

..... First, there must be a sacred literature which by its antiquity has become venerable and by long usage has been woven into the thoughts, affections, customs of the people. If added to this practical authority a high doctrine of inspiration developed, like the Platonic conception of ancient poets possessed by the divine afflatus and writing in a trance, then the scriptures become so exalted that nothing in them can be trivial, and so holy that to doubt them becomes blasphemy. If the people possessing such a body of sacred writings could always remain in the same culture and circumstance as was theirs when the scriptures were produced, the perfect harmony between their book and their life would not be disturbed. But no people ever do remain^{so}/static. Circumstances alter, new philosophies come in, new ethical problems and ideals emerge, new religious conceptions arise, and new cosmologies are proposed. Sooner or later the people with their book find themselves in a modern age with elements in it with which the book does not agree. Then they allegorize. They go behind the natural historic sense of the passages which they object to or do not understand and read into them the sense they wish to find there.

This is being done all over the world to-day in every religion with a sacred literature. You find it in India. Out of the ancient Hindu faith have come reform movements whose devotees have been affected by modern ideas and customs. They are proposing something new but they still are passionately desirous to be true to Hinduism and they so regard themselves. Such loyalty to the ancient faith, however, involves loyalty to the ancient books. How shall they harmonize their sacred writings with their own modernity. Allegory is the panacea. ~~THEY BELIEVE IN THE KORAN~~ But they still believe in the Koran. They insist with ardent faith that they alone understand it and are true to it. They are doing with the Koran what the Greeks did with Homer. They hold that it does not mean what it literally says, that it has an inner, allegorical sense, and many of them maintain that they alone are truly interpreting what that sense is.

But Fosdick says that he himself believes the Bible and thinks Calvin's principle of non-allegorization is right.