

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

Committee, which began with the help of the Austrian children, has been continued for the benefit of many others in need through poverty and ill-health; and much good work is being done in providing holidays and in placing Welsh girls in situations. They remember, too, their studies in Christian politics, in the problem of democracy in industry, in prison reform, in education. They are glad of the fellowship and international schools established by members, of experiments in the care of delinquent children and older girls through free discipline and self-government, like 'Riverside' and 'Fairby Grange,' of experiments in sharing like 'the Brethren of the Common Table,' of much experience of worship and prayer together in the spirit that assuredly can be the only lasting foundation for Christian reunion. They rejoice in the high service in the Church itself to which many members have been recalled since the War.

This is not the place to speak of innumerable conferences and campaigns, not even of the Christ and Peace campaign, a considerable interdenominational peace effort led two years ago by the Bishop of Chichester, to which the Fellowship gave the original impetus. Nor is there space to speak of waiting tasks. Members of the F.o.R. unite with many others in anxiety over poverty and discontent at home, violence in the Near East, in Germany, in South America, and closer at hand, over disarmament and economic reconstruction long postponed, and over the League of Nations, so insecurely

based. These things call for a Christian politics and a Christian diplomacy, and chiefly for men who are reconcilers and the makers of real peace. What might not another Söderblom do at this moment between France and Germany?

The Fellowship of Reconciliation, though looking eagerly for the day when the Church as a whole shall have made its special witness unnecessary, feels impelled to try to maintain a focus of peace-making, and to think of itself as something like an order of Christian activists believing in the Kingdom of God 'here and now,' pointing to the way of peace in Christ and seeking to walk in it. It must not over-emphasize one aspect of truth to the exclusion of others, and must realize how challenging to every part of life is the truth it sees. Its guidance and its safeguard lie in the continual reminder as it seeks peace and justice and the ideal community, that 'in Jesus Christ is the true solution of all the problems of the complex world order of to-day.'¹ Its members desire humbly and reverently to urge their Christian brethren not only to recognize that war is incompatible with the way of life to which the gospel calls us, but that the Cross, that supreme 'truth insistence' and 'suffering harmlessness,' while it rejects the whole idea of defence and refuses any guarantee of personal safety, reveals to us the things which belong unto our peace and have so long been hid from our eyes.

¹ *The Fellowship of Reconciliation* (Foundation Statement, 1914).

Loisy's Mémoires.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D., ILFORD.

THE three large volumes of Loisy's autobiography,¹ reaching a sum total of 1700 pages, are much more than the record of an individual career. They contain the completest account we possess of the controversy on Biblical criticism and the Modernist Movement in France. The materials from which the author has made selections were very extensive, but the work would have been improved by condensing. There is much unconscious self-revealing. And whether regarded as a study of the relations between criticism and faith, or of the gradual

¹ *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire religieuse de notre temps*, 3 vols. (1931).

disappearance of personal religion, these volumes awaken many serious reflections.

As Professor at the Catholic Institute in Paris, under the presidency of Mgr. d'Hulst, Loisy was associated with Duchesne, whom he criticises severely, and with Vigouroux, Secretary of the Biblical Commission, writer of some twenty volumes of eminently safe, indeed ultra-conservative studies on Scripture. Loisy as a critic was very soon in trouble with the authorities. His independent treatment of Biblical inspiration caused so much alarm that Icard, Head of the College of Saint Sulpice, forbade his students to attend the lectures.

In a chapter appropriately entitled 'Publications and Tribulations,' Loisy recounts that his opinions on the date of the Proverbs of Solomon were denounced at Rome, with the result that he was unofficially informed that the injury which his opinions inflicted on the literary glory of the Hebrew king was resented in high places, and that if he continued on these lines he would not escape an official condemnation. In spite of the warning, he started a periodical of his own, *L'Enseignement biblique*, intended for the instruction of young priests. Whereupon d'Hulst expressed the hope that the periodical would not become dangerous to its editor. Meantime, Loisy confided to his private diary the reflection that the Church at the present hour was an obstruction to the intellectual development of mankind. Not that this obscurantist influence is necessarily involved in its principles and constitution, but is an abuse which easily springs from them. Loisy assures his readers that he had not yet begun to doubt the essential presuppositions of Catholic Theology. Yet he did not shrink from indicting painful sentences about the sacred legend of Judaism and Christianity, which Duchesne and he, in spite of real or verbal precautions, were labouring to demolish in the interests of Truth.

Further complications arose. D'Hulst, the principal, was sympathetic towards the modern critical school, and anxious to mediate between the conservative and progressive extremes. His biographer, Baudrillart, recorded years ago how greatly d'Hulst appreciated Loisy's learning and ability; but d'Hulst was in a difficult position, and naturally apprehensive about the safety of the Institute. Yet he wanted to be fair to those on the rationalist side. Prompted by conciliatory motives, he published in the *Correspondant* of 1892 an essay on Renan. It was shortly after Renan's death. D'Hulst declared quite uncompromisingly that Renan's philosophical presuppositions had determined his critical conclusions, and that he had outraged the religion recognized by the State; but at the same time d'Hulst admitted that the instruction given in the theological seminaries had been elementary and obsolete. This was followed by another article on the 'Biblical Question,' well meant as an overture for larger toleration, but producing in authoritative circles precisely the contrary effect. In acknowledging the existence of errors in the Bible, d'Hulst risked his own condemnation. There was a storm of opposition. Rome was disturbed. D'Hulst felt obliged to make a pilgrimage and explain in person to the Pope the

motives which prompted his essays. He returned to Paris convinced that if he hoped to avert a public censure he must place the suspected orthodoxy of the Catholic Institute above suspicion. He was forced most reluctantly to inform Loisy that it was impossible to retain him.

This, however, was the time selected by Loisy for publishing in his periodical an article on the 'Inspiration of Scripture,' criticising the view that Divine inspiration necessitates the absolute truth of the inspired word. He declared that non-Catholic critics of the Bible had arrived at a certain number of conclusions which, in all probability, they would never surrender, since they had powerful reasons for regarding them as scientifically verified. Loisy's article put d'Hulst in despair. Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris, was aghast. A meeting of Bishops in Paris decided that Loisy must be dismissed. He resigned his professorship.

Toward the close of the same year, 1893, Leo XIII. issued his Encyclical, 'Providentissimus Deus.' It affirmed that no error is compatible with Divine inspiration. Loisy contended that Divine Authority is not applicable to a book. Cardinal Richard advised him to suppress his periodical, which after an interval he did. He also wrote a letter to Leo XIII. professing his entire submission to the doctrine of the Encyclical on the study of Holy Scripture. If he expressed himself publicly in the usual deferential terms, he could not resist observing privately that he was not an adept in the art of genuflection. Cardinal Rampolla's reply was to the effect that the Pope had received Loisy's letter with special favour, but advised that the writer should apply his talents to cultivate more particularly some other branch of science. The exasperated recipient of this reply exclaimed, did the Pope and his Secretary of State imagine that you can change your special scientific study as easily as you change your shirt? The sequel was that Cardinal Richard made Loisy chaplain of a Convent School for Girls. There he remained five years.

As to the state of his religious convictions, he says that he did not accept literally any article of the Catholic Creed unless it was, 'Crucified under Pontius Pilate.' He seems to have regarded religion with singular detachment as an immense force which had dominated the history of mankind in the past and seemed destined to dominate it in the future. But of personal religion very little is revealed.

Loisy ceased for a while to publish anything in his own name. But he wrote anonymously over various signatures: either as Fermin, or as Sharp,

or as Jacques Simon, a somewhat fantastic blend of Bossuet's Christian name with the surname of his well-known critical opponent. Anonymity, however, did not shield his writings from official condemnation. The long-established Journal, to which he contributed, the 'Revue du Clergé Français,' now unhappily deceased, received a letter from the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris condemning Loisy's article on the 'Religion of Israel,' and forbidding the publication of the remainder.

The fate of Loisy's most celebrated book, *L'Évangile et l'Église*, is from any point of view, pathetic. Written to prove that Harnack's reduction of the Essence of Christianity to the solitary doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, could not, on Harnack's own premises, be sustained, Loisy's book was irresistible. His proof that the doctrine of the Kingdom of God was essential to the Teaching of Christ was conclusive.

But the sensation created by this little red book was immense. Troeltsch appreciated it. Von Hügel was deeply sympathetic. Robert Dell¹ said, 'to many of us who are Catholics it seems that M. Loisy has found at least the main lines of a synthesis between faith and criticism.' Batiffol criticised it with great severity. Dr. Inge, the present Dean of St. Paul's, said that 'no intelligent reader can fail to see that M. Loisy's attitude towards the Gospel history is that of rationalism pure and simple. In his *Le Quatrième Évangile* supernatural events are simply set aside as un-historical; and the same presupposition seems to underlie the argument of his two other books.' Cardinal Richard condemned *L'Évangile et l'Église*, as seriously disturbing the faithful on fundamental dogmas of Catholic learning, especially the authority of Scripture and Tradition, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, etc. In 1903 the Congregation of the Holy Office condemned five works of Loisy and placed them on the Index.

Cardinal Merry del Val, Papal Secretary of State, sent a letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, which the latter read to Loisy, requiring immediate and unreserved withdrawal of the five volumes. Loisy informed the Archbishop that this demand was impossible for him to comply with. The Archbishop himself insisted that he must retire to a religious house in order to recover a catholic mentality. This condition appeared to Loisy ludicrous.

Loisy wrote to Pius x. declaring his desire to live and die in the Communion of the Catholic

Church. He had no wish to contribute to the ruin of the faith in his native land. It was not within his power to efface in himself the results of his studies. But so far as concerned himself he submitted himself to the judgment pronounced against his writing by the Congregation of the Holy Office. As a proof of his goodwill, and to promote peace, he was ready to relinquish his teaching in Paris, and to suspend the publication of the scientific works which he had been preparing.

Loisy's religious creed went to pieces. He said 'Von Hügel believes altogether differently from myself in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Setting metaphysical verbal controversy aside, I no more believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ than does Harnack or Reville. I regard personal incarnation of God as philosophic mythology. Christ holds less place in my religion than in that of liberal Protestants. For I do not attach so much importance as they do to this revelation of the Fatherhood of God. If I have anything in religion it is rather pantheist—positivist—humanitarian than Christian. I do not attribute to the essence of the Gospel that absolute and abiding value which Harnack desires to recognise in it.'

Two years later (1906) Loisy wrote a letter explaining his attitude to Religion, in which he said that the fundamental religious problem of the present time was not whether the Pope was infallible, or whether there were errors in the Bible, or even whether Christ is God, or whether there is a revelation. All these problems are superannuated, or they have changed their meaning, and depend on the one and only great problem whether the Universe is soulless, and the conscience of man finds nothing more real, more true than itself. He concluded with the reflection that faith demands Theism, but reason tends to Pantheism.

In a further letter he repeats Von Hügel's opinion, that reason leads to Monism, but the heart is able to find God. But for himself Loisy cannot find Him. God is for him an ideal projection of human intelligence.

The Encyclical 'Pascendi Dominici Gregis' of 1907 led to Loisy's exclusion from the Roman Communion. Cardinal Merry del Val, Papal Secretary of State, required him to condemn unreservedly all and each of the propositions condemned by the decree 'Lamentabile'; and the Modernism condemned by Pius x. in the Encyclical 'Pascendi.' Loisy replied to this that the decree 'Lamentabile' contained various extracts from his writings, but with their meaning gravely misrepresented. He could repudiate them, protesting

¹ *Church Times*, 22nd April 1904, p. 531.

against the meaning imported into them. Other extracts seemed to him indisputably true, and it was impossible for him to pronounce them to be false. He was unable to live in the intellectual atmosphere of the decree 'Lamentabile' and the Encyclical 'Pascendi.' The Cardinal reiterated his demand requiring submission within ten days. Loisy refused, and there followed in 1908 his excommunication. He says that the announcement brought him a feeling of genuine relief.

These volumes are by no means concerned only with Biblical Criticism. They are concerned with the problem of the ultimate reality of Religion itself. The author does not confine himself to historical criticism. He introduces his own speculative theories and philosophic presuppositions. He goes far beyond the province which he has made his own, into a province much deeper, and in which there is no reason to credit him with expert capacity or experience. The formidable fact confronts us in these volumes that one after another the advanced critics lose all faith in supernatural religion, and indeed in the personality of God. Margival begins as a priest agreeing with Richard Simon, ends as a layman engaged in a firm of publishers. Marcel Hebert similarly begins as a priest, throws aside his orders, and terminates his career in a vague philosophy of which even Loisy himself confesses its unsatisfactoriness.

When we reflect on the existence of great Theistic Religions independent of Christianity, there is plainly no reason why Biblical Criticism, however advanced or individualist, should end in denial of the personality of God. Are there no grounds in the Natural Universe, and in the intelligent and moral and spiritual capacity of man, to suggest a contrary conclusion? Have not millions rested their religious interpretation of life on these?

Loisy's strenuous indictment of the baleful influence of authoritative restriction on the freedom of the historical critic is powerful and indeed effective. But at the same time the total loss of anything that can be called religion goes far to neutralize his accusation. He seems entirely and strangely unconscious that his negative conclusions provoke reaction towards religion. Biblical Criticism is not necessarily ruinous to faith, nor can criticism ever be an adequate substitute for religion.

No notice of these volumes could reasonably omit a reference to Loisy's friendship with Von Hügel, a friendship extending over more than thirty years. It is superfluous to dwell on Von Hügel's sympathy with Loisy's critical labours, or on the encouragement which he lavished on the French Professor's troubles, or on the efforts which he made in the highest quarters to secure considerate treatment for his friend. Yet it is impossible not to feel that the difference between them was profound. Von Hügel watched with grave concern the diminishing hold of Loisy on anything that can be called Religion. In an impressive, indeed pathetic letter, Von Hügel sees that the line which Loisy is taking will if pursued lead to fuller exposition of his sceptical conclusions. Such a result Von Hügel owned would be very painful, and very harmful to many souls. Yet he had no fear that life's experience would not ultimately lead our fellow-mortals beyond the realm of radical scepticism.¹ To Von Hügel Loisy was the born enemy of the Transcendent, while the Baron 'took the Transcendent under his protection—not, however, that it needed it.' Loisy's influence on religion has become increasingly negative, whereas Von Hügel's last work was to bequeath to mankind his convictions on the Reality of God.

¹ iii. 168.

Literature.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

IN her most recent volume, *The Golden Sequence* (Methuen; 5s. net), Miss Evelyn Underhill sets out her personal conclusions on the principles which are involved in a theology of the Spirit. The book takes its title from the Church's great hymn to the Spirit, the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, known as the

'Golden Sequence,' and represents an attempt to enter into the meaning of that hymn and to interpret the doctrine which it declares. In the four sections into which the work falls, Spirit, Spiritual Life, Purification, Prayer (the last named being perhaps the most useful to the ordinary reader), the relation between man and God is considered in its various aspects. If some readers