granted to our society once will not be refused if we ask for it again in a contrite spirit and with a broken heart"[27].

II

We are not surprised to find that a scholar who, like Toynbee, adhering thus strongly to a transcendent doctrine of salvation and grace,

---

27) Ibid., Vol.6, p.321. - As a social scientist I have no business to take issue with such religious and theological thinking as long as it is based on faith and nothing but faith, and as long as this is made clear beyond doubt. Toynbee thus acknowledges that "the nature of Transfiguration is a mystery that passes our understanding" (Ibid., Vol.6, p.157). Discussing the dogma of the Trinity, he confesses that God "is as accessible to the human heart as He is incomprehensible to the human understanding." (Ibid., Vol.6, p.162). Science, natural and cultural, can only deal with "human understanding", namely reason, as far as reason is common to all human beings. Furthermore, science has to make it clear that the idea of "the human heart" today is unthinkable since science has shown that there are as many human hearts as there are Civilizations, peoples, classes, individuals, and ages. Finally, science can partly explain the immanent socio-historic conditions inducing "God" to become "accessible" to certain men of certain historic groupings and ages and to remain "incomprehensible" to other individuals of a "God-alien" social sphere and historic age. This, we hope, is sufficient explanation why we cannot accept Toynbee's religion and theology. In addition we are surprised to discover logical flaws in Toynbee's theology that necessarily strengthen our cautious attitude. For Toynbee states that "the divine nature, in so far as it is accessible to us, must have something in common with our own" and that it is the "faculty of Love" "which we also can attribute with absolute confidence to God - because God would be spiritually inferior even to Man (quod est absurdum) if this faculty were not in Him but were nevertheless in us..." (Ibid., Vol.6, p.164). Granted that the Godhead, in order to be accessible to us, must have something in common with us - what entitles us to single out "with absolute confidence" the "faculty of Love" as the common ground? Certainly, if the title be nothing but faith, we do not object. But Toynbee seems to ratiocinate in using the terms "because" and "absurd". Where has true faith yet been afraid of absurdity? Has Toynbee forgotten the old tenets credo quia absurdum est and credo ut intelligam? On the other hand, if we follow Toynbee's allegedly logical argumentation, do we not have to assume that the Godhead has all the faculties granted to man, and does this not imply that God be both Love and Hatred? If the term "spiritual inferiority" did make any sense in a comparison of a trancendent Godhead with mortal beings - and logically we are inclined to say that it does not make any sense at all! - would it not refer to a lack of hatred as well as to a lack of love? Would not thus God be "spiritually superior" just because He possesses all attributes of man and many more? But it is certainly not logic and reason which cause Toynbee to fancy his God as Love - it is the old attempt to find a supernatural confirmation for his own desires and intentions - intentions certainly laudable, yet also human and transitory. After all, the very term "superior" betrays the animal metaphysicum which looks up to the stars and hopes to find there all the Love (both libido and caritas) which it has been missing in this valley of tears. - With all this criticism, we must not be understood as objecting to the ethics of love and fellowship implied in Toynbee's theology. We do prefer this ethos to the metaphysics of hate and domination glorified, for example, in Spengler's pagan theory. But while we are, like Toynbee, longing for the Kingdom of Love and Brotherhood, we do not feel justified to transfigure our human anguish into a transcendent and cosmic Godhead, nor even into a future Millenium.