

was said to have died and risen again. The Rimmon of Damascus and the Ramman of Babylonia both come from this Jerahmeel. Jacob called his altar Jerahmeel-God-of-Bethel. How widespread was the worship of this divinity we may conjecture when we note that his name underlies the names read in the Syrian or Phœnician inscriptions—Rekubel, Eshmun, Melek, Hamman, Baal, Ramman, Naaman, and others. One of his titles was Dôd, and another Son-of-Man. After this we are not surprised to find that the Spirit which at the beginning brooded on the cosmic egg was really Ishtar, and that the Ark and Tent popularly ascribed to Yahweh belonged by right to this goddess.'

'The Son of Man'—let us continue Dr. Smith

a little longer—'the Son of Man of the Book of Enoch has already been disclosed to us as Jerahmeel. The Elohim who appears so often in our Hebrew text is really the same divinity. So is Michael of the New Testament Apocalypse; so is the "Wisdom" of Proverbs, chap. 8, and the Logos (Memra) of late Jewish documents. Why Belial should be found in this company is not so clear, but his name resembles Jerahmeel at least as much as some of the others, and we have Professor Cheyne's vote in his favour. The cherubim, the angel of Yahweh, and the angels in general are so many forms of Jerahmeel, and we reach the climax when we discover that the number of the Beast in Rev 13<sup>18</sup> has supplanted Asshur-Ishmael, the fuller name of the region called Jerahmeel or Ishmael.'

## The Problem of Modernism

IN THE CHURCH AND OUT OF IT.

BY THE REV. C. T. CRUTTWELL, M.A., CANON OF PETERBOROUGH.

WHEN the re-birth of the human spirit took place four centuries and a half ago, forces were awakened which required many generations to display their full power. So rich and complex a process it is, of course, impossible to comprehend under one formula; but we shall not be far wrong if we fix on two elements as supreme: the desire for true knowledge in the intellectual sphere, and the desire for freedom in the practical. Of these, the former has to a great extent realized itself, and stands on a secure basis; the latter is still in process of fulfilment. Though in some quarters amply recognized, its inherent limits and its relation to knowledge are still imperfectly understood; so that its unchecked progress inspires alarm even among those who possess it, and deters those who do not possess it from encouraging its increase.

Both these forces belong to the spiritual order, which is as much as to say that they are uncontrollable and irresistible. Man does not dominate them: he is dominated by them. All he can do is to guide, limit, and to a certain outward extent repress them; but he cannot subdue them. In a sound

social organism the two forces co-operate: they act and react powerfully on one another. They are the leaven which ferments in the modern world, and permeates every portion of it.

We have recently witnessed an instructive and pathetic spectacle. An old man, justly venerated for his piety and singleness of heart, in his capacity of supreme head of the greatest religious community in the world, has issued an encyclical letter condemning in the severest terms what he calls modernism in religion, and declaring it to be absolutely subversive of the faith of Christ. He has done this deliberately, with the aid of advisers who have thoroughly mastered the demands of the modern spirit, after having been earnestly petitioned by eminent and loyal clergy to refrain, and though he knew that more than one Cardinal, many Bishops, and a large number of priests were in entire sympathy with the views he condemned. And this at a time when his Church is confronted with exceptional dangers from outside; when its forces, if ever, need to be united and concentrated with the fullest possible efficiency against the

common foe. Moreover, his manifesto has been subjected to a severe and scathing criticism by one of the ablest members of his communion, and exposed in the columns of the *Times* to the indignation or ridicule of mankind. He must have been prepared for this. It is but reasonable to suppose that the astute intellects which inspire the policy of the Vatican see clearly the steps in front of them, and have thus designedly chosen their battleground, confident that their attack will redound to the greater efficiency of the Church as the instrument for winning souls to Christ.

Now most English Churchmen respect the Pope's motives. They do not doubt his single-hearted devotion to His Divine Lord, nor the sincerity of his belief that the dogmas for which he stands are the only true expression of Christ's Gospel. And granting this, they cannot blame him for his uncompromising attitude, but must rather admire such courageous outspokenness. And should he prove right in his contention, they will be compelled with sorrow to admit that the gloomy forecasts of destructive heresies in the last times, and of the failure of faith upon the earth, are apparently fulfilled, and that the Christian Church has become again what it was at the beginning, a little flock of faithful men and women in the midst of an ungodly and unbelieving world.

And yet to admit this would surely be a counsel of despair. Looking only to the Roman communion, and leaving out of sight the other bodies of Christians, it would cause us all profound sorrow to see that great Church weakened in her hopes of success, compelled to thrust out from her ranks or terrorize into hypocrisy such a phalanx of devoted adherents as those to whom we refer, and narrowing her message to a formula which the enlightened of our age cannot accept.

Nevertheless, if the Pope be in the main right; if his syllabus is based on no mere considerations of unity, efficiency, or discipline, but solely on a conviction of its divine truth, then, however much we might lament its results, we should not only respect it as an utterance, but we should be inclined to go further, and expect that through God's providential guidance it would in the long-run be utilized to the good of souls and the benefit of His Church.

But if he is mistaken; if by training and environment he is unable to discern things as they really are; if, coerced by a system, he cannot separate the

immutable and eternal gospel from human (however venerable) expressions of it, then he must bear the penalty of lack of insight, which in a ruler cannot be excused by purity of motive, but will be brought before the bar of judgment both of man and God.

And here it is permissible to broaden our point of view, and extend our observations so as to include not only the Roman Church but the Church of England; for modernism, intellectual and social, is quite as truly a factor in English Churchmanship as in that of Rome; and the criticisms of Father Tyrrell seem quite as applicable to our communion as they are to his own.

The progress of social democratic ideas may be more difficult to adjust with the organization of Roman Catholicism, but it has its urgent problem for ourselves also. This aspect of the question, however, demands an essay to itself. I can only allude to it here, and must confine my remarks to Modernism on its intellectual side. Father Tyrrell strikes the right note in his defence of it when he pleads that men's categories of thought have altered, and that scholastic presentations of dogma no longer fit in with them. This is a consideration which I believe to be of first-rate importance, one which cannot be too clearly apprehended.

By the categories of thought I mean those ultimate generalizations or modes under which we cannot help conceiving of things. They result directly from our education and environment, and indirectly, though not less powerfully, from the spirit of our times. Many of them are unchanged in form since the Middle Ages, but changed in inward significance. Such are *Natural* and *supernatural*—*Divine* and *human*: *Revelation*, *Law*. Others are practically new—such as *Evolution*, *Scientific Knowledge*, *Fact*. But my contention is, that all, or nearly all, have been reborn with the modern world, and must be understood in their modern sense if they are to convey to the modern world any spiritual message. It may be worth while to enlarge a little on this point.

In the Middle Ages, as Bishop Creighton pointed out in some remarkable lectures on Indulgences delivered in Leicester in 1893, the Church was universally accepted as an ultimate category of thought: a mould into which men's conceptions unconsciously fell, and which was as inevitable as life itself. Now this category has gradually fallen

out. It is possible to conceive of human life independently of the Church, however mutilated and imperfect such a conception may be. But it is not possible to conceive of life apart from Evolution, at least for those that reflect. We can only think of the universe and all that is in it as being what it is through having come to be what it is. And this is as true of states of mind, knowledge, or belief as it is of the material world. A ready-made, mature, and unprogressive civilization, for example, is for us inconceivable, though in former times this was by no means the case. It is true that in the operations of the mind, development is of two kinds: that which governs the progress of science, law, and civil life, which builds up fresh material as it advances, and is made certain only by experience; and that which governs the progress of mathematics, morals, and religion, which consists in the progressive realization of principles already fixed and unchanging. But in either case we cannot, if we belong to modern life, free our minds from the constraining influence of this category of evolution, which compels us to conceive of all things within our experience as having to come to be what they are, not by being as it were unpacked successively out of a locked portmanteau, but by some inward force or law of organic unfolding or growth. This the Pope's encyclical denies, and Father Tyrrell and all modernist theologians affirm.

Again, let us take the category of Fact. To scientific men a fact is a proved sensible effect, or a phenomenon which makes itself known by some proved sensible effect. The invisible or miraculous is not fact in the scientific sense, though it may rightly be believed to have happened in order to account for some sensible or spiritual results. This conception of a fact is by no means generally accepted. But it is gradually becoming characteristic of all scientifically trained minds. To them a fact so conceived is a sacred thing; and religious thinkers, to whom the word fact bears a much larger significance, may well be asked to show some consideration for the difficulty which scientific men feel in accepting as proved facts historical or theological truths which to themselves are abundantly certified. In the Middle Ages the category of fact was undefined. As every historian knows, very little evidence was required to entitle a story that fell in with the prevailing thirst for marvels to rank as a fact, certain and sensible as any that

were seen or verified. They had no clear test to apply in discriminating fact from fancy.

Again, take the category of Law. In mediæval times this implied the command of a superior: the command of God, or of the Church, or of the king or chief. In our time the conception of Law has not lost this meaning: it still holds the field in every branch of our life; but side by side with it has arisen a different conception of law as the invariable sequence of cause and effect, founded on the uniformity of nature; which in one sense is less stringent than the other law, because it does not act by compulsion, and in another sense is more stringent, because there is no room for any change of purpose. The force of this category in modern thought is shown by such books as Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*; and it is daily widening its domain.

Once again, let us take the categories Divine and Human. In mediæval times God was conceived of as transcendent, and this conception was emphasized by the miracle of the Altar. The human was always regarded as in sharp contrast with the divine. In modern religious thought this clear-cut antithesis can no longer be maintained. The category of Evolution has reimported into theology the doctrine of the immanence of God, and with it all its momentous consequences. That God became man is no longer an isolated marvel. It is the expression in time of an eternal truth, which Holy Scripture tells us the angels desire to look into. And that man is also in a real sense divine is a necessary corollary from it. So, too, the Scripture is both divine and human: human because divine, and divine because in the highest sense human. But, here again, Modernism does not deny the transcendency of God. It heartily acknowledges this as a vital portion of the truth; but it emphasizes the immanence as nearer to ourselves, and more helpful to our highest life.

Two more illustrations shall be added from the more strictly theological sphere. Revelation was once regarded as the external communication from God to man. The modernist regards it as the self-revelation of God to man from within, and thus it becomes both continuous and progressive. The birth of Christ within the soul reveals the truth of His external message. At the same time the modernist does not deny, but rather emphasises the external revelation of God through His creation and through the history of man. The laws of

nature as discovered by science are conceived as a revelation of God's mind; the different non-Christian religions are regarded as more or less imperfectly apprehended communications of God to man. Thus the conception of truth has been transformed concurrently with that of revelation: for it has become an axiom that all things that are proved are true, and that truth cannot possibly conflict with truth. And though one mind cannot grasp the whole body of truth, yet humanity as a whole may do so, and must not be content until it does so. Hence the idea that all truth was communicated at one time cannot be retained. Truth is not static; it is dynamic. It is futile to hark back to any particular epoch and endeavour to revive its faith or doctrines. Such an effort can only result in an illusion; for the plane of thought, the moral and spiritual standpoint, has irrecoverably shifted.

And as a last example let us take the word Catholic. At first this meant all-inclusive, and was applied to the Church. But soon it was extended to the doctrine taught by the Church, which, indeed, made a bold effort to be worthy of its name, but soon became identified with a rigidly fixed body of formularies. In our days the word Catholic as applied to the Church is reaching out towards a larger meaning, and striving to extend itself to all those who call themselves by the name of Christ. I grant the difficulty of correspondingly enlarging the content of Catholic doctrine. The time has not yet come for a clear insight into this problem. But the transformation of the Hebrew Gospel into the Greek theology without loss of continuity was a process no less wonderful than would be the restatement of the Christian theology in a form corresponding with the exigencies of modernist thinkers at the present day. They have their categories of thought now as the Græco-Roman world had then; and what was possible in the one case ought not to be impossible in the other.

From these illustrations, to which others might be added, it is evident that the Problem of Modernism, as we have called it, is to ascertain whether it is possible to harmonize the demands on the Christian's faith made by Scripture and the Creeds with the new categories of thought that have taken possession of the more progressive minds, and to a certain extent prevail everywhere in civilized communities. The Syllabus denies this possibility, and subjects

those who believe in it to its anathema. The modernist contends that as primitive Christianity was itself stigmatized as modern, as scholasticism was once a modern innovation, it does not follow that the present demands of thought are necessarily unsound.

For, be it observed, modernism is not mere rationalism. Rationalism claims the competence of human reason to understand and account for the religious truth which it decides to receive. If not in words, yet in substance it claims supremacy over faith. Modernism within the Church asserts no such ambitious claim. Many of its adherents profess entire loyalty to the Church's creed, and, judged by their fruits, display convincing evidences of the gospel spirit. What they plead for is the recognition by the Church's leaders of the deeper and wider philosophy which has supplanted scholasticism, as needing co-ordination with the Church's formularies for her sake as well as its own. They remind us that Divine foreknowledge was once thought to be incompatible with human freedom. Few would now believe this. Truth, and, above all, spiritual truth, cannot be confined within one alternative presentation. When Kant declared that the pure reason demanded one set of postulates and the practical reason another, we are not to understand that there are really two different reasons in man to which correspond two contradictory spheres of truth, but that the one truth is so large that it cannot be grasped in its entirety, but only through the artificial process of separating man's faculties and assigning to each its appropriate facet of the total reality. If we consider the instances here alleged, we shall see that none of them are primarily concerned with a negation, but all reach out towards larger and more deep-reaching comprehensiveness. The element of negation is accidental; the element of comprehension is fundamental.

The modernist may appear at first sight to be an agnostic. But the agnostic aspect of his theology, which need not be denied, is more than balanced by his unshakeable consciousness of the inward revelation of Deity, which by its own vital energy carries itself beyond the individual into the outer world. '*God is love*' is perhaps no more an exhaustive definition than the older '*God is force* (or power).' But it is universally felt by Christians to be a higher one; precisely for this reason, that it appeals to the inner light, which the other does

not; that it has the power, which the other has not, of reproducing or externalizing itself in the spiritual union of mankind.

It is granted at once that the problem here indicated is of the utmost arduousness and difficulty, and such as may well appal those who have taught and guided men's religious life on the ancient lines. But to admit its difficulty is not to assert its impossibility. Surely the Pope's attitude is a counsel of despair. And we contend that, if such an attitude were ever justifiable, there is not sufficient ground for adopting it in the present circumstances. If we observed side by side with it a growing irreverence towards the Person or teaching of our Lord; if we observed a hostility towards the Christian ideal of brotherhood and self-sacrifice, a rejection of the scriptural view of sin and man's need of a Saviour, or even a contumacious disobedience to the Church's authority, we might have better ground for distrusting the growth of modernism as essentially anti-Christian. But he would be a bold controversialist who affirmed these to be its characteristics. The Pope is candid enough to confess that it is the earnestness, zeal, and self-sacrifice of many of its advocates which make this movement all the more dangerous. Strange that it should not have occurred to him to consider whether this fact could not be better explained as the effect of true convictions than as the result of heretical self-will.

That in a movement so complex and far-reaching there are elements dangerous to the historic faith, it is impossible to deny. All the more necessary is it for our soundest theologians carefully to study and clearly to understand its varied developments in order that they may successfully defend the citadel of our faith, and not spend their efforts in the defence of outworks that have already been undermined. These are times of stress and perplexity. And in such times the temptation is strong to close in our defences, and by entrenching ourselves within a rigid barrier, to emphasize the contrast between a dogmatism forced by events into an ever-narrower exclusiveness and the free movements of the human spirit, needing, as they always must, instruction, help, and comfort. We shall do well to remember the fate of Judaism. A religious opportunity, the greatest ever seen, was by that very policy lost, and lost for ever. And there are signs that the Roman Church is re-enacting the same policy; and if this be so, have we

any right to expect a different result? May we trust that our own Church will be inspired with a larger hope, a firmer trust, a broader outlook! In it are united more than in any other communion the two rival forces of authority and liberty: hard to balance justly no doubt, but when so balanced, harder still to overcome. There are signs that Science, now aware of her limitations, does not mean to close her ears to the voice of religion speaking to her of that sphere into which she knows she cannot enter; but to speak with effect, religion must not use the tongue of a foreigner (*βάρβαρος*<sup>1</sup>), but must learn the native dialect. Surely this is the spiritual significance of the gift of tongues. 'How hear we them every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?'<sup>2</sup>

This is the goal towards which we may humbly believe our branch of Christ's Church has been started by the Divine Master. This is why sound and first-hand learning must ever be our Church's strength: not the learning of handbooks or party-histories, still less of popular treatises and reviews, but the learning of the original documents, above all of the Scriptures, and the researches upon them; and next, of all first-hand thinkers and writers who have gone to the making of our modern intellectual life. These last are not useless to the theologian, but, on the contrary, help him greatly towards appreciating the needs of man's spirit, and according to Christ's commands, understanding the signs of the times.

And this leads me to my final point. The title of my paper speaks of modernism in the Church and outside it. At this very moment we see unfolding before us outside the Church an intellectual and spiritual process as momentous as the European Renaissance and even more extensive. I allude to the awakening of national ideals in the East. Through the whole of Asia, from Japan to Egypt, a ferment is in process which has spread from the intellectual leaders and is fast taking possession of the different peoples: an impulse towards enlightenment, mental and spiritual, with a resulting aspiration after national independence, which it will be vain to suppress, and mere blindness to ignore. When we consider that it affects nearly half of the human race, and peoples of high intelligence and ancient civilization, there can be no two opinions as to its significance. It is described with eloquent earnestness in an article in *East and West* (Oct. 1907), by

<sup>1</sup> 1 Co 14<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Ac 2<sup>8</sup>.

the Rev. C. F. Andrews, of Delhi, which none can read without reflecting, 'What has the Church of Christ, and especially the Church of England, to say to this great uprising?' If we believe that the inner life of our own civilization is founded on the influence of the gospel, then we must admit that the adoption of our Western civilization by the East without the gospel that inspired it, would be the possession of the body without the soul.

It is only possible for me just to refer to the arguments which the writer advances why this movement should be recognized and grappled with by the Church. The essay should be read and digested by all who are interested in the problem. All I would suggest here is that modernism, as it has been conceived of in these pages, is as rife and as powerful in Asia as it is in Europe or America. The highest intellects in Asia are no longer concerned with the truth or falsehood of their old religions: they are concentrated on the question of enlightenment, of intellectual and social freedom, and above all of national unity: thus reproducing almost exactly the process which took place in Europe more than four centuries ago.

If their aspirations are to be guided by religious conviction (and what else can ever accomplish them?), that religion must be the gospel of Jesus Christ, which alone supplies a firm basis of brotherhood. And if that gospel is to be accepted by them, it must be presented in terms which they can understand, and assimilated in forms congenial to their categories of imagination and thought.

It has been suggested by more than one writer that in the Sacraments of the gospel will be found the mightiest of all unifying powers. Doctrines are only expressible in terms of the philosophy of the age or region of culture: even if the same thing is meant, the expression of it must necessarily vary where the mental inheritance is so completely different. But the two gospel Sacraments appeal irresistibly to the universal heart of man. The drinking of one Spirit by all; the kneeling side by side as they eat the one Bread; the brotherly bond of the one Body, with its members who all rejoice and suffer with one another: these simple emblems have a cohesive force which no intellectual confession of faith can hope to rival. Unhappily, the disputes that rage around sacramental doctrine among us have tended to obscure the wonderful religious power of sacramental ordinances, so that to a considerable proportion of nominal Christians they have almost ceased to convey any message. Yet nothing is more certain than in them, laid down as they are by the Lord Himself as indispensable necessities, lies the organic uniting force of the future: and looking beyond the present Church to the as yet unconverted nations of mankind, one may believe that amid the intellectual diversities and perhaps incompatibilities of modernism, something grander and richer than intellect will proclaim that Christ is among men, according to His own promise, 'all the days'<sup>1</sup> (*i.e.* all the successive epochs of progress), 'even to the end of the world.'

<sup>1</sup> Mt 28<sup>20</sup> compared with Lk 17<sup>22</sup>.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Gaston Frommel's 'Studies.'<sup>1</sup>

WE have here a collection of papers written during the years 1893-1905. Most of them were read before assemblies of theological students and persons interested in religious problems, or were published in magazines. As they all deal with a small number of closely allied subjects there is naturally a certain amount of repetition. But when the same thoughts recur they are usually in a fresh setting, and, in any case, are of such value

<sup>1</sup> *Études Morales et Religieuses*. Gaston Frommel. Saint-Blaise: Foyer Solidariste, 1907. 3 Fr. 50.

as to be sure of a welcome. It would not be easy to find anywhere a deeper, more reasonable, more spiritual embodiment of Pauline Christianity, in forms suited to the needs of the present day. These essays make us feel afresh the sternness and the grace of the gospel. Few will read them without a searching and a lifting up of the heart.

The titles which four of the nine bear are a clear enough indication of the theme which excited the author's warmest interest: 'The Actual Conditions of the Christian Faith,' 'Human Trust and Christian Faith,' 'Psychology of Faith,' 'The Victory of Faith.' Frommel was painfully aware of the eclipse