

may sound but always (as in the world of theology) find ultimate reconciliation, Fragmentation sets in; tonality turns into cacophonous polytonality, which in turn gives way to the homeless voice of atonality. The haphazard dance of atoms in the music of chance becomes the engineering of casual noise as six radios are played at once -- until in the end there are only great chunks of silence with occasional squeaks of sound like radar blips. A rather startling sequence! It is as if Mozart were to break down and stammer in the incoherent fragments of Samuel Beckett's *Lucky* and then at last become silent.²³

Silence, cold silence unbroken by even the faintest whimper. Is that the end, the dead-end of modernity?

Pondering this appalling *denouement* of twentieth century man self-divorced from a theistic and Christian heritage, we are driven to reconsider the experiential and cultural relevance of biblical faith. How, we wonder, does one avoid this Humpty Dumpty descent into abyss? How? We resolutely refuse to embrace modernity's false assumptions. We challenge the modernity and likewise the validity of the modern mind. Unhesitatingly we grasp the option held out hypothetically by Karl Löwith:

I think it would be very difficult to refute the so-called "nihilism" of existential ontology, on theoretical as well as moral grounds, unless one believes in man and the world as a creation of God or in the cosmos as a divine and eternal order -- in other words, unless one is not "modern."²⁴

Shall we, thus encouraged, assert our belief in the biblical view of God and man, affirming that we are "modern" in one sense, but decidedly not "modern" in another? Shall we, in other words, flatly repudiate the prevalent notion that to be genuinely modern one must be anti-biblical? Shall we boldly trumpet the contrary? Shall we insist that to be genuinely modern one must think and live biblically? Why not?

C. G. Jung, one of Freud's most intimate associates and originally his heir-apparent as the doyen of the psychoanalytic movement, stresses the ambiguity inherent in the concept of modern man. That species of homo sapiens, Jung cautions, is not simply any individual who happened to be born in the twentieth century. By no means! Jung suspects that "he is rarely met with" -- this genuinely modern person. Indeed, Jung is stridently emphatic about his rarity. "It must be clearly understood that the mere fact of living in the present does not make a man modern, for in that case everyone at present alive would be so. He alone is modern who is fully conscious of the present." The genuinely modern man needs, for this reason, to be carefully differentiated from the chronologically modern man, the man whose modernity is *ersatz*. "Many people call themselves modern -- especially the pseudo-moderns. Therefore the really modern man is often to be found among those who call themselves old-fashioned."²⁵ So it is possible to be old-fashioned and yet modern, or maybe modern precisely because old-fashioned. What, though, is more old-fashioned than the biblical faith, and what, assuming the truth of that faith, is more contemporary -- truth that is always ahead of any culture's *avant-garde*? Hence, whether or not Jung would tolerate the claim that so old-fashioned an orientation is genuinely modern, the Christian makes just that claim. No pseudo-modern who divorces himself from the biblical worldview, the Christian claims that he is the genuine modern, sensitively and critically appreciative of post-renaissance creativity, a self-confessed