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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LXI.

LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1929

722ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 8TH, 1929,

AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the Election of the Rev. Carment Urquhart, B.A., as an Associate.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Lieut.-Col. Lewis Merson Davies, R.A., F.G.S., to read his paper on "The Philosophic Basis of Modernism."

THE PHILOSOPHIC BASIS OF MODERNISM.

By LIEUT.-COL. L. M. DAVIES, R.A., F.G.S.

"(Know) this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying 'Where is the promise of His Coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as from the beginning of the creation.'" (2 Pet. iii, 3–4.)

"(Hypotheses) on the origin of species are an indication of our mental tendencies, rather than the synthetic result of facts incontrovertibly ascertained. Let us admit it without further preamble: the success attained by the theory of evolution is not due primarily to its self-evident character, for even the most generally admitted facts cannot always be reconciled with it, but rather to the sympathy of the scientific world for the dogma of continuity of natural phenomena." (G. Fano, *Brain and Heart*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1926, p. 41.)

"The essence of Evolution is unbroken sequence." (Dr. W. W. Watts, *Geol. Mag.*, 1924, vol. 61, p. 532.)

THE NATURE OF THE BASIS.

"EVERY philosophy," says Le Roy, "presents itself in its initial stage as an attitude, a frame of mind, a method" (*A New Philosophy: Henri Bergson*, p. 12). Thus every philosophy is said to originate as a particular MENTAL ATTITUDE; and I have accordingly defined a "philosophy"

as being a " method, of explaining and co-ordinating facts, which suits a certain type of mind " (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. lviii, p. 216, footnote).

An illustration of what that means was afforded to the Members of this Institute when the Rev. Canon V. F. Storr read a paper before them, on the subject of " Revelation," in the course of which he showed that his own conception of Revelation was utterly unlike that of most of his hearers. When challenged to reconcile his views with the statements of the writers of Scripture, to whom the Revelation had actually come, and who alone could therefore give direct evidence as to the manner of its coming, Canon Storr declined to attempt any such reconciliation. He asserted, somewhat strangely, that his opponents " begged the question " by taking the testimony of the writers of Scripture at its face value ; and he further declared (which is well worth noting) that he and his critics could not get into touch with each other, since they *started from different presuppositions* (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. lviii, pp. 135–6).

It was therefore clear that the Canon himself was admittedly starting from one or more *presuppositions ;* presuppositions which, as Le Roy would point out, doubtless indicated, and were in harmony with, the Canon's " attitude " and " frame of mind," and determined the " method " by which he subsequently dealt with the facts. It was also clear that these presuppositions of Canon Storr's must have been of a nature altogether hostile to the acceptance of any testimony to an objective Revelation of His Will on the part of the Almighty.

I draw attention to this incident because, trifling as it may seem to be, it goes to the root of things. It shows that Modernism, as represented by the teachings of people like Canon Storr, is not a matter of science (as some suppose), but is purely a philosophy. It is not determined by objective facts, but by subjective *presuppositions.*

Nor is this all ; for the incident also indicates the nature of the " attitude," the preliminary " frame of mind," which Le Roy would regard as the all-important " initial stage " of Modernism, and which I would prefer* to call its " basis." This initial stage, or basis, is seen to be purely negative ; it apparently takes

* For the words " initial stage " seem to me to suggest something which may be outgrown, whereas the mentality originating a philosophy remains a permanent necessity to it, even in its most advanced form.

the form of a rooted antipathy to ideas of Divine Interferences with the natural courses of events. In other words: It appears that the "Philosophic Basis of Modernism" is the FRAME OF MIND* which is *opposed to belief in Divine Interventions.*

ITS INCOMPATIBILITY WITH CHRISTIAN BELIEF.

One sees its effects everywhere. Indeed it is a commonplace, among Christians, that their Modernist opponents are determined to rule "miracles" out of court when dealing with the Bible.† One has only to pick up a book like *Peake's Commentary* to see how the whole aim of its writers appears to have been to eliminate the supernatural from the Bible; to remove all idea that the natural courses of events could ever have been interfered with by Divine action. It also seems clear that, although he claims to be an "orthodox Liberal Evangelical," Canon Storr's own tendencies must be along much the same lines—if he is consistent‡; for if his "presuppositions" are of such a nature as to preclude his considering even the possibility that God has objectively revealed His Will to man, then the same presuppositions must be all the more opposed to belief in those far greater Interventions which comprise the Gospel story, and to which we will now turn our attention.

---

* Modernists themselves often instinctively recognize that their system is based upon their own frame of mind. How often we are told that "traditional" Christian beliefs are "repugnant to the Modern Mind." The remark is really very significant.

† And the fact is openly admitted on the other side. "We of the Churchmen's Union" says Dean Inge, "come into conflict with traditionalism chiefly on the question of miracles" (*Modern Churchman*, Sept., 1924, p. 227). Mr. Hardwick writes: "So long as the uniformity of nature is unrecognized, miracles tend to occur" (*ibid.*, p. 384); "We need to disencumber our religion of this incubus of the supernatural" (p. 392). Note the appeal to the supposed *uniformity of nature*; for this, as I try to show above, characterizes all Modernist attacks upon Christian doctrine.

‡ I say "if he is consistent," because Modernists are not always consistent, and some of Canon Storr's statements seem to leave room for hope that he believes in the Deity of Christ and His literal Resurrection. If Canon Storr really believes in these things, of course, he is to that extent not a Modernist but a Christian. But it seems clear that a man who can believe in the literal Incarnation and the literal Resurrection has no business to appeal to his "presuppositions" against believers in literal Revelation. In any case, we are concerned here with the logical implications of certain "presuppositions," and not with the providential inconsistencies of individuals.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Some years ago, up in Simla (India), a group of Modernists began to show great enthusiasm in advertising what they called a "Social gospel"; something which they seemed to think they had newly discovered. This so-called "gospel" proved, however, on examination, to be simply a re-hash of ordinary Socialistic ideas; the old "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" stuff brought up to date.*

A certain number of Christians, therefore, who were then living in Simla, resented this use of the word "gospel." They remembered the warnings against the acceptance of strange "gospels" (Gal. i, 6–9), and set themselves to find out, more exactly, what it is that the Bible calls the "Gospel." By comparing all the New Testament passages in which the word occurs, and tabulating the matters referred to in them, they found that the Gospel, as recognized in Scripture, is simply and solely the story of the Incarnation by a Virgin of the Eternal Son of God, His vicarious Death, physical Resurrection, Ascension into Heaven, sending of the Spirit, and future Return in the clouds to receive His resurrected and transformed saints to Himself.

It is noticeable, therefore, that every one of these headings involves Divine Intervention of the most pronounced order. So we see that if we are right in our identification of the *Philosophic Basis of Modernism*, then that basis must stand in direct opposition to belief in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.†

* There was much about brotherhood, and nothing whatever about Salvation, in their talk. It was typical that one of these Modernists, during the course of an address, entitled "Why I am a Christian" (*sic*), to a large gathering of Hindus and Mahommedans, told his hearers that at one time he used to think that he ought to try to convert people of other religions; but he had long since got beyond that idea, and now only tried to make them "better Mahommedans, better Sikhs, and better Hindus." Obviously the "Social" gospel could dispense with the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

† Thus the Rev. A. H. Finn, in a recent article entitled "The Case Against Modernism," declares that: "The Modernist rejects the Virgin Birth, atoning Death, bodily Resurrection, literal Ascension, enthronement at God's right hand, and personal Return" (*Bible League Quarterly*, Jan.–Mar., 1929, p. 40). On the previous page, Dr. Finn points out that the Modernists' Creed, as drawn up by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, "contains no mention of the birth, death, rising again, ascension, and return of our Lord. These," adds Dr. Finn, "have ever been believed to be the actual facts on which the Christian Church was founded. Are they now to be reckoned among the 'lies and legends' which must be 'jettisoned'?"

Christianity is a Matter of Faith in Divine Interventions.

The fact is often obscured, in these days, that Christianity is a matter of *belief in Divine Interventions*. It suits Modernists, of course, to gloss that fact over, since they wish to pass for Christians without accepting any such belief. It is our duty, therefore, to see that the fact is not ignored; for it is vital. Indeed, it forms one of the chief differences between Christianity and all other religions.

In other religions, divine interventions tend to be arbitrary or fortuitous: if they are eliminated, the creed is not vitally affected. For all other religions are, at best, simply ideals of life and conduct; and the implication seems always to be found in them, that the person who lives pretty well up to the ideal acquires positive merit by doing so, and this merit can be used to offset his demerits of conduct. Interventions of the godhead, if they occur in such religions, seem to have no crucial place in the systems concerned. They may be supposed to accredit the teachings of the prophet, avatar, guru, priest, or other spokesman of the god or gods concerned; they may arouse wonder, fear, enthusiasm, etc.; but they are mere accessories to the scheme of things, not essential parts of the system itself.*

In Christianity, all is different.† Christianity is the most uncompromising of all religions, in its attitude towards sin and the sinner. Even to look on a woman with desire is to commit adultery with her in one's heart (Matt. v, 28); and men shall, we are told, give account of every idle word that they speak (Matt. xii, 36). There is no exaltation of any individual, for "There is none righteous; no, not one . . . all have sinned and come short" (Rom. iii, 10, 23). Yet, while morality of the strictest kind is severely enjoined, there is no positive merit to be acquired thereby, of a saving kind, to serve as a counterpoise to our misdeeds; for we are told that, when we have done all, we should say "We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do" (Luke xvii, 10). There is only

---

* Thus the belief of the Ephesians, that the image (or symbol?) of their goddess had fallen down from Jupiter (Acts xix, 35), certainly roused their enthusiasm, but could hardly have affected their doctrine.

† It is not denied that accessory miracles abound in the Bible; but the point is that, where the Gospel itself is concerned, the Interventions become the substance of the message and the body of the creed.

one sentence for sin, and it is a death sentence ; for " The wages of sin is death " (Rom. vi, 23).

It is here, then, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ comes in, with its unique character as a story of DIVINE INTERVENTIONS essential to man's SALVATION. The very Son of God, whose goings forth have been from of old, even from everlasting (Mic. v, 2), becomes Incarnate, to fight, as man, where the whole rest of Adam's seed has failed. He triumphs where all others have failed. As the Representative of the race, He disinherits the Serpent, who had disinherited the first parent of our race in the beginning. In Him, the Father can look upon the race of Adam and see it perfect—and only *as perfect* can eternal life be granted to it. As ETERNAL GOD this Incarnate One then went further and tasted death for every man. He who knew no sin, who need therefore never have died, allowed Himself to be " made sin " for us (2 Cor. v, 21 ; *cf.* Col. ii, 14), and laid down His Life —Infinite in its merits, as the Person who laid it down was INFINITE—on our behalf (Matt. xx, 28 ; 1 Tim. ii, 6). That the payment was complete is proved by the physical Resurrection of our Lord. As Paul said, if Christ be not Risen our faith is vain ; we are yet in our sins (1 Cor. xv, 17). If Christ is not Risen, He is still in process of paying for our debts ; and the least part of those debts still unpaid is sufficient to slay us by reversion. The *Resurrection* of the Christ, therefore, is the discharge certificate of those for whom He died.*

---

* This doctrine of a *completed payment*, by the Godhead Himself, for our sins, is emphasized in many ways in Scripture. Paul's references to the Resurrection of our Lord, in connection with our sins, cannot, as we have seen, be explained apart from it. Christ is also said to have offered Himself a RANSOM (Gr. *antilutron*, or " equivalent price ") for all (1 Tim. ii, 6). And we are told that we are *justified* by faith (Rom. v, 1 ; *cf.* 9) ; that God is not only a Forgiver of sins but also a *Justifier* of the believing sinner (Rom. iii, 26) ; that He is *Faithful and Just* to Forgive us our sins (1 John i, 9) ; etc. Whence comes all this talk of " justification " ? God might be Merciful to forgive ; but how could He be *Faithful and Just* to do so, unless the price of guilt were fully paid upon condition of belief in the Payer ? Why this extraordinary choice of adjectives ? Some years ago, in India, I corresponded with a Modernizing Bishop, who was decrying the doctrine of Substitution, and soon found how utterly unable he was to account for these and other passages apart from that doctrine. And it seems significant that, whatever Modernists may say, full and assured peace with God is found nowhere outside of belief in the Bible story of the completed vicarious Atonement for our sins by the Son of God Himself.

And note that it is a *physical* Resurrection. The Bible hangs together. As the death of Adam was physical, so must the Resurrection of the Christ be also. And a physical resurrection implies that the death even of the body is not part of the normal scheme of creation. Death came upon us through sin, we are told (Rom. v, 12). But this is utterly contrary to all ideas of evolution; it is only compatible with belief in literal creation and a literal fall. So we may note, in passing, how the physical Resurrection of our Lord *implies* the Genesis story of the literal Creation of our first parents; while the story of that literal Creation both explains and *justifies* the physical Resurrection of the Christ.

To return. Our Lord having Risen, and proved the fact of His Resurrection to all His disciples, then Ascends to Heaven before their eyes, in order to send the Holy Spirit, and wait until a future day when, the numbers of His Church (a unique body, which is identified in Scripture in a peculiar way with Himself, and whose calling appears to be far above that of the righteous of all other dispensations, both past and yet to come) being completed, He will return in the clouds as He went, to receive His resurrected and transformed saints to Himself.

THE SCRIPTURE EMPHASIS ON THESE INTERVENTIONS.

Peculiar emphasis is laid, in Scripture, upon the above series of unique *Interventions*. For there were Modernists, of a sort, on earth before there were any Christians, and each of these gospel points needed stressing. The Apostles themselves were all Modernists, at least in regard to Christ, before they became Christians. They had all that our present-day Modernists can claim; a sincere devotion to our Lord's person, and a very great belief in His moral authority. But He was only a great *man* to them, until Peter openly avowed the first tenet of Christianity by declaring that Jesus was none other than the Incarnate Son of God (Matt. xvi, 16). And note how significantly our Lord welcomed this admission (*vv.* 17–19).

Peter himself, however, was still very largely a Modernist; for when our Lord went beyond the first tenet of Christianity in order to press the second—that the Son of God must DIE for our sins—it was none other than Peter himself who voiced the Modernist idea that the *life* of the Christ was of more importance to us than His *death* (for what Modernist to-day—to whom the

death of the Christ is simply a great tragedy, or a supreme " gesture " at most—would not urge, as Peter did, that our Lord had much better have continued to live and teach, than have deliberately set His face to a shameful death ?). But the essential character of *this very death* is immediately stressed by our Lord, who did not hesitate to counter the well-meant but deadly* obstruction of His follower by the strongest language possible, showing the Devil at the root of the very attitude which Modernists are reviving to-day (Matt. xvi, 22–23).

Then, again, even when the disciples had probably all accepted the first tenet of Christianity, and mournfully acquiesced in the second, they were still Modernists enough not to understand the third—that our Lord should Rise again from the dead. Not until after the Emmaus talk, and the Appearances to every one of them in person, did the disciples at last accept belief in the Resurrection (Luke xxiv, 25–47).

The Ascension, which followed shortly afterwards, they could not well doubt : it was enacted before the eyes of them all (Luke xxiv, 50–52 ; Acts i, 6–11 ; 1 Cor. xv, 6–7). Similarly, Pentecost was not to be denied ; it directly seized upon them all, in the presence of vast numbers of strangers in Jerusalem at the time, of whom three thousand were converted at the sight (Acts ii, 1–41).

It seems, however, that the yet future Return of our Lord, together with the attendant resurrection of the dead, and transformation of the living, believers which is linked up with it, was still doubted by some, until Paul showed the interrelation of this tenet with the other parts of the Gospel doctrine (1 Cor. xv, 12 *ff.*).

So we may note the continual New Testament insistence upon Divine Interventions. By no natural law, but only by postulating the direct Interventions of God, can we account for any one of the above facts, if we are to believe in them at all. Yet these are the essentials of the Gospel story, covering the period enclosed by the two Advents ; that period to which our Christian rite of Communion belongs, looking back to the Cross and forward to the Return, " showing forth our Lord's death until He come " (1 Cor. xi, 26). Attack any one of these points, and you attack the very heart of Christianity ; the finished

* For if Peter had had his way, our Salvation would never have been won.

Christianity of Paul's Epistles, as distinct from the confused Modernism of the days before Peter's great avowal.

The Modernist Basis Foretold.

It seems clear, then, that Christianity is a system of belief; of belief in a set of Divine Interventions representing the *Acts of God for our Redemption.*

Modernism, on the other hand, as it exists around us to-day, is founded upon "an attitude, a frame of mind" which is utterly hostile to belief in any such Interventions; a frame of mind which must, of necessity, compel its possessors to deny every one of those Interventions.*

And now let us turn to the Bible again. Has it anything to say regarding the rise of this singular "frame of mind"? It seems to the present writer that it has.

The Bible is full of statements regarding the condition of things which it says will be found to prevail in the "last days" of our present dispensation, just before our Lord returns to earth. For those are not to be days of faith, it seems, but of unbelief in the Gospel. Widespread apostasy is to be their leading characteristic. Men will, indeed, retain a form of what Paul could call "godliness," *i.e.* belief in the Gospel (*cf.* 1 Tim. iii, 16), but they will deny the power of it (2 Tim. iii, 5).† Evil

* According to the Moderator of the Free Church in Scotland, in 1925, Modernism taught that "the doctrines of Special Creation and the Fall of man were (to be) rejected. . . . The Supernatural or miraculous was set aside in the name of Science and the Reign of Law. The record of miracles in the Scriptures was not accepted as true, for miracles did not, and could not, happen. Hence the miracles of the Virgin Birth of our Lord, His bodily Resurrection, and His actual Ascension to Heaven were expressly repudiated by Modernists. . . . The God of Modernism is not the Triune God of the New Testament, but a monad, a single personality. . . . Christ . . . is in essence no more divine than any other man. . . . Christ can no longer be thought of as . . . the redeemer of men" (cited in the *Journal of the Wesley Bible Union*, April, 1926, pp. 79–80). It is characteristic that the Moderator opens his list of unbeliefs by appeal to the "modern mind" which, he said, "had rejected the orthodoxy of a former generation."

† It seems significant that Modernists like Dr. Major repeat the Christian creeds to-day, but with mental reservations which rob them of all significance. The Incarnation was no real Incarnation; the Resurrection was not a Resurrection at all; the Second Advent is not to be taken literally. The outer form, as Paul foretold, of Christian profession is still retained, while all that it once stood for is denied. When Dr. Major undertakes to say, in plain language, what he really believes, he omits all mention of Christian facts.

men and seducers are to wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. The days are to be perilous ; marked by world-wide abandonment to blood and lust, as were the days before the Flood. People will be, pre-eminently, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God ; ever learning, yet never able to come to a knowledge of the Truth ; disobedient to parents ; unthankful, unholy ; boasters, proud, blasphemers.* It is not a flattering picture.

There is also, it seems, to be a marked resort to spiritualism—or "spiritism," as Dr. Schofield prefers to call it—at that time ; the results of which will be disastrous to Christian faith (1 Tim. iv, 1–3).

It seems clear that the bonds of Bible authority and warnings will sit lightly on the minds of people in the last days. All the prophecies testify that men will go their own ways, following their own lusts regardless of anything that Scripture may have said to prohibit their practices.

And now we come to a remarkable fact. If we turn to 2 Pet. iii, we will find the Apostle clearly indicating that these latter-day people are not only to be Modernists (for Modernists, of a sort, have always existed),† but MODERNISTS OF THE TWENTIETH-CENTURY TYPE, *i.e.* men with "presuppositions" of the identical kind adopted by Modernists to-day, and employing those presuppositions in the very manner that Modernists now employ them.

There is no mistaking this fact. I have pointed it out, time and again, in public and in private, to the teeth of Modernists themselves, and have never yet found a single one prepared to dispute my claim. Modernists, so far, have either been silenced, or they have tried to change the subject ; as one gentleman did, who reminded me that the authorship of 2 Pet. is disputed, and

---

* Matt. xxiv, 3–28 ; Luke xvii, 26–37 ; 2 Tim. iii, 1–iv, 4 ; 2 Thess. ii, 3–12 ; etc.

† A "Modernist," by my definition, is simply an unbeliever in a Christian tenet, whose unbelief is founded upon a lesser or greater idea of uniformity ; for Christianity is a system of belief in certain Divine Interventions, and Modernism is founded upon belief in uniformity (which characterizes a frame of mind now called "Modernist"), which is incompatible with Christianity. Many minds are, it is recognized, Modernist only in patches, and Christian in other places ; for consistency is not by any means universal, and some early beliefs or unbeliefs often remain long after consistency should have disposed of them.

asked what right I had to assume that Peter wrote it. I reminded him, in return, that, whoever wrote the Epistle, its *early date* has never been disputed; and the exact fulfilment of the Prophecy, as exemplified by Modernists like himself, shows that St. Peter probably was the author, as the Epistle itself declares. Deliberate liars are not apt to prove true prophets. That apparently silenced this gentleman; for it brought him back to the fulfilment of the prediction, which he could not deny.

So I would again draw attention to this passage. Mark its importance. The Apostle urges us to place this fact *foremost*, when considering the conditions which will exist at the time of the end. We are to remember this "FIRST," he says, that in the last days scoffers shall arise, walking after their own lusts, and saying "Where is the promise of His Coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, *all* things *continue* as from the *beginning of the creation.*"

Pregnant words! How few they are; and yet, when we look into them, what a complete, universal, and exclusive dogma of uniformity they represent! It is clear that these prophesied scoffers have, in perfection, that twentieth-century Modernist FRAME OF MIND which excludes the idea of Divine Interventions in all space and all time.

To a geologist this prophecy is peculiarly remarkable, for it shows that the rise of the fundamental postulate upon which all modern geological theory is founded—the postulate which underlies all geological and biological attacks upon early Genesis to-day—was expressly foretold in Scripture more than eighteen centuries ago; and it is worth remembering that the prophecy was actually translated into our *present English form* (which expresses things so perfectly) nearly two centuries before geology itself began to exist as a science, or the men were born who first established this very dogma as a "scientific" axiom, and so fulfilled that prophecy.

For note that these prophesied scoffers are represented as doing exactly what our "scientific" opponents of Scripture are doing to-day. They are represented as claiming to know the history of all things, right back to the very beginning of creation itself: they speak as if they were quoting demonstrable fact: and yet Peter's very next words show that their assertion will not represent true science after all—it will not be founded upon proofs but upon prejudices—for the scoffers are to be "willingly

ignorant" of the fact of the Flood (2 Pet. iii, 5–6). Indeed, what these people are represented as doing is precisely what our geologists and biologists are doing to-day; they are represented as announcing an unproved and unprovable dogma of uniformity as a scientifically verified fact, and shutting their eyes to everything which conflicts with it. Nor is this all; for the very words "since the Fathers fell asleep," with which they introduce the dogma, are peculiarly significant in the light of the now known history of the rise and development of that dogma.

The Development of Modernist Dogma.

We should, perhaps, consider this point. We may remember, therefore, that the often fantastic talk of miracles, during the Middle Ages, by uncontrolled religious enthusiasts, encouraged by a clergy who made capital out of the same, led to reaction on the part of Protestants. This reaction, like all reactions, favoured a movement to the opposite extreme. Convinced Protestants, indeed, would not surrender the miracles of the Bible, but they were little concerned to defend belief in miracles which were not certified by Scripture; so they were on common ground with the more reactionary party in accepting the continuity of natural processes "since the (Christian) Fathers fell asleep." This agreement (clearly indicated in Peter's prophecy)* was then exploited by the new Deistic—or what would now be called the "Modernist"—party in working backwards into Scripture times, in order to attack beliefs which Protestants held as firmly as their Catholic opponents.

(*a*) *Hume's Contribution: The Denial of "Miracles."*

Now the first thing to be attacked, in thus working backwards from the admitted uniformity of the post-apostolic age, was belief in the miracles which are said to have occurred in the

* For the scoffers seem to be apostate Christians. In any case, they are addressing real Christians in regard to a Christian doctrine—that of the Second Advent. But Christians have, even from before the days of this Epistle, been a body of believers drawn from many nations. So who could these "Fathers" be but the Fathers of the Christian Church; in other words, the Apostles themselves and their immediate successors, exactly as we speak of them to-day?

Fathers' own day; the miracles recorded of our Lord and His followers in the New Testament. We can see, in the writings of David Hume, how belief in those miracles was attacked upon the grounds that nothing comparable to them could be shown to have happened in recent times. Thus he said that "firm and unalterable experience" was against belief in miracles, and that they were "most contrary to custom and experience" (*Essay on Miracles*).* Unless he deliberately meant to beg the very question at issue, he could only have been referring to "custom and experience" dating "since the Fathers fell asleep"; so we see how the characteristic Modernist doctrine was brought well to the front, that we must regard *the present as the key to the past* and the measure of all possibilities.

(*b*) *Hutton and Lyell: The Denial of the Flood.*

Matters, however, could not stop there. In progressing still further backwards, belief in the Deluge of Noah, which involves belief in a very definite Intervention of God, had to be got rid of. The task was not easy. The question as to whether we have evidence of the Deluge is mainly one for geologists to decide; and the early geologists (geology being then quite a new-born science) were emphatically of opinion—and remained so, as a body, until well on into the nineteenth century—that we have abundant evidence of the Deluge. St. Peter, however, had long before declared that belief in the Flood would finally be given up, and had even shown on what grounds it was to be given up; and in time his prediction was fulfilled to the letter. So eminent a geologist as Sir Archibald Geikie tells us how James Hutton and his supporters took up the principle of Hume, that "the present is the key to the past," and introduced it to the notice of geologists, who were told that "we are not at liberty to imagine new causes of change when those seem insufficient†

---

* To this day there is nothing the Modernist appeals to more often, after the "Modern Mind" itself, than the "regular order of nature," the "uniformity of nature," etc. When quoted as a disproof of Bible statements, this talk of uniformity, or continuity, becomes simply a formula for begging the question at issue, and is itself a mere product of the Modern Mind.

† Had he said "sufficient," instead of "insufficient," it might have seemed more reasonable.

which occur in our experience " (*The Centenary of the Geological Society of London*, p. 115). In other words, however much evidence the geologist may find as to abnormal events in the past, he is *not at liberty* to admit its apparent significance, but must explain it away in terms of present-day processes, however " insufficient " the latter may seem to be for the purpose. Is it not fitting that the Apostle should have described the men who support such an arbitrary dogma as being " willingly ignorant " of the fact of the Flood ? And did he not predict their method accurately when he showed that they should measure the past by the present, and declare that nothing abnormal could be found anywhere ?

Opposition, at first, was vigorous. The older geologists were strongly opposed to the acceptance of such an obviously unproved and unprovable dogma. Indeed, as I have shown elsewhere, leading geologists have, right up to within the current century and a few years ago, vigorously protested against the way in which the now orthodox school of geologists have shut their eyes to the plainest facts, when the same seemed to demand belief in the Deluge. But nothing could stop the advance of the long foretold (yet long postponed) movement in thought, when once it had fairly started. The pleas of Hutton were all too well suited to the " Modern Mind " (then rapidly becoming dominant) to be set aside. Both within the ranks of science and without, men in general were acquiring " an attitude, a frame of mind " which predisposed them to deal with facts after the " method " adopted by Hume in one sphere and Hutton in another. It only needed the eloquence of a really gifted pleader like Sir Charles Lyell to establish this method firmly as the orthodox one among geologists ; and the result is that belief in the Flood has now, in spite of the protests of experts of recognized sound judgment, been generally surrendered by scientists on the exact grounds foretold eighteen centuries ago.

(*c*) *Darwin and his Successors : The Denial of Literal Creation.*

Even this, however, did not go so far as consistency demands, or the prophecy indicates. For the words put by Peter into the scoffers' mouths show that they do not simply deny the Flood : they carry their denials right back to the very beginning of the Creation, thus showing that they include creation itself in their scheme of uniformity.

And, again, the event has justified the prediction. For although Lyell was not inclined to tamper with belief in the literal creation of living forms, it was otherwise with people like Charles Darwin. Such men saw that Lyell had simply paved the way for themselves to go further. As Huxley said, Lyell was "the chief agent in smoothening the road for Darwin. For consistent uniformitarianism postulates* Evolution as much in the organic as in the inorganic world" (*Life*, vol. i, p. 168). It is obviously inconsistent to deny Divine Interventions in the matter of miracles, and deny the Deluge, if we are still to admit such Interventions in the course of creation. Men were thus forced to go further, and attack belief in Creation itself, so far as the latter implies Divine. Interventions with the course of natural processes; and the success already gained by Lyell prepared the way for Darwin, just as the earlier successes of Hume had prepared the way for Lyell. So note how Darwin simply transferred the identical methods of Hume and Lyell into the sphere of organic studies. Just as Hume and his followers have tried to account for the reported miracles of Scripture (where they do not flatly deny them) in terms of

---

* Note that uniformitarianism "postulates" evolution. The modern belief in continuity is not derived from a proved evolution, but belief in evolution is derived from it. The doctrine of biological evolution is essentially one of unbroken genetic connections; and yet, as I tried to show in my paper on "Evolution" (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. lviii, pp. 214–36), the one thing which science is incapable of proving, apart from historic testimony, is the fact of a genetic connection between two supposed ancestors. So continuity, which is the essence of biological evolution, has of necessity to be assumed, for it can never be proved. Knowing, as a palæontologist, the impossibility of proving continuity; and knowing, as a Christian, that the rise of belief in unlimited continuity was expressly foretold, in Scripture, as a characteristic of the "last days"; it is interesting to me to see how constantly the modern man of science appeals to his *belief in continuity* in order to justify his evolutionary speculations. Thus Professor E. Blatter tells us that the first thing we have to take for granted, in talking of evolution, "is the uninterrupted continuity of birth in any series of descendants" (*Proc. Thirteenth Ind. Science Congress*, 1926, p. 199). Professor J. A. Thomson objects to belief that man's spiritual nature may have come from God, on the ground that "it jettisons continuity" (*The Gospel of Evolution*, p. 127), and he details the things we must believe in order "to obviate any suggestion of discontinuity" (p. 161); etc. At all costs the average modern man of science cleaves to the foretold doctrine that "all things *continue* as from the beginning of the Creation."

present-day events; and just as Hutton, Lyell, and the more modern school of physical geologists explain away (where they do not ignore) the evidences of the Flood in terms of *current* geological processes; so did Darwin attempt to explain creation itself in terms of what he considered to be *still existing* biological processes. For the great fundamental dogma of Modernism is that "the present is the key to the past"; that the past must be explained by means of things that still continue to happen to-day; or, as St. Peter puts it, that "All things continue as from the beginning of the Creation." Taking, therefore, "Natural" and "Sexual" Selections (processes supposed to be everywhere operating *to-day*), Darwin showed how the supposed operations of the same might be extended backwards in time, even to the heart of creation itself, in order to explain how a great part of creation might conceivably have been effected by purely natural processes, and without any Intervention by God.

I say a "great part" of creation; for even Darwin did not carry things out to their logical conclusion, since he admitted (perhaps as a concession to his contemporaries) belief in the literal creation of a few simple forms of life to start with, from which all others have been developed by natural processes.* His successors, however, more consistent than he, have since carried the idea of continuity further; demanding belief in the spontaneous generation of life, and postulating uniformity right back to the very BEGINNING of the Creation. Theories as to the evolution of chemical elements have recently helped to complete the Modernist scheme.

So we see how gradual the development of the dogma has been; and how slowly, even in recent years, the opponents of Scripture have approached the complete formula of denial which Peter foretold, with crystal clearness, eighteen centuries before they were born.

(*d*) *Dr. H. D. A. Major: The Denial of the Second Advent.*

Peter's prophecy, however, goes still further. Brief as it is, it not only foretells the rise of the *perfected* Modernist dogma, but it also expressly indicates at least one of its corollaries. For those who deny that God has ever Interfered in the past, can hardly be expected to believe that He will ever Interfere in the future. Christ, to them, is just a man; that He should reappear

* Concluding words of *The Origin of Species.*

physically from Heaven, two millenniums after He was crucified on earth, is an intolerable anomaly for which their ideas regarding the past afford them no precedent or excuse.

Modernists, therefore, in this third decade of the twentieth century (*i.e.* since the comparatively recent perfection of their dogma) are at last openly denying belief in the Second Advent, just as Peter foretold. The following will show how unblushingly this is now being done :—

> "THE SECOND COMING.—'*No Hope of Physical Manifestation*' declares Dr. Major. *Evolution Faith.*—'The hope that Christ will reappear in a physical manifestation is not held nowadays by educated people.' So declared the Rev. H. D. A. Major, of Oxford, preaching the Advent sermon yesterday at St. George's Church, Stuyvesant Square. Such people, he said, based their hopes of human progress on their conception of evolution." (*The Daily Mirror*, 1/12/1925, p. 2.)

I have quoted the above before (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. lviii, p. 228), but draw attention to it again, not only because it represents the teachings of a leading Modernist (one of the fore most representatives of the movement; and Editor of *The Modern Churchman*, which is a principal organ of Modernism), but also because it indicates the connection between belief in the doctrine of Evolution and the denial of the Second Advent; both of which result from the acceptance of the one fundamental dogma of *continuity*, which was so clearly foretold in Scripture.

For if we deny that God has ever Interfered in the past, we can hardly admit that He is likely to Interfere in the future. Nor, if we deny God's Interferences in the past, can Christ be anything to us but a man; and to expect people, who cannot accept the Deity of Christ in particular or the Interferences of God in general, to look for the physical return in the clouds of a man who died on a cross two thousand years ago, is simply impossible. On the other hand, if God has never Interfered in the past, then we ourselves cannot be creatures who were literally created: we must have evolved; and not only evolved, but evolved—*i.e.* risen—by the operation of still continuing processes ("the present being the key to the past," by Modernist dogma; for only by appeal to known, or still continuing, processes can we profess to explain evolution on naturalistic lines, *i.e.* by appeal to natural "known causes"). But if we have risen by means of processes which still "continue," then our

creation must still be going on; and there is no knowing how far we may yet progress under the influence of those same processes.

So the man who accepts the dogma foretold in Scripture is compelled to re-orient his views. The Modernist, if he was once a Christian, rejects his Christian beliefs as impossible. He turns from the traditional Hope of the Church (Titus ii, 13) to new hopes based upon the doctrine of evolution; hopes which are implicit in the very idea of uniformitarian CONTINUITY.

When Dr. Major, therefore, attributes this new orientation of hopes to "educated" people, he means people who have accepted the foretold dogma of *continuity*, put by the Apostle into the mouths of the scoffers of the last days. Those twin-fruits—denial of the Hope of the Church, and adoption of hopes based upon evolution—are derived from the dogma of continuity alone; and from no species of "education" apart from that dogma.

SUMMARY.

There is very much more that could be said, for Paul's prophecies about the last days dovetail in with Peter's, reinforcing and amplifying them, and removing (to my own satisfaction, at least) all possibility of doubt that the Modernist movement was expressly predicted in Scripture, and its end foretold. We are clearly, to my mind, working up to that end now. Space, however, is limited, and my title also limits me to talk only of the Philosophic *Basis* of Modernism. I have tried, therefore, to show what I conceive a "philosophic basis" to be: I regard it as being the *frame of mind* which gives its character and shape to a philosophy.

In the case of Modernism, the characteristic frame of mind is one of hostility to all ideas of Divine Interventions. It finds its expression in various phrases, a popular one being that "the present is the key to the past." I have traced the rise and extension of this idea, starting from appeal to real or supposed uniformity in "present" times, and extending its real or supposed applications further and further into the "past," by successive stages of denial represented by Hume, Lyell, and Darwin; until we find, in the mouths of the successors of Darwin, a dogma of uniformity pushed to the very beginning of creation itself.

I try to show how this identical dogma of uniformity, in its latest and perfected form, is expressly foretold in Scripture as a characteristic of scoffers at Christian doctrine, who shall appear in the "last days." There we find it clearly indicated that "present" events—the events of a recent historic period ("since the Fathers fell asleep")—are to be used as a gauge for measuring all "past" events, back even to the very "beginning of the Creation," to the entire exclusion of all belief in Divine Interventions subsequent to that beginning.

This summary, put into the prophesied scoffers' mouths, perfectly expresses the present Modernist "frame of mind"—the philosophic basis of up-to-date Modernism—by translating it into a quasi-scientific postulate, which underlies all Modernist teaching to-day. A postulate so completely excluding all ideas of Divine Interventions is not, I think, necessarily fatal to other religions; but it is certainly fatal to Christianity, which is essentially (as I have tried to show) a system of belief in a series of Divine Interventions representing the *Acts of God for our Salvation*. It is a matter of fact, which anyone can verify for himself,* that advanced (*i.e.* consistent) Modernists actually do reject belief in every one of those Interventions. We have seen in particular how they reject the doctrine of the Second Advent and the story of the Flood, both of which are instanced by St. Peter as true beliefs destined to be discarded, in the last days, by people who will accept this misleading postulate.

It will, I hope, serve a good purpose if we clarify our ideas as to the nature of Modernism.† It may serve a still better purpose

---

* "The Modernist," says Mr. Pryke, "believes in neither a descent, an ascension, nor a return of Christ" (*The Modern Churchman*, Sept., 1925, pp. 346–7). "None of the doctrines of Fall of Man and Atonement and Heaven and Hell . . . are credible to-day" (p. 359); "no doctrine of everlasting punishment can ever hold place in the Modernist creed" (p. 348); any "reference to the Flood" is "clearly legendary" (p. 337); "belief in the resurrection of a physical body is jettisoned by the Modernist" (p. 346); "he looks for no visible return of Jesus upon the clouds" (p. 347); "no instructed Christian still looks for a return of his Master" (p. 343).

† We will then know exactly what to expect of it *when consistently applied*. By its very essence, Modernism is a system of unbelief opposed to Christian belief. It is based upon a "frame of mind" which expresses itself in terms of a *dogma of uniformity* which excludes all idea of Divine Interventions, and so inevitably opposes acceptance of every essential of CHRISTIAN faith.

—confirm us in resisting Modernism—if we, as Christians, realize that Modernism was foreseen and perfectly summed up, two millenniums ago, in that wonderful Book which tells us of the Acts of God for our Redemption. It is a characteristic of the Word of God that it dissects its enemies and judges its judges. May we, in gratitude to the Spirit who foresaw this great present apostasy and directly warned us against it, remember that warning, and remember also the injunction towards the close of the passage containing it :—

> " Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the delusion* of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness." (2 Pet. iii, 17.)

Discussion.

Rev. Charles Gardner (the Chairman) thanked Colonel Davies for his paper, which he thought he might call " militant," as was fitting from a soldier. The paper had the great merit of making the issues clear. Modernists so often used the same language as orthodox Christians to express another meaning. Christianity involved the belief of God's intervention or intrusion into history. Intervention necessitates the supernatural and the miraculous. Give up God's intervention, and little would remain of Christianity beyond the Sermon on the Mount.

Yet there is a gold thread running through the fabric of Modernism. It was in its beginning a reaction and protest against

---

* The Greek word here (*planē*) is the same as that used by Paul, when he prophesies that, because men in the last days will not receive the love of The Truth, that they might be Saved, " God shall send them strong *delusion*, that they should believe The Lie : that they all might be Judged who believed not The Truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness " (2 Thess. ii, 11–12). I have no space to prove it here, but have shown elsewhere (*The Significance of Modernism*, Marshall Bros., 1927, pp. 17–27, etc.), that " The Truth " is, in Scripture, a technical expression for the Gospel of Salvation ; and " The Lie " is a technical expression for the denial of the Second Death, the everlasting Lake of Fire, or Judgment to come. The old Lie of the Serpent, " Ye shall *not* surely die," together with his old promise " Ye shall be as gods ! " are both inherent in Modernism (as represented by the dogma of *Continuity*) ; and men fall to the combination to-day, just as our first mother fell to it in Eden.

a one-sided Christianity, which spoke as if God had made an exclusive revelation to Israel, and left the rest of the world in darkness. Modernism found in the deepest utterance of men of all nations the Voice of God. Christianity was but a still deeper utterance of the same Voice. It regarded revelation as a matter of experience rather than statement. In the older and stronger theology, God's diverse modes of revelation were recognized. To us Christians Christ is the full revelation of God, not only by His words, but by His actions and miracles.

Again, Christians often used to make the spiritual world appear arbitrary. In the nineteenth century the scientists, with their increased study of Nature, discovered everywhere the working of Law, and proclaimed its sovereignty. Gradually, men began to see that Law ruled in the spiritual world, and in the realm of morals.

Yet, after all is said of the sovereignty of Law, it must not be forgotten that Law is an abstraction. It involves a Law-giver. God is behind His laws. Deny the supernatural and miraculous, and you imprison God in Law: affirm them, and you affirm the free will and liberty of God.

Mr. Gardner added that there was just one question he would like to ask the lecturer. He said in his paper that Peter had declared that Jesus was none other than the Incarnate Son of God. Now, it is true that Peter said, in St. Matthew's Gospel, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the Living God." But in St. Mark's Gospel, which is usually considered the older, Peter says only "Thou art the Christ." A Modernist would say that Peter confessed the Messiahship of Jesus, but not that He was the Incarnate Son of God. What would Colonel Davies say?

Rev. H. C. MORTON, Ph.D., said: I have followed with the greatest interest Colonel Davies' paper, which is full of valuable things. But I am not at all certain that the wild variety of beliefs, which goes under the title of Modernism, is worthy of being credited with a philosophic basis; and, if we are going to seek for the affinities of Modernism with the permanent forms of philosophic thought, then my impression is that its affinities are with two philosophies, which are inconsistent with one another.

Colonel Davies has stressed the one, namely, the theory of Continuity, which is distinctly philosophic and not scientific, and

he has stressed the frame of mind which is induced by the idea of Continuity. But another frame of mind which is almost universal among Modernists is Subjectivity. They dislike the appeal to definite *fact*. They have no certainty as to what *truth* is. What is truth for me may not be truth for you. Truth must evince its verity to each individual by taking possession of that individual's mind. In keeping with this the real Modernist doctrine of the New Testament is not that it is the Word of God, but that it is the statement of the *experience* of the Christians of the first century; and for themselves the Modernists are asserting upon all hands that the only truth they can be certain about is the truth of their own personal experience. This makes all truth relative to the individual.

Is there any basis for this Subjectivism? Has it any warrant in any of the ultimate forms of philosophic thought? These ultimate forms are four, and only four. All forms of philosophy can be classed under one or other of these four, viz., Materialism, Idealism, Scepticism, and Realism. Now Modernism has a distinct affinity with Kant's Ideal Dualism. The general assumption of Idealism is that our knowledge is only knowledge of subjective states. But Kant admitted the existence of the external object of Perception, though of that "thing in itself" we know nothing, and are only concerned with the impression which that external thing makes upon our own mind. In that philosophy there is an evident basis for, or at all events an affinity with, the Subjectivity of Modernism.

But are these two philosophic bases, namely, Uniformity and Ideal Dualism, consistent with each other? The answer is an emphatic negative. Continuity assumes a real and unchangeable world of material things outside of, and capable of being definitely known to, ourselves. Idealism assumes that it is possible only to know the impression made upon the changing human mind by some external thing, which it is impossible to know in itself. The scientist must be a Realist, just as certainly as the Christian must be a Realist; and it is upon this fact that the underlying sympathy between true science and the Christian Faith chiefly rests; and the confusions of Modernism are well illustrated and in some measure accounted for by its two philosophic bases, and its affinities with such irreconcilable philosophies as Realism and Idealism.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said: An investigation of the essential basis of Modernism has utility in these days, when it is so often disputed whether this or that person is, or is not, a Modernist. Unfortunately, the characteristics which Colonel Davies has ascribed to Modernism are not peculiar to that school. "Presuppositions" are common to all philosophies. The author himself is a firm believer in the doctrine of the "continuity of nature." If he planted an acorn he would be astonished to reap a geranium! We cannot say that all Modernists deny all miracles, for every one knows that some Modernists admit some miracles.

Our difficulties are not diminished when we meet a writer who advances inconsistent views, for we have then to determine whether he is an inconsistent Modernist or an inconsistent Evangelical. The suggestion that a man can be partly a Christian is unfortunate. A man is either dead in trespasses and sins, or he has eternal life.

While Colonel Davies has failed to indicate any radical distinction between Modernism and Evangelical belief, it is difficult to believe that the difference is only a matter of degree. Perhaps the solution lies in the concept of objective and subjective revelation referred to by the Chairman. Here, too, is the distinction (not mentioned by the author) between the Modernist and Agnostics and others who admit no Revelation of any kind.

Mr. W. HOSTE said: I am glad to be in entire accord with all that is essential to the author's findings. As he says, the basis of Modernism seems to be "a frame of mind." This is with difficulty distinguished from "obscurantism," for it refuses to admit that there are some things in heaven and earth outside its philosophy. One is reminded of the Negro chief who laughed at a man who said it was possible in his country to walk on solid water; to him it was unthinkable and so impossible. He was a Modernist. It is also, of course, true that Modernism, like certain mental afflictions (*e.g.* hallucinations, sane or insane) can affect a man in "patches." If a "hall-mark" were demanded by which the true brand of Modernism might be distinguished, I would suggest some points of unbelief—a denial of the fall, atonement, plenary inspiration of the Scriptures and "eternal judgment." These are out of harmony

with the modern mind and must be deleted ; one wonders they have not deleted *death* too !

There is one point, a secondary one, where I cannot quite follow the lecturer, that is, his use of the 2 Pet. iii passage—" all things continue as they were from the beginning of the Creation," as directly embodying the modern doctrine of Continuity. It seems to me that it is rather a denial of any future disturbance of the civilized order of things, as would arise from the coming of the Lord, based on the assertion that such a disturbance has never taken place, since the fathers (*i.e.* the early patriarchs) " fell asleep." The word for " continue " (*diamenô*) does not express the thought of a continual development, but as Grimm puts it, of things remaining permanently as they were. I hardly think scientists to-day have got far enough to be taken up with the Coming of the Lord, and therefore such would not be specially in view here. But in the religious world few things are more openly scouted than the idea of a personal return of Christ.

There is one other minor point: on p. 198, where the author has been speaking of the day of Pentecost, he adds " three thousand were converted at the sight." Strictly speaking, this took place only *at the preaching of the Word by Peter.* This is not without importance in these days, when there is a great thirst for the miraculous, and mushroom sects are bidding high for the suffrages of the religiously inclined by promising miraculous displays of tongues and healings. We cannot pretend to work miracles at will, but we can preach the Gospel. I think the contention of the Chairman, not out of harmony with the paper, as to God's care for all His creatures, to be important. God has not left Himself without a witness in any era or clime. He did not choose Israel to the *exclusion* of other nations, but to enjoy " a most-favoured nation clause ": " above all other people, for all the earth is Mine " (Exod. ii, 5). Also those who have never heard the Gospel will be judged on righteous principles, without prejudice to the fact that there is only one ground of salvation, the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the light they have had from the works of creation or the workings of conscience, which render them " without excuse."

Lieut.-Col. T. C. SKINNER said : The teachings of Modernism are

subversive of Christianity. And yet side by side with their subversive teaching we have the singular fact that many Modernists, if indeed not all, have a devotion to the Person of Christ that is unquestionably real; they love the same Lord as we do, though, with strange inconsistency, they refuse to believe what He says. It is an attitude I find it quite impossible to explain; yet there it is, and, paradoxically enough, their very inconsistency would seem to be their saving grace.

We have, as it seems to me, to recognize the fact that these men are more often misled than wilfully misleading, and we have somehow got to find a way of winning them back to the truth.

A question has been asked, "How are we to tell a Modernist when we see him?" Perhaps the only safe test is in the fruit-bearing. Modernism immobilizes the Gospel, and works havoc in the Mission field; but, between the honest doubter, who, like Peter and his fellow-apostles, is groping his way towards the light, and the evil-worker who leads men away from the light into the outer darkness of unbelief, there is a gulf which we would do well to consider.

Mr. PERCY O. RUOFF said: Some references have been made to Darwin and Evolution. In future discussions, it will be well to have regard to the very remarkable facts cited in a recent paper by Dr. Rendle Short from Dr. Leo Berg's book *Nomogenesis*, otherwise a just accusation may be made of "flogging a dead horse."

The lecture seems to be based on a saying of Le Roy's that "every philosophy presents itself in its initial stage as an attitude, a frame of mind, a method." It is to be observed that the governing words in the sentence are "*in its initial stage.*" Le Roy does not say that every philosophy is an attitude, etc. The lecturer proceeds to a false deduction which interprets a philosophy as a perjudice, and gives a definition in accordance with prejudice by using the words "a method which *suits* a certain type of mind."

The references to Canon Storr's lecture on "Revelation" do not appear to be quite fair. Colonel Davies says that Canon Storr's presuppositions "must have been of a nature altogether hostile to the acceptance of any testimony to an objective Revelation of His will on the part of the Almighty." But Canon Storr affirmed

in the lecture his belief in predictive prophecy, which must to some extent involve an objective revelation. I joined in the protest against Canon Storr's lecture, but on other grounds.

What does the lecturer mean, on p. 196, by the words "disinherits the Serpent"? What inheritance had the Serpent? And again, what authority is there for saying "In Him (Christ) the Father can look upon the race of Adam, and see it perfect, and only *as perfect* can eternal life be granted to it"? I cannot discover either any such words or ideas as these in the Scriptures. On the contrary, instead of being perfect, all men are referred to as "dead in trespasses and sins." Life and perfection are in the Son of God, and not in the race of Adam—in Him (Christ), any of the race can by means of faith in Christ obtain eternal life and perfection.

In the footnote on p. 196, the doctrine of a "*completed payment*" is referred to. It has often been pointed out that such terms are objectionable, because they involve the idea of debtor and creditor, and it is doubtful if the doctrine of the Atonement is ever presented thus in the Scriptures. It seems incongruous to refer to Peter (p. 197) at Cæsarea Philippi as "still very largely a Modernist." This is a pure abuse of language, and nobody reading the record referred to would suppose that Peter remained for a single moment a so-called "Modernist" after the Lord's rebuke. There is at least no evidence that he did.

The Lecturer's Reply.

The Chairman asks how I would defend my statement, to a Modernist, that Peter confessed that Jesus was the Incarnate Son of God. Apparently I must not avail myself of Matthew's Gospel. Well, I would, in that case, point out that the very word "Christ" implied, to the Jews of our Lord's day, "Son of God." It was not, to them, a mere surname, or just a generalized term for any anointed person. Thus, Ps. ii shows that the "Christ" was both King and Son of God. Ps. xlv shows that the "Christ" was God, anointed by God, and Heir to an everlasting throne. Hence we constantly find the term "Christ" used in the New Testament *in apposition to the expression "Son of God,"* which was

clearly its recognized equivalent.* Our Lord was crucified for the supposed blasphemy of declaring Himself to be "THE Christ, THE Son of God."† So clearly is it recognized that Deity is implicit in the very term "Christ," that John says that the characteristic of the Antichrist is the denial that "Jesus CHRIST is come in the flesh" (1 John iv, 2, 3). Now, "Jesus" being a Jewish name in common use, it seems clear that (in order to make sense of the passage) a declaration of Deity lay in the very word "Christ." To deny that CHRIST is come in the flesh was manifestly equivalent to denying that GOD is come in the flesh. This denial of His humanity, however, which might arise after His Ascension, could not (on the Modernists' own showing) have taken shape when Peter made his avowal. Nobody then doubted that the Jesus, who lived, ate, slept, and shared all the innocent weaknesses of the flesh before their eyes, was truly *man*. To call Him "CHRIST" to His face, therefore, could only mean, to those present, an avowal that He was the *Incarnate Son of God*.‡

The Chairman claims a thread of gold in Modernism. But this thread certainly did not manifest itself "at least 300 years" ago,

---

* John (who was probably present) quotes Peter as calling Jesus "THAT Christ, the Son of the Living God" (John vi, 29). We should remember that Mark's Gospel probably represents *Peter's own version*, and so passes lightly over things to Peter's credit, while emphasizing his failings. Thus, not only is Peter's bold admission here cut down to its simplest terms, but our Lord's warm commendation of it is entirely omitted; while Peter's soon-following fault, and its stern rebuke, are given without sparing him. Similarly, Mark withholds Peter's name, as being that of the only disciple who dared to draw sword in his Master's defence in the Garden; but gives his subsequent denials of our Lord in fuller detail (three denials before *two* crowings of the cock) than we find in any other Gospel (*cf.* Mark ix, 28–30 and 31–33; also xiv, 47 and 29–31, 66–72).

† Mark himself (Peter being here in the background) quotes the High Priest's words as being "THE Christ, THE Son of the Blessed"; the context showing that "the Blessed" meant God. Mark could hardly have recognized two "THE" Christs in his Gospel, especially when the same Individual is addressed in each case.

‡ When, too, and by whom, can the Modernist suppose that Jesus was *anointed*? For He was never officially anointed on earth. For a JEW to call Him "THE" Anointed, therefore, inevitably refers one to the Old Testament, to the Son of God, anointed in Heaven before any New Testament man was born.

when, as he himself shows,* the "Modern Mind" came into existence. It manifested itself in the 19th century, in the form of the (then quite new) study of comparative religions; the object being to prove that Christianity was not a thing apart from Paganism. I doubt if this movement is really commendable by us, although it excuses its existence by pointing to a fact, never questioned by Christians, that God has given lesser revelations to other nations, which they have corrupted out of sight (Rom. i, 21–32).† This recent movement seems to be simply part and parcel of the general Modernist system. If God has never Interfered, then the differences between Christianity and Paganism can only be matters of degree, not of kind. This proposition, I fear, is not a thread of gold, or anything like gold. Nor is it a basis of Modernism. It is a late sprig from the dogma of CONTINUITY.

Dr. Morton points to the wild vagaries of Modernism, and the many philosophies represented by its advocates. All that he says is true. One can, if one likes, legitimately distinguish many philosophies in Modernism, as represented by the various schools of thought contained within the same. But when one considers the elements *common* to all, and upon which all are ultimately founded, one finds that the frame of mind to which I devote my paper lies *at the back of all* and is presupposed by all. For *all* forms of Modernism postulate the non-Interventions of God. All would become untenable if those Interventions were allowed. (Thus, if

---

* *See* his Address entitled "The Philosophy of Modernism" (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, lvi, p. 258). I read this paper after writing my own, and was interested to find how often it seemed to bear me out. The Chairman there shows how the "Modern Mind" rejects supernaturalism; how this rejection is common to Determinist, Pragmatist, and even to Dean Inge, whom the Chairman can only compare to Augustine "*before he became a Christian*" (p. 271; the italics are mine). The whole of the Chairman's most interesting and able paper deals with successive schools of thought, all of which accept that *bias against the Supernatural* which he himself spontaneously calls "the time-spirit—the spirit of the age"; whose equivalent is belief in "a uniform nature" (p. 268, etc.). The Chairman takes a narrower view of the term "Modernist" than I do; but he has only to take it, as I do, as meaning one possessed of "the modern mind, the time-spirit, the spirit of the age," as described by himself, to find his own paper anticipating mine in almost every particular—except that I show how the rise of this "Modern Mind" was *foretold in the Bible*.

† Until John could declare that the whole world, outside of Christianity, "lieth in the Evil One" (Gr. *ponêros*, 1 John v, 19).

we grant the Interventions of God, then God, who knows all things, can doubtless shape His message to give the right impression to the minds receiving it. Hence Idealism is discredited at once.) Every one of these philosophies also *obtains its prestige* from its supposed *support by science* in denying those interventions. And we find that the denial of those interventions is the admitted characteristic of the "Modern Mind," as claimed by *all* schools of Modernism. So we find that the dogma of CONTINUITY, foretold by Peter, lies at the roots of the whole Modernist system, on the testimony of Modernists themselves. Determinist may be succeeded by Pragmatist, Realist by Idealist, older Psychologist by later Behaviourist; but these are simply related to each other as trunk to branches, or greater branches to lesser ones. Peter laid his axe at the roots of the whole. (By the way, I do not "stress the frame of mind which is induced by the idea of Continuity," but the other way about. The dogma either arises from, or is accepted as suiting, the frame of mind; and the frame of mind is a matter of the HEART.)*

Mr. Leslie's objections imply: (1) that "presuppositions" are not worth noticing, since they are "common to all philosophies"; (2) that a characteristic error cannot take the form of an *illegitimate generalization*; (3) that there is no "radical distinction" between belief in God's interventions and flat denial of the same; and (4) that the "Modernist" who talks of "subjective" Revelation (*i.e.* does not believe in a literal Virgin Birth, Resurrection, etc.) is better than "Agnostics and others," who also do not believe, but say so in plainer terms.

All of these propositions are obviously untenable. Mr. Leslie does not think that a man can be partly a Christian; by *my* definition of a Christian, he *can be*. If Mr. Leslie thinks that people who deny the fundamental truths of the Gospel are not dead in

---

* "My son," says Scripture, "give me thine *heart*" (Prov. xxiii, 26). "With the *heart* man believeth" (Rom. x, 10). The "strong delusion" of Continuity is sent upon the men of the last days because they "received not the *love* of The Truth, that they might be saved" (2 Thess. ii, 10–12). The Gospel being a story of Divine Interventions, the *heart* that rejects it exhibits a *frame of mind* which welcomes a *dogma of continuity* excluding all idea of Divine interventions.

trespasses and sins, I do not agree. It is by faith that we are saved, not by Modernist unfaith.

Mr. Hoste offers a valid criticism. He shows how my statement, that the 3,000 at Pentecost were converted " at the sight " of the miracle, might be taken to mean that I denied the effect of Peter's speech in securing that conversion. My words were never intended to deny that Peter's sermon afforded the " hearing " by which " faith " came to the 3,000 (Rom. x, 17). I was treating of the evidences of Interventions ; and my words meant that the 3,000 would never forget the obvious miracle which forced their attention to the Word of the Cross, in which they found eternal life.

Mr. Hoste's criticism, however, of my appeal to the prophecy of 2 Pet. iii, is not so well justified. It is not necessary that *diamenô* should suggest the idea of development *apart from the context.* It is the *context* which makes it imply development, since " Continuity " is postulated from the very beginning of Creation itself, thus ruling out literal creation. The Greek word *diamenô* (always either rendered " continue "* in the New Testament, or else " remain "† in the sense of continuance) is not only the exact equivalent of our English word " continue," but is here used by Peter's scoffers in the exact way that geologists and biologists quote the dogma of Continuity to-day, in order to *deny Creation* and preach *Evolution.* Compare the first two quotations at the head of my paper, and also my remarks (text and footnote) on p. 205, etc.‡ I know what I am talking about when discussing the theoretical foundation of modern geological § speculation. Nor

---

* Luke xxii, 28 ; Gal. ii, 5.

† Luke i, 22 ; Heb. i, 11.

‡ I try to show that the supposed " continuance " is of the laws and processes of nature, which are regarded as being inviolable by Divine Interventions. The idea is, that the changing face of nature evolves under the influence of unchanging law, without a break in the uniform operations of the latter. Hence the dogma of UNIFORMITY (or Continuity) " *postulates* Evolution," as Huxley said, although Uniformity is not itself Evolution.

§ According to a first-rate authority, K. A. Zittel, the dogma of Uniformity (or Continuity) is the " basis of all modern geological investigation " (*History of Geology and Palæontology*, p. 197). Even Le Roy, as a philosopher, traces the modern belief in Evolution to the modern bias in favour of CONTINUITY (*op. cit.*, pp. 202-3).

can one dissociate religious Modernists from scientific ones.* No consistent believer in the dogma of Continuity can possibly advocate belief in the Second Advent. And deniers of that Advent, as Dr. Major shows, found their denials upon the supposed truth of evolution. Everything goes back to the dogma of CONTINUITY.

Colonel Skinner declares that Modernists often combine Christian beliefs with Modernist unbeliefs. The inconsistency of many Modernists is repeatedly stressed by me. I also make a particular study of the "fruits" of Modernism, tracing everything back to the fundamental dogma at the roots of the whole; and showing that the rise of this dogma into its present perfected form, together with certain of its characteristic "fruits," was expressly foretold in Scripture as the peculiar mark of scoffers in the "last days." I could far more reasonably apply the term "Christian" to a consistent Mohammedan than to a consistent Modernist.† No one desires the conversion of Modernists more fervently than I do; but Colonel Skinner will agree that conversion will not be forwarded by people who have no clear view of the dire *need* of the Modernist to be converted.

Mr. Percy Ruoff suggests that my remarks about Darwin were "flogging a dead horse" in view of Dr. Rendle Short's recent references to L. S. Berg's *Nomogenesis*. But how can anything, that Berg or anyone else has said, affect the unquestionable fact, which I point out in this paper, that Darwin applied the principle of Hume to organic studies, and thereby set the fashion to all successors, whether they all accept Darwin's "Selection" ideas or not?

Mr. Ruoff also suggests that Le Roy taught that the "attitude," "frame of mind," and "method" of a philosopher are continually

---

* Note that the scoffers are not *only* denying the Second Coming. They expressly carry their denials back to the very "beginning of the Creation"; and Peter shows that they are thereby *denying the Flood*, just as Uniformitarians are denying it to-day.

† Thus the Mohammedan admits many most important things which the Modernist flatly denies, *e.g.* that the Bible, as first received, was literally Inspired; that our Lord was born of a Virgin, physically rose from the Grave, ascended into Heaven, and will return again to destroy the *Dhajaal* (Antichrist). For a finished Modernist clergyman to officiate at the Communion is a more shocking blasphemy even than it would be for a Mohammedan Mullah to officiate at it.

changing. He had better get Le Roy's book and read it. Meanwhile, I would point out that although I never seriously supposed that anyone could imagine such an absurdity, I regarded Le Roy's wording as defective, and deliberately made my own definition "fool-proof" by talking of a "BASIS" instead of an "initial stage" (p. 192 and footnote).

Mr. Ruoff doubts "if the doctrine of Atonement is ever presented in Scripture" so as to "involve the idea of debtor and creditor." I would invite him to look up Matt. vi, 12; xviii, 23–35; xx, 28; Mark x, 45; Luke vii, 41–48; Acts xx, 28; 1 Cor. vi, 20; vii, 23; Eph. i, 7, 14; 1 Tim. ii, 6; 1 Pet. i, 18–19; 2 Pet. ii, 1; Rev. v, 9—as samples of passages which show him to be wrong.

I was not unfair to Canon Storr. I charged him only with doing what he himself openly avowed. To argue that he believes in "predictive prophecy" only emphasizes his inconsistency. I do not, as Mr. Ruoff asserts, indulge in "a pure abuse of language" by suggesting that Peter did not accept our Lord's rebuke. I never even discuss how he took that rebuke. I talk of Peter's action *before* that rebuke, as anyone can see from my words on p. 197. And since our Lord called Peter "Satan" for doing the very thing for which I call him "still very largely a Modernist," how does Mr. Ruoff propose to characterize our Lord's language, if he waxes so indignant over mine?