

Encyclopædia
of
Religion and Ethics

EDITED BY
JAMES HASTINGS

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF
JOHN A. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE
UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, ABERDEEN
AND
LOUIS H. GRAY, M.A., Ph.D.
SOMETIME FELLOW IN INDO-IRANIAN LANGUAGES IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK

VOLUME VIII
LIFE AND DEATH—MULLA

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK
1916

III.; the best monograph on the subject is J. Lebon, *Le Monothéisme sévérien*, Louvain, 1900. In writing the present article the author has drawn upon his contributions to *PRE* ('Julian von Halikarnass', 'Justinian I.', 'Monophysiten', 'Philozenus', 'Severus', 'Zacharias Scholastikus', etc.), and upon his *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, I. (Tübingen, 1911); additional literature will be found both in the articles and in the book. G. KRÜGER.

MONOTHEISM.—In the history of religion monotheism, the doctrine that 'there is one God,' or that 'God is One,' is somewhat sharply opposed to a very wide range of beliefs and teachings. The contrast, when it appears in the religion of a people, or in the general evolution of religion, tends to have an important bearing both upon religious practices and upon religious experience, since to believe in 'One God' means, in general, to abandon, often with contempt or aversion, many older beliefs, hopes, fears, and customs relating to the 'many gods,' or to the other powers, whose place or dignity the 'One God' tends henceforth to take and to retain. If these 'many,' as the older beliefs, which some form of monotheism replaces, had dealt with them, were themselves for the older faiths 'gods,' then the monotheism which is each time in question opposes, and replaces, some form of 'polytheism.' This is what happened when Judaism and Muhammadanism replaced older local faiths. If one were satisfied to view the contrast in the light of cases closely resembling these, and these only, then the natural opponent of monotheism as a belief in 'One God' would appear to be, in the history of religion, polytheism as a belief in 'many gods.'

Since, however, there are various religions and many superstitions which recognize the existence of powers such as, despite their more or less divine character, lack some or all of the features which naturally belong either to God or to gods, and since demons, the spirits of the dead, or magic powers may be in question in such religions, the name 'polytheism' can hardly be quite accurately applied to the whole class of beliefs which are in any important way opposed to monotheism. So, in the history of religion, monotheism has two opponents: (1) polytheism proper, and (2) beliefs that recognize other more or less divine beings besides those that are properly to be called gods.

In the history of philosophy, however, monotheism has a much narrower range of contrasting or opposing beliefs. Polytheism, as an explicit doctrine, has played but a small part in the history of philosophy. To the doctrine 'God is One' or 'There is one God,' where this doctrine forms part of a philosophy, there are opposed forms of opinion which are often classified under three heads: (1) philosophical pantheism, (2) philosophical atheism, (3) philosophical scepticism regarding the divine beings. The modern name 'agnosticism' has been freely used for a philosophical scepticism which especially relates either to God or to other matters of central interest in religion.

Frequently, in summaries of the varieties of philosophical doctrine, the term 'pantheism' has been used as a name for such philosophical doctrines as 'identify the world with God.' Pantheism is often summed up as the doctrine that 'All is God,' 'Everything is God,' or, finally, 'God is everything.' But a more careful study of the philosophical doctrines which have gone under the name of pantheism, or which have been so named by their opponents, would show that the name 'pantheism' is too abstract, too vague in its meaning to make any clear insight easily obtainable regarding what ought to constitute the essence of a philosophical pantheism as opposed to a philosophic monotheism. The two propositions (1) 'God is One,' and (2)

'God is identical with all reality,' or 'with the principle upon which all reality depends,' are not, on the face of the matter, mutually contrary propositions. How far, in reference to a given creed, or theology, or religious tradition, the first proposition appears to be contrary to the second depends upon the special interpretation, and sometimes upon the special prejudices of critics, sects, or philosophers of a given school.

One who asserts the 'unity of God' may or may not be laying stress upon the fact that he also makes a sharp distinction between the reality called God and other realities—*e.g.*, the world. That such sharp distinctions are often in question is an important fact in the history of philosophy. Nevertheless the doctrine that 'God is One' has been philosophically maintained at the same time with the doctrine that 'God is all reality.' For such a view, the two doctrines would simply be two ways of expressing the same centrally important fact. One who wishes to understand the numerous controversies, subtle distinctions, and religious interests which at one time or another have been bound up with the name 'pantheism' must be ready to recognize that the term 'pantheism,' when used without special explanation, is a poor instrument for making clear precisely where the problem lies. In brief, one may say that, while the term 'pantheism' has been freely employed by philosophers, as well as by those who are devoted to practical religious interests, it is, as a historical name, rather a cause of confusion than an aid to clearness. The proposition, 'God is One,' has, despite the complications of doctrine and of history, a comparatively definite meaning for any one who advances a philosophical opinion concerning the nature of God. But the proposition, 'God is all,' or 'God is all reality,' has, in the history of thought, no one meaning which can be made clear unless one first grasps all the essential principles of the metaphysical doctrine of the philosopher who asserts this proposition, or who at least is accused by his critics of asserting it.

If we endeavour, then, to make clearer the essential meaning of the term 'monotheism' by contrasting the historical forms of monotheism with philosophical doctrines which have been opposed to it, we may attempt to solve the problem of defining what is essential to philosophical monotheism by dwelling upon a contrast which, especially in recent discussion, has been freely emphasized. One may assert, *e.g.*, that in speaking of the nature of the 'One God' who is the essential being of monotheistic belief, either (1) one holds that God is 'immanent' in the world, thus asserting the doctrine of the 'divine immanence,' or (2) one holds to the doctrine of the 'transcendence' of God, thus asserting that the divine being in some fashion 'transcends' the world which He has created or with which He is contrasted. But here, again, one deals with two doctrines which, in certain philosophical contexts, do not appear to stand in contrary opposition to each other. For, as is well known, there are philosophies which insist that God is in a certain sense 'immanent' in the world, and also in a certain sense 'transcendent' in His relation to the world. Aristotle, in a well-known passage (*Met.* xii. 10), gave a classic expression of the relations of the doctrines which are here in question, when he stated the question as to whether the divine being is related to the world as the 'order' is to the army, or as the 'general' is to the army. Aristotle replied by saying that 'in a certain sense' God is *both* the 'order' of the world and the 'general,' 'although rather the general.' Thus the opposition between divine immanence and divine transcendence does not precisely state the issue and class of issues which one finds play-

ing the most important part in the history of philosophical monotheism (see art. IMMANENCE).

Another attempt to get the issue between monotheism and the contrasting or opposed philosophical doctrines clearly before the mind may take the well-known form of declaring that monotheism, properly so called, lays stress upon the 'personality of God,' while the opposed or contrasting doctrines, which so often are regarded as constituting or as tending towards pantheism, have as their essential feature the tendency to view God as 'impersonal.' From this point of view, it would be of the essence of monotheism to declare that the One God is a person, while it would be of the essence of those doctrines which are opposed to monotheism to declare, in a fashion which might remain simply negative, that the divine being is not personal. It would then remain for further definition to consider whether the divine being is 'superpersonal' or is 'merely material,' or, again, is 'unconscious,' or is otherwise not of a personal character.

But the difficulty in this way of defining the contrasts which have actually appeared in the history of thought lies in the fact that the very conception of personality is itself, in the history of philosophy, a comparatively late as well as a decidedly unstable conception. It is fair to ask how far the most widely current modern ideas of personality were present to the minds of such Greek philosophers as Plato and Aristotle. All the ideas of personality which philosophers may now possess have recently been vastly influenced by the whole course of modern European civilization. The problem of how far the Occidental and Oriental minds agree regarding what a 'person' is one about which those will be least likely to dogmatize who have most carefully considered the accessible facts. In fact, the whole experience of the civilized consciousness of any nation or philosopher is likely to be epitomized in the idea of personality which a given philosophy expresses. It seems, therefore, inconvenient to make one's classification of the philosophical doctrine about the nature of God depend upon presupposing that one knows what a philosopher means by the term 'person.' It is true that whoever makes clear what he means by 'person' will thereby define his attitude towards nearly all fundamental philosophical problems. But the idea of personality is, if possible, more difficult to define than any other fundamental philosophical idea. Therefore, to define monotheism as a 'belief in a personal God' will give little aid to the understanding of what sort of belief is in question, so long as the idea of what constitutes a person remains as obscure as it usually does.

A still further effort has been made to define monotheism by making explicit reference to philosophical doctrines concerning the question whether the world was created or is self-existent. As a matter of fact, that set of Christian theological doctrines and of scholastic interpretations of Aristotle which goes by the name of 'creationism' has played an important part in the history of the more technical forms of monotheism. Yet the issues regarding creation are, after all, special issues. How they bear upon the problem of monotheism can hardly be understood by one who has not already defined monotheism in other terms. Creationism is the familiar doctrine that 'the world was created by God.' This doctrine can become clear only if one first knows what one means by God.

The effort to make some further advance towards unravelling the great variety of interwoven motives which appear in the history of monotheism, and which have been suggested by the foregoing considerations, will be aided by attempting, at this

point, once more to review the issues with regard to the nature of God, but now from a somewhat different point of view. The problems, both about 'God' and about 'the gods,' have everywhere been inherited by the philosophers from religions whose origins antedated their philosophy. In a few cases, notably in the case of Greece on the one hand and India on the other, the origin of the philosophical traditions regarding the divine being can be traced back to ancient religious tendencies, while the transition from religion to philosophy is fairly well known, and passes through definite stages. In one other instance, the transition from a tribal religion to a form of monotheism which was not due to philosophers but which has deeply influenced the subsequent life of philosophy is also decidedly well known, and can be traced in its essential details. This is the case of the religion of Israel. Now in the three cases in question—that of India, that of Greece, that of Israel—the rise of a doctrine which is certainly in each case a monotheism can be fairly well understood. The three forms of monotheism which resulted led in the sequel to contrasts of doctrine which, in the case of the history of philosophical thought, have been momentous. Ignoring, then, the complications of early religious history, ignoring also the effort further to define and to classify those doctrines which have been summarized in the various definitions of monotheism and its opponents which we have just reviewed, it seems well to reconsider the important varieties of philosophical belief regarding the divine being in the light of the great historical contrast of the three forms of monotheism which India, Greece, and Israel put before us. We shall discard the name 'pantheism,' and make no attempt to define the contrast between divine immanence and divine transcendence, or to speak of the problem in what sense God is personal and in what sense impersonal. Nor can we here exhaust the varieties of philosophical opinion. But the threefold contrast just given will help us to make clearer the philosophical issues of monotheism by naming certain varieties of philosophical thought which have both a definite historical origin and a great influence upon the character of opinion about the divine being. Simplifying the whole matter in this somewhat artificial but still well-founded way, we may say that, from the historical point of view, three different ways of viewing the divine being have been of great importance both for religious life and for philosophical doctrine. No one of these three ways has been exclusively confined to the nation of which the form of opinion in question is most characteristic, and in the history of philosophical thought the three motives are interwoven. But a comparatively clear distinction can be made if we emphasize the three contrasting doctrines, and then point out that these doctrines, while not exclusively due each to one of the three nations or to philosophies which have grown out of the religious traditions of the nation in question, are still, on the whole, fairly to be associated, one with the tradition of Israel, the second with the influence of Greece, and the third with the influence either of India or of nations and civilizations which, in this respect, are closely analogous in spirit to the civilization of India.

(1) The monotheism due to the historical influence of the religion of Israel defines God as 'the righteous Ruler of the world,' as 'the Doer of justice,' or as the one 'whose law is holy,' or 'who secures the triumph of the right.' The best phrase to characterize this form of doctrine, to leave room for the wide variety of special forms which it has assumed, to indicate its historical origin, and also to imply that it has undergone in the course of history a long process of development, is this: 'the

ethical monotheism of the Prophets of Israel.' We include under this phrase that form, or type, or aspect of monotheism, which characterizes philosophies that have been most strongly influenced, directly or indirectly, by the religion of Israel.

(2) The monotheism which has its historical origin very largely in the Greek philosophers defines God as the source, or the explanation, or the correlate, or the order, or the reasonableness of the world. It seems fair to call this form 'Hellenic monotheism.' In the history of philosophy, and especially of that philosophy which has grown up under the influence of Christianity, this idea of God has, of course, become interwoven—sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously—with the ethical monotheism of Israel. But, when a philosophy of Christian origin is in question, while in some respects this philosophy, if positively monotheistic, is almost sure to be strongly influenced by ethical monotheism, the most important and essential features of the philosophy in question will be due to the way in which it deals with the relation between the order of the world and the nature of the 'One God.' Aristotle's statement of his own problem regarding whether God is identical with the 'order' or is related to the world as the 'general' is related to the army is a good example of the form which the problem of monotheism takes from this point of view.

(3) The third form of monotheism is very widespread, and has actually had many different historical origins. In the history both of religion and of philosophy this form of monotheism, somewhat like the Ancient Mariner, 'passes, like night, from land to land' and 'has strange power of speech.' Often unorthodox at the time or in the place where it is influential, it has indirectly played a large part in the creeds of various times and places. Usually fond of esoteric statements of doctrine, and often condemned by common sense as fantastic and intolerable, it has had many times of great popular influence. The official Christian Church has had great difficulty in defining the relation of orthodox doctrine to this form of opinion. In the history of philosophy the more technical statements of it have formed part of extremely important systems.

This form of monotheism is especially well marked in the early history of Hindu speculation. It is often called 'Hindu pantheism'; and it is indeed fair to say that it is in many respects most purely represented by some systems of belief and doctrine which have grown up on Indian soil. On the other hand, it has a less exclusive relation to Indian philosophy than the Hellenic form of monotheism, in its later history, has to Greek philosophy, so that the connexion here insisted upon between this kind of monotheism and the early history of Hindu philosophy must be interpreted somewhat liberally. In fact, at the close of the history of Greek philosophy this third form of monotheism appeared as a part of the Neo-Platonic philosophy. Yet in this case an Oriental origin or direct influence is extremely improbable. Examples of the tendency of this form of monotheism to take on new forms, and to be influenced by other motives than those derived from the religion or philosophy of India, are to be found in the recent revival of such types of doctrine in various forms of 'intuitionism' and 'anti-intellectualism' in European thought.

The essence of this third type of monotheism is that it tends to insist not only upon the 'sole reality of God,' but upon the 'unreality of the world.' The name 'acosmism' therefore is more suggestive for it than the name 'pantheism.' It might be summed up in the proposition 'God is real,' but all else besides God that appears to be real

is but an 'appearance' or, if better estimated, is a 'dream.' If we attempt to make more precise the vague word 'pantheism' merely by saying, 'God and the world are, according to pantheism, but one,' the natural question arises, 'If they are but one, then which one?' But what we may now call, in a general way and upon the general historical basis just indicated, 'Indic monotheism,' whether it appears in Hindu philosophy, in Spinoza, or in Meister Eckhart, tends to assert, 'The One is God and God only, and is so precisely because the world is but appearance.' This definition of the third form of monotheism relieves us of some of the ambiguities of the term 'pantheism.'

The threefold distinction now made enables us similarly to review some of the great features of the history of philosophical monotheism in a way which cannot here be stated at length, but which, even when summarily indicated, tends to elucidate many points that have usually been unduly left obscure.

The ethical monotheism of the Prophets of Israel was not the product of any philosophical thinking. The intense earnestness of the nation into whose religious experience it entered kept it alive in the world. The beginnings of Christianity soon required philosophical interpretation, and in any such interpretation the doctrine of the righteous God must inevitably play a leading part. In the course of the development of the Church this doctrine sought aid from Greek philosophy. Consequently, the whole history of Christian monotheism depends upon an explicit effort to make a synthesis of the ethical monotheism of Israel and the Hellenic form of monotheism. This synthesis was as attractive as, in the course of its development, it has proved problematic and difficult. The reason for the problem of such a synthesis, as the philosophers have had to face that problem, lies mainly in the following fact. Whether taken in its original form or modified by philosophical reflexion, ethical monotheism, the doctrine that 'God is righteous,' very sharply contrasts God, 'the righteous Ruler,' or, in Christian forms, 'God the Redeemer of the world,' with the world to which God stands in such ethical relations. On the other hand, for the Hellenic form of monotheism, the problem which Aristotle emphasized about the 'order' and the 'general' indeed exists. But in its essentials Hellenic monotheism is, on the whole, neutral as to the kind of unity which binds God and the world together. Our later philosophies, in so far as they are founded upon Hellenic monotheism, must therefore attempt explicitly to solve the problem which Aristotle stated. And, on the whole, such philosophies tend towards answering the question as Aristotle did: God is both 'order' and the 'general' of the army which constitutes the world. Hellenic monotheism, moreover, is influenced by strongly intellectual tendencies. On the other hand, the monotheism of Israel was, even in its ante-philosophical form, a kind of voluntarism. God's law, viewed as one term of the antithesis, the world which He rules, or which He saves, viewed as the other, are much more sharply contrasted than Aristotle's 'order' and 'general' tend to be. When, in the development of the philosophies which grew out of the Greek tradition, the Hellenic concept of the Logos (*g.v.*) assumed its most characteristic forms, its intellectual interests were, on the whole, in favour of defining the unity of the divine being and the world as the most essential feature of monotheism. But, at each stage of this development, this intellectual or rational unity of the Logos and the world gradually came into sharper and sharper conflict with that ethical interest which naturally dwelt upon the contrast between the righteous

Ruler and the sinful world, and between divine grace and fallen man.

Therefore, behind many of the conflicts between so-called pantheism in Christian tradition and the doctrines of 'divine transcendence' and 'divine personality,' there has lain the conflict between intellectualism and voluntarism, between an interpretation of the world in terms of order and an interpretation of the world in terms of the conflict between good and evil, righteousness and unrighteousness.

Meanwhile, in terms of this antithesis of our first and second types of philosophical monotheism, we can state only half of the problem. Had the monotheism of Israel and the Hellenic doctrine of God as the principle of order been the only powers concerned in these conflicts, the history both of philosophy and of religion would have been, for the Christian world, far simpler than it is. The motives which determine the third idea of God have tended both to enrich and to complicate the situation.

It is true that a direct connexion between ancient Hinduism and early Christian doctrine cannot be traced. But what we have called, for very general reasons, the Indic type of idea of God became, in the course of time, a part of Christian civilization for very various reasons. As we have seen, the doctrine that God alone is real while the world is illusory depends upon motives which are not confined to India. In the form of what has technically been called 'mysticism,' this view of the divine nature in due time became a factor both in Christian experience and in philosophical interpretation. The Neo-Platonic school furnished some of the principal technical formulations of such a view of the divine nature. The religious experience of the Græco-Roman world, in the times immediately before and immediately after the Christian era, also in various ways emphasized the motives upon which this third type of Christian monotheism depends. The Church thus found room within the limits of orthodoxy for the recognition, with certain restrictions, of the tendency to view the world as mere appearance, ordinary life as a bad dream, and salvation as attainable only through a direct acquaintance with the divine being itself.

The very complications which for philosophy have grown out of the efforts to synthesize Hellenic monotheism and the religion of the Prophets of Israel have repeatedly stimulated the Christian mystics to insist that what the intellect cannot attain, namely, an understanding of the nature of God and His relation to the world, the mystic experience can furnish to those who have a right to receive its revelations. Philosophy—intellectual philosophy—fails (so such mystics assert) to solve the problems raised by the contrasts between good and evil, between God and the world, as these contrasts are recognized either by those who study the order of the universe or by those who thirst after righteousness. What way remains, then, for man, beset by his moral problems, on the one hand, and his intellectual difficulties, on the other, to come into real touch with the divine? The mystics, i.e. those who have insisted upon the third idea of God, and who have tested this idea in their own experience, have always held that the results of the intellect are negative, and lead to no definite idea of God which can be defended against the sceptics, while, as the mystics always insist, to follow the law of righteousness, whether with or without the aid of divine grace, does not lead, at least in the present life, to the highest type of the knowledge of God. We approach the highest type of knowledge, so far as the present life permits, if we recognize, in the form of some sort of 'negative' theology, the barrenness of intellectualism, and if,

meanwhile, we recognize that the contemplative life is higher than the practical life, and that an immediate vision of God leads to an insight which no practical activity, however righteous, attains. To teach such doctrines as matters of personal experience is characteristic of the mystics. To make more articulate the idea of God thus defined has formed an important part of the office of theology.

Without this third type of monotheism, and without this negative criticism of the work of the intellect and this direct appeal to immediate experience, Christian doctrine, in fact, would not have reached some of its most characteristic forms and expressions, and the philosophy of Christendom would have failed to put on record some of its most fascinating speculations.

It is obvious that, on the face of the matter, the immediate intuitions upon which mystical monotheism lays stress are opposed to the sort of insight which the intellect obtains. Even here, however, the opposing tendencies in question are not always in any very direct contrary opposition in the thought or expression of an individual thinker or philosopher. Thus, in an individual case, an exposition of mysticism may devote a large part of its philosophical work to a return to the Hellenic type of theism. That this was possible the Neo-Platonic school had already shown (see art. NEO-PLATONISM). Wherever Christian monotheism is strongly under the Neo-Platonic influence, it tends to become a synthesis of our second and third types of monotheism. In such cases the monotheism is Hellenic in its fondness for order, for categories, and for an intellectual system of the universe, and at the same time devoted to immediate intuitions, to a recognition that the finite world is an appearance, and to a definition of God in terms of an ineffable experience, rather than in terms of a rational system of ideas. Such a synthesis may, in an individual system, ignore the conflicts here in question. Nevertheless, on the whole, the opposition is bound to become, for great numbers of thinkers and, on occasion, for the authorities of the Church, a conscious opposition. And the opposition between the ethical and the mystic types of monotheism is in general still sharper, and is more fully conscious. Despite all these oppositions, however, it remains the case that one of the principal problems of Christian theology has been the discovery of some way to bring the third of the ideas of God, the third of the tendencies to define God as One, into some tolerable and true synthesis either with the first or with the second of the three types of monotheism, or with both.

In the technical discussions of the idea of God which have made up the introductory portions of many systems of so-called 'nature theology,' it has been very general for the philosophers of Christendom to emphasize the Hellenic type of theism. The so-called philosophical 'proofs of the divine existence' make explicit some aspect of the Hellenic interest in the order and reason of the world. The 'design argument,' first stated in an elementary form by Socrates, and persistently present in popular theology of the monotheistic type ever since, is an interpretation of the world in terms of various special analogies between the particular sorts of adaptation which the physical world shows us and the plans of which a designing intelligence, in the case of art, makes use. The so-called 'cosmological argument' reasons more in general terms from the very existence of this 'contingent' world to the Logos whose rational nature explains the world. The highly technical 'ontological argument' insists upon motives which arise in the course of the effort to define the very nature of an

orderly system. In its briefest statement the ontological argument is epitomized by Augustine when he defines God as 'Veritas' and declares that Veritas must be real, since, if there were no Veritas, the proposition that there is no Veritas would itself be true. The more highly developed forms of the ontological argument reason in similar fashion from our own ideas of the nature of the Logos, or of the rationally necessary order system of the universe—in other words, from the realm of Platonic ideas, in so far as it is manifested through and to our intellect, to the reality of such a system beyond our intellect.

It has been insisted, and not without very genuine basis, both in religion and in the controversies of the philosophers, that all such efforts, through the intellect, to grasp the divine nature lead to results remote from the vital experience upon which religious monotheism and, in particular, Christian monotheism must rest, if such monotheism is permanently to retain the confidence of a man who is at once critical and religious. Into the merits of the issues thus indicated, this is no place to enter. In any case, however, both the warfare of the philosophical schools and the contrast between intellectual theology and the religious life have often led to philosophical efforts to escape from the very problems now emphasized to some more immediate intuition of the divine, or else to assert that there is no philosophical solution to the religious problem of theism. Thus intellectualism in theology, in the forms in which it has historically appeared, has repeatedly tended to bring about its own elimination. The more highly rational it has become, and the more its apparent barrenness, or its inability to combine the various motives which enter into the three different monotheistic tendencies has become manifest, the more the result of a careful analysis of the intellectual motives has led either to the revival of mysticism or to a sceptical indifference to philosophical theism. To say this is merely to report historical facts.

Some negative results of the more purely Hellenic type of monotheism became especially manifest through the results of the Kantian criticism of reason and of its work. It is extremely interesting, however, to see what, in Kant's case, was the result of this criticism of the traditional arguments for the existence of God. By temperament Kant was indisposed to take interest in experiences of mystic type. For him, therefore, the failure of the intellect meant a return to the motives which, in no philosophical formulation, but in the form of an intensely earnest practical faith, had long ago given rise to the religion of Israel. Therefore the God of Kant is, once more, simply the righteous Ruler. Or, as Fichte in a famous early essay defined the idea, 'God is the moral order of the world.' This Kantian-Fichtean order is, however, not the Hellenic order, either of the realm of Platonic ideas or of the natural world. It is the order of 'the kingdom of ends,' of a universe of free moral agents, whose existence stands in endless contrast to an ideal realm of holiness or moral perfection, after which they must endlessly strive, but of whose real presence they can never become aware through a mystical vision or by a sure logical demonstration. The righteous man, according to Kant, says: 'I will that God exists.' Kant defines God in terms of this will. Monotheism, according to this view, cannot be proved, but rationally must be acknowledged as true.

Yet, in his *Critique of Judgment*, Kant recognized that the requirement to bring into synthesis the intellect and the will, and to interpret our æsthetic experience, i.e. our acquaintance with the kind of perfection which beauty reveals—this ideal, a

synthesis of the ethical, the intuitional, and the rational—remains with us. And, despite all failures, this ideal is one from which philosophy cannot escape.

The revived interest in intuition and in religious experience which has characterized the transition from the 19th to the 20th cent. has once more made the mystical motives familiar to our present interest. The permanent significance of the ethical motives also renders them certain to become prominent in the attention of serious-minded men, even though the Kantian formulation of the ethical ideals seems for the moment, in our mobile contemporary philosophical and religious thought, too abstract and rigid. And so we are not likely, in future, to accept any merely one-sided Hellenism.

While no attention can here be given to the solutions of the problem of philosophical monotheism which have been proposed during the last century, the problem of monotheism still remains central for recent philosophy. It may be said that dogmatic formulations are at the present time often treated with the same indifference which is also characteristically shown towards the faith of the fathers, viewed simply as a heritage. Nevertheless, the problems of philosophical monotheism remain as necessarily impressive as they have been ever since the early stages of Christian theology. They are as certain to survive as is philosophy itself. What the whole history of the monotheistic problem in philosophy shows becomes to-day, in view of our explicit knowledge of the philosophy of India, and in view of our wide comparative study of religions, more explicit than ever. Philosophy is a necessary effort of the civilized consciousness, at least on its higher level. Monotheism is a central problem of philosophy. This problem is not to be sufficiently dealt with by merely drawing artificial or technical distinctions between Platonic or Neo-Platonic theories; nor can the problem be solved by calling it the problem of the immanence of God as against His transcendence. The question 'Is God personal?' becomes and will become more explicit in its modern formulation the more we become aware of what constitutes a person. Meanwhile, as was remarked above, the problem of monotheism has other aspects besides the problem of personality.

The essentials of the great issue remain for us, as for our fathers, capable of formulation in the terms which have here been emphasized. To repeat, the philosophical problem of monotheism is (1) In what sense is the world real? (2) In what sense is the world a rational order? (3) In what sense is the world ethical? The effort to answer these questions cannot be made by exclusive emphasis on one of them. For, as we have seen, the problem of monotheism requires a synthesis of all the three ideas of God, and an answer that shall be just to all the three problems. Whether monotheism is true or not can be discovered, in a philosophical sense, only through a clear recognition of the contrast of the three ideas of God, and the synthesis which shall bring them into some sort of harmony. The further discussion of the nature of this harmony does not come within the scope of this article (see art. God [Biblical and Christian]).

LITERATURE.—I. Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, Riga, 1781, 'Dialektik,' III., 'Das Ideal der reinen Vernunft,' tr. J. M. D. Meiklejohn, London, 1890, p. 350 ff.; G. W. F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Beweise für das Dasein Gottes*, printed as a supplement to *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion*, in *Werke*, Berlin, 1832-37; J. Martineau, *A Study of Religion*, Oxford, 1888; Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism*, London, 1912; W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, do. 1890; J. Royce, *The World and the Individual*, New York, 1900-01.

JOSIAH ROYCE.

MONOTHELETISM.—I. The problem.—The Monenergistic or Monothelæte controversy seems