, saint and sage, no less than the "ordinary" sinner need conversion.¹¹ And inside the Christian pale, too, there is similar need—if we are thinking only of empirical Christianity. For here, also, the truth can be evaded, the best corrupted. The science of comparative religions, indeed, leads us to admit some traits in other religions which are even superior to those found in Christianity "in its historical manifestation."¹² Then in what better case, it may be asked, is the Christian than his Hindu or Buddhist neighbour? Kraemer answers: "There is only one great differentiation between empirical Christianity and the other faiths. Empirical Christianity has stood and stands under continuous and direct influence and judgment of the revelation of Christ and is in virtue thereof in a different position from the other religions."¹³

It is this condition, and this condition alone, which makes the Christian an evangelist. It is this awareness which provides the Christian with his criterion, enabling him, nay obliging him, to pronounce "no weak or meek

8. *Ibid.*, Ch. III, pp. 65, 67, 70, 74 ff.

10. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 122.

12. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 109.

9. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 113.

11. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 120.

13. *Ibid.*, Ch. V, p. 145.

judgment" on religious perversity, wherever it is perceived, while recognising all that is magnificently good. Thus the Christian attitude to other faiths, as to the world in general, may be described as *dialectical*—"the combination of a fierce 'yes' and at the same time a fierce 'no.'"¹⁴

A critic might aver that there is a good deal more of the fierce "No" than the fierce "Yes" in Kraemer's treatment of these other faiths. Examining one system after another, he says: No, there is no real preparation here for the truth revealed in Christ. The naturalistic monism of Hinduism can only be met by a "No," and even the God of the Bhakti tradition must be rejected, since he is not the God of *Holy* love. In Buddhism, as in Hinduism, man is really the measure of all things and this is the fundamental accent even in the doctrine of salvation by faith propounded by the "Japanese Luther," so again the word is "No." As to Islam, radically theocentric indeed, arising "in the shadow of Biblical realism," "taking God as God with awful seriousness," the idea of Revelation, externalized and fossilized, means the substitution of "a set of immutable divine words" for the God who acts, and this affects even Ghazali, "one of the deepest apologists of religion that have ever lived," so here, too, the word is "No"—though perhaps a more hesitant "No."¹⁵

One reason for this estimate is the fact that Dr. Kraemer's dialectical approach is combined with what he calls a "totalitarian" approach. In every religion there is "some fundamental essential apprehension of the totality of life."¹⁶ In other words, the significance of any religious picture will depend on what is put in the centre. It is, therefore, futile to take two pictures, one Hindu, the other Christian, and observe that there are the same saints and vagabonds in both foregrounds if in the one all eyes are turned to a mysterious Light around a dark Cross on a dark hill, and in the other they are simply looking at their own reflection in a gigantic mirror.

But if this is the case, where do we look for any dialectical "Yes" or point of contact? A confusing problem, says Dr. Kraemer, and his own reply is not free from confusion. In one place there is the suggestion that it is all a matter of time and circumstance, a "No" today and "Yes" tomorrow; "the answer . . . depends wholly on the concrete circumstances of a given period."¹⁷ In another place, however, there is the suggestion that the "Yes" is to be given to "a groping for God which throbs in the misdirection which governs all religious life," enabling a Christian to feel that there are kindred insights as well as kindred aspirations in such a scripture as the *Bhagavadgita*.¹⁸ This may either mean that the dialectical "No" to each religion considered in totality is accompanied by a faint "Yes" to the half-truths lost in its context—an opinion Dr. Kraemer appears to reject—or that the "Yes" may be given to this or that individual's personal faith and experience despite his professed and misdirecting Credo.¹⁹

14. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 104.

16. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 136.

18. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 139; cf. pp. 130, 137.

19. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, pp. 123, 134 ff., 140.

15. *Ibid.*, Chs. V, VI, pp. 141 ff.

17. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 103.

To all this may be added Kraemer's insistence, at first confusing, then illuminating, that all apparent similarities are really dissimilarities; "points of contact . . . can only be found by antithesis,"²⁰ which may mean, among other things, that what should most concern us are the *challenges* of other faiths.

On one point Kraemer is very clear and emphatic: the challenge of the great non-Christian systems of life and thought at the present day is such that there can be no question of compromise or accommodation, no traffic with syncretism or relativism, no building on the half-truths or distorted truths of rival systems, no theories of "fulfilment"—"fulfilment is not the term to characterize the relation of the revelation in Christ to the non-Christian religions,"²¹—no vain and futile comparisons, no proposals for a Stoic, a Platonic, a Hindu or a Buddhist Christianity. There can only be a return to the Biblical realism which confronts all who know it with the counter-challenge, not of religion, not even of the Christian religion, but of "the creative and redemptive will of the living, holy, righteous God of Love, the exclusive ground of nature and history, of man and the world."²²

Dr. Kraemer's influence was immediately evident in the Tambaran reports. Statements affirming the valuable elements in non-Christian traditions were qualified by the strong affirmation that Christ is the norm and "all values must be tested before God in Christ." As an introduction to the Christian Gospel, the Old Testament had no rivals, and attempts to make this Gospel intelligible to Hindus and others must never be allowed to impair its integrity. At the same time, it was realized that the questions raised in the course of the Tambaran discussions pointed the need for further consideration and "united study."²³ Many have thought since that this need has still to be met. When the World Council of Churches met at Evanston, steps were taken which led to a further consultation at Davos, Switzerland, in the summer of the following year. While this consultation did not result in any significant pronouncements, it at least served to point the urgency of the situation and it perhaps indicated the possibility of some basic agreements.

III

In the meantime, however, there have been a number of individual statements which show the continued impact of Kraemer's doctrine and related theological discussions. Prominent among these is Professor Farmer's "theological interpretation" of religious types, the subject of his Gifford lectures.²⁴ Dr. Farmer makes only two explicit references to Kraemer's book, but there are many passages and conclusions which recall the earlier work. In both cases, the starting point is essentially the same: the Christian experience of

20. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, pp. 136, 139.

21. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 123.

22. *Ibid.*, Ch. II, p. 83.

23. "The World Mission of the Church": *Findings and Recommendations of the Meeting of the I.M.C.*, Tambaran, 1938 (I.M.C.), V, pp. 51, 52.

24. H. H. Farmer, *Revelation and Religion* (Nisbet, 1954).

Divine Revelation centred in Christ. In both cases, the notion of a purely detached, objective study is rejected; Farmer describes it as an *ignis fatuus*.²⁵ For the Christian, it is his experience of God revealed in Christ which should determine his estimate of other religions. In both cases, consideration of the effects of sin qualifies anticipation of what is to be found in other religions, though Farmer's expectation is the larger: we should expect to find, he says, that *all* the elements of true religion tend to be present, obscure, maybe,—“faint, fleeting, germinal or perverted,”—but nevertheless there, since God is seeking man everywhere.²⁶ Farmer's affinity with Kraemer is further evident in his distinction between natural religion and natural theology. There are, indeed, significant differences. Where Kraemer turns to Biblical realism for his premises, for example, Farmer turns to the implications of Christian worship. But the attitude of both to other religions is very much the same.

Even among those whose approach would be regarded as more liberal, some basic agreements with Kraemer's position may be observed. Dr. E. C. Dewick, for instance, who is much more disposed to welcome fellow-travellers in other traditions, affirms that “in Christ we find the highest and fullest truth about God and man—a *central* truth that must determine our judgments on all the major issues of religions, and a *distinctive* truth that is not to be found with equal clearness elsewhere.”²⁷

Before we conclude, however, that Tertullian is indeed master of the field today, two observations are pertinent. The first is the fact that a distinction can and should be drawn between Kraemer's dialectical attitude and Tertullian's straight “No.” Thus we have at least three, not two, attitudes to other religions, all of them claiming to be Christian. Some would make a further analysis and name five attitudes.²⁸

Secondly, it may be said that in this article we have only surveyed a narrow field. While there is good reason to observe the theological debates associated with the three great missionary conferences of our day, there are other statements which influence a wider public opinion. Not all of these statements are directly addressed to the issue of the relation between Christianity and its rivals, but they are none the less relevant. Among these we may name Canon Raven's Gifford lectures. While he is more specifically concerned with the reconciliation of Science and Religion, Canon Raven encourages a standpoint which, if accepted, strongly supports a liberal attitude to non-Christian traditions. As he himself explicitly affirms: “to trace, as Clement of Alexandria . . . loved to do, the ‘many coloured wisdom’ of God in His works, . . . to find points of contact with Christian doctrine and experience in the writings of the sages of India and China, of Persia and Arabia, this is not to diminish the unique significance of the Christ but to

25. *Ibid.*, Ch. III, p. 43.

26. *Ibid.*, Ch. IV, p. 86.

27. E. C. Dewick, *The Christian Attitude to Other Religions* (C.U.P., 1953), V, p. 137.

28. Cf., D. T. Niles, *An Evangelizing Church* (World Student Christian Federation), IV, p. 5.

magnify His glory and confirm His claim.”²⁹ Of another theologian, Paul Tillich, who today is exercising an increasing influence on Christian thought, it may be said that the more his doctrine of correlation is accepted—and understood—the stronger will be the “Yes” to other religions on the part of those who adopt the dialectical attitude.

But perhaps the greatest influence of all in this liberal direction is not that of a theologian, but that of the historian, Arnold Toynbee. Toynbee’s more recent pronouncements are directly related to this issue and they are certainly challenging. Earlier conclusions from his monumental survey of world history were relayed with approval from many Christian pulpits. All that he said about the persistence of the Church and its role in human history encouraged a new respect for the Christian faith and revived confidence in its future progress. Toynbee’s more recent volumes, however, reveal the fact that his own respect is not confined to the Christian faith. It includes all the higher religions; they recite, he says, the same “heavenly music,” they refract the same Divine light. He regards the claim that Christianity is an exclusive or definitive revelation of spiritual truth as blasphemous;³⁰ it results from regression to an Old Testament pattern, and the substitution of “the incongruous Israelitish concept of ‘the jealous God’ Yahweh” for the Christian concept of the God of Love.³¹ Christian charity demands a more liberal attitude, and it is so liberal that Toynbee can hope for a day when there will be “a reconciliation, *on Christian initiative*, between hitherto exclusive-minded religions,”³² a day which will be an eclectic’s paradise, when each will seek where he will and believe what he likes, in the light of his greater knowledge of other traditions than his own. Does Toynbee speak as a Christian? He admits frankly that his approach is not in Christian terms, as generally and previously understood. But it is clear that he himself believes it to be much more Christian than some of the opinions he describes; he considers that his attitude is justified by Christian premises, properly understood. It is also clear that his interpretation of these premises has been stimulated by what he has found in other religions including the spirit of tolerance which he calls “the characteristic virtue” of Mahayana Buddhism and Hinduism.³³

Toynbee writes in a day when more and more books on other religions are being published at popular prices and many are influenced thereby to a similar conclusion. Another reason for this conclusion is the growing concern for world peace. To a great many people it seems axiomatic that Religion should be on the side of peace and intolerable that a conflict of religions should menace this peace.

With such a spirit abroad, and exponents so influential as Raven and Toynbee, it can scarcely be said that Tertullian is entirely master of the field or the Alexandrines vanquished and silent.

29. Charles E. Raven, *Experience and Interpretation* (C.U.P., 1953), I, p. 19.

30. Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, Vol. VII (O.U.P., 1954), Part VII, pp. 428 ff., 444.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 439.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 441. Italics mine.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 440.

IV

Tertullian, then, still speaks, but so does Clement, and the home-town evangelists faced by the challenge of relativism no less than the urgent churches of Asia concerned with the missionary situation, may perhaps conclude that they have long to wait before they can hope for less divided counsel. It is true that attention may be called to certain surface agreements, as when it is remarked that all Christians emphasize the supremacy of Christ. On examination, however, such agreements prove little more than verbal, and they are often accompanied by inferences or denials which maintain the cleavage of opinion.

It is more illuminating and encouraging to look beneath the surface of our modern discussions, ignoring for the moment the discrepant conclusions and regarding instead the ground surveyed in the process of reaching these conclusions. It may then appear that there has been a significant change, which affects different schools of thought, in the estimate of what a previous generation termed "Christian evidences" or, more broadly, "religious evidences." In particular we may observe the very general recognition of what we may term *depth religion*. By this term is meant the whole realm of reference which is indicated when a distinction is made between the language of faith and the language of theological or philosophical explanation; between the connotation of such terms as 'theocentric' and 'theological'; between religions considered as systems of belief and religions considered and studied as total systems of life and faith most variously expressed. Both the Biblical realists and their liberal opponents make this same recognition, though in different ways.

Nothing makes the liberal advocate more uneasy than the kind of appeal to Biblical realism which appears to desert the discipline of reason for a cloudy region of confused paradox, magnifying the *skandalon* of faith in a way which seems to override all legitimate investigation and criticism. But a more searching analysis of this position may lead to the conclusion that this "strange new world of the Bible" to which attention is directed is not so different from that larger world of religious faith and practice which the liberal himself acknowledges when he allows his approach to the subject to be influenced by modern developments in the sciences of comparative religion, psychology and sociology. He may be the more disposed to make this analysis when he considers that the Biblical reference has led at least some of its exponents towards a more sympathetic appreciation of non-Christian traditions. While still hesitant about "points of contact" between rival systems of belief or interpretation, they are prepared to consider the possibility of points of contact in the more personal faith of this or that individual; between faith, so to speak, within Faith. In allowing this, they do more than acknowledge that human need and human aspiration are much the same everywhere. They are saying that the God denied or misrepresented on the surface plane of intellectual interpretation may yet be known in the depths.

The science of Comparative Religion today points in a similar direction, calling attention to the many-sided cultural expressions of religious faith. In attempting, for example, to account for the fact that Theravada Buddhism has been a dynamic faith for centuries and is today a resurgent faith, we must look beyond intellectual denials of God and the soul. We cannot, indeed, disregard these denials but we must see them in a whole context of religious aspiration and practice which includes the quest for Nibbana and the respect for Dhamma (universal order). We must even have regard for the significance of Buddhist architecture—those lovely ‘pagodas’ set on the hills with golden spires pointing skywards. In doing this we are passing, as in the appeal to Biblical realism, beyond the language of intellectual interpretation to the poetic language of faith, to depth religion.

Joined with this recognition may be the further recognition that religion everywhere is sustained by story, truth ‘embodied in a tale.’ “The Christian Gospel,” it has been said, “implies many abstract or general truths, but it is not itself a series of such truths; it is a *mythos*, a story that God sent His Son . . . the unchangeable kernel of the Christian faith is not doctrine but story.”³⁴ Further analysis may reveal that this is true of all depth religion. May it not be said,—though doubtless with important qualification—that similarly the religion of the Buddhist is the story of the Buddha, the religion of Islam is the story of The Prophet, and, that for some Hindus at least, their religion is the story of Ram or Krisna?

Such considerations may well lead to the conclusion that the Biblical realists and their critics are not so far apart as might appear.

One thing at least seems clear as we study the direction of modern discussion, including the recent discussions at Davos: it is the fact that all concerned with the question of the Christian apologetic, whether they are interested in the problems of the home-town evangelist or the missionary abroad, whether they are liberal or conservative in their outlook, are being obliged to consider more straightly the question: What does the Christian mean exactly when he says that Christ is *the Truth*? It is apparent that Christians in general mean much more than the affirmation that the teaching of Christ includes statements which are more illuminating than those of any other religious teacher. But how much more? And what of the significance of the fact that this affirmation is joined with the further statements that Christ is also *The Way* and *The Life*? Our full answer will involve more than any consideration of how the Christian Gospel can best be *communicated*. The prior question is the question: How is this Gospel known and *received*? Time may prove that the further analysis of what has here been termed depth religion may enable an answer that is both more intelligent to ourselves and convincing to others.

34. N. Micklem, *What is the Faith?* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1936), III, 71.