

A

One of your
best efforts.
By the way, don't
you want to meet
Archibald MacLish?
He will be here
next week.

Modernism

Martha Hartwig

People in the world today have the feeling that nothing is stable. All is ever changing and we live in the constant expectation of a new discovery. With this view it is hard, in fact impossible, to have the same unquestioning confidence in the old beliefs, thus ^{what we could call} modernism develops as the sum total of the various attitudes in the world as we know it. With the ^{post problems} war never present in our thoughts people have started to turn more and more to God for help. / This in itself shows the tendency in our modern world to think only of ourselves and ways to escape reality as it presents itself. / In itself this sudden shift to a religious attitude is of no ^{use} avail as "the idea of God is of such a scope that an occasional five minutes of perplexed wonder does not suffice to give it life in our mind."¹ Christianity is too large and wonderful to be intended for those who are more interested in themselves than in anything else in the universe, save as it offers them escape.² How then can we know anything as real unless it is in our thoughts constantly? Certainly the majority of people today are more concerned about ^{the atom bomb} Hitler than about the proof of the existence of God.

In our present life the pressures of the day keep us occupied so that we have little time for the greater questions.³ There is so much to be done and there is so little time that we crowd our days and thoughts with the

¹ Willard L. Sperry, Yes, But--, pp 114-115

² Ibid., p 47.

³ William Adams Brown, Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel, pp 3-4.

exclusion of God. This is an obvious explanation of our thoughts today, but also we must consider the fact that we are in a state of ^{change} transition and progress. In all progress there are regressions which may at the time seem to blot out all else. As Brown said it is like climbing a mountain, to get to the top we must naturally expect to go down in a valley before we reach the peak. In these valleys our angle of vision is ever changing and we are more conscious of the near and little. Today we are in a valley and our vision is obscured by the bushes and wild life. When we climb out of this valley, and we undoubtedly will, we can look back to see that the valley wasn't as dark as it seemed.

The conflict between religion and science has always been brought forth as very important. This we can see is ^{not true} quite inconsistent as we look at the facts. There is no definite proof for the existence of God, but then there is no proof for the law of gravitation. We must have faith in all that we believe, otherwise we would have nothing to live for or by. Even if there could be demonstrative proof for religious convictions faith would include more as:

"You must mix some uncertainty
With faith if you would have faith be."⁴

A Christian is a hopeful being, yet his is not a blind faith. Religious experience which is not proven has done much to ^{build up} bolster the claim of religion today, thus

4. Bishop Butler, The Analogy of Religion, p 19.

we have a faith which keeps its value by the trust we place in it. Science is upheld by the intellect yet in reality it is simply glorified common sense;⁵ with this in mind it would seem to destroy the conflict between the physical and spiritual world. It may be possible that in the following pages I can sum up some of the general ideas to prove that science and religion are compatible.

Truth is sought after in science as the ideal intellectual construction by which all experience would be correlated.⁶ But "truth in itself is not the whole of Reality and the knowledge which grasps Reality must be something more than scientific knowledge which grasps Truth,"⁷ thus there must be more than pure intellect to grasp reality as the world understood only in scientific terms would be a mere dissected corpse. This is where faith comes into science as well as religion; in order to ^{understand} comprehend this universe we admit the reality of lower beings which we know nothing about. Therefore it is only logical that we admit the existence of a perfect Reality. Some may still uphold that we can experiment and observe in science and not in religion, but it is necessary to remember the fact that all of our knowledge in science is due to our faith in our experimentation which rests on our judgments of natural objects. Thus it is that by acceptance of a large group that experimentation in science is held up as the trust, likewise in religion we

⁵ Op. Cit., W.A.Brown, p 11.

⁶ William Temple, Mens Creatrix, p *Class notes*.

⁷ Ibid., p *Class notes*.

have the consensus argument. This argument in religion is not based on the fact that millions have believed in God, but on the fact that so many people have reported religious experiences. Many today reject these reports due to the modern notion that they are nothing but a "subjective experience within man."⁸ But before we reject religious experience and accept the modern belief we must as Thomas Huxley said, "sit down before fact as a little child." One thing to be remembered in all investigation is the fact that until a thing can be proven false it is still true in our knowledge. Some people will admit that religious experiences do occur to some people, but discredit them since everyone can't produce such an experience at a given time. This can be answered by the fact that his own concern for himself and his continual taking of his own spiritual pulse would mean that the most important conditions for such an experience could not be met.⁹ Just as in science the conditions are controlled to have an accurate experiment we must assume a certain attitude in religion. There are five conditions of prime importance to be able to experience spiritual vision: 1) the attitude of reverence; 2) the attitude of the child spirit; 3) quietness; 4) moral obedience; 5) a combination of aloneness and togetherness.¹⁰ These conditions are listed here merely to show that as in science, religion, too, has certain necessary conditions

⁸ Elton D. Trueblood, The Knowledge of God, p 10.

⁹ Ibid., p 158.

¹⁰ Ibid., p 144-156, For a discussion of these in detail read these pages in connection with Chapter VI.

which are preparations, but not necessarily sufficient conditions to see God. The steps in a scientific investigation are likewise necessary but not sufficient conditions. In the scientific methods as used today we attempt to discover what the object is apart from ourselves, thus in religion we realize that God is more perfect than, yet distinct from and yet not unlike all subjects and objects.¹¹ In both religion and science there is a personal element which cannot be discounted simply because it is personal. Experience itself is as Sir Henry Jones said, "the final court of appeal." ~~Luther and Kant also did much to bolster the attempts of modernism by their belief in experience.~~ Even though experience is momentary with thought extending it¹² we base all of our assumptions of reality upon it, thus we can see that science uses the same methods to prove a thing.

Another connection between these two fields is the fact that in both we see what we want to see. We believe what our hearts want us to believe, we can never make our heads believe in a moral world unless we will the belief. Facts come with faith and without an open mind and a willingness to accept them they will be hidden from us. No one needs to fear facts or to fear that disillusionment will follow in the course of progress. Truth is not absolute, but relative.¹³ Science has accepted many beliefs that have later been proven false and yet we still accept new theories, why then

¹¹Baron Friedrich von Hugel, Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion, p *CLASS NOTES*.

¹²Ibid., p *CLASS NOTES*.

¹³ William James, The Will to Believe, p

if religion has stood criticism and still stands must we reject new theories merely because they conflict with old beliefs? Religion has stood up much better under ~~the on-~~slaught of progress than has science, and it may be that many people don't accept the new theories due to the fact that they are thoughtful people waiting, rather than jumping in to the mess of the world today. With all else changing we can naturally expect a change in spiritual life in that we won't accept the old blindly, but rather we question. By this questioning, religion has not been killed by science but is now more open to the simplest believer. If we attempt to answer our questions today with the answers accepted in the past we may find their ^{religion} ~~theology~~ rather uninteresting. But this is true in science too, we can never accept other's answers for our questions.¹⁴ Things are ever changing in the world today. Once stable beliefs have been discredited and vice versa; new sciences have developed; critical questioning is replacing blind belief. Thus we can see that to ~~keep~~ up with the world today we must accept the scientific method and historical criticism.

It is consistent with the world today that we believe in evolution, not only in the development of man but in all sciences, and in religion. This does not mean that we must give up the essential truths, but it is necessary to form a ^{relationship} ~~synthesis~~ between the truth in religion and the truth of modernity as we know them today. In doing this we will

¹⁴Op. Cit., W. A. Brown, p 7.

think and speak as a modern churchman in a modern world. Thus we can use the scientific methods and habits to bring God nearer and to make religion more the common property of man. Science has taught us to think of the world as a unity. This gives us the new impression of the greatness and wisdom of the Being who is the cause and increases our faith in the intelligibility of the universe and the trustworthiness of our own faculties as a guide to truth.¹⁵ This as we can see still keeps our essential ideas, but merely gives us new laws to use in the approach. It may seem to some that the new belief is cold and cheerless. It is true that it is to those who don't have a strong enough mind to accept facts as we know them. Facts, as I speak of them, are those beliefs we hold as first laws that have never been proven, but again they have never been disproven, therefore we accept them. In this light hopes and fancies are powerless when compared to our facts,¹⁶ but we must accept the change from the Orthodox into the Scientific Belief as surely as we accept the change from Youth into Manhood.¹⁷

Let us not have the idea that all of the changes from the old to the new have been beneficial to the Christian belief. There are many who haven't been able to see the fact that science and religion do aid each other. Auguste Comte, founder of Positivism, believed that science had

¹⁵Ibid., p 16.

¹⁶S. Laing, Modern Science and Modern Thought, p 222.

¹⁷Ibid., p 222.

killed religion. He held the idea that the old forms of supernatural religion had become incredible, thus he sought a logical religion with an appointed hierarchy. This he planned would be "positive" or based on fact yet fervid enough to satisfy the cravings for religious sentiment. All was to be based around "Humanity", as in this he found love and veneration for the abstract idea of the human race, taken in its past, present, and future relations.¹⁸ An idea like this is too wide in its scope to be influential to all. A logical form can never carry the power that faith hold over people.

Pessimism is another form that has grown out of our complex world today. It can be said that this is the gospel of feebleness and failure with its base in certain laws of science. It is to be expected that in a complex society there will be some who fail and thus develop a mass of misery and discontent. In lower levels this develops into anarchism, in higher levels we find theories of regeneration of the world by levels, while still higher minds see the futility of it all and take refuge in a philosophy that considers the world a mistake, life an evil with the only solution being a universal suicide. We find this belief among men who are weak and can see no way out. They are not strong enough to accept the new changes in the world, or they tend to lead too busy a life to ever stop to think. It has been said that people today tend to read too much and to think

¹⁸Ibid., p 227.

too little, and that may be the reason for the present condition.¹⁹

These are only two of the ways out of the world today and both are escape mechanisms. The fact that there are so many "isms" today shows us the confusion from which we must make our way. To say that we will rise above it all is useless unless we accept events and trends as they come and still cling to our own beliefs. This is only one more example of the value of rational thought, "it is always wiser to look before you leap". Our religion today must help us more than ever as modern men are developing the attitude of the right to chose between religions. This is one reason that we must be careful of our criticisms. Science and religion progress together, and we must have them both as neither can satisfy the cravings of man alone. Science alone would not be able to explain the values of certain events, as it is more concerned with the causes and can't answer the questions of how or why flashes of insight that occur. These may be considered miracles and as such they are not looked down upon by science, rather they are shown to be indispensable for religion and explained as an exceptional event wrought by God in the world for a moral purpose.²⁰

Progress in this view takes place by new beginnings and we should never reject an idea fearing that it may disillusion us. To be disillusioned by the discovery that our beliefs are illusions is hard to accept, but we should never refuse

1. ¹⁹Ibid., p 229.
2. ²⁰Ibid., p 249.

to accept the truth as this is the way of progress. After the truth is once learned it is useless to try to cling to the old falsehoods, as in religion we have our faith in our beliefs, if any of these are rejected it is futile to attempt to build an illusion around a falsehood, as the central basis of religion is in the trust we place in our faith in the essentials.

The effect of science can again be shown to be an important factor in shaping modern ideas by the three definitions of modern faith as given by Bauer. It can either be believed as a hypothesis or a postulate to be tested, thus resulting in pragmatism or it can be thought of as a wish a will-to-believe which is voluntaristic, and lastly it can be thought of as a quasi-instinctive trust or instinct which is more or less blind. These three show the effect of science, most clearly and directly in the first by the use of empirical methods. In the last two the effect is direct and indirect as these may be considered the consequence of a reaction to scientific rationalism.²¹ From all of the above it can now be said that there is no conflict between Science and Religion, but we must remember that by Religion we mean "that temper of the soul inculcated in the ethical sayings and deeds of Jesus; or even simply an attitude of reverent communion with the Universal Spirit. It is thoroughly false if it means that there is no conflict between Science and the antiquated cosmologies, theologies, psychologies,

/ ²¹ Joachim M. Bauer, The Modern Notion of Faith, pp 3-48.

ethics, and doctrines of salvation which have been built up around the sublime human figure of the prophet of Nazareth until his human lineaments have been effaced."²² Thus we well accept the New Reformation with its new synthesis of religious, ethical, social, and scientific ideas.

The rise of modernism has often been linked with the rift between science and the literal interpretation of the Bible. The Bible today is known by few and used by still fewer for practical purposes. It cannot be overlooked in our treatment of modernism as "it is the point at which modern theology began, and because it is in connection with the Bible that we find the most pressing and most difficult of our practical problems."²³ We need the Bible today as a source of religious inspiration and as a standard for the church, likewise in the historic theology the Bible was used as a means of grace and as a rule of faith and practice. But now we must turn to the differences in the new and old views. Traditionally the Bible was believed to be all consistent and accurate in its history, science and chronology, but now men at large are beginning to see inconsistencies and apparent contradictions, thus we must find some way to reconcile them. Modern theology makes possible a scientific interpretation which allows for the human element of the various authors to enter in and also it takes the Bible, not as a single book, but as a library. From this we are

²² Joseph A. Leighton, Religion and the Mind of Today, p vi.

²³ Op. Cit., W. A. Brown, p 48.

able to read the Bible and realize the development of different levels that are represented. In this it is able to reach all people of different ages, race, and generations and thus be a progressive revelation in that it meets the needs of a growing and progressing life. Scientific study has thus helped us to regain the value of many parts of the Bible, we can now use it to answer many of our questions and to help us solve many practical problems. But the Bible is not only valuable to the individual, it has a social function in that it is the common standard by which the church is to test its Christianity. The old view didn't allow the Bible a test that would work in practice, today Christ is given to us by modern theology as the key to the Bible. He is thought of more in an exact sense and stands out as an individual from the vague and uncertain traditional belief. He is our guide in our journey through the Bible and it is never safe to stray far from Him. Our task is difficult as the Bible is an ancient book hard to read, understand, believe, and follow in the modern world, especially since many of our sciences disprove much that is in it. But it is necessary to keep the Bible and to keep it in its high position as we can never think about religion without the Bible.²⁴

To get at the center of the difficulty we can sum up the attitude of many people today. Science has been accepted and in believing in this they find it impossible to accept

/ ²⁴Harry Emerson Fosdick, The Modern Use of the Bible, p 3.

the "miracles, demons, fiat creation, apocalyptic hopes, eternal hell or ethical conceptions of Jehovah in the Old Testament".²⁵ Thus their spiritual experiences clash with their inherited view of the Bible, they cannot under the new view accept them both and when one threatens to collapse the other is found to be tottering. It can be easily seen then that the preachers of today have an important task in helping to solve the doubts of many, to show them that the Bible has not been lost and that the better understood the more usable it becomes. Take the example of prayer in the light of the new approach to the Bible. At first the idea of God was such that no one would have wanted a personal relationship with him, and even if they had wanted to reach Him His presence was localized and couldn't be reached except in certain appointed places. If ever an individual did reach Jehovah, it was impossible to reach His interest which was not for individuals as individuals. With these ideas at the beginning of the Old Testament we can see how much progress has been made to now believe in a personal, loving, universal God as we come to the New Testament. Regardless of all of the new approaches to the Bible, the amazing fact remains that the essential truths are timeless in dealing with the spiritual life of man. These truths get their strength from the Bible's appeal to the deep and abiding realm of man's basic experiences, for out of this realm the Bible came. Surely there is no use to approach

²⁵ Ibid., p 5.

our task with fear for we are fighting for our ideal, it is an old ideal with a new solution.

With all of our new approaches and positions concerning the Bible there are also certain things to be avoided. Granted that we do have a scientific mind we must take care that we don't close out all except facts, that is we must keep our eyes and heart open to the vision of things known only to insight, appreciation and reverence. This in a few words can be stated as, "analytic criticism may smother reverent appreciation."²⁶ Another peril comes from the release from literalism itself in that we may escape from the bonds of ancient categories without undertaking the mental toil of constructing new ones and the issue may result in obscurity and confusion. We must forge ahead and build a new orthodoxy even if in time it will be replaced with a new liberalism. Our next peril to watch for is a moral danger, that is, we may become so blinded by the modern views and thus forget to take Jesus in earnest. This in itself is the most searching ethical enterprise ever undertaken on earth. We as men are meant to reproduce the spirit and quality of Jesus and if we neglect or dim this demand of the Master, Christianity has lost its reason for existence. With these warnings we leave the Bible and the modern view; to some who are confused and bewildered at the new and unaccustomed aspect of the Bible a fear may set in, but this fear will pass when it is not so new. The new methods are

²⁶Ibid., p 191.

giving us far more than they are taking away; our task now is to restore wisdom, insight, courage, and spiritual power and to use these for the redemption of the souls and societies of men.²⁷

Thus far we have sought to reconcile modern science and biblical criticism with religion. This movement has deeply affected the Catholic faith as their religion demands that they keep all of the old faith in a rigid unity. Their doctrinal position gives a wider target for criticism, their scholastic logic has bound them into a position which is so compact that it shows no distinction between fundamental and contingent elements, thus they feel this new question more than the loosely organised churches. Other faiths can afford to lose a few of their parts, but in the Catholic church "Rome would bleed to death if she sacrificed her little finger."²⁸ In this position and with their fundamental presuppositions they are assailed by the philosophers today due to the study of religions, past and present. Some may feel that it would matter little if the Roman Catholic church did change and some other faith took over, but our interest must not take this turn as the fate of any other church that shares any dogmas, or rests on the same ultimate presuppositions lies in Rome's fate. "If Rome dies, other churches may order their coffins."²⁹ Modernism has been regarded by the traditionalists to be a synthesis of

²⁷Ibid., Most of this material can be better understood by reading Chapter VI.

²⁸George Tyrrell, Christianity at the Cross-Roads, p 9.

²⁹Ibid., p 10.

all the heresies as it not only criticises this dogma or that ecclesiastical institution, but it criticises the very idea of dogma. In their own defense the Catholic church issued several decrees and measures which successfully stamped out all modernism within the church. These were issued in 1907 and there has been no subsequent revival of Catholic modernism.

Many new ideas have been the result of the modernist view; there are several that I shall try to bring forward. The first of these is the idea that God is not transcendent but immanent in the world. Heaven is not really another world, but only this world viewed as the fulfillment of the immanent spiritual principle which guides its development, thus the process of evolution is a continual unity of action. Outside of this time-process of evolution there is no reality, "heaven is only the point of view from which it can be seen as a whole."³⁰ Therefore since God is the immanent principle and does not exist above or outside the universe the idea of the Incarnation as God's Son on earth is impossible to hold as any intervention by God in the long process is nonsensical. These are views of the idealist, Caird, and are not in agreement with many other modernist views due to their possible danger. This is shown by Professor Pringle-Pattison's view as he repeatedly insists that the real actual self-hood of God is more and not less personal. He contrasts the Divine transcendence with the Divine

³⁰Oliver C. Quick, Liberalism, Modernism, and Tradition, p 44.

immanence only in the sense that the ideal is contrasted with the actual. God transcends human life only as human ideals transcend human actualities. His metaphysical concern is to keep the idea of God within the range of a possible or ideal human experience and to disregard any idea of God which in principle is unknowable to man. This then seems to bring us to the idea of the Liberal Protestants in their tendency to identify God with good manhood. We can thus see how these conflict with the traditional doctrine of the two natures in Christ. As through this doctrine we have the two natures in men and the conception of two worlds. It was by the holding of this conception that the orthodox doctrine has developed what might be called "agnosticism" in that it has become a permanent habit to put off ultimate solutions to another world. Here we find the principle that faith is beyond reason, but not contrary to it. Reason is accepted, but rejected in favor of faith in that it doesn't go far enough. Modern thought in contrast depends on a "one world" view, not merely because supernaturalism has given way to science but due to the characteristic of today to depend on experience and in this dependence the experience of the world has proven so overwhelming that man has not the faith to go beyond it. Thus the modern thinker builds his theories on data not only presented in this world but comprehended by it. Therefore all truths are relative to man and his mental life in this world. To speak to him of the old views is to be answered with the retort that

"you are talking of something outside of human experience, which is, of course, meaningless." These conflicting views naturally result from a wide and deep difference in the conceptions of God and the world.

Another Modernist idea is that prayer is effective only in its psychological effect on the one praying. Our acceptance of new theories of science has given us varying concepts of the God to whom we pray. To the rationalistic scientists of the latter part of the 19th century the object of religion was the Unknowable. Later psychologists made God a mental projection; emergent evolutionists have made a Space-Time Deity, while an "organismic" physics offers us a God who is the "Principle of Concretion." Likewise modern thought has given us a belief that denies all that is supernatural. Following from these ideas prayer could be nothing but psychological as the Immanent spirit will evolve and individual can do nothing to alter his progress. God today is a God of law, he acts everywhere and always in the same way. He is not God the Father, the Supernatural, as the old dogmas believe him to be, His relation to the world today is such that we find it difficult to draw consequences that will result in practical helpfulness. His is a uniformity of method that does away with inconsistency, His aim never varies from the single purpose and thus men and women are changed by whatever is inconsistent in them with His aim. Prayer, can be said, to be the way in which the soul of man is renewed through contact with God. Modern

theology again has put a new light on this, it is more a communion of will with will than the vague feelings of awe and worship. In the world today people don't take time from the activity of the world to even think about prayer unless a crisis occurs. This will naturally be a release from their conflict as in their few moments of prayer they can "tell their troubles to someone else" which according to psychologists is merely an emotional outlet which relieves the individual. In such a case, and there are many, it cannot be expected that a communion with God will be established. Prayer and faith are interdependent, and neither can be used as a last resort to gain from them. It can be said that "he who rises from his knees a better man has prayed." Is this to be considered psychological?

Modernism is a result of the various approaches to religion and is too broad a subject to have justice done to its views in a short discussion as this. There are many of its ideas that I agree with and there are others which I can't accept; thus, this may account for the varying stresses which I have placed on different topics. Much of this material may bring in more of the trends of modern thought than of the modernists as a group, thus resulting in a superficial treatment of their ideas and doctrines. In the writing of this paper I have become convinced of the desperate necessity of religion in the world today, as James said, "It is better to hope there is a religion than to fear that there isn't."

Religion is one of the ultimate facts of life, it is a feeling of absolute dependence existing as an inwrought nature of man which can't be stifled, thus we can say that religion is universal, but every religion is not equally valuable. Modern theology has made it clear that if there is to be a universal religion it will be Christianity as no other religion satisfies the permanent needs of man. Modernism claims three advantages over Traditionalism and these are in harmony with the essential Christianity as with the Modern mind. These are: 1) it satisfies the modern Christian's intellect by giving him freedom of research; 2) it satisfies his conscience by giving him freedom to teach truth as he learns it, and 3) it satisfies his heart by admitting to Christian fellowship all who call Jesus Lord. But with the advantages of Modernism we must also accept the disadvantages which accompany it. It is true that the "nationalistic theologies" have developed very rapidly and in doing so hardly any two theologians agree as to their theories. Modernism is in this stage and may result in an extremely individual religion or else it may lead to a sceptical attitude which rejects the essential truths; this would be fatal not only to the modernists but to religion as a whole. But thus far we have not come to this as today it is not a question of absolute faith against absolute disbelief, but the more or less shade of faintness with which men cling to the "larger hope." Fewer believe the old creeds and even these believe more faintly, but still fewer denounce them

and are insensible to the good that they have done in the past. Thus many men are sceptical and still religious, Tennyson expressed this when he said:

"There is more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half the creeds."

The problem, then today, is to keep alive the glow of religion and not to succumb to the pressures of the world, remembering always that, "Earth changes, but thy soul and God stand sure."³¹ Religion cannot be forced upon us, we must accept it and build our lives around it. In this religion can be compared to a poem in that,

"a poem should not mean
But be."³²

³¹ Robert Browning, Rabbi Ben Ezra.

³² Archibald MacLeish

Bibliography

- Bauer, Joachim M., The Modern Notion of Faith, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1930.
- ✓ Brown, William Adams, Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1914.
- ✓ Butler, Bishop, The Analogy of Religion, J. M. Dent and Company, London, (no date).
- Elliot, Hugh, Modern Science and Materialism, Longmans, Green, and Company, London, 1919.
- * Fosdick, Harry Emerson, The Modern Use of the Bible, The MacMillan Company, New York, 1924.
- ✓ Hugel, Baron Friedrich von, Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of religion, (no publisher named), New York, 1924.
- * James, William, The Will to Believe, New York, 1927.
- * Laing, S., Modern Science and Modern Thought, Champman and Hall, London, 1889.
- * Leighton, Joseph A., Religion and the Mind of To-day, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1924.
- Quick, Oliver C., Liberalism, Modernism, and Tradition, Longmans, Green and Company, London, 1922.
- ✓ Sperry, Willard L., Yes, But--, Harper and Brothers, London, 1931.
- * Temple, William, Mens Creatrix, MacMillan and Company, London, 1917.
- ✓ Trueblood, Elton D., The Knowledge of God, Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1939.
- Tyrrell, George, Christianity at the Cross-Roads, Longmans, Green and Company, London, 1910.
- Wenley, R. M., Modern Thought and the Crisis in Belief, The MacMillan Company, New York, 1909.