

THE MODERNIST MOVEMENT IN THE ROMAN CHURCH ITS ORIGINS & OUTCOME





THE MODERNIST MOVEMENT IN THE ROMAN CHURCH ITS ORIGINS & OUTCOME

BEING THE NORRISIAN PRIZE ESSAY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
FOR THE YEAR 1933

by

ALEC R. VIDLER, M.A.

Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd Formerly Exhibitioner of Selwyn College

CAMBRIDGE AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS 1934



CAMBRIDGEUNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107657076

© Cambridge University Press 1934

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1934 First paperback edition 2014

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-107-65707-6 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



To W. L. K.





CONTENTS

Prefa	ice	page xi
Introduction		I
	PART I	
	THE ROMAN CHURCH IN THE	
	NINETEENTH CENTURY	
CHAI	. .	
I	The beginning of the Catholic revival	15
II	The new ultramontanism and liberal Catholicism in France (1814–1848)	20
III	Liberals and intransigents in France (1848–1878)	.25
IV	LIBERAL CATHOLICISM IN GERMANY	32
V	LIBERAL CATHOLICISM IN ITALY	40
VI	LIBERAL CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND	43
VII	Newman	53
VIII	THE ACCESSION OF LEO XIII AND THE EFFECTS OF HIS POLICY	60
	PART II	
	LOISY	
IX	Vocation (1857–1892)	69
X	The biblical question (1893)	81



Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-65707-6 - The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church: Its Origins and Outcome: Being the Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge

for the Year 1933

Alec R. Vidler

Frontmatter More information

viii	Contents	
CHAP.		
XI	Revising dogma (1894–1899)	page 88
XII	Preliminary skirmishes (1900–1902)	95
XIII	The challenge of liberal Protestantism	104
XIV	'L'Évangile et l'Église' (1902)	113
xv	'Autour d'un petit livre' (1903)	123
XVI	'Res dissociabiles' (1904–1908)	132
	PART III	
	TYRRELL	
XVII	A CONVERT DISILLUSIONED (1861–1901)	143
XVIII	'Lex orandi,' 'lex credendi' (1901-1906)	157
XIX	Prophet of revolution (1906–1909)	171
XX	LOISY AND TYRRELL	179
	PART IV	
	OTHER MODERNISTS:	
	OTHER MODERNISMS	
XXI	In France	185
XXII	In Italy	191
XXIII	In Germany	200
XXIV	In England	204
xxv	SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS	213



Contents ix

PART V

THE OUTCOME OF THE MODERNIST MOVEMENT

CHAP.	
XXVI WITHIN THE ROMAN CHURCH page	e 217
XXVII OUTSIDE THE ROMAN CHURCH	234
Appendix I On the use of the terms 'modernism', 'modernist'	270
Appendix II Lamennais on the need of doctrinal renovation	272
Bibliography	274
Index	281





PREFACE

The words 'modernism' and 'modernist' are used throughout this essay with exclusive reference to the movement which is its subject, i.e. to the movement in the Roman Catholic Church which began about 1890, was condemned in the encyclical Pascendi in 1907, and lasted till about 1910. This usage is determined by considerations of convenience, and it is not intended to deny the propriety of giving to these words that much wider application which is now current especially in England and America. They were indeed originally applied to the movement with which we are here concerned, and it is permissible to regret their application to other movements and to other groups of persons, which, however similar in some respects, have in view a different, and even a directly opposite, aim. Such regrets have been expressed by more than one English writer.2 They are however idle. The wider and more comprehensive usage is now securely established among us; both its existence and its legitimacy were in fact acknowledged by Tyrrell as early as 1909.3 Nevertheless, since I need here some single term to denote the particular movement and group of persons which form the subject of my essay, I restrict myself to the original, narrower usage, which still retains its ascendancy in France.

This statement requires qualification if the occasional use of the words

3 Christianity at the cross roads, p. 3; cp. Medievalism, pp. 143 ff.

by earlier writers is taken into account; see Appendix I, p. 270 below.

² E.g. by A. Fawkes in a letter to The Times, February 19th, 1914 (quoted by M. D. Petre, Modernism, p. 101), by W. R. Matthews, Studies in Christian philosophy, p. 16, and by J. N. Figgis, The fellowship of the mystery, p. 265. Cp. C. W. Emmet, Journal of Religion (November, 1922), p. 562; S. C. Carpenter, Church and people 1789-1889 (1933), pp. 143, 578; J. S. Bezzant, Theology (August, 1933), p. 100; The Times Literary Supplement (October 12th, 1933), p. 680.

³ Christianity at the cross roads, p. 3: cp. Medievalism, pp. 143 ff.



xii Preface

Perhaps a yet further restriction ought also to be mentioned. Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church was not a single, unified movement, but a complex of movements. They fall into two main divisions, for doctrinal modernism was largely separate, and is in any case easily separable, from sociological modernism.¹ The 'Christian democrat' movements in France and Italy, whose course was more or less contemporaneous with that of doctrinal modernism, were not condemned by the pope in the encyclical *Pascendi*, but on other occasions. This in itself explains their exclusion from the scope of this essay; if they enter into it at all, they do so

only indirectly.

Its prescribed subject was 'The origins and outcome of the modernist movement condemned by the encyclical Pascendi gregis'. The greater part of my essay consists of an investigation of the course of the movement itself, rather than specifically of its origins and outcome. The reasons for this method of treating the subject are readily explained. It is impossible to take for granted any definition or description of what the movement was, or of what were its principles or doctrines. The whole subject is one about which widely different opinions are held. It would be futile to try to trace the ancestry of, and the influences which moulded, a character in history, or the outcome of his activity, unless his identity and the distinguishing features of his life were evident. A fortiori this applies to a movement in which many different persons were engaged, and of which the characteristics were anything but simple and coherent. It is therefore necessary to investigate and to understand the character of the movement itself in order to appreciate in what sense, and to what extent, it had, or could be expected to have, any specific origins and outcome. Moreover, to follow the course of the movement, and in particular the careers of the two most prominent figures who took part in it, is to go a

¹ Cp. E. Buonaiuti, Le modernisme catholique, pp. 98f.



Preface

long way towards discovering the nature of its origins and outcome.

I do not know of any book that covers the same ground or that is constructed on the same plan as the present essay. In the bibliography (see pp. 274-9 below) I have marked with an asterisk those books to which I am consciously most indebted. In the text or in the notes I have tried to acknowledge as fully as possible the sources from which I have derived particular pieces of information, and also to make clear where I have depended at all closely on the work of others.

While in connexion with each part of the essay I have carried my investigations and verifications as far as time and opportunity permitted, the subject is so vast and so varied that I cannot claim to have produced more than a general introduction to it. There does not exist such an introduction in English. The books of Archdeacon Lilley and Miss Petre, both of which bear the title *Modernism*, valuable as they are, are more restricted in their scope. The two best studies of the movement as a whole, those in French by Houtin and Rivière, are written on plans which have not suited my purpose, within limits which I have had to exceed, and from points of view neither of which is my own.

A. R. V.

xiii

The Oratory House Cambridge February 1934