that God is so finite that he cannot conserve values. He holds that every argument for God, whether as absolute or as finite, is an argument for God's power to control His universe so as to achieve value, and every argument for His goodness is an argument for his obligation to conserve Persons as intrinsic values.48
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48. This paragraph also appears in King's earlier essay for Brightman. In that essay he attributed the quotation correctly to Brightman, Philosophy of Religion, p. 401. The original passage reads: "There is no sufficient reason for supposing [God's power] to be so finite that he cannot conserve values. In a word, every argument for God, whether as absolute or as finite, is an argument for God's power to control his universe so as to achieve value; and every argument for God's goodness is an argument for his obligation to maintain persons in existence as intrinsic values."

“Crozer Quarterly”

[12 December 1951]
[Boston, Mass.]

During the first semester of DeWolf’s Seminar in Systematic Theology, students were required to give a twenty-to-thirty-minute oral report on a religious journal, chosen from a list of twelve journals compiled by DeWolf, and to submit a one-page
typed review. In preparation for the review King had contacted his former Crozer professor Morton S. Enslin, editor of the Crozer Quarterly. In his summary King uses some of the information Enslin provided and comments on an article by his former professor, George W. Davis. King reveals a dissatisfaction with liberalism’s doctrine of man: "Any theology which does not have an adequate anthropology is not worth the name." King’s analysis of Davis was considerably longer in the draft of this report (see below, note 2); he shortened his critique to meet length limitations.

1. The Crozer Quarterly was begun in 1924. It was the result of a feeling by the faculty at that time, under the direction of Dr. Milton G. Evans, that such a journal was needed. Andover Theological Seminary was invited to join in the project but found it impossible to accept. Accordingly Crozer has continued it alone from the start. The journal has had several editors, namely, Edward B. Pollard, A. S. Woodburn, R. E. E. Harkness, and Morton S. Enslin.

2. Subscription rate for the Crozer Quarterly is $2.50 per year; single copies are $.75. Publishers: Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

3. The journal is intended chiefly for professional students of religion and also for intelligent laymen.

4. The literary style is of the highest quality with few typographical errors. The type is small.


6. Typical contributors include, Vergilius Ferm (Philosopher), Edwin E. Aubrey (Theologian), Albert C. Knudson (Dean emeritus of B.U. School of Theology).


8. Regular features—Five or six articles. A number of book reviews (usually about 20). Several shorter notices and a list of books received. Identification of current contributors and reviewers.

9. Dominant point of View—Liberalism is definitely the dominant point of view. Occasionally very controversial issues are discussed with opposing views represented.


11. Defects: None

12. Fifteen to twenty book reviews and notices of the highest quality.


1. See Morton Scott Enslin to King, 26 October 1951, p. 59 in this volume.
Dr. Davis begins his challenging article with the affirmation that Christianity is a religion of depth. By depth as here employed, he means that Christianity breaks through the surface phenomena of reality, bringing an apprehension of what lies beyond these phenomena. He admits that Christianity has its surface and subsurface phenomena, but interest in these must never obscure the significance of depth phenomena. Liberalism, with its emphasis on higher criticism, important as this emphasis is, has devoted much to the surface and subsurface factors to the complete concealment of the depth phenomena originally responsible for biblical religion. If liberalism is to produce anything more than a secular and surface arrangement of intellectual propositions, it must explore and recognize the depths in Christianity. Some of the depths in Christianity which liberalism must recognize are: (1) The Moral foundations of Reality, (2) Spiritual Control, (3) Specific Action, i.e. the faith that specific divine action for human redemption occurred in Jesus of Nazareth, (4) Continuing Divine Concern and Human Opportunity. Can liberal theology, now on the defensive, experience a rebirth? Dr. Davis feels that it can if it takes full cognizance of the depths of the Christian faith.

Critical Comment: I feel that Dr. Davis is grappling with a profound problem and one that all liberals should take cognizance of. It seems to me, however, that Dr. Davis fails to even mention one aspect of a theology of depth which is all important namely, the doctrine of man. Any theology which does not have an adequate anthropology is not worth the name. It is essentially at this point that liberalism has been criticized for being all too shallow. How Dr. Davis could overlook the significance of an adequate anthropology in a theology of depth is quite incomprehensible to me.

---

King's rough draft provides a fuller expression of his thinking about Davis: "In this article Dr. Davis is grappling with a profound problem. Indeed it is one that all liberals should take cognizance of. No true Christian thinker can fail to see the necessity of delving to the depths of the Christian faith. Yet Dr Davis is right in affirming that liberalism has all too often been overly concerned with the surface and subsurface phenomena of the Christian faith to the total exclusion of the depth phenomena. Neo-orthodox theologians have reminded us, on every hand, of [liberalism's] appalling failure at this point. Reinhold [Niebuhr,] probably more than any other thinker in America, has stressed the need of a 'dimension of depth,' transcending nature, transcending history, if ethical action here and now is to be sustained by a faith that touches absolute bottom. But such a criticism was expected to come from neo-orthodox circles. Now that the same plea for a dimension of depth comes from a man who is an avowed liberal, makes this article all the more significant.

"Yet even though Dr. Davis' article is a significant and necessary one, I must confess that he fails to go the limit in calling liberalism back to a theology of depth. He fails to even mention one aspect of a theology of depth which seems to me all important, viz., the doctrine of man. Any theology which does not have an [adequate] anthropology is not worthy of the name. I'm sure that Dr. Davis, after such a brilliant analysis, would not be so naive or optimistic as to believe that liberalism has always been depthful in its doctrine of man. It is essentially at this point that liberalism has been criticized for being all [too] shallow. Who can doubt that the criticism has been warranted? There is a strong tendency in liberal Protestantism toward [sentimentality] about man. Man who has come so far in wisdom and [decency] may be expected to go much further as