

of cognition, rationalism is opposed to sensationalism, the doctrine that our knowledge is derived exclusively from sensations, or to empiricism, the doctrine that our knowledge is derived exclusively from experience, or interaction of sensation and reflection. Condillac was a sensationist, Locke was an empiricist, Kant was a rationalist. Philosophical rationalism is the doctrine that reason acts by an energy, and under laws, of its own, without which neither sensation nor experience would be possible. It is easy to see how rationalism may swing into idealism, the doctrine that reason not only cognizes the real, but creates it. It is this extreme form of rationalism that Lord Bacon had in mind, when he said: "The empirical philosophers are like pismires; they only lay up and use their store. The rationalists are like the spiders; they spin out of their own bowels. But give me a philosopher, who, like the bee, hath a middle faculty; gathering from abroad, but digesting that which is gathered by his own virtue."

In theology, rationalism is opposed to mysticism, insisting that faith is a rational faculty, that ideas must be clear, capable of intelligible statement; it is opposed to traditionalism, claiming that to reason belongs the right and the duty of examining the ground of authority, and the credibility of tradition, insisting that truth is its own guarantee, the reasonableness of the doctrine being the living ground of its authority; and it is opposed to supernaturalism, its claim being that the reason of man is its own sufficient guide, and that divine illumination and instruction are superfluous and unwarranted. To apply Lord Bacon's phrase, traditionalism is theological empiricism; and rationalism is theological idealism. The traditionalists are pismires; they only lay up and use what is stored in the creeds. The rationalists are spiders; they spin all theology out of their own bowels. The true theologian is like the bee, gathering from abroad, but digesting that which is gathered by his own virtue.

In criticizing the logic of the rationalistic critics, I have in mind the disciples of theological idealism, for whom the human reason is the sole source of truth, and who sturdily refuse to concede or to consider the possibility of supernatural illumination and instruction. When such men come to the study of the Bible, their mental attitude compels them to eliminate or to ignore its peculiarities, and to reduce it to the rank of ordinary literature. The procedure is defective philosophically, historically, ethically, and scientifically.

1. The logic of the rationalistic critics is philosophically defective. It claims to be unprejudiced, without prepossessions. It is, in fact, rooted in prejudice, and kept alive by prejudice. It will not tolerate the idea of divine intervention. Its onslaught upon miracles is comparatively a side issue. It makes war upon the supernatural as distinct from the natural. The superhuman elements of the Bible are reduced to poetic myths, valuable for popular impression, as are the fables of *Æsop*, and the rhymes of the nursery, but useless for philo-