THE WAR AND THE CHURCH AND OTHER ADDRESSES

BY CHARLES GORE, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.

E.C. Kemp

23A

THE WAR AND THE CHURCH

AND OTHER ADDRESSES

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

(Fifth impression, completing 12,000 copies.)

THE BASIS OF
ANGLICAN FELLOWSHIP

IN FAITH AND ORGANIZATION

An open letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford.

SIXPENCE NET.

PATRIOTISM IN THE BIBLE

TWOPENCE NET.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. Ltd.,
LONDON AND OXFORD

THE WAR AND THE CHURCH

AND OTHER ADDRESSES

Being the Charge delivered at his primary Visitation, 1914

BY

CHARLES GORE, ~~D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.~~

BISHOP OF OXFORD

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON : 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.
OXFORD : 9 High Street
MILWAUKEE, U.S.A. : The Young Churchman Co.

First impression, 1914
New impression, 1915

PREFACE

The addresses contained in this volume have just been delivered as a charge on a Visitation of the Diocese of Oxford and circulated to the clergy. But in the hope that some part of them may be of interest to some people beyond the diocese they are also being published.

I have added to them an essay on the place of symbolism in religion, reprinted from *The Constructive Quarterly* of March, 1914, though it has no direct connection with the addresses, because I so frequently read statements which suggest that if an element of symbolism is admitted in any of the clauses of the Creed it must be illogical and unfair to limit its application. The purpose of this essay is to show that the very arguments which justify the recognition of symbolism in some clauses of the Creed prevent its legitimate application to others. And I am re-publishing it here in the hope that it may obtain, even at such a time as this, a little attention.

C. OXON:

All Saints' Day, 1914.

CONTENTS

THE WAR AND THE CHURCH

I

THE WAR AND THE CHURCH

A bishop's Visitation is his inquiry into the efficiency and soundness of his diocese: its officers, its apparatus, and its methods. I have had nearly three years to make acquaintance with this diocese; I have had the ungrudging assistance of archdeacons and rural deans; I have made careful inquiries on particular points through the rural deans and directly. Thus I should have been prepared in the usual way to review the situation and seek to formulate our policy for the immediate future. But across my preparation there has fallen a "visitation" of a different kind. God has visited the sins of Europe by suffering them to lead to their natural issue in a tremendous war. This visitation is so overwhelming, and preoccupies so inevitably all our thoughts, that

it is at this moment impossible to seek to win your attention for many matters which would have interested you in ordinary years. I have decided to go about my Visitation, and to meet you at the different centres. But I cannot but begin from the point on which all our thoughts are fixed—the war.

The call of the war has stricken this nation into a sense of unity and fellowship, the like of which neither we nor our forefathers of many generations have experienced. I may take it for granted, I dare say, that we are all of one mind in believing that it was our duty to engage in this war, and, having engaged in it, to see it through with all the concentration of forces which we can command. Thus, apart from our common duty as citizens in this emergency, there are duties which fall specially upon the church and the clergy, and which come home to us without any effort—I mean the duty of organizing the force of persistent corporate prayer, about which I shall hope to speak to-morrow; the duty of giving the authorities — civil, military, and naval—all the support which we can in our parishes; the duty of supplying chaplains for the navy and army; the duty—or should I not say the privilege?—which falls to the

parochial clergy of providing services, at whatever personal inconvenience, for camps not fully equipped with chaplains or for the soldiers billeted in our different parishes. There is also the duty of acting vigorously, and in co-operation with the public authorities, so as to afford sufficient and prompt help for those whom the war plunges into distress and poverty, whether through the breadwinners being called away to the service of their country, or through scarcity and unemployment.[1] Next to those actually fighting, and to those who bear the responsibility of public authority at this anxious moment, the burdens of this war, as of every war, will fall most heavily upon those who have least to say to it, whose thoughts and interests are always utterly alien to questions of foreign policy, who feel themselves in matters of peace and war to be entirely at the mercy of other people—the poor and generally those whom we must consent to call the working classes.

Of these and the like duties we are constantly being reminded. We are not likely

[1] I have recently been asked to remind the parish clergy how much Lord Kitchener requires their help for the wives and dependents of soldiers in securing for them their separation allowances (see *Diocesan Magazine*, October, 1914, p. 148).

to forget them. But meanwhile there is another duty much harder to fulfil, a duty which cannot be postponed, the duty of seeking to interpret the purpose of God at this tremendous crisis of the world's history, and of organizing in the nation a common mind among those who above all things are anxious to know our Lord's will, and so to prepare that the issue of the war may serve the purposes of the kingdom of God. It can hardly be necessary for me to remind you of the great difficulty of fulfilling this duty. The thoughts and feelings which patriotism inspires legitimately fill our minds and imaginations. But this is not enough. I am sure that if we simply yield ourselves to these thoughts and feelings we shall fall disastrously short of what our Lord would have us think. The Bible is full of patriotic emotion; but even more conspicuously the Bible is full of a great warning against the sufficiency of patriotism, against the sufficiency of the thoughts natural to flesh and blood. Some of the most conspicuous figures in the Bible, like Jeremiah, are called to the truly terrible vocation of appearing as unpatriotic, as men who "weaken the hands of the men of war," who "seek not the welfare of their people, but the

hurt."[1] And our Lord Himself required His immediate disciples—Simon the Zealot amongst them—to accept so fully the doom upon their nation as being God's inevitable judgement, that they could await, without an effort to avert it, the ruin of their city and temple, and watch the approach of the day of disaster with an awful joy: "Then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." Personally I can conceive of no trial greater than, in an intensely patriotic nation, to be called to play what would be regarded by the nation as an unpatriotic part. Mercifully no such call is on us to-day. We can wholeheartedly yield ourselves to the stream of patriotic enthusiasm which is sweeping so mightily through the nation. But that is not the whole of our duty. Unless we are altogether to fail to correspond with the divine purpose, we must be also in a real sense detached. We must recall the tremendous rebuke which our Lord addressed to the religious leaders of His people, "Ye cannot discern the signs of the times,"[2] or "How is it that ye know not how to interpret this time?"[3] If we are to catch the voice of God, there must be detachment and reflection

[1] Jer. xxxviii. 4. [2] S. Matt. xvi. 3. [3] S. Luke xii. 56.

and conference: as when of old "They that feared the Lord spake often one to another: and the Lord hearkened, and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before him, for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name."[1]

Yes, we may depend upon it that we shall not realize God's purpose and correspond with it, unless we, professing Christians, are making a great effort for detachment of mind. We are praying with passionate desire for the success of our arms—for the defeat, if it be God's will, of Germany and Austria. But suppose the end attained, suppose the moment come when the hearts of the whole community will burst into the joy of victory—victory and the spirit of victory do not commonly put a nation into correspondence with God. We look back to the time after Waterloo when we had done so nobly; when we felt ourselves to be the saviours of Europe as well as of our own country. Was England ever in a worse condition morally and religiously than then? If, on the other hand, anxiety and failure in war have, as constantly happens, a purifying power on a nation, yet we cannot pray for failure nor desire the

[1] Mal. iii. 16.

lengthening of the tremendous strain. What I am sure that we need to do without delay is to look as deeply as we can into the causes of this tremendous visitation, so as to be ready not only to fight the war through, but also to learn the deeper lessons which it is meant to teach us.

We seem to be face to face to-day with one of the most startling instances in history of the insolence which is bred of intense racial pride, when it is supported by what seems like an overwhelming strength of military organization. We seem to see in Germany the spectacle of a nation dominated by a military caste, indoctrinated by a false philosophy, giving itself over to be possessed by the spirit of militarism and making it its religion—degrading the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the common, impartial Father of all men and all races, into a German War God. We go back in mind to the old sentiment, which is both Hebrew and Greek, about insolence in men and nations, and the divine vengeance which lays it low. If Germany falls in this war we shall recognize the divine judgement on insolence. But we shall be indeed short sighted and unspiritual if we let ourselves think that all we have to do is to crush Germany, and that the insolence

and idolatry of Germany are all that the world is suffering from.[1] No; what we are suffering from is something far more widespread than the German Empire. Is it not the case that what we are in face of is nothing less than a breakdown in a certain idea and hope of civilization, which was associated with the liberal and industrial movement of the last century? There was to be an inevitable and glorious progress of humanity of which science, commerce, and education were to be the main instruments, and which was to be crowned with a universal peace. Older prophets like Thomas Carlyle expressed their contempt for the shallowness of this prevailing ideal, and during this century we have been becoming more and more doubtful of its value. But we are now witnessing its downfall. Science, commerce, and education have done, and can do, much for us. But they cannot expel the evil spirit from human nature. What is that? At bottom—love of self, self-interest, selfishness individual and corporate.[2] As a theory the

[1] I should wish to refer to a truly noble and Christian article called "What are we fighting for?" in the *Times Literary Supplement* of September 17th.

[2] I make no apology for speaking of corporate selfishness. What the French call selfishness "à deux ou trois," the selfishness of a family in pursuit of its own interests, or the selfishness of a class or of a nation has really, when analysed, the same moral quality as the selfishness of an individual.

philosophy of selfishness has been often exposed. But, to an extent that it is difficult to exaggerate, it has been the motive acknowledged and relied upon without shame or apology in commerce, in politics, and in practical life. Our civilization has been based on selfishness; our commerce on competition and the unrestricted love of wealth; our education on the motive of self-advancement. And science and knowledge, made the instruments of selfishness and competition, have armed man against man, class against class, and nation against nation with tenfold the power of destruction which belonged to a less educated and less highly-organized age. We have been becoming conscious, as a nation, of the rotten basis of our civilization, but it has none the less dominated. Recently it looked as if it were to lead to a bitter war of classes at home, a civil war of capital and labour. Instead of that we have got a war of nations on a scale such as the world has never hitherto witnessed, which is devastating Europe and destroying human lives with a quite unprecedented destruction.

But what I want you to recognize is that the temper, the motive which has so largely dominated our civilization at home, and which

has been organizing class against class for civil war, is exactly the same temper as, between nations, has been dominating international politics, calling itself the "balance of power," and arming every nation against every other till an outbreak of war became only a question of time and occasion. It is something far wider and more general than the particular form of the disease which is horrifying us in Germany. How far the destruction which is the fruit of this war is going to proceed we cannot tell. How many millions of corpses are going to lie on the battle-fields, how many Louvains are to perish, how many peaceful Belgiums to be laid waste will depend on how long the war lasts. But then the question is—Supposing the war over, supposing that we and our allies are utterly victorious and two vast empires are humiliated to the dust, is it all to begin again? Like France after Sedan, like Russia after its defeat in the far East, is the humiliated nation to begin again to build itself up from the ground on the old principles? Are other empires to dominate the Continent of Europe and the world for a while till insolence betrays one of them again into intolerable aggressiveness, and another universal war ensues?

Some of us see the chief security against this in the progress of democracy—the government of the people really by the people and for the people. We believe that the old Latin saying is substantially true—"quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi." The mass of the workers who suffer most from wars, though the spirit of nationalism may enter into them also, and fill them for a time with enthusiasm for a war, yet on the whole will always be on the side of peace; so that the more really democratic our governments become, and the more the interests of labour become international, the greater will be the security for peace. I am one of those who believe this and desire to serve towards the realizing of this end. But the answer does not satisfy me. I do not know what evils we might find arising from a world of materialistic democracies. But I am sure that we shall not banish the evil spirits which destroy human lives and nations and civilizations by any mere change in the methods of government. Nothing can save civilization except a new spirit in the nations. It is selfishness, unlimited acquisitiveness, competition, which has armed individual against individual, class against class, nation against nation. Science, commerce, and education all tend naturally to fellowship, to

binding together men and classes and nations. But where the spirit of acquisitiveness, selfishness, and competition prevails, they simply arm this evil spirit with weapons of greater destructiveness: they do but aggravate a thousand times over the evils of warfare.

But there is another spirit which, however imperfectly, has really claimed the allegiance of mankind: it is the spirit of fellowship—a spirit which teaches us that individuals and classes and nations are endowed by the creative love with different gifts, not to hurt and outwit and overrule one another, but to supplement and help one another in a beneficent co-operation. This is the old message of Christianity. My point is that the conspicuous breakdown of a European civilization which has been in the main based on a false principle, affords us a fresh opportunity for preaching the true. Are there not to-day ears to hear? For instance, at home we seemed, as I have said, to be on the verge of a tremendous class war, a war of capital and labour. The great European war, with its imperious exigencies, has for the moment healed all labour disputes, and stricken us into a real unity and national sense of brotherhood. Cannot we use this opportunity to

realize that we were making a terrible mistake? "Sirs, ye are brethren." Is it too much to hope that when we get time to think again about our labour conditions, we shall be willing to ask ourselves not how little need this class or group or individual yield, or how much can the other class or group or individual successfully claim, but what is really just as among brothers, what is right in a body corporate in which the weakness of any one member is the weakness of all? I can conceive this changed spirit of brotherhood, the spirit which is now at work because of the war between landowners, farmers and labourers, between employers and employed, surviving the war and helping us to approach what had become the terrible menace of a class warfare on a quite new basis. But I am sure it will not do this unless we realize how much was amiss amongst us, and make the most of the changed spirit which has begun to work. If this changed spirit can gain a new prevalence first in one nation and then in another nation, depend upon it, it will spread beyond national boundaries, and build European or world peace upon some infinitely securer and sounder basis than the balance of power and the mutual terror of one another's armaments.

Is this talk about universal human brotherhood vain talk? I do not believe it. There are many who have for years past been saying these things. It is the common spirit among the best of the working classes; I do not say it of all of them, but I am sure that, though they are not now for the most part attached to our organized religious bodies, the best of the working classes are thinking and feeling along these deeply spiritual lines about God's fatherhood and human fellowship. I am sure that this horrible war, when it is ended, will let loose a vast flood of purifying emotion, feeling, and thought, and a profound disgust of war and of the military spirit in nations.

I feel sure that at home the new spirit, the gospel of brotherhood and peace, will wholly take possession of the Nonconformists, and it will fire multitudes of Churchmen in England. It will gain a vast accession of strength in America. Who can tell what uprising of revolt against a military autocracy and the military spirit may not follow the downfall of the present régime in Germany? Doubtless, then, this new spirit will command, in the world at large, quite new force and importance. But it will matter enormously what is the temper and tone of the ancient churches, and whether

they are preparing themselves for a new departure. What will be the mind of the great national Church of Russia, which may occupy in the future a position of far greater influence than it has ever occupied yet outside its own boundaries? What will be the mind of the Roman communion, the Church of France and Belgium, which has so strong a tradition of the influence of the church upon the world? What will be the mind and policy of Benedict XV? And with a special sense of responsibility we must ask ourselves whether our own national church will really, in its corporate life, in its common sentiment, yield itself to the glorious but tremendous task of proclaiming afresh the gospel of brotherhood, and rebasing our civilization on the basis which alone can have the blessing of Christ.

There are two attitudes possible of the church towards the world. There is the attitude of saying that the world, the common social life, is hopelessly corrupt and deaf to the voice of God, and we must go out of it. That is not, I think, the attitude which has inspired the monastic movement or the movement of the religious communities generally; but no doubt it was a dominant motive at certain moments of their history.

It is an attitude of mind, let us acknowledge it, which, especially at certain periods, has a great deal to say for itself, and to which I believe even civilization owes more than it commonly recognizes. But I may take it for granted it is not our attitude. We want to mix in the common life. We refuse to give it up in despair. We want to be the salt of the earth, which keeps it clean by a pervading contact. Well and good. But if the salt has lost its savour? If the church itself acquiesces in a worldly ideal in common life and commerce and education, if its own religious membership is made possible for men without their worldliness and selfishness feeling itself under continual and sharp rebuke, if it tries to combine the worship of God and of mammon, does it not fall under the stern and tremendous judgement of its Master?

I am sure, sure with a terrible certainty, that we have been too often walking along this easy path. What I pray with all my soul is that, under the enlightenment of this terrible war, coupled with the warnings of class warfare which were in our ears before the war broke out, we may wake up to the fact that we have been acquiescing in belonging to a civilization which rested on

a fundamentally anti-Christian basis, without any adequate consciousness of antagonism or adequate protest. What I pray is that we may hear afresh the call of Christ, and, with an energetic repentance, begin to co-operate with that great movement within the church, but also in great measure alas! outside it, which is seeking, and will be seeking with a new vigour and determination, to rebuild our modern society on the basis of brotherhood and not of selfishness. It is not possible for us to deny that on that basis alone is it possible for a nation or a civilization to be built which in any sense can claim the name of Christian.

Fifteen hundred years ago, when the barbarians were battering on the gates of Rome and the cities of the empire; when the hearts of Christians were failing them for fear, all over the Roman world, as they watched the crumbling of the mighty empire of which they had come to believe themselves to be the protectors, S. Augustine amidst all the turmoil set himself to think; and he was ready with his message before he died. It is at bottom the message about the two civilizations which I have been trying to reproduce. There had always been, so he reflected, a civilization, a city of this world, built upon a false basis,

on the basis, that is, of self-love, and exhibiting itself in refusal of God, in insolence and mutual hostility among men. Of such a civilization the world, S. Augustine felt, was now witnessing a downfall. But there was also in the world another kind of society, the city of God, which we shall never see perfectly realized in this world, but which the Catholic Church exists at least to embody and represent. This civilization is based on the true regard for God and man, and is a community of all nations and classes and individuals. It is the *Civitas Dei.* S. Augustine, I say, had his message ready and published before he died, and it was enormously influential. It is not too much to say that it was the source of what was best in the ideals of the Middle Age, as well as of some of its mistakes. Under the influence of our unhappy divisions we seem to have lost the whole sense of a Christendom and a catholic church—a great fellowship with a common mind, inspiring and restraining nations as well as individuals. And is it not exactly this sense that we must set ourselves to recover? We recall Mozley's great and famous sermon on War. It is a profound and solemn utterance. But is there not one thing which we ask for in vain in it—the lack of

which makes a great difference? I mean the sense that, within the area of Christendom, and even the wider area within which the Christian gospel has influence, the church of Christ is meant so to embody the spirit and principle of Christ as to act as an effective witness against the spirit of selfishness and selfish competition, whether in individuals, classes, or nations, unmasking, rebuking, restraining, and correcting with a felt authority. And if the Christian church had been anything like what it ought to have been, would there not have been—I do not say a common government over nations, but a common sense in nations, taking effect in councils and conferences, and bearing constant witness to a unity wider than the nation?

Will the church to-day have its message for a new moment in history ready when it is needed? Depend upon it we shall have a unique opportunity of proclaiming again the tidings of the kingdom of God, as a present power in this world, as well as a hope of another world, as soon as the war is drawing to an end and the world is asking "What next?" We have before our eyes in Germany to-day an even startling spectacle of a nation possessed with an idea. That idea we believe

to be false, even devilish. But the antidote to false ideas is true ideas. Can we to-day in England and our English Christianity so labour that a true idea can take possession of our minds with a compelling force, and through us really and effectively minister to the coming of the kingdom of God ?

II

THE OPPORTUNITY FOR PRAYER

No one can accept the witness of our Lord without believing that there is no human faculty more productive of real results than prayer. The great intention of God is the bringing in of the divine kingdom; and it is in response to prayer that the kingdom is to be brought near and to come. And in subordination to this great end there are multitudes of things which God knows that we need, and which He would fain give us, but which He cannot give us unless, with the persistency which belongs to all real work, we ask for them as sons of our Father, who when we ask for bread will not give us a stone. At this moment we are filled with an anxiety the like of which has not for generations absorbed and concentrated the heart of the nation. We desire passionately to help our country, to win victory for the allies, to redeem the bloodstained world, to bring back the blessings of peace, to bring about such a spirit as shall prevent the recurrence of the

scourge of war, to strengthen the cause of justice and right for which we confidently hope that we are fighting, to weave a web of divine protection around our soldiers and sailors, to comfort and help the sick and wounded and those whom the war reduces to poverty and need. All these things can be accomplished by prayer as well as by visible means: nor need we hesitate to follow the souls of those who die in battle or on their beds into the unseen world, and plead there for mercy and peace for the departed as the Christian church has ever done. This is then the first conviction for us to have vividly in our minds, and to use all our endeavours to impart to others—I can do work by my prayers; I can help as effectively as soldiers and sailors who are fighting, or statesmen who are planning.

But there is a second lesson, perhaps a more difficult lesson, which we have to learn. Our Lord, in His teaching about prayer, seems to have had two objects: first, to encourage in His disciples a boundless belief in the efficacy of prayer to obtain real results; and, secondly, to lead them to feel that the efficacy of their prayers would depend upon their learning to pray aright—that is (as He ex-

presses it in different places) to pray the prayer of "faith in God" as He really is;[1] or to pray as only one can pray who abides in Christ and has His words, His teaching, abiding in him;[2] or who prays after the "manner" of the Lord's Prayer, that is, entering into its meaning and observing its order;[3] or who prays "in Christ's name."[4] I suppose we do not need to be reminded that we cannot cause a prayer to be in Christ's name by merely adding at the end of it the words "through Jesus Christ our Lord." We interpret best the phrase "in the name of Christ" if we think of an ambassador speaking "in the name" of his country, or of a commercial traveller speaking "in the name" of his firm. We mean in each case that the representative, who speaks in the name of another, expresses not his own plans and wishes, but the mind of the greater person or body whom he represents. He prays in Christ's name who has learnt to make Christ's mind his own.

This is, doubtless, a very difficult lesson for us to learn. We feel the meaning of what our Lord says to His disciples, "Hitherto

[1] S. Mark xi. 22.
[2] S. John xv. 7.
[3] S. Matt. vi. 9.
[4] S. John xvi. 23, 24.

have ye asked nothing in my name"—so many things in their own names; so many things which were the expression of their own personal and national desires, but "nothing in my name." We know what the prayers are which it comes natural to us to pray to-day. We know how earnestly we pray for the preservation of our soldiers and sailors; we know how passionately we pray for victory. And, believing that our cause is just, we can pray for victory, "if it be thy will." Loving our friends, we can pray for their protection. But we can never allow ourselves to forget that there are many things which we desire rightly, which may not yet be according to God's will. When our Lord said, "The very hairs of your head are all numbered" the words follow immediately on the intimation, "They shall deliver you up, . . . some of you they shall cause to be put to death."[1] Our friends may be protected by God, even if they have to suffer and die. The real efficacy of our prayers depends upon our learning really to desire what our Lord desires: to pray first for those things which He certainly means to give. This, as I say, is an extraordinarily difficult lesson to learn,

[1] S. Luke xxi. 16–19.

that of praying after the manner of the Lord's Prayer: really subordinating our natural and national longings to those divine ends which may come about in ways most repugnant to flesh and blood; really desiring, above all things, the coming of the kingdom of God. God, "whose never-failing providence ordereth all things both in heaven and earth," has a purpose through this war—a purpose which, no doubt, will be difficult for us to learn; and the end of our prayer should be, above all else, to generate that spiritual atmosphere in which the minds of men may once again, in true and deep repentance, be ready to learn the purpose of His love. "Hallowed be thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, As in heaven so on earth"; and only then, "Give us this day our bread for the coming day." The object of praying is not to persuade God to alter His mind;[1] it is rather to liberate the hand of God to do, through us, that which He wills to do, to give us the blessings which He wills to give, but cannot do, cannot give, until our hearts are ready to desire and our minds to receive and our wills to correspond.

[1] "Our prayer," says S. Thomas Aquinas, "is not directed to change the divine intention; but that what God intends may be obtained by our prayers."—*S. Th.* 2a. 2æ., 83, 2.

For the moment our habitual individualism is overcome by a great unifying need. That is a great help to prayer, for it is concordant united prayer, the prayer of many minds inspired by one spirit, which has the greatest power. At all times it is our greatest help in prayer to remember that we are not alone. The intercession of Christ, our great High Priest, and the intercession of the Holy Spirit, binding up with Him His whole body in one fellowship of supplication, is always going on. There is one great prayer — the prayer of Christ and the prayer of all His people, the glorious saints and all the blessed dead, and all the company of the living joined together in Him, that is always being prayed. Whenever we fall to prayer we should remember this: that we are not isolated individuals crying in the dark of the vast and unintelligible universe; nor arrogant individuals trying to impose our ignorant desires upon the Allwise; but that we are joining in the expression of one great will and desire—the will and desire of Christ—which is one day to become absolutely and universally effective. Filling up all the gaps in our intermittent prayers, and supplying all the defects of our wandering thoughts and worldly or

selfish blindness, that great prayer—the prayer of Christ and His saints united in His spirit—is around us and about us to avail against our weakness, to correct our blindness and to perfect our imperfection.

This war, then, plunging us into a profound sense of our need, binding us, as nothing has for many years availed to bind us, into a realized fellowship, constitutes, as we all feel, a quite new and special call to prayer, united prayer in the name of Christ for the accomplishment of His will. It gives to every pastor a new opportunity for leading his people in prayer and teaching them about prayer. And it gives me an opportunity of saying what I had in any case to say about our churches as "houses of prayer" on a new basis.

I would say, then, to the clergy and laity alike—let us set to work afresh in this time of deep national and human need to read some one of the many books about prayer;[1] let us study afresh the wonderful wealth of teaching about prayer which is to be found

[1] I would name Andrew Murray, *With Christ in the School of Prayer* (Nisbet), a book which I have found specially useful, though of course it is not written from the point of view of a Churchman; also Worlledge's *Prayer* (Longman's Oxford Library), and my own little book, *Prayer and the Lord's Prayer* (Wells Gardner).

in the Bible and in those models of spiritual worship, the great Catholic liturgies; so that we all may pray better, and that we who are teachers may equip ourselves afresh to be teachers of prayer, teachers as they can only be who are themselves advancing learners.

I would say also: Let our churches all stand open. The special dangers, which led to so many churches being closed recently, are over now, thank God; and there is a quite fresh opportunity for getting people to feel it a natural thing, when they can get a little leisure, to go and pray in the church. There are so many people in town and country who have not the advantage of quiet homes. I hope, moreover, you are all adopting the suggestion of having the church bell rung with solemn strokes at the hour of noon as a reminder of the call to prayer.

We have been supplied by authority with special prayers for use during the war which seem to me on the whole excellent[1] both for

[1] The only criticism I am disposed to make is upon the second special collect for use in the Order of Holy Communion, "O God, who hast taught us." It is a good prayer, but not very like a collect. At celebrations specially intended to be "in time of war" I sanction in this diocese the use of the following collect translated (or adapted) from the Sarum Missal:

O God, the ruler of all kings and peoples, who dost both by smiting heal, and by forgiving preserve us; extend unto

the regular services and for prayer meetings of different kinds. I hope we may seize the opportunity to get rid of some of the stiffness and formalism which has beset our church, and to learn something of the blessing of prayer meetings. In the regular services, I hope you will use frequently the biddings to prayer which are provided for use in the Eucharist at the Offertory, and also the special clauses in the Litany. In connection with Matins and Evensong and in prayer meetings I think there is no way so good of commending special needs to the prayers of our people as the method of naming them from the pulpit, using the freedom we are allowed in bidding to prayer, then leaving a space for silent prayer, using a few collects, and summing up the petitions in the Lord's Prayer. This method is far more profitable, I am sure, than that of introducing collects into the course of the service. And in this way we can always commend special needs to our people without waiting for directions from authority. But also I would earnestly beg you not to lose the present opportunity

us Thy mercy at this present time, that peace being restored by Thy power may be used for our amendment; through Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord.

of advancing the cause of the daily recitation of Morning and Evening Prayer. "All priests and deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause. And the curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word, and to pray with him." I ask you: has not your experience since the war began been such that you would not willingly have lost even one of the daily services? Have you ever felt the daily psalms and lessons and the litany to contain greater comfort and strength for your soul? And if you feel this, cannot you make a fresh attempt to get your people to feel it?

Some of us, and I am one, desire the revision of our services. I think the proposals of our Convocation, the Upper and the Lower House, to be, not without exception but on the whole, good, and I desire their enactment (as optional at first) with whatever adjustment is found necessary of the proposals of one house to those

of the other. But meanwhile let us make the best of the Prayer Book as it stands.

If I may mention a detail, I earnestly hope that we may speedily abolish our excessive use of monotone. Let us, as often as we can or find desirable, sing or chant the part of the service that is meant to be sung. But let us make an end of monotoning what lies outside the liturgical forms, as for instance, any prayers we may say in the pulpit or in the vestry; let us say in a natural speaking voice the preparatory portion of Morning and Evening Prayer (from the beginning down to the end of the first Lord's Prayer)—unless it be in very large churches—as its nature suggests and our liturgical teachers have advised us; let us say in the same way the concluding prayers after the third collect; let us teach our choirs to follow the lead of the clergy, and not to sing the *Amen* or the response when the priest says and does not sing the prayer or the versicle; and in sung celebrations of the Holy Eucharist let us follow the use (for example) of the church of the Cowley Fathers, and leave great parts of the service to be said in a natural voice. Such rules are in accordance with liturgical precedent and are, I am sure, more edifying than the constant monotoning.

I would make two other suggestions with regard to what is sung. (1) I have been in small country parishes where the psalms are beautifully sung, but it is not always so. It is difficult to sing the psalms intelligently and intelligibly. Would it not tend to edification if in a good many parishes, especially country parishes, we were to revert to the old fashion and to *say* the psalms and sing the *Glorias*? I cannot but think that that would be more edifying in many places. (2) My other suggestion is this. Is it not really excessive to have as many as five hymns in connection with Morning or Evening Prayer? Surely three are sufficient at an ordinary Evensong, and four when there is also a procession.

Now I come to the Eucharist. I am sure that we may congratulate ourselves on the revival which has been going on, and still continues, of the sense that this is "the Lord's own service" for the Lord's Day. We ought to be familiar, and make our people familiar, with the origins of Christian worship. There is nothing that moves me more than the accounts we get from East and West of the Sunday worship of the ancient church; how, Sunday by Sunday, the Christian body came together for their united service of praise, of

instruction by the reading and explanation of Holy Scriptures, of intercession, of communion with God and with one another in Christ and by His Spirit; and how the instrument and centre of this great weekly renewal of their spiritual life was the oblation of the elements of earthly nourishment—the bread and wine—and their consecration to be to the church the body and blood of Christ, the effective representation thus made of the great sacrifice, and the Holy Communion in the divine gifts. I want Churchmen of all kinds to be animated by a strong determination that we will repent of the great mistake which we have made in letting anything else than the Holy Communion be regarded by our people as the chief or normal service of the Sunday morning. Do you say that tradition is strong the other way, and that our people are conservative? I know it, and I would not offend them. But I think we forget how much tradition has changed within less than a hundred years. The Evangelical, and still more the Tractarian, movements effected immense changes in what was popularly accepted as the proper order and kind and manner of Sunday services—changes some of which we may wish could be reconsidered. Any way, the changes have been

very great, and changes as great may be made in the future by careful guidance and careful teaching. The service of Holy Communion is the great service of Christian fellowship with God and with man, with the living and with the dead. And the intense feeling of fellowship which animates us at this moment will, I am persuaded, if rightly used, draw men to the altar.

I realize that we must try different experiments as to the hours at which, and the manner in which, the Holy Communion is to be celebrated on Sundays. There is no reason why the chief service should be at eleven o'clock. I have my own ideas as to what is most desirable, but I do not propose to trouble you with them at the moment. Only I beg you to make a renewed effort, according to the wisdom given to you, to make the service of Holy Communion understood by your people generally to be the chief and normal service of the Sunday morning, the great act of Christian loyalty, Christian worship, and Christian fellowship.

There are, I find, still some parishes in which there is not a celebration of the Lord's Service on every Lord's Day, a good many where it is not celebrated on every Saint's Day, and a few

where it is still not celebrated on Ascension Day. I beg you to use the opportunity of the present awful time of need, with its deep and wide desire to approach the throne of grace in the most acceptable manner, so that every one of our parishes may have its service of the Holy Communion on every Sunday and Saint's Day. Even in the smallest parishes there will surely, at such a time, be communicants.

But I will take the opportunity of saying a word about the second and third rubrics after the Communion service, taken in conjunction with the first rubric before the Communion service. No doubt these rubrics require the communicants to give notice of their intention to communicate on each occasion, and would have the clergy not proceed in the service unless, even in the smallest parishes, there be four, or three at the least, to communicate with the priest. The intention was that we should have nothing but general communions. That intention has been found impossible of execution. I would not allow the principle of the communicant giving notice to fall altogether into disuse. I should like notice to be required each Easter. And more certainly I would require every person who comes newly to

reside in a parish or frequent a church to give notice of his or her intention to be a communicant. I should hope that some day we may require that that preliminary notice should be accompanied by a certificate from the former parish that, if it has been so, the newcomer has been a communicant there. Meanwhile the requirement of the rubric has been long ignored, and, that being so, I think it is not necessary nor quite fair for the curate to refrain from celebrating on a Sunday or Holy Day if the numbers of proposing communicants unhappily fall short of the required minimum. As things stand at present, if a priest gives notice of Communion on a Sunday and does not require the intending communicants to give notice of their coming, I think he may celebrate without counting the number of communicants. But I hope we shall adhere steadfastly in will and judgement, as well as in fact, to the principle that in every church the multiplication of Communions must depend upon the supply of persons who present themselves for Communion. I cannot countenance the continuance of a celebration of the Holy Communion on a day or at an hour when normally, or on the average, there are not a sufficient number of communicants beside the priest.

As to Communions on ordinary days of the week, there are one or two things I should like to say. I would have every parish priest be known by his people to be more than willing to celebrate on any day when any group of his parishioners wishes for a celebration. If it can be foreseen, let them be encouraged to mention their wish on the previous Saturday, so that notice of the celebration can be given on the Sunday in the ordinary course. Again I am persuaded that in many parishes we might more often try the experiment—at present almost confined to Ascension Day—of a very early Communion at five o'clock. There is an appreciable number of people who can come to Communion if they are able to come quite before the day's work begins ; and I think that for some people there is no time when they are more likely to make a well-prepared Communion than early on a Monday morning when they have had the Sunday leisure to prepare. We are too wooden and conventional in our arrangements. We ought to try experiments.

My brethren of the clergy, I do from my heart desire and pray that we should take the opportunity of the present urgency of national need, and the stirring of men's hearts and

feelings by the war, to make every parish church a school of prayer, and the centre and home of all the best aspirations which are finding admittance into our minds and hearts; and what is learned and practised in a time of emergency may become part of the customary heritage and practice of the faithful.

It was a great encouragement to me, and I wish to hand it on to you, to learn that one of the wounded in our Oxford hospital had reported that he heard more than one officer reminding his men, when under a hot fire, that "people in England are praying for us."

And, finally, let me recall to your minds the fact, that whatever uncertainty may attach to the question of our Lord's attitude towards war, at any rate He gave us the definite commandment to pray for our enemies. And I hope that we shall not let ourselves forget to pray for the Germans, even while we pray for victory over them—that God's best blessings may, in His own way, come upon that great people.[1]

[1] The following prayer (see next page), with others, may be obtained from Miss Lucy Gardner, The Collegium House, 92 S. George's Square, London, S.W. I think others, beside myself, may find it suggestive.

A PRAYER FOR GERMANY

Give Thy blessing, O Father, to the people of that great and fair land, with whose rulers we are at war. Strengthen the hands of the wise and just, who follow charity, and look for justice and freedom, among them as among us. Drive away the evil passions of hatred, suspicion, and the fever of war, among them as among us. Relieve and comfort the anxious, the bereaved, the sick and tormented, and all the pale host of sufferers, among them as among us. Reward the patience, industry, loving-kindness, and simplicity of the common people, and all the men of honest and good heart, among them as among us. Forgive the cruelty, the ambition, the foolish pride, the heartless schemes, of which the world's rulers have been guilty. Teach us everywhere to repent and to amend. Help us so to use our present afflictions which come from us and not from Thee, that we may build on the ruins of our evil past a firm and lasting peace. Grant that, united in a good understanding with those who are now become our enemies, though they are our brethren in Christ, they and we may establish a new order, wherein the nations may live together in trust and fellowship, in the emulation of great achievements and the rivalry of good deeds, truthful, honest, and just in our dealings one with another, and following in all things the standard of the Son of Man, whom we have denied, and put to shame, and crucified afresh upon the Calvary of our battle ground.

Among the apochryphal "sayings of Jesus" (Grenfell and Hunt) is this, "And pray for your enemies. . . . He that to-day is afar off shall to-morrow be near you."

III

OUR TEACHING OFFICE

There can be no question that at the period of the Reformation the intention of the leaders of the Church of England, which they shared with the leaders of the Reformation generally, was to bring the teaching office of the ministry —the preaching of the word—into the first line of importance. It was felt that in the mediaeval idea of the ministry the sacerdotal functions had been exaggerated and distorted. Among us these sacerdotal functions were not repudiated, but retained. But the prophetic or teaching office was to be brought into high relief. This was quite legitimate. It was restoring the balance as Scripture and antiquity had set it. There have been in the Church of Rome great teachers, like Estius the commentator, who would have redressed the balance of emphasis on the functions of the ministry in the same sense. "The chief function of the bishop or of any shepherd of souls," says Estius, "is the preaching of the word of God." [1]

[1] Estius (Van Est, died 1613) *Commentarii* on 1 Tim. iii. 13. I have quoted the whole of the remarkable passage in *Orders and Unity*, p. 156.

But the lamentable thing is that, in spite of all the stress laid in the Prayer Book on the teaching office, we have in our part of the church been so unsuccessful in fulfilling it. Of recent years we have been spending much pains on the teaching of children, and on preparation for confirmation. About that part of our work I shall be speaking directly. But if we think of our young men and women of all classes growing up and going out into the world; if we think of our emigrants going out to make new nations, in Canada or some other of our dominions; if we think of the fathers and mothers of families confronted with the duty of teaching and helping their children; if we think of the mass of readers, of all classes, who listen eagerly in novels or journals to the prophets of the day, we cannot feel with any degree of satisfaction that their minds have been really furnished with a reasonable knowledge of the meaning of the Christian faith, or that they are now looking to our pulpits hopefully as a source of enlightenment and guidance. There are exceptions, of course. But I think if you were to talk to those who have to do with the student movement they would tell you that the young and ardent spirits with whom they have to deal, if they attend our churches,

feel very much like sheep that are not fed in the majority of cases; and there is a widespread feeling of disappointment among fairly thoughtful people of all classes. They feel that they do not get the help for their minds and lives that they ought to be getting from our sermons.

Doubtless it is for us preachers a difficult time. It is a time of widespread mental unsettlement —a time when the old faith has to be reinterpreted in terms of new needs and startlingly fresh inquiries and possibilities. And I am speaking about this matter to-day because I am sure that this great war will intensify the perplexity of men's minds and deepen and broaden the need for help. The old question —how, if God be Almighty Love, the world can be what it is to-day, in the slum and on the battlefield, in the ways of vice and selfishness, and in the council chambers of nations and churches—this is a question which will press upon the conscience and mind of every thoughtful person with increasing force. No doubt the strain is felt in some places more than in others; but in all places, in the smallest country places, there are some doubtful and anxious hearts and minds.

I venture to think we clergy need, every one of us, the courage to explore the depths

of doubt and anxious questioning. We need to be much better listeners than we are—listeners, either directly by being men of such sort as that people can speak easily to us about what they really feel, or listeners indirectly by reading the popular prophets, the men and women writers who have a vogue, mostly not because of the solutions which they offer to the problems of life, but because they put into words the difficulties and repugnances to what is understood to be orthodoxy which people commonly feel. I think that a great many of us clergy give people the impression of a lack of intellectual courage. We seem to be men who take refuge in the traditional phraseology because we have not made the venture of thinking freely. But there are books in the Bible, like Job and Ecclesiastes, which encourage us to think very freely: which would assure us that the road to faith is by freely thinking, and not by refusing to think. We have no chance of helping people, unless we let them feel that we really know what they are thinking about and talking about amongst themselves. There is no likelihood of our stirring doubts: the popular literature does that. What we have to do is to show that we have felt and thought, and that we have found

in the Christian faith light for the intellect as well as strength for the heart.

Moreover, it is not enough to broach the questions in our mind: to read some suggestive book or article about the character of God, or the trustworthiness of the Gospels, or the question of miracles, or the elements of truth in religions other than our own. The question must be thoroughly faced, and we must with all the faculties of our being seek to arrive at an honest decision—not in a day or a week but (shall I say?) in a year. May I give one instance? I fancy there are a great many of us whose preaching about the Old Testament is paralysed and rendered meaningless, because we never make up our minds whether we really and sincerely think that the old position of Wordsworth and Liddon and Pusey still holds, or whether we are convinced that the modern critics have, on the whole, proved their case. Let us decide in whichever sense, at each point, our honest judgement finally inclines. Only let us recognize that we must come out on one side or the other, if we are to have any power as teachers or preachers. Intellectual decision after due consideration is a great moral duty and a considerable element in the Christian character.

You know that in an "open letter" which I addressed to you at the beginning of the year and which I should wish to be considered as part of my present charge, I urged strongly that there are certain intellectual decisions, at which if a man's mind forces him to arrive, he cannot any longer with due regard to public sincerity continue to exercise his ministry. But conscientiously and reverently we must run the risk. We must not retain orthodoxy by either refusing to think or by shrinking from decision. If we are to preach the faith so as to help people, we must preach it as men only can who have felt the difficulties, and whose faith is the faith of the church because they have found in that faith the best solution of all the needs of our complex intellectual as well as moral being—because personally they believe it to be true.

Of course, I know that to most Englishmen intellectual labour—the labour of thinking—is the most irksome of all tasks. We prefer any "business" to study. But when we read the service of our ordination we recognize that we are, by Him who called us, pledged to life-long study. We can only be teachers if we give both young and old the impression that we are ourselves always learners. We may not like

reading—we may not enjoy facing intellectual problems—but we must do it to the utmost of our power, or be judged with the man of one talent who could not face the risks or take the trouble of using it.

There is another thing which I would say about the matter of our sermons. Let us see to it that each sermon conveys a definite message. Sermons may be of different kinds. They may be expository — explanations of a passage or text of Scripture. I am sure, indeed, that there is no way in which we can help people more than by carefully and sympathetically explaining the Bible, whether going systematically through some portion or book, or by explaining the lections of the day or some particular text. Or they may be sermons on subjects: in which case we need carefully to mark the limits of our subject and to show that we understand the objections to the view we are going to enforce, and can state them candidly and sympathetically; before we seek to refute them or to substitute a better view. But the great point is that our sermons should be about something in particular, and produce some definite impression. I think nothing can be more useful than a sermon, or a series of sermons, on the Holy Communion, as sacrifice,

as communion, as fellowship: but surely nothing is more futile than to drag into almost every sermon at the end an allusion to Holy Communion and the duty of coming to it. Let the real human and divine meaning of the sacrament be brought home to men's hearts and minds and imaginations, not only by the spectacle of worship, but also by careful teaching: then we can entertain a just hope that they will desire to be communicants, and regular communicants; but the constantly reiterated brief admonition to come to the communion introduced at the end of a sermon almost as a matter of course is, I am persuaded, absolutely ineffectual.

I think our chief privilege and opportunity as preachers to-day is to refound the convictions of those we teach on the central verities of the Creed and the New Testament. The question at the root of most modern controversies is not whether there is a God, but what He is. The paradox of Christianity is that God is love. No one will ever really believe this doctrine till he feels what a paradox it is. It has been a popular idea that the belief that God is love may be taken for granted, and that, inasmuch as this is what chiefly matters, the dogmas of the church are superfluous encumbrances upon

the simplicity of this religious conviction. But I think nowadays people who think at all feel that here is the heart of the religious question. Is it true that the tremendous force which made and pervades the universe, this awful and mysterious energy, is really Love, pure unadulterated Love, really our Father and my Father? I think there is a supreme need and opportunity for teaching people how distinctive and unique is the Christian idea of God, how it came into men's minds through the prophets of Israel, how it reached its consummation in Jesus Christ. We need to let them feel how, beyond all reasonable question, Jesus Christ claimed authority to teach men infallibly the truth about God: how He commended a doctrine which seems in itself so improbable, in view of all the pain and confusion of the world, by Himself entering into all that pain and confusion, by being Himself the Man of sorrows, enduring in mind and body everything that has ever seemed to men an argument against God's love, with an unflinching confidence of trust: how not only did He teach about God, but led His first disciples and, through them, all the world, to believe in Himself as manifesting God, as being truly (so they came at last to hold) God incarnate;

translating the remote and unintelligible God into the intelligible lineaments of a human nature: how when this dawning faith of His first disciples suffered and quailed under the shock of His seeming failure and under the terror of His cross, it was reconstructed upon a basis of everlasting security by the evidence of His resurrection: how this miracle, just because it is a physical miracle, is (as Westcott emphasized) essential to the faith, because it proves that the power which made and rules the physical world is, in spite of all seeming failure, on the side of Christ; that love and power are at bottom one and the same thing. So men are led to see that the dogmas of the Creed, the dogmas about Christ's person and His miracles, are not a cumbersome decoration upon an otherwise self-subsistent building, but are in truth the substructure on which alone the faith of mankind in God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, has been effectively reared and can permanently subsist.

It is upon this distinctively Christian idea of God, the Creator and the Father, that the whole sequence of Christian ideas and doctrines depends. The articles of the Christian creed cohere with one another, and depend upon the

doctrine of God.[1] I am sure that by careful preaching we can help people to feel this, not in learned language, but in language which appeals to common people's hearts and minds. And I can hardly imagine a time when we had a better opportunity than we have now for bringing home to men's minds the meaning of half-forgotten Christian verities.

Do not the sights which are under our eyes to-day, at home and abroad, inspire us to teach men afresh the meaning and horror of sin? Is not the powerlessness of Christendom to-day to bear any collective witness a good occasion for teaching men again that a Catholic Church, binding nations and classes into a real fellowship, was the intention of Christ? Is not the widespread yearning after fellowship an opportunity for teaching men again the real meaning of the church as the body of Christ, and the real meaning of the sacraments?

. . . . . .

Now I must proceed to speak of that very important part of the teaching office with regard to which I have made special inquiries of the clergy—the teaching of children. If we

[1] I have tried to develop the idea of the separate meaning and mutual coherence of Christian doctrines in a tract, *The Solidarity of the Faith* (Longmans, 6*d.*).

confine our attention to the period of the school age, the results of my inquiries are on the whole satisfactory. As regards the religious teaching in the church day schools, it is possible that we may improve our syllabus, and of course there is division of opinion as to the desirability of inspecting the religious teaching of a school by means of examination. I am not proposing to deal with either of these questions at the present moment. Nor am I going to discuss the merits and drawbacks of the religious teaching in Council schools. My present point is this only: if we confine our attention to the school age, I cannot doubt that we have very great occasion for satisfaction with the result of the religious instruction in the church day schools on the whole. I am not sure that I am satisfied with the part played in this religious instruction by us clergy. Many of us frankly say that we do not teach ourselves because the lay teachers teach better. But the inspectors and the parochial clergy in their returns to me bear witness to the zeal and efficiency of the lay teachers and to the high level which is attained in the results.

As regards the Sunday teaching, there is, I have no doubt, advance being made in catechizing in church, not, indeed, as the

Prayer Book desires, before the general congregation, but in a special children's service in the afternoon, whether or no the method be the method of S. Sulpice or some adaptation of it. I have no doubt also that progress is being made in our Sunday school teaching and in using the Sunday school to lead up to the catechism. That appears to be the best plan in most parishes; to make the most of the Sunday school in the morning to lead up to the catechism in church in the afternoon.

I have no doubt that we owe a great debt of gratitude to our Sunday School Association, to the Sunday School Teachers' Training Week, which has been held at different centres, and to the Clergy Training Week, which has been held at Twyford now for four years, for which, and for all that he has done for our Sunday teaching work, we owe so great a debt of gratitude to the Vicar of Twyford, Mr. Acworth.

I have had in my life lamentably little to do with the teaching of children. And, as a consequence, I think other people are much more likely than I am to speak with authority on the subject. I confine myself to saying that when I study carefully the reports before me of our teaching of children, I get an impression

of advance being made both in weekday and Sunday teaching, and I should feel full of hopefulness about the future if we could confine our inquiry within the limits of the school age. But this is what we cannot do, and when I proceed to ask the most important question—how far does the teaching given in church day schools, Sunday schools, and catechism in church really lay hold of the growing souls of the children so as permanently to influence their adult lives?—the answer which I receive is not on the whole very encouraging. Some of the best of us feel something like despair.[1]

In great measure we are hindered in our judgement by our inability to follow up our pupils. In our country villages the girls and the boys in most cases go away from home. They leave school, they are confirmed, and they go. If I ask a careful clergyman how many of those confirmed in the last ten years

[1] Almost all the clergy report to me that in districts where there is only a church school, there is among Nonconformists "no demand" for separate teaching for their children. I often hear that "the bishop's prize" has been won by a Nonconformist child. In certain districts Protestant parents send their children quite willingly to Roman schools where they are handy. This implies, I think, not so much that the parents are really willing that their children should absorb the teaching in question as that they do not think they will absorb it, but only "learn" it and forget it.

in his parish have remained communicants, he can mostly give me no trustworthy answer, because so large a proportion in country and town have vanished out of his ken very soon after being confirmed. But so far as we can judge, the impression—not the uniform impression (for there are very bright exceptions), but the general impression — is discouraging. The lads and young women who seemed so promising when they were at school, and when they were being prepared for confirmation, are absorbed by their homes and by their class into the old traditional level: and all our efforts seem to be swallowed up. The tradition of the homes and the tradition of the class have swallowed them up.

This is the common complaint as regards not only the religious instruction but the whole instruction and influence of day school and Sunday school alike. We have been accustomed on innumerable platforms, when we have emphasized the importance of the religious education of children, to quote a saying of some Roman Catholic bishop, "Give me the children to teach, and you may do what you like with the adults." We must cease to quote that saying. It has been proved to be a fallacy. To a degree hard to

exaggerate, the mental disturbance of the period of puberty, coupled with the change of environment involved in emancipation from school and going out to work, obliterates the influence of school. The influence of the home and of the "mates" conquers, and our labour seems to be in vain.

This is a very great problem. Continuation schools, when they are accepted into the sphere of our elementary education, and Bible classes and other classes corresponding to continuation schools, will doubtless supply part of the answer to the problem. But not, I think, the main part of the answer.

The main part of the answer will be found in a truer idea of education, both secular and religious. The memory of a child appears to be the most easily developed and the most superficial of his faculties. He can learn and forget with marvellous ease. That which sticks is that which has stimulated the reaction of his heart and will: that on which he has learned to act for himself: that which, out of school, has become part of his individuality. Every one knows how hard it is, especially in villages, to develop and maintain individuality. But it is worth any labour to do this. After all, there are differences between the

children: there are boys and girls with remarkable characters and tastes. When such appear, we ought to think no pains wasted upon them. The labour world will be influenced through their natural leaders among themselves. If you get to know the best of the workers, you are disappointed to find how few of them are Churchmen. But many of them were children of the church. Probably they were rather remarkable boys and girls. Only they seemed to feel that their aspirations and ambitions were not sympathized with or encouraged, and they went off to where they thought they could find more sympathy. It is a common story. I cannot help feeling that we want to spend a great deal more pains on cultivating individuality and giving it all encouragement: bearing with the crudeness and conceit of youth, and striving to encourage and help more than to instruct or repress. If there is to be progress, especially in our villages, we must set ourselves with all our might to develop individuality.

And now for my last point. The development of individual capacity is hindered by social conditions which, in town and country alike, depress the young man and woman with an almost overwhelming force of pressure into

the old ruts. This is especially apparent when you take the young man at the age when he wants or ought to want to be married. His conditions crush him back. Putting the matter conversely, and having regard for the moment to the country only, I would express a confident hope, that if we had a sufficient supply of adequate houses in the country and better wages and freer access to land, and security of tenure for land and house, and the freer and more hopeful outlook upon life which would go with these things, we should have a far richer development of character. The present conditions depress character and individuality. Grace, it is true, may triumph over circumstances, but we have no kind of right to maintain the manifold hindrances to the purpose of God which our present system involves. And we have no ground for saying that conditions could not be improved. It is selfishness and indifference and lack of courage which have brought them about and which maintain them.

This, then, is what I wish to have impressed upon the minds of Churchmen and of the clergy. All our labour upon education, secular and religious, will fail to produce any general fruit unless we set ourselves courageously, in com-

bination with all men of goodwill, to secure social reforms on behalf of the workers in town and country, in accordance, as far as possible, with the workers' own wishes, so that they may be trained not to act under orders, but with freer opportunity to take the management of their own life. And I pray, almost more fervently than I pray any other prayer, that, before it is too late, we, the clergy of the Church of England, may wake up, in far larger numbers than at present, to our duty of taking a side courageously and intelligently with the movement of social reform, treading the road on which in Ireland, in Germany, in Belgium, and in France the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church have already shown us an encouraging example.[1]

[1] May I invite the clergy to read *The Priest and Social Action*, by Father Plater, S.J. (Longmans), 3*s.* 6*d.*? I have no doubt that the picture painted by Father Plater is somewhat too rosy. I think I could introduce some darker shades into it. But I think the Roman clergy have acted *corporately* in some countries more courageously and effectively than we have done.

IV

SACRIFICE AND NATIONAL PENITENCE

Among the emotions which we are sharing to-day, stirred in us by the experience of the war, there is none deeper than the enthusiasm which we feel as we witness on a vast scale the reality of sacrifice—self-sacrifice for the country. We have watched the troops of lads going from our villages, and the recruits from the towns, and the young men whom we have complained of as too fond of pleasure, the product of our Public Schools and Universities; they have gone to the war and to the prospect of wounds and death with such light-hearted readiness. I could not put into words what we feel as we watch them go. And we know what their mothers have thought and said. And we know that among their sisters—nurses and helpers—there is the same eagerness for sacrifice. "O God, my heart is ready; my heart is ready." There is a splendour of sacrifice being shown for the

honour and safety of England which is lifting the whole country to a higher spiritual level, and which gives us who stay at home, who perhaps have not even brothers or sons and daughters to give up, a good deal to think about.

The kind of self-sacrifice in the cause of one's country that we are witnessing is not indeed distinctively Christian. We have seen it burning with a splendid flame among the Japanese, and we recall the glorious examples of it among Greeks and Romans. But if it is not confined to Christianity, it reminds us that Christianity takes this capacity for sacrifice for granted, and has made sacrifice of a most distinctive type and on most distinctive motives the normal type of Christian life.

The enthusiasm for the war which we all feel has led in a few of the clergy to what is, I think, a mistaken form of sacrifice. It has led to some of the clergy volunteering, or desiring to volunteer, as soldiers. On this subject I read the archbishop's letter with great thankfulness. "By every line of thought which I have pursued," he wrote, "I am led to the conclusion that I have been right in maintaining from the first that the position of an actual combatant in our army (or navy) is

incompatible with the position of one who has sought and received holy orders. The whole idea which underlies and surrounds ordination implies this." On this subject the judgement of the Christian church has been almost unanimous—that it is not lawful for the clergy voluntarily to fight. Of course, it is a different matter where, as in France, the law of their country regards the clergy as reservists and compels them on emergencies to come back into the ranks. To this compulsion the Christian church has submitted; but this does not touch the point that the church universal has forbidden the clergy serving of their own will as soldiers.[1] And the prohibition means, I think, a good deal. Military enthusiasm in times of national danger is overwhelming. It is like the enthusiasm of religion in a whole nation at certain specially susceptible epochs of history. It pervades the whole atmosphere. It carries all before it. It inspires to great sacrifices, but also it has shown in all history a strange power to blind the eyes and harden the heart. Thus, even at periods of great national necessity it needs counterpoise.

[1] See S. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theol.* 2a. 2æ., qu. 40, art. 2, where the prohibition is presented and defended.

Our Lord, we may say with Mozley, in his famous sermon on War, takes patriotism for granted. But He presses upon men something which is different from patriotism and must control and regulate it—an ideal of the divine kingdom based upon methods and maxims as far removed as possible from the ordinary methods and maxims of war; and His doctrine of God, the common Father of all, no longer admits of any one nation or empire regarding itself as a chosen people in the midst of "lesser breeds" or less important races.

Before our God, and in the fellowship of His Christ, there is neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian nor Scythian. God's care is for all nations equally according to the diversities of their gifts. There is to be a fellowship of all nations on an equal basis in a Catholic Church. This is what the Christian church has always seen when it has been true to its Master. But, as we were recently reminded in an admirable and most Christian article in the *Times*,[1] this is an extraordinarily difficult doctrine to keep in remembrance in an atmosphere of war. Thus the war spirit,

[1] *Times Literary Supplement*, September 17th, "What are we fighting for?"

even at the best, needs counterpoise. It is the special function of the clergy, occupied in their proper ministry, to maintain this. Even at such a moment as this we must say, "We will give ourselves to prayer and to the ministry of the word." We will seek to live, with special alertness of mind, at the feet of Him who said to the first of His apostles in an hour when He was the subject of the grossest physical violence, "Put up the sword into the sheath." It is our privilege in every way to support our soldiers and sailors in a just war, and to encourage recruiting, and to bless the recruits, and to pray for God's blessing on our arms, bringing to bear upon the war the whole power of organized prayer, public and private. But it is our duty also to remember the perils of military enthusiasm, and to keep our minds full of the ideals and laws of the Lamb of God, Jesus of Nazareth, so that there may be a steady and quiet and constant counterpoise to the emotions of war.

I have spoken of the clergy. A more difficult question has been raised about the duty of candidates for holy orders. Ought the man whose vocation is for the ministry and whose mind is steadily set to fulfil it, to

turn aside and postpone his ordination in order to offer himself for the service of his country as a soldier? Here again the mind of the church has been steadily against his doing so, voluntarily.[1] It has had so profound a sense of the incompatibility of shedding blood with holy orders that, in its ancient canons, it has declared that even those who in the execution of their public duties as soldiers or even as magistrates have taken human life or condemned men to death are to be forbidden to go on to ordination.[2] It has pointed to the popular soldier saint, Martin, who, after his baptism, though he remained by request in the army for two years, yet, when the occasion for fighting came, refused to fight and withdrew.[3] The Roman Church to-day has elaborate "dispensations from irregularity" and regulations for

[1] See Thomassin *Vet et nova eccl. disc.*, index, under the words, "milites et militia."

[2] Thomassin, *op. cit.*, pars ii, lib. i, cap. 66, sect. 10: "Usque adeo abhorret ecclesia a fundendo sanguine, reorum etiam quos leges ipsae addicunt, ut ne eos quidem qui justitiae huic scelerum ultrici linguas manusque commodaverunt, in ministris haberi velit incruentae suae et caelistis victimae." ("The church has such a horror of shedding blood, even in the case of criminals condemned by the law, that it has refused to have men who have given their hands and tongues to this avenging justice among the ministers of its bloodless and heavenly victim.")

[3] Sulpicius Severus *Vita*, 3, 4, *P.L.* xx, 162.

those who are candidates for orders and are compelled by state laws to serve in the army.[1] I suppose that such a formal rule has been subjected to many exceptions; and it is in itself open to so many objections, that I would not by any means have it brought back into force as a rule amongst us. But I think it has represented a deep and right instinct in the church. I could not myself put any pressure upon the conscience of a young man who feels himself, candidate for holy orders though he be, overmastered by the sense that he must serve his country's need in arms—I would let him go with a blessing. Nor should I have any hesitation in letting him resume his studies when he came back nor in ordaining him, when he is prepared; but, on the other hand, I would give all the encouragement I can to our candidates, especially those who are already at theological colleges or just going thither, to abide by their realized call and to pursue their preparation, even if they have to bear the accusation of cowardice. I think they will in this manner show the truest and highest courage, and that there is no better way in which they can serve their country than by

[1] Gasparri *de sacra ordinatione* § 540 ff.

preparing themselves for the ministry of the gospel.[1]

I have felt bound to turn aside to this subject of the relation of the clergy and candidates for holy orders to military service, but now I want to bring your thoughts back to the moving spectacle of self-sacrifice—unselfconscious, unostentatious, but deliberate, voluntary, and unflinching—which our youth to-day are exhibiting. I am quite sure that it ought to produce in us clergy and laity, who for various reasons cannot go as soldiers, the sort of holy rivalry which shall in the years to come make a great difference in the life and witness of the church. You know that many besides Macaulay have reproached our English Church for lack of self-sacrifice, and have

[1] The tendency to go for a soldier which has been so apparent among candidates for orders has appeared equally among medical students. The *Times* of October 26th quotes "alarming figures" from Cambridge—64 entries this year instead of 116 last year. The writer adds, "Those of us who have the duty of advising our young men have done everything in our power to keep medical students to their studies." Of those who have remained he says, "It has been very hard for these young men to curb their natural desire to do what their companions are doing. They have been subjected to much ignorant comment. They feel that people are saying to themselves, 'That man ought to be at the front,' but they are doing their duty, and among the heroic things this war has produced, not the least heroic is the action of those students who have had the courage to sacrifice their ambitions and to stick to their course, for the sake of our poor suffering humanity."

contrasted it with the Church of Rome, in which they have seen altogether more of the same heroic spirit which belongs to soldiers. They have not denied to us the glory of kindness and goodness and faithfulness and all the circle of domestic virtues. Only they have not seen in us the school of the heroic spirit —the school of sacrifice.

Now, in part, these reproaches belong to an older day. Where, it was asked, is to be found in the Church of England the splendid sacrifice of the religious orders—the life of voluntary poverty and celibacy and obedience? Well, since Macaulay's days these and the like reproaches have been in part removed. The sacrifice of the religious orders has been revived among us—nowhere so abundantly as in this diocese, where we have six or seven religious communities of men and women which have produced a profound impression on the life and the ideals of the Church of England. And in a measure we may thankfully claim that, beyond the area of this special vocation, religion and sacrifice are again associated in our minds in such a way as would make it impossible now for any one to write about the Church of England as Macaulay wrote. Moreover, we are a very "unshowy"

people. We desire, the best of us desire, to *be* rather than to seem. Behind the show of comfort there is a vast deal of very real self-sacrifice; and in innumerable country vicarages the married priest with his family (and how much of what is best and noblest in our records does England owe to the families of the clergy!) living in the straitest circumstances, with uncomplaining dutifulness, offers to God, I am persuaded, as noble and glorious a sacrifice in His sight as any monastic cell can show.

Nevertheless there is truth in the reproach aimed at us; and just at this season we do well to heed it. For instance, the Roman Church has been magnificently helped in the maintenance of religious education on its own lines because it has been able to draw upon a vast store of voluntary sacrifice. Men have been found in multitudes who felt that they had the vocation to be teachers for Christ's sake and His little ones, and who, without hope or prospect but their work and their faith, have given themselves for teachers, wanting nothing for it but their barest living. There is hardly anything in modern Christendom nobler, or more successful in attaining its end, than the institution of the Christian Brothers; and the

women's Teaching Orders do not fall behind them. Why have we never struck anything like this store of deliberate and joyful sacrifice, with all our talk about the supreme importance of religious education? There has been something lacking. Again, how do matters stand to-day in the field of missionary endeavour? The inquiries that I have made for my Visitation convince me that, though there are still some parishes where almost nothing is done for the work of the church overseas, yet there has been an immense advance in our response to the missionary claim. There is a far more widespread interest: far more intelligence given to the propagation of the universal gospel: far less stupid scoffing at the missionary cause: far more, and more systematic, prayer: and a far greater readiness to contribute money and to recognize such contributions as a regular part of the normal duty of a Christian man and a Christian parish. We owe, in fact, an immense debt of gratitude to the "Forward Movement" for overseas work, the initiation of which is our chief claim to distinction among dioceses in recent years.

Yet in spite of all this that is satisfactory we must acknowledge that, with all the increase of need and of knowledge, the number of men

and women, laymen and priests, who are offering themselves for work abroad, I do not say specially from this diocese, but from the church as a whole, is yet sadly inadequate. And knowing what we know of the circumstances of the church overseas, we cannot regard it as fair or reasonable that we should have in this diocese of 690,000 inhabitants about a thousand clergy.[1] Now what I pray, what I from my heart desire you to pray, is that the glorious spirit of sacrifice which has animated the volunteers for this war and lifted to a higher plane the whole level of our common life, may not fail to produce in the church a blessed rivalry: and that along all the different paths of vocation we may be witnesses in the years to come of deeper and broader streams of sacrifice than we have ever witnessed before.

Truly as we read and meditate on the Gospels we see our Lord standing over every human soul that is a candidate for discipleship, expecting, eliciting, and then welcoming and blessing sacrifice. Truly He did intend that sacrifice should be one special and arresting characteristic of His religion. Truly no society

[1] Population 690,137. Clergy beneficed 636, assistant curates 179, other licensed clergy 153, resident with permissions 39, total 1,007.

of men which claims to be part of the church of Christ can be content to be less than brilliant in sacrifice.

Sacrifice, real and also visible, makes a deep appeal to the imagination of men. There is nothing which wins men's hearts more than the spectacle of a priesthood which visibly embodies the spirit of sacrifice. Besides the reality there must be its visible expression. As I move about the diocese, I see frequently the large vicarage or rectory standing in a beautiful garden, which speaks of the ideal of a clerical country gentleman. The idea of sixty years ago was that it was essential to have a resident clergyman in every village, however small; and that if there was only a good parsonage house, a man would always be found to "take the living" without regard to the smallness of the income. Now we have come to doubt the ideal, and to know that the anticipation has proved less and less true. We feel that it would be better for ourselves and for our people, on the whole, if our parishes were larger, and if each incumbent had a living wage. Thus I know that to the present-day incumbent of many a parish the large house is a mere burden upon his straitened means. It embodies and represents an ideal now anti-

quated by new conditions, and also an ideal which never was easy to reconcile with the divine pattern of ministry. I wish from my heart that we could get rid of many of these expensive rectories, and house our clergy in a manner which would represent to the imagination a truer picture of the Christian ideal, and of the actual facts of the incomes of our clergy.

But, most of all, I feel that a change is needed with regard to our bishops. We have, I dare say, all read the tract which was called *The Fatal Opulence of Bishops.* You know well enough that a bishop's life in these days cannot well be an easy life. He has every inducement to a life of sacrifice. Still the great house and the income of £5,000 makes a disastrous impression upon the imagination of people, especially of the working class. It is a most real stumbling block. I believe it ought to be removed. May I explain briefly what I would do? The plea for these large incomes of bishops is that so much is required of them. Yes: but why should that be paid out of their private incomes? Let some suitable sum, say £2,000 of what is now the bishop's income, become a diocesan fund in the hand of lay trustees. Let them be required to pay the

necessary expenses of the bishop's office, such as the salaries of his officers, his travelling expenses, his legal expenses, the expenses of the ordinations and other diocesan gatherings: and let them also put at the bishop's disposal a very considerable sum for charitable administration of which he should give account. This fund would be then neither in appearance nor in reality any part of the bishop's own income.

Then as to the great house. I think every diocese should have its great house, which might or might not be the present bishop's palace, a great house which should be available for gatherings of all kinds for diocesan purposes and for retreats for laity and clergy. The bishop could use this in various ways, and the Diocesan Fund would keep it up. In it the bishop could have his own apartments and his chapel. Then the bishop's income might be really a very modest sum, like the income of most bishops in the church outside the Established Church in England; and a really great cause of scandal and misunderstanding would be removed. I have in my own mind considered this particular cause of stumbling and the way to remove it somewhat in detail. But I will not trouble you with

the details now. My desire is that we should, as a church, set ourselves to disembarrass the clergy of those outward marks which to the imagination of men, and especially to the great mass of the workers in town and country, associate our ministerial office with the symbols of wealth and ease.

There is one other point on which I desire to speak to you to-day.

The anxieties of this great war have truly thrown us upon God. We are feeling very widely the value of prayer. Moreover, the circumstances out of which the war arose have caused us to feel, and I think rightly to feel, that we are fighting for justice and the rights of weaker nations and the cause of liberty against a monstrous spirit of aggressive and selfish and cruel militarism which has for the time possessed the soul of Germany. There is all the greater need therefore that we should not be Pharisaical, that we should not be saying, "We thank God that we are not as those Germans." Are there not with us, even with us, sins against God? The prophets of Israel make a tremendous claim upon the worshippers of God that they should bethink them whether, God being what He is, they are fit to approach God and inquire of Him. For

He will not be "inquired of" by the wilfully disobedient. To all this body of prophetic teaching there is serious reason that we should give heed to-day. This is as great a moment for corporate penitence as for corporate prayer. You know what our national sins are. You know, for instance, how slowly we are making way in combating sweating or the underpaying of our workers in our industrial life ; and how stern are the warnings of Holy Scripture that "to grind the faces of the poor" disqualifies any nation—and we are all responsible, if we are indifferent or acquiescent—from approaching God. Again, you know how from time to time some anxious question of an employé in a place of business reveals to us a widespread commercial dishonesty, or how some public scandal discloses a distressing prevalence of illicit commissions. Again you know how terrible is the hold which drink still has upon us and how awful its ravages. The Czar's decree, abolishing the retail sale of *vodka* throughout his dominions, at a vast initial sacrifice of revenue, has overwhelmed us with shame. For in the days of the war we have learned that drinking has been increasing terribly among women, owing apparently in great part to the wives of our soldiers, who

receive their allowances and, while they have the money, have nowhere but the public houses in which to satisfy their excited feelings and craving for news. And we know that it is not without cause that Lord Kitchener has appealed to our patriotism not to tempt our soldiers to drink. And in such a distressing emergency we feel how little we, as a democratically governed country, can do or have done to counteract so serious an evil. Once more, you know the terrible prevalence of sexual sin—the vast number of girls, mere children, who are corrupted; and, I must add, the vast number of cases in which girls or women are rather the tempters than the tempted to sexual sin. You know how both without and within married life the artificial prevention of conception is becoming nothing less than a national habit, descending from class to class in the social scale. Surely on these and many other grounds there is the gravest need for national penitence. We clergy ought to know before we speak: we ought to know what it is that is actually going on among our people. We ought to choose carefully the right occasion for speaking. But we ought not to be content with vague talk about sin. With much self-preparation and prayer we ought to strive to unmask the forms

of evil, and so to awaken the consciences of men and women as that they should feel that if they want God to protect them and their cause, truly they must cleanse their lives and hearts so that the hands which they lift up in prayer may be really "holy hands."

V

CHURCH REFORM

We have been, and are, living in a period of profound social change. It has been of late years unusually rapid. If we are to judge from previous experience, we should conjecture that the vast war of nations in which we are at present engaged will lead to social changes in European society even deeper and more rapid than those to which we had been accustoming ourselves. Now a society which, like the church, claims to be continuous and to carry down the ages a continuous and constant religion, turning "the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers," must be prepared especially in an age of change, while it clings to what is unchanging in its faith and system, to adjust itself, to reform its methods, to remove scandals and abuses, and to interpret the old faith to the wants of a new age. This is what is meant by the familiar demand for church reform.

There are particular reforms which we should, I dare say, be unanimous in demanding: for

instance, we should, perhaps, most of us be agreed that the power which still remains with private patrons of "livings" to sell the advowson, that is to sell, as an ordinary piece of property, the power of presenting in perpetuity to a cure of souls, is intolerable and ought to be altered. No one would tolerate the continuance of such a power, if what were concerned were a professorship at a University or a head-mastership of a school. Again, we are all agreed that there is still an excessive difficulty in dispossessing of his benefice a clergyman who, by the confession of all good men, has shown himself unfit to hold a cure of souls. Again, we are all agreed that the so-called representation of the clergy in the Lower House of Convocation is profoundly unsatisfactory and unfair. For example, from the area of this diocese there sit in the Lower House the Deans of Christ Church and Windsor, and a representative of each of their two Chapters, and the three archdeacons; while the whole body of incumbents (636) are represented by only two proctors; and the unbeneficed clergy are not represented at all. Again, we are agreed that the representation of the laity does not interest the mass of our people, and in particular does not interest the

working classes, who feel that they have no real share in the management of affairs. Once more, it is an admitted scandal that, when the liberality of church people has provided the means of dividing an overgrown diocese, there should be so great a difficulty in procuring the necessary Parliamentary sanction. These are examples of commonly admitted abuses.

And those who have thought most deeply on these things have come to the conclusion that the best method of reform is not to attack each abuse in turn and seek to pass through Parliament a Bill to amend it. The root of the mischief is that the church has lost the power effectively to express its mind on these and all subjects which concern its common life, and to reform itself. There can be no doubt that the church from the beginning believed itself to be, by the will of its Founder, a society with the power of "binding" and "loosing," that is legislating to prohibit or allow, with a divine sanction: "What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven": [1] and also a society with the power of applying its laws in disciplinary action upon its members—that is, of

[1] S. Matt. xviii. 18.

absolving and retaining sins—also with a divine sanction: "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."[1] This legislative and disciplinary power has been lost, or largely lost, in our church, because there are so many things which it cannot do without Parliamentary sanction, and the process of obtaining Parliamentary sanction is an exceedingly cumbrous and ineffective process.

If we seek further to examine the conditions of this difficulty, we find that the explanation is certain. We inherit from the Middle Ages the tradition, quite alien to the first age of Christianity, of a single society which is both church and state, or, to put it otherwise, in which church membership is the necessary condition of political privilege. When at the Reformation we in England threw off the Papal authority and claimed to reorganize our church on more independent national lines, no change whatever was made in this fundamental idea. The church and the nation of England were to be the same society, and if the church was to be, in a new sense, subject to the king and restrained by the Parliament, on the other hand, Parliament no less than king was to be

[1] S. John xx. 23.

an organ of the church. Political privileges and liberties were to belong only to members of the church. The one society was still to be, in different aspects, nation and church.

This condition of things has now wholly passed away. Changes in political and religious opinion; the universal acceptance of the principle of religious toleration—these and the like movements have wholly antiquated the state of things in which a man must be a Churchman in order to exercise the privileges of a citizen. As a consequence it is now absurd, in the highest degree to talk about Parliament as representative of the laity, or as the Lay Synod of the Church of England. In Parliament or out of it the church is only one of a great variety of religious bodies. If the governing authorities of the country to-day want any religious or educational work done, they have to appeal not to the church only, or the clergy of the church, but to all the religious bodies with all their different ministries. And Parliament, consisting of members of all religions or none, cannot pretend to be, and (to do it justice) does not pretend to be, a body suitable for legislation in matters affecting the church in particular.

In view of such a changed condition it is

concluded that the church, as it cannot continue in a healthy state without government, must resume its inherent power of self-government. There are those who would say: well, in that case, it must be disestablished; it must cease to be or be called the National Church. This position I am not going to discuss. There are a great many Churchmen who feel passionately the advantages of such a national recognition of religion as is secured by an established church, who yet declare that they would sooner have disestablishment than that the church should remain in its present bondage. But they doubt the necessity for disestablishment; and they point to what is certainly the fact, that the demand for disestablishment is weakening rather than strengthening in the country as a whole. And they dispute altogether the position that the restoration of self-government to the church, under the supremacy of the Crown, need carry with it disestablishment. What has happened and what is happening in Scotland seems to them to vindicate the possibility and the reasonableness of an established church retaining or regaining its proper spiritual liberties. Those who feel in this way have procured the appointment by the archbishops

of a very important committee on the relations of church and state, to consider how the church, consistently with establishment, could recover real legislative and judicial freedom under the control of the Crown and with due regard to the proper functions of Parliament. On this committee, of which Lord Selborne is the chairman, this diocese is very amply represented. It contained the honoured name of Sir William Anson, whose services in this world, alas! are no longer ours. It contains your bishop, the Dean of Christ Church, Lord Parmoor, one of the members for the University (Lord Hugh Cecil), and Mr. A. L. Smith. It is a thoroughly representative body of men, and it is working hard in the preparation of its report. I suppose that the chief business of such a committee will be the establishment of a great Church Council, or the provision of the scheme for its establishment—a Church Council such as can really claim to be the Church of England by representation—that is, a body really representative of those members of the nation who deliberately are and intend to be members of the Church of England. Granted such a body, the claim of which to be what it professes to be could not be reasonably disputed, many of us are full of a great hope that such a body could effectively

claim and obtain the legislative freedom necessary to inaugurate and carry particular reforms. But it is felt on all sides that no such claim can be effectively made unless there is real and adequate representation of the laity; and, I must add, unless the representation of the laity can be so arranged as that it should not appear to be the representation of a class, but as fully and really the representation of the workers as of the wealthy.

Of course, all who care for church reform recognize that our representative system, as it exists at present, is profoundly hindered by the feeling that our church assemblies—parochial, diocesan, provincial, and national—have no real power; and people will not take pains to attend bodies which they feel to be in the main nothing better than debating societies. I have no doubt that it is the sense that they have important business to do, and the powers necessary for doing it effectively, which accounts for the fact that, in the case of the Wesleyan and other Nonconformist bodies, the attendance at church assemblies of their lay members puts us to shame. I went this summer to Leeds to speak on the co-operation of all Christian bodies in social work at an open meeting in

connection with the Wesleyan Conference, and when I was there I was assured that the attendance of the laymen from all parts of the country, throughout a whole week of exacting meetings, had been constant and as full as that of the ministers, though the lay representatives were largely men prominent and active in business or politics in their own districts, who could only with difficulty arrange for a whole week's absence from their ordinary affairs. I dare say quite as good a record in lay attendances could be shown by non-established churches of our own communion. This serious ground of weakness—the absence of real power — is what we seek to remove.

But meanwhile our existing system of representative church assemblies is preparing the way for better things, and it is upon our existing Convocation and House of Laymen and Representative Church Council, and Diocesan Conferences and Synods, and Ruridecanal Chapters and Conferences, and Parochial Church Councils, duly reformed and reorganized, that we must seek to build. And, in particular, we must lay the basis of a representative system in a proper suffrage. Now, since the Representative Church

Council was established, ten years ago, we have had such a suffrage. The "qualified persons" who alone were to vote for the parochial representatives, and indirectly to elect to the Diocesan Conference and the House of Laymen, were to be those in each parish who were either actual communicants or had the status of a communicant; that is, who were baptized and confirmed, and did not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England, and who were not otherwise debarred from communion, and who also had signed a paper to say that they were in this sense qualified persons. Great stress was laid in the Church Council, when this suffrage was initiated, both on the possession of a distinct qualification and on the readiness to profess the qualification by signing the paper. The body of persons signing in each parish was intended to correspond to the body of people who were really and deliberately Churchmen, leaving out for the moment the question of the women. I have made for my Visitation careful inquiry about the number of persons signing in each of our parishes, and I admit that it has been to me something like a shock to discover in how many parishes we have

practically not yet made a beginning in bringing this church suffrage into effect. There are 656 separate parishes in the diocese. Of these, in only 182 parishes (28 per cent.) has the declaration been signed at all. The total number of male communicants who are returned as having signed is 1,396. To this total should be added some persons from twenty-two parishes in which "very few" are said to have signed. The total must be something considerably under 2 per cent. of the whole body of our Easter communicants. In the great majority of parishes the system has not been put into effect at all. "No interest is taken in it," I am told; or "Those few who attended the meeting to elect ruridecanal representatives were well known and there was no need for them to sign"; or "There is the greatest objection to signing any paper." As we stand to-day there is no doubt that our representatives in the House of Laymen are not validly elected at all, for the basis of election has been generally ignored.

Now, as you know, this year the whole scheme of election has been reconsidered and amended by the Representative Church Council. Three important changes—all in my judgement, great improvements — have been

made. (1) Non-resident attendants at any church can enroll themselves to vote with the parishioners, if accepted by the parish authority. (2) It has been left open for the diocesan conference in any diocese to determine that the lay members of the diocesan conference shall be elected directly by the parish, so that each parish shall have at least one representative. (I fear that our diocese is too large to admit of our taking advantage of this opportunity.) (3) All women (and not merely ratepaying women) have been admitted to vote on the same terms as men. This change seems to me to be required by justice. I am sometimes conscious when I am reading expositions of the aims of the "Women's Movement" that some day I may be brought into collision with it. For I believe that there is an essential headship of man over woman which neither physiology nor Scripture will allow us to ignore. There are, therefore, certain aspirations after the equality of the sexes to which I cannot assent. But I see no reason why women should not have, and the strongest reasons of justice why they should have, the vote. I am not here concerned with the political vote, but the vote in ecclesiastical matters in which they have

always shown a zeal and interest which puts men to shame.

Other changes were made at this year's Church Council of minor importance. I have mentioned the three most important. The council deliberately reaffirmed the requirement that "qualified persons" should not only possess the qualifications, but should sign the paper to say that they possess them. Now I proceed to express a very strong desire. I earnestly desire that every incumbent next spring, when new elections are to be made, shall diligently put the present system of election into force and work it to the very utmost of his power. I beg every incumbent, by due notice and after giving the fullest explanations to the parishioners generally and to individuals, to summon the meeting of qualified persons, men and women, at the proper time and to cause them[1] to sign the paper which affirms their qualification; and then to form from the papers so signed a roll of qualified persons, male and female, for his parish, which can be open at any time to inspection; and then, in the future, constantly to correct it and keep it up to date. I would have every clergyman study the rules care-

[1] Either at the meeting *or previously.*

fully in good time before the meeting and make a determined effort to carry them out. They will doubtless be supplied to all incumbents, and they shall be also published in the *Diocesan Magazine* for January. I will give any assistance in my power, if doubt is felt as to their meaning. I want you all to realize, both clergy and laity, that we are really seeking to form a roll of those throughout the country who are full church members. And all our future action in reorganizing the church will be based upon this roll. I am well aware that there are objections felt to signing anything. You will do well to form a body of people willing and able to explain to every one in the parish of every class, who is qualified, the importance of signing, and to overcome objections.

I know that the process of signing on, and the interest in all church assemblies, will be much stimulated when we gain real powers of legislation and action. Meanwhile, I hope that the new method of diocesan finance will impart some fresh interest to ruridecanal and diocesan conferences.

But I feel sure that the root of interest for most laymen will be in the affairs of the parish. I hope that at no distant date we

shall have Parochial Church Councils with real authority. I am glad to observe that the new movement in financial administration is already bringing more such Councils into existence. At present about 10 per cent. of our parishes appear to have Church Councils of some sort. I believe, in spite of difficulties and hindrances, that a Parish Church Council, with gradually growing powers, is a valuable asset. I will give any help I can in formulating rules for it till such rules are provided for the whole church. Meanwhile I hope to see a steady extension in the number of these Councils, and, whether you have one at present or no, I beg you to set to work to make the roll of church voters an effective reality in your parish, and as complete a roll as possible of church members.

I would also remind you that women are not only admitted now to vote equally with men, but also to sit, without restriction of numbers, on Parochial Church Councils, though not upon the councils of the rural deanery, the diocese, or the province.

Of course, I am well aware that there exists a body of religious opinion amongst us which views with anxiety the admission of lay representatives into our church assemblies. The

sacred synods of the church, diocesan and provincial, have, it is urged, always been synods of the clergy. In this diocese we remember how strenuously Dr. Pusey contended for this principle. Well, I would say, let our synods, strictly so called, so remain. Let us have in each diocese a synod of the clergy which can sit apart. I formed such a synod in my former diocese; and it is only the unwieldy size of this diocese which has prevented me from summoning one here also. Then let each diocese have also a house of laymen which can sit apart. And let the clerical and lay houses sit together for most diocesan purposes as a diocesan conference or governing body. Let the same principle continue in provincial affairs. Let us have the convocation of the clergy and the house of laymen for the province; and let both bodies from both provinces, with the bishops, constitute the Representative Church Council for the National Church.

I would also ask you to remember that the special responsibility and authority of the clergy and the episcopate in matters of doctrine is safeguarded in the existing constitution of the Representative Church Council. "Nothing in this constitution," it is

there written, "nor in any proceeding of the council, shall interfere with the exercise by the episcopate of the powers and functions inherent in them, or with the several powers and functions of the Houses of Convocation of the two provinces. It does not belong to the functions of the council to issue any statement purporting to declare the doctrine of the church on any question of theology; and no such statement shall be issued by the council. Subject to the provisions of the last two preceding clauses, questions touching doctrine and discipline may be discussed, and resolutions relating thereto may be passed by the council in like manner as in the case of other questions: provided that any projected legislative measure touching doctrinal formulae or the services or ceremonies of the church, or the administration of the sacraments and sacred rites of the church, shall be initiated in the house of bishops and shall be discussed by each house sitting separately; and the council shall either accept or reject the measure in the terms in which it is finally proposed by the house of bishops after that house has received and considered the reports of such separate discussions."

These articles of the constitution of the council seem to me sufficiently to safeguard the principles of the general tradition of the church. What we have now to do is so to reform our procedure as that the laity shall again be brought into the position which the principles of S. Paul and S. Cyprian allow us, or even require us, to give them, a position in which they shall really feel that alike in the parish, the diocese, the province, and the national church, they are taking an effective part in the management of church affairs.

VI

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

"Political privileges are the correlative of political duties done." That is the saying of one who was truly a prophet of modern democracy, Joseph Mazzini. It is a lesson much needed by democracies but also by other forms of society. It embodies a principle which lies deep in the heart of the system of the church. No one would question the fact that the first Christians were taught to believe that, while they owed their new standing ground in Christ simply to the unmerited grace of God and not to anything that they had done, yet that admission to membership in Christ was admission to a condition of responsibility and obligation. It was admission to membership in His body, the visible human society, the church; and that membership meant much. It meant loyalty and service and subordination to the community. Thus the glorious freedom of a Christian was not freedom to dispense himself from obligations to the beloved community, but was the privilege

of a membership heartily accepted. That is the condition of every healthy society, state or church. In this moment of national peril and national awakening, what is it we are learning afresh? It is the lesson that the maintenance of our freedom as individuals—that freedom that we value so much—depends upon emphasizing and not neglecting the obligations involved in membership in the nation. For those who have eyes to see, the church as well as the nation is passing through a period of peril. And we have to learn afresh the same lesson in the sphere of the church. If the Church of England to-day is to show itself capable of the sacrifices required of it, and capable also of adjusting itself to new conditions, we can depend upon it that its membership must be understood again to mean subordination to the reasonable authority of the community and cheerful service. A church which asks little or nothing of its members, and from which no slackness or disobedience cuts men off, is a church which carries so much dead weight that it cannot move.

Earlier in the year I wrote to you an "open letter" which was mainly concerned with the obligations of the clergy. It is now of the

obligations of lay-membership that, in the first instance, I wish to speak.

We criticize the Prayer Book, but more often we need to criticize ourselves for ignoring the Prayer Book. Certainly in this matter of church membership and its obligations, the Prayer Book sets us a high ideal. According to the Prayer Book, baptism is our personal regeneration: our new birth into spiritual privileges. But it is this, because it is also our incorporation into membership—membership and its obligations. Before the age of the Prayer Book that principle had been made emphatic in the ancient Orders of Baptism: and it was not abandoned. Baptism, according to the Prayer Book, is to be no hole and corner ceremony, no merely domestic function: and if, owing to sickness, it has to be this, the defect is to be supplied by a public reception into the church. Apart from necessity, baptism itself "should not be administered but upon Sundays, and other Holy Days, when the most number of people come together," and that in order "that the congregation there present may testify the receiving of them that be newly baptized into the number of Christ's church." In the case of adults no other time for baptism than after the second lesson at Morning or

Evening Prayer, on the Sunday or Holy Day when the people are assembled, is even contemplated as possible. And sponsors are to present the person, or infant, to be baptized, who in the case of the adult are to keep him up to his duties, and in the case of the infant are to guarantee his being brought up to understand the meaning of his baptism, and his being instructed in his religion. Then, as soon as he is of sufficient age, he is to be instructed and examined in the Church Catechism, and that again openly in the full congregation. Then before his confirmation (at which, again, he is to have a godfather as a witness) he is to make a public renewal of the vows of his baptism. Only those so confirmed after a public renewal of their vows (or those who are ready and desirous to be so confirmed) are to be admitted to the Holy Communion, and then again the privilege of communion is to be guarded by a public discipline.

Here the church of this land in the sixteenth century made a great change. The discipline of auricular or private confession to the priest was no longer required of any man. It was left optional for those who felt that they needed it. But the significance of this change is not rightly appreciated, unless due stress is laid

upon the fact that, as was widely the case among the Reformers, there was a strong determination to revive the practice of *public* discipline for such sins as were matter of common knowledge outside the man's own conscience. Thus evil livers, and those living in malice and hatred, are to be restrained from communion till satisfaction is made; or if no satisfaction is made, things are to proceed to excommunication by the bishop; and excommunications are to be publicly read at the time of the offertory; and excommunicate persons are to be "avoided" until they be openly reconciled by penance, and received back into the church. And—doubtless in part for purposes of discipline—those who desire to communicate are "to signify their names to the curate at least some time the day before"; and the communion is to be a corporate act of the general congregation, large or small; and at Eastertide the communicant is to acknowledge his financial obligations, the paying of the "ecclesiastical duties."

Then, again, those who are to be coupled together in matrimony are subject to public law and obligation. Those only can be married with the rite of the church whose marriage is not excluded by the Table of Kindred and

Affinity, and the canon prohibits the re-marriage of those who have been divorced. Again, when men are sick they are to be examined as to their hold upon the common faith—the Apostles' Creed—and to make reparation for their offences against their neighbours. And, finally, the Burial Service is not to be read over those who "die unbaptized or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves."

All this is doubtless very familiar, but I have put together these familiar rubrics and rules because they represent clearly a high ideal of obligation attaching to membership. I know that it seems to some people simply an antiquated ideal which has no relation to modern church life. I recognize that it has, in fact, fallen at almost every point more or less into desuetude, and that it is not, perhaps, at every point recoverable in its original shape. But let us make no mistake about it. The intentions of the Prayer Book not only represent the original idea of the church, but also an idea that must be recovered in practice if the church is to live and do its work. Membership in any vigorous and progressive religious society must involve recognized obligations, and the refusal of obligation must at last involve loss of membership.

Let us, then, return to consider these rules of the Prayer Book point by point. And let us begin with the sacrament of initiation. A sacrament is not a charm, and there is truly no justification for administering baptism to an unconscious infant, not in danger of death, unless the principle is guarded that the society guarantees its education to understand the meaning of its baptism. A canon was made and published by the Convocation of our Province in 1865 to allow of parents being also godparents. This has been criticized, and the canon has never been confirmed by the Crown. But it has the authority of the Province, and we may act upon it. Moreover, what I am chiefly anxious for is that we should go behind the details of the rule and consider its meaning. Wherever an infant is to be baptized, in health, responsible members of the church are to respond for it and to guarantee its proper training. I do not think, I know, that by taking pains we can really, if only gradually and not yet perfectly, revive the acceptance of both the principle and practice of sponsors. You are authorized by the Prayer Book to require notice of a baptism "overnight or in the morning." You cannot *require* more, if the proper sponsors are provided. But, though it

cannot be made a matter of obligation, you will find it of great value to use the forms for giving notice of baptism which are being prepared for this diocese and will be procurable from S.P.C.K. next year. Similar forms are already in use in some of our parishes. The intention in using them is to bring back into common knowledge the obligation of sponsorship and its meaning.

There are two points I would add. In towns especially, the incumbent of a parish should not baptize the children of those who do not belong to his parish or to his congregation without an attempt to get them to apply to their proper pastor. A great deal of good comes of observance of this rule. Also I would say, that where parents are conscientious Nonconformists, and intend their children to be brought up as Nonconformists, I conceive that it is far better that they should be baptized by those who are to have the responsibility for their training.

I know the great difficulty there is in bringing back the administration of Holy Baptism into that public place in the ordinary services intended for it in the Prayer Book. But I would have no incumbent fail at least occasionally, and specially in the case of adults, to

administer the sacrament in the presence of the full congregation, and to make it the occasion, perhaps on the previous Sunday, for explaining the service. I am sure that we need to preach about Holy Baptism and its meaning a great deal more than we do.

In my "open letter,"[1] which I should wish to be taken as a part of my charge, I explained why I cannot connive at relaxation in any direction of our rule requiring Confirmation of those desirous to be communicants, and I will not here revert to the subject.

As to the Confirmations in the diocese, I have to report to you that no perceptible change appears to be taking place in the proportion to the population of those confirmed. During the last seven years it has varied between 1·34 per cent. of the population in 1911 to 1·10 per cent. in 1912. But I have no doubt that we are making steady progress in realizing the meaning of Confirmation; and I must tell you that I hardly ever go to a Confirmation Service without feeling with a profound thankfulness that, in the case of most parishes, there has been a real and sifting preparation for the reception of the Holy Spirit by the laying-on of hands. The attention

[1] *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship*, pp. 39–40. Mowbray, 6*d*.

and reverence also of those who come to be confirmed is excellent. I hardly ever leave a Confirmation without feeling that it witnesses to a spiritual capacity in our people which we are very far at present from making the most of in their lives as a whole. I hope that what is done in many parishes will be done in every parish, and that a roll of those confirmed year after year will be compiled and kept to be handed on from incumbent to incumbent.

With regard to marriage, I believe that you know I have given serious thought to the responsibility which belongs to the incumbent and ultimately to the bishop. In securing notice from those who desire the proclamation of banns, I advise you to use the forms, which are to be obtained from the S.P.C.K., authorized by me, on my own responsibility, for use in this diocese. I advise, but I cannot do more. The recent law allowing marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and the law admitting re-marriage after divorce are confessedly contrary to the law of our church. I will not discuss the question now whether our church law ought to be altered, but I do seriously deprecate the policy of those who acquiesce in our church law remaining as it is, without any effort to

alter it, and at the same time would have us accept the change in statute law as dispensing us from its observance. I think this involves nothing less than treason to the principle that the church has a law and standard of marriage, distinguishable from the law and standard of the state, received from Christ Himself; and that the "binding" and "loosing" authority in respect of this law and standard must remain with the church. And where the binding and loosing power has been exercised publicly and for a whole province or national church, as is the case with us, it cannot be rightly reversed or altered by any individual bishop, but only by similarly public and responsible action.

I cannot accept the expedient by which it is becoming customary to bridge over the contradiction between church law and state law, viz., that those who are resolved to be married contrary to our church law must be married elsewhere than in the church, but may subsequently be admitted to Communion at our altars. Our church has pronounced against such marriages, rightly or wrongly—not irreversibly perhaps, but deliberately—on most serious grounds. And those who deliberately set the ruling of the church aside cannot expect to retain the privilege of membership.

Moreover, I have no doubt that the privilege of Communion is the highest and most comprehensive privilege of Churchmen, and covers all minor privileges of church membership, such as that of being married in church; so that no principle can justify us in admitting to Communion—the greater privilege—while we refuse the celebration of matrimony—the lesser privilege—a privilege which, for social reasons, has always been kept as widely open as possible.

In any case of difficulty as to the acceptance of banns for marriage in church, or as to admission to Communion, I am prepared to advise or give instructions, and to take as far as possible all responsibility, but I would beg that, where my counsel or instruction is to be sought, I may be consulted by the incumbent before he has done anything to hamper the freedom of the decision.

As regards the number of our Easter communicants, I do not think that any noticeable change is going on. Within the last seven years the proportion of communicants to the whole population has varied between 11·99 per cent. in 1907 to 12·58 in 1912. But it sank again (perhaps owing to an early Easter and a wet Easter) to 12·05 per cent., that is by 3,700, in

1913. From these figures you cannot deduce any conclusion of growth or decline.

I said that in the Prayer Book a certain financial obligation attaches to the members of the church — the paying of dues to the curate—and this obligation we are trying to renew in a different form and for a different class of objects. As you know, the diocese, through its diocesan conference, now accepts the responsibility of collecting for all our diocesan purposes. The board elected by the conference fixes a certain sum to be collected from the diocese year by year for diocesan needs, and it is allocated to the various rural deaneries and by the rural deaneries to the various parishes. The intention is—not that this allocated sum should be paid by the few who have more or less wealth. We desire that they should subscribe independently to the diocesan fund. The allocation we hope will be paid by the mass of the people, so that it should again come to be recognized that church membership carries with it for every one a certain financial obligation according to his means. We desire that every Christian should regard it as his duty to set apart a definite proportion of his earnings or income for the purposes of the kingdom of

God: that part of this should go to his parish, part to such public objects as hospitals, part to the work of the church overseas, and part also to the diocese—for the diocese is the unit of the organization of the church, and every church member, rich and poor, should feel that it has a claim upon him.

Now I have passed in review, in the light of our present day circumstances, most of the points at which the Prayer Book emphasizes the obligation of church membership. Those which I have not mentioned are those which require no fresh application, but which remain to-day as they were when the Prayer Book was compiled—permanent conditions of healthy membership, which we simply need to-day to recognize and accept.

But I may say one word about the conditions attached in the Prayer Book to burial with the Order for the Burial of the Dead. It is not to be used for those who die unbaptized or excommunicate, or who have laid violent hands upon themselves. In the Special Service Book for this diocese an office is provided of a more penitential character, which may be used for those for whom the Burial Service of the Prayer Book may not be read. I am ready to take the responsibility of deciding

on such cases where I am asked. But I may say that I think that a verdict of "suicide while in a state of unsound mind" is so often returned without any evidence of mental unsoundness, that, without unreality, we cannot always accept it. I think that the Prayer Book does not intend its service to be used over a suicide, where there is no evidence of unsoundness of mind other than the fact of suicide. And in such cases we had better use the alternative service, which can be used without unreality, and without attempting to judge of what we cannot know—the real state of a soul before God.

The purpose of all that I have been trying to say is that we are bound, if we would restore the life of the church, to pay careful heed to the conditions and obligations which the Prayer Book attaches to membership from its initiation in baptism till it closes for this world at the grave. I would have you believe that these conditions and obligations simply express a fundamental principle of healthy membership in any society, secular or religious —the principle that privileges of membership are correlative to duties loyally accepted and performed. And it cannot be said that the requirements which in the Prayer Book the

church makes upon its members are either inquisitorial or such as involve any infringement of reasonable personal liberty. I am very well aware that by adherence to these requirements we shall sacrifice a certain kind of popularity—I do not say for ourselves but for the church. But it is a popularity unprofitable alike to those who avail themselves of our laxity, and to the church itself.

THE PLACE OF SYMBOLISM IN RELIGION[1]

One purpose of *The Constructive Quarterly* is to give representatives of the different religious communities of Christendom an opportunity of expressing as clearly as possible what they stand for; in part that they may learn to understand themselves and one another; in part also that those who desire to serve the cause of union may take note of the real obstacles in their path and study them carefully, so as to get upon the lines of least resistance in furthering the cause of unity, or at least be made fully aware at what points the deepest difficulties are certain to arise.

In the September number the Rev. F. J. Hall states "the Anglican position constructively." With his statement I find myself in cordial agreement. But among his "affirmations" I find the following: "The Catholic Faith is to be maintained in its purity and

[1] Reprinted from the *Constructive Quarterly*, see Preface.

integrity, as contained in the Scriptures, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils." Now of course there are those among us Anglicans who would oppose such an affirmation, but it is not with them I am concerned. I am concerned rather with the type of mind which is called Modernist; which is conscious how the practical and devotional life of the church is bound up with its Creed, and how the different "articles" of Catholic belief are connected together as links of a vital whole —which accordingly desires to retain in its integrity the Catholic tradition, but at the same time insists that it should not be pressed upon the intellect with "a crude literalism." In particular it is conscious of the intellectual opposition which exists among educated men to-day to belief in such physical miracles as are recorded in the Gospels and are affirmed in the Creed in connection with our Lord's person—"I believe in Jesus Christ, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary . . . and the third day He rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God." The Modernist does not ask for an alteration in the phraseology of these clauses. He acqui-

esces in the plain statements of fact being taught as the church's message, but he would plead that in the sphere of the scientific or critical intellect they should not be pressed in their literal meaning. They are, in his view, symbolic statements: that is, statements which have certain spiritual values. They represent the spiritual truth that a divine providence and purpose accompanied the human birth of our Lord and that a divine assurance was given of His survival of death and His spiritual pre-eminence; but they are not to be insisted upon as literal statements of historical fact. Doubtless the mass of men will so take them. But the critical intellect finds in such statements literally understood an insuperable difficulty, and it is enough that they should be accepted as symbolical statements true in respect of their spiritual values.

This Modernist attitude of mind towards the physical miracles is sufficiently widespread to make it very well worth while to examine it especially in *The Constructive Quarterly*, because no such statement as Mr. Hall's "affirmation" just quoted can pass to-day without the consciousness that the Modernist interpretation will be put upon it fairly widely

in intellectualist circles, and Christians of all religious communions must be deeply interested to know how far the Modernist interpretation can be taken as an accepted interpretation of the narrative in the Gospels and the clauses in the Creed.

The question of miracles can be considered from various points of view: from the point of view of philosophy or science, or from the point of view of evidence. But I am proposing to consider it from another point of view—I am proposing to confine myself to this question of symbolism. I propose to ask, not whether the principle of symbolism has any application to religion—for I agree that it has—but whether the particular application of it here suggested is legitimate or tolerable.

I begin then with the general question, and I agree that symbolism must be admitted to apply to the language of religion in general and of the Christian religion in particular—meaning by symbolism the use of material images, images couched in the language of human experience, which are not to be understood literally by the trained intelligence, but only as the best available expression of transcendent spiritual realities. The great classical example of these symbolic statements in non-

Christian thought is to be found in Plato's beautiful "myths"—stories which are to be taught as simple narratives, but which any one endowed with some measure of intellectual discernment will see to be valuable only because they are the vehicles of certain ideas. This method was admitted to have its place in the interpretation of the Jewish Bible by Alexandrian Jews like Philo and by many Christian theologians besides Origen. Even a Spinoza could see in such a method a bridge between what he thought to be intellectually true and what he saw to be morally edifying and spiritually necessary for the mass of men. Men like Renan and Matthew Arnold, who wanted to retain and make the best use of a religion which in the strict sense they did not believe to be true, have popularized it in modern literary circles. It has become the accepted device of the reconcilists who find themselves unable to believe in the actual occurrence of the physical miracles but want to retain the religious tradition.

The principle of symbolism, I say, must be admitted to have legitimate application to some of the statements or doctrines of the Bible and the Christian religion. S. Paul certainly admits this when he says of our present Christian

"knowledge" that it is a seeing "through a glass darkly"—that is, a blurred reflection of reality "in a mirror," or truth conveyed "in a riddle." This must be so, for, to begin with, human language is inadequate to thought. As Victor Hugo says in *L'Homme qui Rit*: "Il est presque impossible d'exprimer dans leur limites exactes les évolutions abstruses qui se font dans le cerveau. L'inconvénient des mots, c'est d'avoir plus de contour que les idées. Toutes les idées se mêlent par les bords ; les mots, non. Un certain côté diffus de l'âme leur échappe toujours. L'expression a des frontières, la pensée n'en a pas." I think that this is an illuminating account of the way in which our best thought about the highest and deepest subjects deteriorates in the attempt to express it with precision. This is why not merely a deep feeling but a great idea seems sometimes so much more convincingly conveyed even to ordinary people in music than in words. And in regard to things eternal it is not only human language but human thought which is at fault. Certainly in this region our "science" is but seeing "through a glass darkly." Let us then try to grapple with the question at closer quarters and more in detail ; and let us begin by analysing the

certainly legitimate applications to our religious language of the principle of symbolism.

1. The theologians have always applied the principle of symbolism to the words and phrases used by the church in speaking about God, not only to the earlier and cruder anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament, in which God is spoken of as "walking" and "coming down to see" and riding upon clouds, but also to the expression of His attributes of mercy and justice, compassion and wrath, which are and must be, for human purposes, spoken of as distinct from one another and overriding one another, while in reality they cannot be so, to the idea of His "foreknowledge," His "descent from heaven" in the Incarnation, and to the mystery of His triune being. On all these and the like subjects the theologians have always been at pains to emphasize that our human language and our theological definitions are utterly inadequate to the divine realities, and that this is the chief sphere to which S. Paul's words have their application—that our present "knowledge" of God is "in part," that we are but seeing "through a glass darkly," and that when we see "face to face" in another state of being, our present knowledge will be "done away."

But in admitting the principle thus fully, we must guard it against misconception. We can feel and hold a quite definite idea of God practically, even if we cannot define it or express it with exactness. The Christian idea of God, the Creator and the Father, the idea of His attributes of justice and love, the idea that God is Himself love, and that Christ's character is God's character, the character of the only Creator and sustainer of the world, the idea of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as three Persons in one Godhead, are quite *real* ideas of God, which we Christians believe to have been through prophets and the Son divinely revealed to us, though in part even the ideas themselves as we conceive them (and much more the expressions of them in words) are inadequate, and only symbolically true. However inadequate the ideas are, they are the truest ideas we can have in our present state of being, and the phrases which are best to express them are the phrases which secure the ideas. Thus it is quite inadmissible to use the symbolic principle in order to evacuate or weaken the ideas. There have been other ideas of God current—for instance the philosophic idea of the immanent Reason and Energy. This idea of God Christianity can

assimilate, but the Christian idea of the Creator or Father is far greater than it, and distinct from it. And while we are admitting that the Christian ideas or phrases are inadequate, we must insist that they are distinct and vivid ideas which tend to produce a special type of character in those who hold them and worship in accordance with them; that the truth of Christianity means the truth (within the limits of human capacity) of these revealed ideas and not of any other ideas; and that the phrases best express the truths which most securely guard and most vividly express these ideas.

2. The same principle of symbolic language must be applied to all that lies outside our present human experience. The Bible begins with an account of creation and ends with an anticipation of the end of the world—things which lie outside our possibilities of present experience. Thus it begins and ends in pictures and symbolical narratives. I do not see that any Christian either can reasonably deny this or has any interest in doing so. As regards the beginning of the world, the object of divine revelation is certainly not to satisfy human curiosity on matters which lie outside the possibilities of human observa-

tion ; but to give, in terms intelligible to men at every stage of civilization, and to men of all kinds of education, such ideas of the origin of the world, of human nature, of human sin and divine providence, as suffice for practical guidance. Thus the Bible begins with what S. Gregory of Nyssa calls "ideas in the form of a story," symbolic narratives which are not to be taken for literal history. So the Bible begins and so it ends. It anticipates the "end of the world": that is, it provides for men the sort of outlook on the ultimate future which is morally necessary for them, both to encourage them to feel that it is worth while doing their best without regard to the shortness of life and the seeming futility of human efforts after the highest ends, and also to prepare them for desperate struggle with the forces of evil within and without. But it is no purpose of God's Spirit to write history for us beforehand. (We must on the whole discard Butler's rather unfortunate definition of prophecy.) Thus the Biblical descriptions of "the day of the Lord" both in the Old Testament and in the New are highly figurative. They project into the end of the vista of history a scene which in most graphic and arresting forms symbolizes what

lies and must at present lie outside of our capacity to realize in literal form. Here again, then, in the region of what lies outside possible human experience in the past and the future we are dependent for practical spiritual knowledge on symbols. We see through a glass darkly.

But here, again, while we recognize the symbolic character of the phrases in which we are taught about the creation and end of the world, we must be careful not to suffer ourselves by this recognition to lose hold of the special idea which they enshrine and to substitute another. The New Testament language about the end of the world gives us a picture of a universal catastrophe, of a judgement coming on the whole world in its alienation from God or forgetfulness of God, a judgement like that which came in turn on the "giant forms of empire" of old, it tells us of the awful figure of the Christ coming in the clouds of heaven as the judge of the world, of the gathering of all mankind before His throne, of the final overthrow of all the enemies of God, and their condign and terrible punishment, of a reconstitution of the whole material world to serve henceforth only the purpose of divine righteousness—

a new heaven and a new earth "wherein dwelleth righteousness"—and of the fulfilment of the divine destiny for man in the New Jerusalem. It is quite one thing to recognize that all this is symbolic language and is not to be taken literally. It is quite another thing to evacuate the pictures of their moral and practical meanings and substitute a really fundamentally different idea. For instance, the idea of a development of the world which shall proceed on the whole from better to better, till it finally issues in the perfection of man, and which leaves out the whole element of catastrophe, and of final judgement on a rebellious world and on individual rebel spirits, and the purging of creation and its reconstitution—such an idea of gradual development towards universal perfection is a different idea from the Biblical idea and will produce quite different moral effects upon the mind. We must recognize that the Biblical language is symbolic, but we must recognize, if we would be Christian believers, that what the symbolism teaches is true. Or again, with regard to the Bible language about angels and devils, it is one thing to recognize that the language about the devil "going about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may

devour," or about the "unclean spirit going through dry places seeking rest and finding none," and then returning to the empty chamber of the human heart, or about the angels of little children beholding the face of God in heaven is symbolical language, but it is quite another thing to dismiss from our minds the whole idea of good and bad spirits and their relation to us and influence on us. Language may be symbolic and also true. And it undoubtedly makes a great practical difference whether we believe in spirits good or evil other than human spirits, and in their actual relations to us.

Again, as in the case of our phraseology about God, so in the case of the language of the Bible about the creation and the end of the world, it should be noticed that to recognize its symbolical character is no merely modern device. Certainly in the first Christian centuries the symbolical view of the early chapters of Genesis was dominant and not only within the range of Alexandrian influence. It is recorded by a late writer that the somewhat literally-minded Irenaeus also argued that the narrative of Eden and the fall must be regarded not "historically" or "literally" but "spiritually" if we are to

give its language any satisfactory interpretation.[1] How far this interpretation of what is narrated as a fact is to carry us will be matter for further consideration. But the principle was in fact thoroughly familiar in the period when Christianity came out into the world both in Jewish and heathen literature and was generally applied to the opening narratives of Scripture. Then, as regards the end of the world, the freedom with which the Apocalyptic writers, including the seer of the New Testament apocalypse, rehandled the traditional scenery of "the day of the Lord" shows that they were thoroughly familiar with its symbolical character.

3. Again, the same principle applies to the revelation of what is "above" and "below" our present sphere of experience—to heaven and hell. It is easy to see that if this world is not all—if God is above and beyond—we must have both an idea and a word for this extra-mundane sphere of the divine presence. We must say and feel that "God is in heaven." But also Christians from the first held as a most certain conviction, on which all was staked, that the life of a man did not end with the grave, that the spirits of the dead were

[1] See Stieren's *Irenaeus*, fragm. 14.

alive in the beyond, and in some sense were now receiving and in a further sense would receive, at the time of the end, the due rewards of their deeds. I say "In one sense were now receiving and in another sense would receive at the end"; for at present they must be thought of as bare spirits, waiting for the time of the resurrection, when they shall receive their spiritual bodies by the resurrection from the dead. So far as they have taken in the meaning of S. Paul and later of Origen, Christians have recognized that the resurrection body would not be built up again of the materials of corruption: but in any case they believed in future life—in a sphere of waiting, an intermediate state of disembodied spirits, in the resurrection of the dead, and in heaven and hell: and later, without warrant of Scripture yet under the pressure of what seems a strong demand of the practical reason, they added to the necessary scenery of the world beyond the idea of purgatory. With this exception, Scripture had already presented not only convictions and ideas but terms and phrases which provided for the imagination a sort of vague spiritual scenery of the other world. In part these terms had a very old history

and were derived from days of very crude imagination, as that God sat just above the clouds—in this sense in heaven, or at a higher place more remote, the seventh heaven: and that the ghosts of the dead were in a hollow place under the earth.

As I have said, it was very easy for early Christian thinkers to recognize the symbolical character of these local and special ideas, for such symbolism was everywhere in the air. I do not feel the least doubt that S. Paul and the author of the fourth gospel did not think they could get to God's house by going up high enough, as in a balloon, or that they would find hell if they could dig deep enough. In fact the way in which S. Paul speaks of us as already in "the heavenly places" (or "the heavenlies") shows that his idea of heaven was more than local. We need have no scruple at all then in recognizing the large element of symbolism in all that affects the life beyond our present sphere of possible experience, though here again it must be emphasized that the ideas in part symbolized in the phrases "paradise," "heaven," "hell," and in the concrete images of the resurrection of the dead from their tombs, are distinct ideas which are of the essence of the Christian religion; and

that the phrases which express them presumably take us nearer the realities than any other phrases we can devise; or if we think we can invent for any particular idea a better phrase than the traditional one, we must take the greatest care that the phrase protects and expresses the distinctive idea, and is not really in the long run calculated to substitute another and a different idea, that is to say, to alter the character of the religion.

4. Once more, we must recognize in the region of the sacraments a proper application of the symbolical principle. The sacraments are acted symbols: but symbols in the sense that the outward act or visible thing really *is* or involves its spiritual counterpart.[1] The object of the symbolic act is to present to the senses some spiritual transaction which is really effected in correspondence with the outward rite. But the symbolic act being so given, it supplies and is intended to supply the language in which we must talk about the spiritual reality. Thus we talk about "washing away our sins" and "eating" and "drinking" the flesh and blood of Christ

[1] See Harnack *Lehrbuch der dogmeng.* I, p. 360 (Eng. trans. II, p. 144—in this case not quite accurate) on the early idea of symbolism.

because the reality of spiritual cleansing or spiritual assimilation lies concealed behind the physical action of washing with water or eating in common. In this sense the principle of symbolism must be applied and has been universally applied to sacramental language.

Now I think I may claim that in all these four regions of Christian conception and language—that is to say the being of God, the beginning and end of the world, heaven and hell, and the sacraments—the application of the principle of symbolism was generally recognized by the Christian Fathers and would be generally recognized to-day. Its assertion may shock a believer who has not thought much about the matter, at first hearing, but further reflection will convince him that the principle is sound.

And the principle thus recognized, affects, and always has affected, the sense in which Christians say certain articles of the Creed, especially "He came down from heaven," "He descended into hell," "He ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God." About the spiritual metaphor of the first phrase we need say nothing more: but what do we mean, what has the church always meant, when it has said that our Lord

"descended into hades"? We need not concern ourselves with the question when the clause got into the Creed, for I think there is overwhelming evidence going back to the first epistle of S. Peter—to a passage obscure in a certain sense but, so far as we are now concerned with it, quite distinct in meaning—that the Christians believed that when Christ died and His body was buried, a really dead man's body in the sepulchre, He, the man Christ Jesus considered as a human spirit, was no more dead than Abraham or Moses. In His spirit He went where human spirits go, and was indeed active amongst them. I do not think it can be fairly pleaded that the phrase "He descended into hades" did mean or was intended to mean anything more than this. It is symbolic because it uses the language of physical descent which is derived ultimately from the idea that the ghosts of the dead are under the earth in a pit. But, as I have said, the symbolic interpretation of such language is older than Christianity. It was an accepted principle among the Fathers of the early period. I have no doubt that there was then, as in the Middle Ages, a great deal of misplaced literalism, but no one today need hesitate to recognize symbolism in

the language which confesses Christ to have "descended into hades."

Now we come to the clause "He ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand." So far as the first part of this clause is concerned it must be understood to refer to an historical incident, viz., that the body of Jesus Christ, forty days after His resurrection, rose before His disciples eyes upwards from the earth and vanished. This fact, which we accept as a fact, if we believe that S. Luke grounded his narrative on good testimony, is quite of a piece with other recorded appearances, and must be interpreted to be, like other appearances after the resurrection, in a special sense a symbolic action. By this I mean that our Lord was not raised to the old conditions of His mortal life. The risen body is represented in the Gospel narratives probably as passing out of the grave clothes, leaving them intact, and out of the sepulchre, before the stone was rolled away to show that He was gone—certainly as becoming suddenly present within closed rooms, as appearing in different forms to different people, as no longer living here or there, or passing by walking from Jerusalem to Galilee or Galilee to Jerusalem. He is represented indeed as walking as a

pilgrim to Emmaus—even as eating with His disciples, as showing them His wounds; but we gather that all His appearances were of the nature of manifestations made out of a higher state, and simply expressive of a spiritual purpose. This I say is the impression made by the narrative when carefully examined. Its data correspond to the idea which S. Paul conveys effectively but vaguely by speaking of a spiritual body. We are led to think of a state in which matter has become simply the instrument of spiritual purpose. Thus it seems to me that when Christ "ascended into the heavens" physically and actually, He was expressing in visible form a certain spiritual idea, namely, His exaltation to the Father's throne.

We of to-day know that heaven is not really a locality above our heads, more clearly no doubt than the first disciples who were witnesses of the event knew it; but still for us and always, the idea of moral glory or moral failure must be expressed in local phrases, by the words "up" or "down," "higher" or "lower." I do not see what other action could, even for us to-day, express, as the "ascension" expressed it, the majestic truth. In the act and in the phrase expressing it we

acknowledge the element of symbolism which is involved whenever we talk of heaven as "above." When we speak of Christ "sitting in the heavenly places" or "at the right hand of God" we are carrying the metaphor further. But here at least Christians have always known that they were using metaphors, and have said so very explicitly, especially about the phrase "sitting at God's right hand."

My point is, then, that in many spheres of Christian language and in certain articles of the Creed, the symbolical principle must be admitted: the language is true symbolically and not literally. And the reason for this admission is in each case the same, because the language applies to what lies outside our possible or actual human experience; it concerns the transcendent God, or regions of existence which lie in "the beyond"; and inasmuch as human language is the counterpart of human experience, and we have no other language to use, and inasmuch as even human thought or conception is limited and confined by present experience—inasmuch as we have no celestial language—we can only speak of what lies in the beyond by symbols, which we must recognize as symbols, even while we also recognize that they are the

best instruments we have for holding and speaking of realities.

5. But—and here I come to what I have specially in view in this essay—we are now urged by our Modernist friends to extend the application of this principle so as to recognize that the phrases in our Creed "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary" and "He rose again the third day from the dead" are symbolical phrases. It is conceded that the phrases were originally intended to represent literal events which actually happened, but now that we have ceased to find such physical miracles credible any longer, we can, it is contended, still use the phrases with sincerity of feeling as expressing *symbolically* realities which for us have an equivalent spiritual value. Thus "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary" would be a symbol of the truth that a special divine providence and purpose attended the birth of Christ: and "He rose again the third day from the dead" would be a symbol of the truth that, though the body of Christ did in fact see corruption in the ordinary course of nature, yet He did really survive death and make His survival known. But such a proposed extension of

the principle of symbolism really violates the principle. We must use symbolic language in the region which lies outside physical experience. But the distinguishing principle of the religion of the Incarnation is that God has also manifested Himself in the body and in physical events, and such events beyond all question we can describe in human language literally. That is exactly the purpose of human language—to describe with sufficient exactness what happens in human experience.

Thus though we do not know wholly how a natural birth of a child occurs, we can describe it in sufficiently accurate language. And though we do not wholly know how the birth of a child from a virgin mother would take place, we can describe the event with the same definiteness. So of a physical resurrection and the subsequent manifestations.

It cannot with any show of reason be denied that the point of Christianity was that these things and the like miracles had actually happened: and that provision had been most carefully made that they should be proclaimed by competent witnesses. The insistence upon actual occurrence and competent witness in the New Testament is unmistakable.

The whole pretension of Christianity centres

upon the real occurrence of an event, the resurrection, and in a secondary sense upon a whole series of events, the special value of which lies in their extraordinary character, their being unaccountable except as direct acts of God calling attention to His moral purpose in the redemption of the world. Of course you may say of such supposed events either that they are, or that they are not, supported by adequate evidence; you may say that they manifest the glory of God, or that they degrade our idea of Him; you may say that they enlarge our conception of nature or that they only confuse it and throw it into disorder. What you cannot say with any show of reason is that their occurrence makes no difference to our conception of God or of nature: or that Christianity would have taken its place, all the same, whether they were believed to occur or not: or that it makes no difference to the validity of Christianity whether the belief was justified or no: or that the precise assertion of their occurrence can symbolize a course of events in which they did not occur. To introduce the idea of symbolism in this manner is to obliterate the difference between happening and not happening, and is to throw all language and thought

into confusion. Symbolism is a necessary principle so far as we are dealing with beings or states or events which lie outside the region of possible human experience in this world, for inasmuch as human language is the transcript of human experience under present conditions we have no adequate language to use about such events or states or beings. We have no "other-worldly" language: we must use the best terrestrial words we can, recognizing their symbolic character. But for events in the terrestrial sphere we have a language and are bound so to use it so as to describe faithfully what occurred. And false language is not symbolic. We could express quite well in human language how Christ was born and died and came to be believed to have conquered death, whichever way these things actually happened. Or we can say that they were at the time believed to have happened one way, but did in fact happen another. But we cannot obliterate the difference or the importance of the difference. No description of an event which professes to be historical can be symbolic of a different kind of occurrence. The word symbolic is out of place in such a connection, and nothing can be more certain than that S. Paul

knew the difference between the function of human language to express the historical events "that Christ died and was buried, and that He rose again the third day" and the function of human language in speaking of the being of God "dwelling in the light unapproachable" or the "mystery" of the spiritual body or the "seventh heaven."

I do not profess to have contributed anything in this argument to the discussion of the question whether the grounds of belief in the miraculous events affirmed in the Creed are adequate or no. But I do profess to have made it evident that the Modernist claim to repeat the affirmations and to interpret them in a "symbolical" sense, because such symbolical sense attaches to other clauses of the Creed, is a claim which completely fails to justify itself. Symbolism is in place where we are dealing with what we cannot express in terms of human experience; it is quite out of place where the affirmation concerns what passed within the limits of present human experience, and to confuse this issue is to confuse the issues between happening or not happening and between truth or falsehood.

PS.—Since this essay was written I have

been asked the question whether I do not admit that there is such a thing as symbolical history, as (to take an extreme instance) when in legends of the saints of the least valuable sort miracles are inserted, without any regard to evidence, just like the halo in art round the saint's head, simply as meaning that such and such a man or woman was a saint and must therefore be presumed to have worked the appropriate miracles; and I am further asked whether I do not admit that this sort of symbolical history is found to a greater or less extent in the Bible. To this question I should answer that I have read the Père Delehaye on *Les légendes hagiographiques*, and I admit the existence of the sort of "history" described, and, in a measure, its existence in the Bible, though I should prefer the term "legend" to describe it rather than "symbolical history." But there is also such a thing as history properly so called, that is a record, not infallible in all details but sufficiently accurate, of events as they actually occurred, and the value of such history depends on its being a true record, and the Gospel narratives unmistakably claim to be history of this kind, of which the value depends upon its truth to fact.

Printed by A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd.
London and Oxford

261.873 91800
G660

Gore, Charles

261.873 91800
G660
Gore, Charles
The war and the church ...