

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

must be a half-hearted business unless there be that in Him which strikes the mind immediately and coercively into that attitude. Man has the capacity to recognize the presence of God in human life, and worship is the instinctive response of the mind to such a recognition. We can see the true, the beautiful, and the good in this world and realize their absolute value. They are sacred, and in this ethically sacred we recognize God.

Now here is the coercive basis for the place Jesus has in the Christian consciousness. We discern in Him the altogether holy will, the altogether sacred. This is the only means we have of identifying God immediately. Where we meet the altogether holy will we know we meet God. We know intuitively, coercively. God confronts us through absolute value. To have the value of God is to be God. No one would have the value of God unless He is God.

Some people feel a difficulty as regards the Christian conviction about Christ because He lived so long ago, and we know of Him only by scanty

records. But if in Jesus there is a complete and adequate unveiling of the Divine character and purpose, in which everything has its being and from which everything derives its meaning, then the lapse of time is irrelevant to the abiding and verifiable significance of Christ. And in proportion as Christ is what Christianity asserts Him to be, in that proportion will He persist in human life and be observable even to-day and in the affairs of our present existence. And you will find in Him the way to peace in our civilization and the solution of the problem of suffering and its relation to sin.

If this be a valid line of thought, it means that by identifying the coercive touch of God upon men's spirits with the sense of the ethically sacred we are given a permanent basis upon which to ground a living conviction about Jesus. And if, in addition to making this immediate coercive impression of the Divine upon us, Christ can in practice produce health of soul and triumph over the world, then the affirmation of His Divinity is as soundly grounded as anything well could be.

Present-Day Faiths.

Modernism in the English Church.

BY PROFESSOR PERCY GARDNER, LITT.D., OXFORD.

THE word Modernism is an ugly hybrid, combining the Latin word *modernus* with the Greek termination *-ism*. Many liberal Churchmen decline to accept it as a label; and one must confess that it is 'soiled with ignoble use.' There is a modernism in manners which it is hard to discriminate from discourtesy, and a modernism in painting which fills the new galleries with abominations. But, of course, in this paper we speak only of Modernism in religion, that is, of the adaptation of Christianity to modern conditions. And, indeed, in use the term is applied only to a particular class of Christians, who, realizing that sometimes the faith of the Christian Church is handicapped by the retention in formula and service of obsolete history, obsolete

science, inadequate ethics, are anxiously desirous to set it free from such hindrances.

The appellation Modernist was first applied in two documents of the Roman Church, the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi* issued in 1907, to a growing party in that Church, which, led away, as the Papal theologians assert, by pride and curiosity, had fallen into serious heresy. The documents sketch, with great clearness, though naturally not without bias, the views in philosophy and Church history which are at the root of this serious heresy, and which are declared to be false and pernicious.

At the bottom of the philosophy of the Modernists the Papal theologians place 'vital immanentism,'

the tracing of the source of religion to human life and inspiration ; in a word, to the religious experience of individuals, whether explicit or subconscious. And at the bottom of Modernist historic views the same authorities place the thesis that the history of Christianity must be sought out by the same faculties and by the same methods as other branches of history. Both of these tendencies are anathema.

The treatment of the history of Christianity in a similar way to the history of Greece and Rome is a tendency which has been for long prevalent in the Universities not under Papal dominion. In this matter Oxford and Berlin, Paris and Florence, the English and the American Cambridge are at one. And it is precisely in consequence of the adoption of this point of view that immense progress has taken place in Christian history. The impossibility of calling a halt, and handing back the history of Christianity to the Roman Curia, was most decisively shown when Monsignor Duchesne, an ardent lover of his Church, and by no means partial to Protestant Theology, was obliged by his intellectual conscience to adopt in his learned Church History similar methods and standards to those which prevail in the colleges of the North and West.

The case is somewhat different as regards vital immanentism. The rules of historic investigation have been evolved by a succession of great writers, and have generally prevailed. But the field of philosophy is not in the same way mapped out and defined. We still have a multitude of schools, hostile one to another, but quite unable to silence one another. For my part, I hold that there is a close relation between the philosophic principle of vital immanentism and Modernist views on Christian history and doctrine ; and I have maintained that view in my recent book on *Modernism in the English Church*. But this is no place for a full discussion of profound philosophic questions. And the great majority of Modernists in Great Britain stand very loose to all philosophic systems. It is of them that I have to speak.

The same tendencies of thought which have produced Modernism in the Roman and in the Anglican Church have acted also among Presbyterians and Congregationalists ; though among the latter the absence of definite external control has made the movement less obvious and more gradual. The Presbyterians of Scotland have certainly greatly changed their attitude since, half a century ago, Dr. Robertson Smith was expelled from his Professorship for holding too advanced views in regard to the Pentateuch. But in a brief paper like the present I must confine myself within rigid limits : so I

shall speak only of the Modernism which is at present a force, a powerful and disturbing force, in the English Church. Some Anglican Modernists would disclaim any relation or any parallelism to the Modernism of men like Loisy and Tyrrell, who were expelled from the Church of Rome at the beginning of the century ; but this is to go too far ; the same insistent problems lie at the root of both movements, though the solution is different.

There has always been a Broad Church party in the English Church, but towards the end of the nineteenth century it was weak. The leaders of it, Jowett, Stanley, Maurice, and the rest, had passed away. The Ritualists were active and confident, and had seized on the theological colleges. And it must be confessed that the protagonists of the Broad party had no very clear or strong platform on which to erect their theories ; it was with them rather a matter of temperament than of reason.

But meantime steady and thorough work on the original documents and the early history of Christianity had been carried on at Oxford and Cambridge and elsewhere. The mantle of Robertson Smith had fallen on Dr. Driver. The enormous labours of scientific theologians on the Old and New Testaments were slowly producing results in England, and had affected even the High Church writers in *Lux Mundi*, to the great disgust of their more conservative friends. Within my memory the character of theological teaching in the University has completely changed, and the field of history is no longer rigidly divided into sacred and profane. The constantly sapping force of historic method has driven the old-fashioned orthodoxy from one post after another. And while brilliant theories and rigidly logical systems in the historic field are appearing and disappearing like meteors, the great body of theological teachers is moving slowly and steadily to new and more defensible ground.

And parallel to the movement in history has been a great movement in science. The idea of development in biology has caused us to take far more interest in origins, and particularly in human origins, social, ethical, and religious. In the last century the rapid growth of science disposed many men to look on religion as an outworn and useless thing, and to expect from our scientists a key to all the problems of the universe. That wave of tendency is mainly spent ; the greatest scientific authorities now feel that science can never solve the ultimate problems ; that there will always be a

point beyond which it cannot go. Science can give us facts, and teach us laws ; but it cannot embark on the problem of values, or show us what we ought to do with our lives. The man of science, like any other man, has duties, personal, social, and political ; and, in order to discharge them, is obliged to resort to some kind of religion, even when he prefers to call it by some other name. Beyond the facts of origin and development stand the great values. The man of science also has a soul to be saved, and he very generally finds that he cannot save it without the aid of a spiritual power working in and through the facts of Nature and the lives of men.

A man may, of course, commit the care of his salvation to an organized Church, which will take charge of it, only insisting in return on his obedience. But, if he rejects this facile resource, he finds no other save by plunging into the sea of difficulty in search of the firm land of faith which lies beyond it.

There is no doubt that the steady advance of historic science has been the chief cause of the rise of Modernism. It has affected the whole intellectual atmosphere, so that many who really know very little about it have found themselves obliged to reject much that our fathers had accepted without question. In particular, the attitude of the modern mind towards miracle has become more and more sceptical. Our fathers found no difficulty in believing that for one short period of history, miracles were by Divine overruling permitted, and afterwards ceased ; but we now look on the whole course of history as a gradual development, with remarkable crises, no doubt, but still under the rule of law, or, to speak more exactly, under the control of a spiritual Power who works through law.

Even the miracles accompanying the birth and the resurrection of the Saviour, the modern mind, accustomed to find parallel tales through the whole course of ancient history, declines to accept when they are presented as a basis of faith in the Christian religion. It finds a far safer basis in the facts of religious experience recorded in Scripture, and verified day by day in the experience of multitudes.

It is largely because certain miraculous events are insisted on as historic in the Creeds that the Modernists claim to interpret them broadly. But this is not their only difficulty. Such phrases as 'very God of very God,' and 'of one substance with the Father,' ordinary Church people cannot in the least understand. Such phrases seem to them completely unreal. And they are right.

Such phrases, which indeed are not confined to the Creeds, but recur in various parts of the liturgy, cannot be understood, and cannot be explained, except in reference to ways of thinking which prevailed in the ancient world, but have long become obsolete. Church-goers cannot understand why such formulæ should not be superseded by direct expressions of religious faith and experience.

There is abroad a notion, which is accepted by many strict Church people, that the Creeds are all-important in the teaching of the English Church. A glance at the Articles of Religion will confute this view. The three Creeds, those Articles say, including the Athanasian, are to be received because they may be proved by Scripture. But this is not in fact the case ; therefore this Article must be regarded as one of those which are out of date, in which category several Articles are generally placed. So far as I am aware, no Church has placed the Creeds on a higher level of authority than the New Testament ; and the historic and doctrinal statements of the New Testament are freely criticised in the theological lecture-room.

The Church of Rome has authoritatively published her views as to Church history and doctrines, which are to be submissively received by all her members. But in the English Church there is far more liberty ; a general assent is all that is required, by the Clerical Subscription Act of 1865.

It would, however, be unfair to speak of the Modernist tendency as merely negative, as leading only to the giving up of some of the beliefs held by our forefathers. It has also a conservative or constructive side. Churchmen, looking at the course of Christian history with the help of psychology, have found that in many cases doctrines which were regarded as set forth by arbitrary ecclesiastic authority are really the expression, probably the imperfect expression, of deep and lasting religious experience. When criticism has done its work, much reconstruction is possible on a basis not of authority, but of fact. This is a process far more difficult than mere criticism, and it must be slow. The rudiments of it are to be found in Robertson's Sermons ; and the influence which has been exerted in England by recent works of the German theologians Otto and Heiler shows how the leaven is working.

The notion, sedulously circulated by some of the Church newspapers, that the Modernists are wanting in loyalty to the Church, and dishonest in repeating statements which they do not believe, is unjust and false. There are certain parts of the Liturgy which are distasteful to them, as there are parts

which are distasteful to the High and the Low Church. The English Church is comprehensive, and that is one of her best features ; but to be comprehensive she must needs give up a thoroughly logical and systematic character. She aims at being the Church, not of a sect, whether Catholic or Protestant, but of the nation so far as it is attached to the Christian religion, and willing to accept her mode of presenting it. The recitation of prayers and Creeds and the like in Church is a corporate, not an individual act, and it must be taken in the mass. It is easy to imagine the confusion and absurdity which would arise if every individual were determined only to repeat such petitions, or to sing such hymns, as he heartily approved of. Of course, he may be silent if he strongly revolts against the words spoken ; but surely in Church we should cultivate a tolerant and generous, not a critical and exclusive, habit of mind.

The Modernists claim to be a loyal element in the English Church. They claim to carry on the tradition of a great party which has always existed in that Church, from the days of Leighton and Cudworth and Butler onwards. And they claim to serve a useful purpose in the Church by acting as officers of *liaison* between it and what is best in modern civilization.

They are by no means well organized. They are a crowd rather than an army, and no one can be called their leader. But at the beginning of the century there arose a danger that clergymen of Modernist tendencies might suffer persecution through the hardening tendencies displayed by some of the Anglo-Catholic leaders. To protect the rank and file of the movement, and to further its influence, there was then formed a society called 'The Churchmen's Union for the Advancement of Liberal Religious Thought.' At first it was weak, and at some of its meetings the spirit of discord was present. But it has rapidly grown in numbers and influence, and is at present the best representative of the Modernist party. It has a monthly organ, ably edited by Dr. Major, the Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, and called the *Modern Churchman*. It has held every year since 1914 an annual conference, at which some of the great questions in regard to Christianity and the Church are discussed, and the discussions are published in special numbers of the *Modern Churchman*, which circulate widely. But, of course, no decisions are reached. The direction of the policy of the Society is in the hands of a Council, which watches the course of events in the Church, and has sometimes

intervened in them with important results. The President at present is Dean Inge.

The objects which the Churchmen's Union sets before itself are eight in number :

1. To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2. To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3. To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4. To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5. To promote the adaptation of the Church Services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6. To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7. To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8. To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

The eighth object has been more recently added in response to the appeal of members, but the Council has always kept it in the background, not because it is of less importance, but for practical reasons. In the first place, there is a multitude of religious societies, of which the so-called *Copec* is the best known, which have worked and are working for this special purpose ; it seemed useless to add one to the number. In the second place, the purpose is so vast and so insistent, and so completely occupies our horizon, that if the Society gave special heed to it, it would be drawn away from its original design, which is rather to remove the intellectual difficulties in the way of a renovated Christianity, than to cope with all the evils of our perverted civilization. But this wise abstention is not always respected, and the members of the Churchmen's Union have had over and over again to listen to preachers and moralists, whether of their own number or from outside, who have dwelt on the greater importance of conduct than of thought (which is, in fact, one of the main proofs of the Modernist position), and have spoken with some contempt of the Society as composed of men who have little sympathy with the life of practical religion. The reproach is utterly unjust, as some of our members, and still more of our sympathizers, are prominent in the work of *Copec*. But there is truth after all in the words, 'Evil is wrought by want of thought as well as want of heart,' and

to clarify and modernize the thought of the Church is, after all, scarcely a less important object than to stimulate the life of practical Christianity.

The Society has already weathered one storm. After one of its conferences, held at Girton in 1921, on the subject of 'Christ and the Creeds,' the papers read at the Conference, and published in the *Modern Churchman*, were delated by the English Church Union to the Convocations of Canterbury and York as containing heresy, and a condemnation of them was demanded. Both Convocations care-

fully considered the matter, and both declined to sanction the 'denunciation of contributions made by earnest men in their endeavour to bring new light to bear upon' the anxious problems of Christian theology. We may regard this decision as a charter of liberty. And liberty in the face of modern thought is what Modernists desire. But liberty in a wider sense has to be protected; for there is a small but eager party in the Church which would if it could establish a tyranny and narrow the national Church into a rigid sect.

Literature.

THE HINDU VIEW OF LIFE.

PROFESSOR S. RADHAKRISHNAN seems to be becoming a kind of official and accredited exponent of Hinduism to the Western world. Apart from his writings, has he not given the Haskell Lectures to the University of Chicago? And here are his Upton Lectures delivered at Manchester College, Oxford—*The Hindu View of Life* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net).

His faith is fortunate in its champion—a man, alert, thoughtful, fair-minded, armed cap-à-pie in the matter of knowledge, and the master of a trenchant style full of the stab of arresting sentences. His book is a defence of Hinduism, a claim that its way is the true way, and its creed the wise creed, and its methods the best even yet for our distracted world. He takes that huge, unwieldy, amorphous mass of contradictions, screaming at each other, the whole babel of it, from the rarefied atmosphere of its abstruse philosophy to the vulgarities of its crudest orgies, and—while now and then gently insinuating an admission of imperfection—boldly defends the lot. His claim is that Hinduism, which at the highest is to him the mode of human thought that has climbed nearest the reality of things, was wisely guided in making provision within itself for all types of minds, down to the very dimmest and least worthy. You must not force the pace of development; to shatter the superstitions of the savage is to shatter his morality; it is futile to stress any one particular metaphysic, and indeed only the half-religious worry about dogma. Live your own better religion, but seize upon crude minds, admit the element of truth in what they see,

even though you can't see it, and gradually educate them or their far-off descendants up to higher things. That, he says, has been the guiding principle of Hinduism. And, while he admits that it has worked imperfectly, no other, he is sure, can do as well. That is a view with which we shall find it difficult to agree. The sinister facts of the history of our own religion, the pitiful fashion in which it has been so largely spoiled and baffled by the inrush of lower views and heathen superstitions, brought in by pagan peoples only partly Christianized, stare at us menacingly. And when Smith, the Cambridge Platonist, is quoted, 'Such as men themselves are, such will God Himself seem to him to be.' No doubt. But the whole point of Christianity is to teach us to think of God in terms, not of our own sullen, foolish, sinful selves, but of Jesus Christ. 'This,' says John, laying down his pen, 'is the real God, really seen by us at last.' And for us dogma is not futile. For only the Christian facts possess the power to make the Christian life.

The defence of Hinduism is whole-hearted, at times even audacious: where, for example, we are told of the encouragement in the doctrine of Karma (dogma, it seems, is not so futile after all); or that the Hindu view that every human being has a personality worthy of reverence is slowly spreading at long last over the earth; most of all in a challenging chapter, largely in defence of caste, which runs out into most interesting comments on the world problems of our time. It is a chastening experience to have this thoughtful observer watch us closely, and announce sadly and courteously but with conviction that the ideals of our age are sordid, and our hopes shallow, and our prophets