

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

SECRETARY: E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

VOL. XLVIII.



LONDON:

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

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1916.

582ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON TUESDAY, JULY 11TH, 1916,
AT 4.30 P.M.

THE VERY REV. HENRY WACE, D.D., DEAN OF CANTERBURY,
VICE-PRESIDENT, TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read and confirmed.

Also the Minutes of the Meeting held on May 24th, 1916, in Commemoration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the First Ordinary General Meeting of the Victoria Institute, which had been held on May 24th, 1866 ; exactly one year after the publication of the circular suggesting the founding of such a Society.

The SECRETARY announced the election of Sir Henry H. Howorth, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., F.R.S., as a Vice-President of the Victoria Institute, and of Mr. C. E. Miller as an Associate.

The SECRETARY also announced that a Committee of three judges had been appointed to consider the essays sent in for the Gunning Competition, and that they had unanimously selected as the best in scholarship and research the one bearing a motto which afterwards proved to have been that adopted by the Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, M.A., D.D. The Council had therefore awarded to Dr. Tisdall the prize of £40.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was glad to see that the winner of the Gunning Prize was a man of such ripe scholarship as Dr. Tisdall. It was an honour to the Victoria Institute that a man of such learning should have taken part in the competition established under the bequest of the late Dr. Gunning. He had great pleasure in handing the sum of £40 to the Secretary for transmission to Dr. Tisdall with their congratulations.

The CHAIRMAN said they were honoured by the presence with them that afternoon of the Right Rev. Bishop Welldon, Dean of Manchester, who had kindly promised to address them on "The Influence of the War on Religious Life in Great Britain."

ANNUAL ADDRESS.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE WAR ON RELIGIOUS LIFE IN GREAT BRITAIN. By the Right Rev. Bishop J. E. C. WELLDON, D.D., Dean of Manchester.

THE Christian view of human history is not the same as the secular view. It does not accept or expect, as an historical law, the continuous evolution of humanity from a lower to a

higher plane of sentiment and conduct. On the contrary, it looks for certain great periodic convulsions which involve, according to the Scriptural language, "the removing of those things that are shaken . . . that those things which cannot be shaken may remain." There must, in fact, as Christians hold, be from time to time a dissolution, and then a reconstruction, of society. Thus human history is Scripturally divisible into æons or eras or periods, each of them beginning and each ending with some striking and dominating event. Such events in Jewish history were the Exodus from Egypt, the Captivity, the siege and fall of Jerusalem under Titus. Such, too, in Christian history were the destruction of the Roman Empire, the Reformation, the French Revolution. Such, it may be, is the world-wide warfare of the present day. Nor is there any one of these historical events which has not profoundly modified the character and influence of religion in the world. For every catastrophic occurrence in human history is properly regarded as a Day of God.

The Christian differs, then, from the secular historian, as he differs from the scientific explorer, not in rejecting or disputing any fact which falls within the range of observation or induction, but because among or beyond these facts he is always looking for the hand of God. He believes in God not only as the Creator, but as the Sustainer and Director, of the Universe. He waits humbly upon the authority of Divine Providence. It seems to him that mankind is half unconsciously working out the solution of problems, which are ultimately decided by the will of Heaven. In his eyes God controls the main issues of history: man can do no more than by filling in the details. The essential severance between the white and the coloured races, or between Oriental and Occidental countries; the ordered progress of civilization from the East to the West; the gradual submission of monarchical and aristocratical governments to democracy—these are facts harmonious with the Will of God, but ultimately independent of human theory or policy. Nor does it lie within the power of human intellect or effort to determine when or how the war now raging over the world shall be brought to a conclusion. Man knows, and can know, only that the war will end; God alone knows what the end will be. Yet it is indisputable that the war, alike in its process and in its issue, must vitally and permanently affect religion.

It is worth while, then, to consider what are and will be, as results of the war, the disturbing influences upon the faith of Christendom.

To many Christians Christianity itself is an accident of time and place. They are Christians because they were born in a Christian country ; because they were educated in Christian homes and schools ; because they have never been compelled to make a choice between the Christian and other religions, or even between one Christian Church and other Christian Churches. Sometimes it is argued that people find themselves, by their birth or education, members of a particular Church, and that, where God has set them, they are justified in remaining, if they are not indeed bound there to remain. Belief is comparatively easy, so long as it is not confronted by other beliefs or by negations. But it tends to become more difficult as soon as it is known to be contradicted. A person who spends his life in a rural village may spend it more happily and peacefully than in a great city. For every man is strengthened in his belief, whether political or religious, so long as he lives among people who agree with him. He is, or is apt to be, weakened in such measure as he is brought into contact with disagreement. Accordingly, experience may, and often does, make him more tolerant and more charitable, but it does not make him more firmly convinced of his own opinions.

It is probable, then, that one reason of the laxity or flexibility in religion during the last half century has lain in the familiarity of men and women with such ways of thought, of habit and of worship as were unknown to any earlier generation. The means of locomotion and of information, as they have brought the nations of the world more closely together, have, in some degree, impaired the force of national character and of individual faith. Travellers, who have known the life of Mohammedan and pagan nations, have realized the possibility of a civilization widely different from the Christian ; and this civilization may have seemed to them, at least in some aspects—as in temperance among orthodox Mohammedans—to be superior to Christian civilization. But foreign travel upon a large scale has, until recently, been the exclusive privilege of the rich, and consequently of the few. Never, I think, in English history, until the outbreak of the present war, except perhaps in the case of the British Army in India, have a large number of citizens been transplanted from their homes in Great Britain to countries where every, or nearly every, usage must have given an abrupt shock to their own prejudices and prepossessions. Private soldiers who have served, not only in India, but in Egypt, in the Dardanelles, and in Africa, cannot have failed to be deeply impressed by their contact with the

alien peoples, who were sometimes their friends, sometimes their enemies, but always and everywhere representatives of a civilization alien from their own, or of sheer idolatry and barbarism. When these soldiers come home at the end of the war, they will come with the knowledge that Christianity is not, and, still more, that their own form of Christianity is not, the one religion in the world; that it cannot be taken for granted as the absolute, unique revelation of God; but that it must prove its claim to the allegiance of mankind by the intrinsic superiority of the doctrines which it inculcates, and of the virtues which it creates and fosters in its votaries. In a word, the truth of Christianity has at all times been challenged; but it has never, perhaps, been so widely or so gravely challenged as it will be in many minds, owing to the experiences, voluntarily or involuntarily, gained in the present war.

But apart from the effect of contact with foreign life, both secular and spiritual, the men who come back after the war will have passed through deep, crucial times. They will have been emancipated from the bonds of routine at home; they will have spent weeks and months, even years, in the open air; they will have undergone privation and suffering; they will have realized how social inequalities vanish in the trenches and on the battlefield; for it may not seldom have happened that the employer, as a private soldier, has obeyed the orders of a man who, until the war broke out, was serving him in his works and drawing weekly wages from him. These men will have been face to face with death; they will have seen their comrades wounded, crippled, slaughtered on every side; they will have asked themselves, with an intensity unknown before, What is the meaning or value of life? Is death the end of life, and, if not, what lies beyond the river, dark and narrow, which is called death?

It is certain that the men, who have so lived and so fought, will never contentedly acquiesce in the old conditions of life. For good or for evil, they will have broken with the limitations of shop or office or factory. It is probable that many of them, when the war is over, will seek the large, free area of the colonies. They will hope and claim to do more, and to be more, than they were of old; to pursue more various careers, and to enjoy more generous opportunities. Nor is there any sphere in which the bracing influence of the war will tell more vividly than in religion. Not a few men, it may be, will have gained a new sense of religion at the Front. It may be an all-

mastering and all-compensating sense. How pathetically significant was the saying of the wounded soldier, who had lost a leg and an eye in the war, that he had gained more than he had lost; for he had found God! Men such as he will have penetrated to the heart of religion. Henceforth they will disdain and despise the trivialities which have so largely occupied the minds of clergymen and Churchmen, in ritual and even in doctrine. If the Church is still concerned, when they come home, with questions of vesture and posture, they will, not improbably, turn their backs upon her. Even the differences which part one Christian Church from another, they will have come to regard as insignificant. It is the relation of the individual soul to God through Christ, which, as they will feel, alone matters in religion. They will look for a Church more practical, more serviceable, more beneficent to human bodies as well as souls—a Church at once more divine and more human. The wonderful success of the Young Men's Christian Association in all parts of the world, where men of British birth and blood have fought, is a witness to the correspondence between the spirit of man, when it is deeply moved, and the clear, simple, practical, dogmatic presentation of the Christian faith. It has been sometimes thought that the Church of Rome would gain an influence over Protestants, and even over Anglicans, who, in countries such as France, have been brought under the shadow of her organization. But the revelation of the Churches of the East will, I think, more powerfully affect the future of Christendom than familiarity with the Church of Rome. Still, the war has tended to mitigate, if not, in some cases, to obliterate, the distinction between Christian Churches; it has afforded occasions for sympathy and courtesy, even between the Church of Rome and other Churches; and, when it is over, there will be a general demand for a Christianity more catholic than Roman Catholic, such as accords with the spirit of Christ's own words, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

But it is impossible that the war should not awaken reflections, painfully distressing and confusing, in many Christian hearts. What is to be said, for instance, of the contrast between Germany and France? Germany has posed as a great Protestant power in the world. France has, officially, cast off, not only the Church of Rome, but the Church of Christ Himself. The Kaiser has in the past been held to be the champion of reformed Christianity: he has been a man of exemplary personal and domestic virtues; he has spoken out boldly and

strongly for the faith of Jesus Christ. His addresses to his sons at their Confirmations were, I think, models of a father's Christian piety. He has been himself on his yacht the preacher of Christian sermons. Yet it is he who has debauched and debased the German people, or allowed them to be debauched and debased under his auspices, by the lust of bloodshed and conquest, until they have broken all the laws of God and man, to say nothing of their own recent and solemn pledges, and until there is no crime of which an impartial judge could say that Germany would not commit it, if it offered her the promise or the prospect of victory in the war. Republican France, on the other hand, has been, if not atheistic, yet professedly agnostic and anti-Christian. She has built, or rebuilt, her social life upon a purely secular basis. That the Church is fully as responsible as the State in France for the alienation and the antagonism between them is a lamentable truth. Too long she has fought against the principles of truth, freedom and charity. She has associated the pure faith of Jesus Christ with beliefs and teachings which the honest reason of cultivated humanity rejects. She has stood on the wrong side in the critical hours of moral decision. France will never forget that the Church left the defence of the Calas to Voltaire and the defence of Dreyfus to Zola. But the sad truth remains that, while France was ostensibly Christian under the monarchy or the Empire, she was warlike, aggressive and immoral, and that under the secular Republic she has been pacific and honourable, in the relations of public life. Whatever may be justly alleged against the condition of private morals in France, it must be surpassed by the statistics of "degenerate Germany," as they are recited in the book of Mr. de Halsalle.

Again, in regard to the ethics of warfare, Mohammedan Turkey has fought with cleaner hands than Christian Germany. Soldiers who have confronted the Turks at Gallipoli or in Mesopotamia may be tempted to forget the atrocities in Armenia.

There are many Christians who have prayed and hoped that they might see the day when the great Church of S. Sofia in Constantinople—now a mosque—would be reconsecrated to Christian worship. They have longed to see a Christian Sovereign receiving the sacrament of Christ's body and blood on the very spot where the last of the Roman Emperors received it a few hours before the Sultan Mohammed II., dismounting from his horse at the western door of the church, marched to the high altar, and, as he sat upon it, summoned the

notaries of Islam to worship there. But who would feel that Christianity was vindicated, or the world itself redeemed from the ignominy of a degenerate religion, if the Kaiser should become the master of S. Sofia ?

It is right to appreciate as sympathetically as possible the causes lying behind the militarism of Germany, or at least of Prussia. The Germans have made an idol of "Kultur," or efficiency. Their worship of "Kultur" has been a worship of the State; for it seemed to them, not perhaps without some reason, that in Great Britain the nation was enervated by the individualism which ran, as they thought, through all the veins and arteries of the national life. But the supremacy of the State depended upon force; the embodiment of force lay in the army; and so it came to pass that in German eyes the army could do no wrong, as appeared in the notorious incident of Zabern, and every individual must sacrifice his pleasure, his freedom, and his honour—nay, if need be, his life itself—to the interest and dignity of the army.

How is it possible that men in England, and especially working men, who have seen what must appear to them the complete failure of Christianity, should not after the war be gravely and greatly exercised in their minds upon the claim of Jesus Christ ?

There has of late been a happy amelioration in the attitude of the people towards the Church and towards Christianity. The spirit of Voltaire's *Écrasez l'Infâme* was never, perhaps, rife in England. But within the memory of living men and women the secularism of which the late Mr. Bradlaugh was the most prominent representative was a powerful force hostile to Christianity. In the last thirty years *The National Reformer*, which was his organ, has died. The Halls of Science, in which he was always a popular controversialist, have been shut up.

One who lives, as I live, amidst a vast operative population must gratefully acknowledge that whether working men, as they are called, are, or are not, Church-goers, they are, at least, generally not ill-disposed to a clergyman or to the Church which he serves. What will happen in the face of the present heartrending warfare ? The question is serious and anxious. May I quote a letter which I received a short time ago, on the occasion of a visit which I paid to one of the great works in the city of Manchester ? I often go to speak to the operatives in such works during their dinner-hour. The letter which I quote I did not, unfortunately, receive until I came back from the

meeting, but I hope I may reply to it when I next visit the works. It ran as follows:—

SIR,

You are announced to address the workmen of these works to-morrow. A number of us would like to know, What has Christianity done to benefit humanity? After 1,900 years of Christianity, Christian Europe is at present a veritable hell. Lord Bryce said some time ago that Christianity had not done what was expected of it to prevent strife among nations. We have seen no reply to that serious charge. Can you give any explanation to-morrow?

The letter is signed by "A workman in behalf of several workmates." It is, I think, indicative of a danger which the Church will be called to meet, not only during the war, but still more when the war is over. What will men in Christian Europe think of the Christianity which allows or fails to prevent the infinite cost of bloodshed, horror, and anguish in the present war among Christian nations? What will men think of it in heathen lands, *e.g.*, in India, where the Hindu and Mohammedan natives see Christian missionaries interned and deported as enemies of the Christian Government under which they live? No doubt there is a difference which must never be ignored between Christendom and Christ, between the Christian nations and Him Whose name they bear. If Christendom has failed, if organized Christianity has failed, He has not failed. The war rages, not because Christian nations are fulfilling His command, but because they are disobeying His command: not because of the Christian spirit, but in spite of it. The new society which will be born after the war will find no hope of security or felicity except in allegiance to Him. But is this the lesson which critical observers will draw from the present state of Christendom? and can they be honestly and forcibly blamed if they do not draw it?

It is evident, however, that, if the war, in its origin and character, may be regarded as a defeat of organized Christianity, yet, while it lasts, it will naturally incline the hearts of men to religion and to the Cross of Jesus Christ. The paradox of human nature has become in effect a truism, that men are less religious in prosperity than in adversity. The Psalmist of old could say, "Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now have I kept thy word"; and again, "It is good for me that I have been afflicted, that I may learn thy statutes." Every chaplain who has visited the trenches in France or Flanders or in Gallipoli, must have noticed the simple faith and penitence, the spontaneous impulse to religious worship, among the troops. It

is not so much during, as after the war, that the critical opportunity of the Church will occur. In the presence of pain and suffering, bereavement and death, humanity turns with instinctive reverence to the strength and solace of religion. The movement of spirituality at home may not of late have kept pace with the movement at the Front. Yet the memorial services which have been held in many churches and cathedrals have at once attested and inspired the deep religious sentiment of the people. For nineteen Christian centuries innumerable hearts have turned in suffering and desolation to the Cross, and they have turned to it with all the old yearning during the last two years. The immemorial qualities of the British character—that “right pious, right honest, and right hardy nation,” as Milton describes it—have asserted themselves once more in the crisis of the present war.

It is almost my daily fortune to converse with the working men in Lancashire. I know that many of these men are estranged from the public profession of Christianity. But deep in their hearts the Cross of Jesus Christ holds sway. In solemn hours, as after the great explosion in the colliery at Atherton, or after the death of Lord Kitchener in the stormy waters of the northern sea, I have seen them doff their caps and bow their heads in prayer; and I have felt that religion was everywhere still a real and integral part of human nature. Everywhere I have found a great reverence for the Person of Jesus Christ. It is not unnatural, then, that once, as the quarters of the hour were sounded before the signal for attack was given at Gallipoli, when the last quarter came, there was not, as I was told by an eye-witness, in a certain battalion of the Manchester Regiment, a soldier who did not offer a silent prayer, leaning upon the rifle which reminded him of his imminent peril and probable death. Letters written by soldiers in France have recorded in awestruck language the impression made upon them now and again by the spectacle of the crucifix hanging uninjured upon the wall of a house, where all else was ruin and destruction. I have quoted elsewhere, but I think I may repeat, the story of the Canadian Roman Catholic who said to me in France, “There are four crosses to be won, your honour, in this war.” “Which are they?” I said. He replied, “There is the Victoria Cross, there is the Military Cross, there is the Cross of the Legion of Honour—and,” after a pause, “there is the little wooden cross above a fellow’s grave.”

The war has done much to create a new sympathy between the Church and the Navy or Army. Alike on sea and on land

the chaplains have proved themselves the friends of the sailors and soldiers. They have lived with them from day to day; they have shared their hardships and their perils; they have been wounded at their side; sometimes, alas, they have laid down their lives with them and for them. No fewer than eight naval chaplains perished in the battle of Horn Reef. The men have borne willing testimony to the gallantry of the chaplains. The Reverend E. N. Mellish, who won the Victoria Cross the other day, represents only the highest example of the spirit which has actuated the ministers of religion through the war. It is just because the soldiers and sailors have seen how much the ministers of religion can do, that, when they come home, they will expect much of them. Amidst the horrors of the war the one redeeming feature, which has been everywhere respected, is the Red Cross. To one who has visited a Military or a Red Cross Hospital, there can be little wonder that the angels of Mons should be said, in play or in truth, to have been the nurses. If the spirit of Christ in His Church has not been strong enough to prevent the outbreak of the war, yet it is that spirit which has chiefly atoned for the sorrows and horrors accompanying the war. There has been no sight more impressive or more beautiful than a hospital ship.

The war has drawn many hearts to the Cross; nay, it will be found to have drawn many minds too, as it has revealed the full accordance of the Christian doctrines with the supreme verities of human life. The self-sacrifice of the rich and the noble is the shadow of the self-sacrifice shown by Him Who was rich yet became poor; Who was enthroned in Heaven, but chose to live, as not having where to lay His head, and to suffer and die upon earth. It is by the shedding of blood that the soldiers and sailors of the King have saved their country and their empire. So, too, it is the blood of Jesus Christ which, in Christian theology, cleanses men from all sin; "Without shedding of blood is no remission." The men who come back when the war is over will have learnt the supreme lesson of the Cross, and it is a lesson which, please God, they will never forget.

In these strangely mingled circumstances of anxiety and yet of hopefulness, the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England have conceived the idea of organizing a National Mission.

It is called The National Mission of Repentance and Hope. It is plainly designed to evoke a general sentiment of penitence for the sins, whether personal or national, of the past, and of courage in facing the moral and spiritual difficulties of the

future. Such a Mission, whatever may be its exact character, must do some good, and can do no harm. It may be confidently believed, then, to deserve and command the sympathy of the Church as a whole. No Churchman is entitled to oppose or disparage it. For of all persons none are so vain as the critics who say that they are eager to see a thing done, so long as it is not done in the only way in which it will or can be done at all.

But happy as the project of the National Mission is, it might perhaps be made happier. As it is now conceived it must be incomplete. For a Mission which takes place in England, while the war is going on, will clearly not affect the people whose lives and minds have undergone the most revolutionary experience as a consequence of the war. The citizens who have stayed at home, have, no doubt, been moved to new thoughts and new actions by the war; but they have not been moved in the same degree as the citizens who have seen active service by sea or by land. These citizens the transference from life at home to life abroad has tried in one way, and the re-transference from life abroad to life at home will try them still more keenly in another. If there were ever Christians who, upon returning to their homes, will need an intelligent and sympathetic welcome from the Church of their fathers, they are the men, who, after two or three years of campaigning under conditions wholly different from any they could have known or dreamt of before, will be called to resume, as far as possible, their old lives in the beaten and rather humdrum tracks of peace.

There may have been some ambiguity about the scope of the National Mission. But it now seems to be practically defined as a Mission of the Church to Churchmen and Churchwomen. It does not directly aim at evangelizing the mass of the people who stand outside the regular ministries of the Church. The idea lying behind it is that, if the spiritual awakening of Churchmen and Churchwomen is achieved, it will gradually make itself felt over all, or a large part of, the general secular unchristianized society which encompasses the Church.

That the more spiritual the Church becomes in the persons and lives of her members, the stronger and deeper will be her influence upon the world, is a proposition which cannot be denied. But a Mission of the Church, if it is directed primarily or exclusively to Church people, is not, perhaps, in the strict sense a Mission at all. It may pass over a country, as over a city, and, in passing, may scarcely raise a ripple on the general surface of the country's life. Churchmen and Churchwomen

will attend a number of services during the Mission, as they are already in the habit of attending such services, and all gain a certain spiritual exaltation; but it is idle, or worse than idle, to multiply religious services in churches for the sake of people who do not yet attend such services at all. Nor is it possible that the nation should be spiritually uplifted by the elevation of the existing Church-life in the same measure as by the evangelization of the masses who have hitherto lived outside the range of the Church and of Christianity itself. The Methodist Revival in the eighteenth century shows historically what a true National Mission may be, and how much it depends upon the personality of its leaders.

There is a danger, too, that the proposed National Mission may dissipate itself in mere words. The working people of the North, so far as I may claim to speak for them, are apt to be impatient and intolerant of professions. If it is true, as the Bishop of London said more than once when he was making his pilgrimage in anticipation of the National Mission, that the Labour Party never looks to the Church for guidance, the reason, if I do not misconceive it, is, in part at least, that the class, which somewhat unfairly arrogates to itself the name of Labour, looks, and perhaps looks not unjustly, for a greater accordance between principle and practice in the Church. They do not, indeed, generally find fault with the ill-paid and hardly worked parochial clergy. But they hold, rightly or wrongly, that the highly-paid and highly-placed clergy might more nearly imitate the example of their Divine Master. I do not wish altogether to justify their point of view. It takes little account of the sensitive generosity which suffers not the left hand to know what the right hand does. But when the nation is called to Repentance, when it is summoned to a National Mission, they ask, Are the authors of the Mission satisfied with Quiet Days, Retreats and Conferences, or even with public prayer and worship? Have they made, or are they prepared and resolved to make, a considerable surrender of their incomes and comforts for the sake of inspiring the nation as a whole with a sense of reality in the Mission? The King has set an example of self-sacrifice not only in abstinence from alcoholic drinks, but in a large contribution of money to the public good. Would it not be well that the Bishops and the other well-paid clergy should inaugurate the National Mission by some collective action after the King's example?

The Gospel of self-sacrifice without inconvenience, or of words without works, does not commend itself to the English

people. Rather they think that the preaching of self-sacrifice, so far from being necessarily a motive to self-sacrificing action, may sometimes be treated as a substitute for it. The aristocracy has rehabilitated itself in the eyes of the people by the spirit in which so many of its members have laid down their lives for the country and the empire. The demagogues who were wont to declaim against the House of Lords, and against all special privilege or dignity, have been practically reduced to silence by the spectacle of nearly a hundred heirs to titles, and many hundreds of youths before whom lay wealth, pleasure and luxury in the world, throwing their lives away with a reckless magnanimity in the crisis of the national history. These young heroes have not preached self-sacrifice, but they have practised it. It is gravely asked whether the leaders of the Church, when they call the nation to self-sacrifice, are themselves prepared, so far as they are able, to practise it.

The Church of England has, indeed, produced an admirable type of character among her clergy. They have upon the whole been, in the past, men wise, upright, moderate, sympathetic and devout. Their homes have been the nurseries of many gifts and graces which have distinguished the highest and noblest Englishmen and Englishwomen. But among the clergy the element of romance has not always been visible. They have been, or have been thought to be, too much like good average Christian laymen. The Church of Rome, by her demand of clerical celibacy, has imposed upon all her clergy a definite, unmistakable self-restraint. The Nonconformist, or Free, Churches, without making the same official demand, have come to expect that their ministers will be teetotallers. I am far from saying that it is wise to impose the law of celibacy upon a great body of men at an early period in their lives, or that it is always wrong to drink a glass of wine or beer. But the principle that the clerical life should be, in some respects, different from the secular, and lifted above the secular, is essentially sound; and it has, perhaps, been less widely recognized in the Church of England than it ought to be. The National Mission affords the opportunity, as it enforces the responsibility, of justifying the teaching which is given from the pulpits by the example of the clergy who give it. If the Mission fails, it will fail because the English-speaking world is in some degree sensible of a contrast between the language and the conduct which precede or accompany the Mission.

It may be not unfairly argued that the chief religious need of the present day is sympathy between the Church and the

people. There is strong reason, then, why the Mission should be conducted in such a manner as will extend the range of that sympathy. No doubt two different conceptions of a Church, and of the function pertaining to a Church, in the twentieth Christian century are possible. The Church may be a narrow body of men and women holding the same ecclesiastical views and practising the same religious observances, but scarcely at all affecting the general course or tenour of the national life. Such a Church is the Church of Rome in most so-called Roman Catholic countries, except where the ignorance of the people, as in Spain, stays, for the present, the danger of a widely spread revolt against the authority of the Church. But in the public national life of these countries the Church counts for little or nothing. The Church goes one way, the State goes another; and except in the rare hours of deep popular emotion they seldom meet, or they meet only as enemies. It has been the good fortune of the Church of England that she has never lost her touch with the national life. To-day, in spite of the undeniable movement towards secularism in some departments of the national life, she is still the greatest moral and spiritual power in the nation. One of the consequences, whether it be good or bad, issuing from the sacerdotal or ritualistic movement in the Church of England, has been a loss of sympathy between the Church or the clergy and a considerable number of the laity. It has happened to me at different times, to be associated in intimate relation with a body of laymen who were working together for a high educational end. They were men of strong religious principle, but they were not theologians or ecclesiastical historians: questions of vesture or posture, of ritual and ceremonial, left them, largely, if not wholly, unaffected; and in listening to the disputations of the clergy, they seemed to feel as though they were Englishmen living in a foreign country, where it was difficult, if not impossible, to understand a word of the language spoken by the natives. Such men were not then, and are not now, opposed to the Church. They are regular worshippers; they are often regular communicants; but they are bewildered at the matters which interest, or appear to interest, the clergy, and from public activity in the work of the Church they are more and more disposed to hold aloof. If the chief, or one of the chief, objects of the National Mission is, as has been suggested, to set up the duty of attendance at Holy Communion as the central obligation of every Sunday upon all Churchmen and Churchwomen, there can be little doubt that the Church, after the

Mission, will be still more ecclesiastical, and less national, than she is now. That this alienation of the Church from the people may be spiritually a gain as well as a loss, I do not deny; but beyond all questions it will be the fact.

For myself, I cannot refuse or forgo the conception of the Church as a leaven permeating the whole national and, in the end, the whole international, life of Christendom. The general sentiment of Christendom has, I think, risen, and will rise still more highly after the war, against the teaching of Treitschke and Bernhardi, that Christianity possesses no rightful place in the history of the nations. Christians, far from agreeing with these German writers, will see more clearly, and feel more acutely, that the only hope of the nations lies in obedience to the Will of Jesus Christ. But if the Church is entitled or qualified to control the international relations of mankind, she must first vitally Christianize the spirit and the conscience of the several nations themselves.

It seems, then, that the war will afford the Church an opportunity such as she has not enjoyed for many years, but that, at the same time, it will impose upon her a responsibility more searching and more trying. It will turn the hearts of all men and classes of men, and of women too, in Great Britain, but especially of men who have served at the Front, to the eternal strength and solace of religion. But at the same time it will create a strong intellectual anxiety as to the function or value of religion, and still more of Christianity. It is natural, although it is not, perhaps, wholly reasonable, that men, when they are occupied with religious questions, should closely and almost fiercely scrutinize the example of the clergy. There will be need of a highly educated clergy; for the Church is called to face the serious fact that, while education is rising in the nation generally, the number of highly intellectual men who take Holy Orders has been, for nearly half a century, and still is, diminishing. There will be even more need of Christians, and above all, of clergymen and ministers, who will evince, by the sacrifice and the sanctity of their lives, that the truths which they officially teach are, to them, the supreme verities. The Church of the greatest holiness and the largest self-sacrifice is the Church which will probably win the day.

It is certain that the experience of the war has raised, and will raise, a demand for a religion at once more practical and more spiritual. The eager, impatient world will refuse to tolerate a Church which occupies herself, in any large degree, with other questions than such as immediately affect the

social and spiritual welfare of humanity. In the ecclesiastical life of England, as in the political life of Ireland, subordinate interests, however important, and subordinate differences, however acute, must yield place to the common national good. If the Church does not justify herself by her present utility, the great body of citizens will, or may, feel and show that they have no need of her in their daily lives.

The war will necessarily incline Christians towards reunion. But the policy of reunion will not apply to Western Christendom alone. Churchmen are beginning to realize the significance of the Orthodox Churches of the East. These Churches, with the Church of Russia, as the best known among them, at their head are, like the Church of England, national and episcopal Churches; and like her, they do not acknowledge—in fact they never have acknowledged—the supremacy of the Pope. They are parted from the Church of England by many differences of custom and ritual, and by a positive difference of doctrine. Yet between the Church of England and the Church of Russia there has been, for some time past, a growing sympathy which asserts itself, not only in the friendly interchange of official letters and visits, but, from time to time, in actual intercommunion. The Churches of the East, in fact, and the Church of England display the Christian spirit, which the Church of Rome unhappily disowns and disdains. It is probably the fear inspired by the prowess of Russia in arms, promising, as it does, a wide extension of the Orthodox Church, that has lain behind the pretence of impartiality by which the Pope has sought to hide what must, I am afraid, be called his moral cowardice in the war.

But if the Church of England can enter, and is entering, into sympathetic relation with the Churches of the East, it will be felt that she cannot logically refuse to show some evidence of sympathy with the Reformed Churches of Great Britain itself. The possibility of a good understanding between all the Reformed Churches, including the Church of England, has already been demonstrated by the war. But the men, who have realized the fellowship of Christians at the Front, will no longer accept as inevitable their severance at home. It is my deliberate opinion that, apart from historical and social prejudices, there is nothing which ought to keep the Reformed Churches, I will not say from union at the present time, but from such a federation as would make it possible to utilize much of the power, now wasted upon controversial antagonism, in the Christian regeneration of society. Already the Missionary Conference at Edinburgh

and the Students' Christian Union at Swanwick, have shown how much can be done, without sacrifice of principle, to foster sympathy of spirit and conduct. A new world will be born after the war. It will be a world in which the duty of the individual to the State will be far more keenly felt than it has been hitherto. The idea that a citizen, although he owes his safety and prosperity in life to the civilized society which is called the State, is entitled to get as much as he can for himself from the State, and to give it as little as he can in return, will have come to seem an anachronism, if not an absurdity. It will be the office of the Church to sanctify the new conception of citizenship. If she brings any message to the nation, it must be that the claims, whether of the State or of the individual citizen, must be determined by the mind of Jesus Christ. The clergy will need, by the revision of the Prayer Book, and, still more, by some mitigation of the terms of subscription, to be set free from the barriers which now exclude a number of the most religiously minded sons of the Church from Holy Orders. For the influence of the Church upon the nation will be proportionate to her success in enlisting the service of the most intellectual and the most spiritual Churchmen in her ministry. In particular she will be called to define the limits of a just and true socialism. For the war will have done much to abolish social inequalities; but it will afford no guarantee for the safe rebuilding of society upon anything like a basis of equal opportunity.

It is possible that the war will, directly or indirectly, affect the educational problem. For as the unity of the nation becomes more and more a commanding ideal, it will be felt that whatever forces tend to segregate children, during their most impressionable years, in different theological or ecclesiastical camps are more or less hostile to the true interest of the State. The State cannot, indeed, justly require its citizens to ignore their theological differences, but it may require them not to ignore their national unity. For it is not, and cannot be, conducive to the strength and safety of the State that any one body of citizens should be taught and trained to regard other bodies, on religious grounds, with any sentiment but respect and sympathy.

But whatever the issue of the educational problem may be, there can be little doubt that in the Church, as in the State, the position of womanhood will be vitally affected by the war. "The Christian religion," as the Comte de Montalembert says, "has been the true country of woman"; and after the war it will no longer be tolerable that women, who have in all the ages been the loyal and faithful servants of Jesus Christ, should be

excluded from active and fruitful participation in the councils of His Church.

The Church is entering upon an age when experiments in Divine worship will be not only valuable, but essential. The freer the clergy are, under due episcopal control, to harmonize their ministrations with the ever-varying needs of the people, the more potent and the more beneficent will their influence become. If the man in the street is the power that rules to-day, then it is necessary to bring him out of the street into the Church. So long as men and women are strangers to the sanctuary of God, neither the most artistic beauty of ritual nor the most inspiring eloquence of the pulpit can do them any good. Somehow or other they must be brought under the influence of the Church before they can be made good Churchmen and Churchwomen.

The Church of England has become, in some sense, the Church of the British Empire. She will not, indeed, attain that lofty ideal until she has succeeded in associating with herself all, or nearly all, the Reformed Christian Churches which live at her side. But the Imperial spirit will rule the future of the Church. It is clear that the colonies and dependencies of the Empire will play an ever-increasing part in Imperial policy. Commerce, indeed—at least, within a certain period after the war—will probably cease to be guided by sentiment. Merchants will sell and buy goods where it is profitable to sell and buy them, whether from the friends or from the enemies of a hundred, or fifty, or twenty years before. The permanent rivalry of two great mutual exclusive federations in the realm of international commerce would ill exemplify the Christian spirit, which will, as all Christians must hope, soon or late heal the festering wounds of the present war.

But it may be hoped that the Church will play her part in creating what may be called the United States of Europe—the only organization which seems capable, even in the far distant future, of putting an end to the continual prospect or menace of international war. To unite the whole Empire in the closest bonds of material and moral sympathy, and then to make that Empire the protagonist in the great causes of truth, freedom, progress and charity—that is the opportunity set before Great Britain and her sons and daughters beyond the seas and all the subjects and constituents of her power, and it is a mission which will never be accomplished except under the influence of the Cross of Jesus Christ.

All good citizens in Great Britain, and not least of all

Churchmen and Churchwomen, must wish that the war may be prosecuted by all legitimate means until victory is won ; but that, when the war is over, nothing may be done to infect the international future with the vices of the past or the present. German militarism must, I think, be slain. They who have taken the sword must perish with the sword. The German navy, if it survives the war, must be wrested from the Kaiser. Krupp's works at Essen must be destroyed. But God has ordained in the drama of human history a part for the Germans as much as for Britons or Frenchmen or Russians ; and so long as they will play that part pacifically without indulging in wild and wicked dreams of universal conquest, it will be the wisdom of all the nations to let Germany accomplish her legitimate destiny. But Great Britain will never have stood higher in the judgment of the world than she will stand at the conclusion of the war. She will have fought an honourable fight ; she will have fought in redemption of her own solemn pledges ; she will have fought for the lofty moral and spiritual interests of humanity. It must be the prayer of all who "because of the House of the Lord their God, would seek her good," that, high and holy as shall be the office of Great Britain among the nations, not less high and not less holy shall be the office of the Church in Great Britain and in all the British Empire.

The CHAIRMAN, in offering the most cordial thanks of the Meeting for the interesting and inspiring Address of the Dean of Manchester, said that the Annual Meeting differed from the other Meetings in that there was no discussion : they were there to listen, not to discuss. And perhaps this was fortunate, as the Meeting would have to be a very long one if it entered in the numerous matters of controversy touched upon in the Dean's Address, and he, for one, might have ventured to break more than one lance with the Lecturer.

The Rev. Prebendary FOX, on behalf of the Council, proposed a hearty vote of thanks to the Bishop for his valuable Address.

Archdeacon BERESFORD POTTER, in seconding the vote of thanks to the Lecturer, said that in two directions he considered that the war was tending to our good : (1) in that it had caused us to look into and check our intellectual conceptions of what Christianity is and of its relation to Science and to Archæology ; and (2), as the Bishop had pointed out, it was showing us that Christianity must be

moral in its effects. At the present time the speaker was engaged in writing an article on the attitude of the Christian nations towards subject races : and the terrible fact seemed clear that, notwithstanding the guarantee of the Powers at Berlin in 1885 that they would aid in the moral uplifting of the natives of the Congo State, its population, which in 1884 could hardly be put lower than 30 millions, had dwindled to $7\frac{3}{4}$ millions in the year before the war. This showed that materialism and the worship of force had been manifesting itself in other nations as well as in Germany.

Bishop WELLDON, in acknowledging the vote of thanks, said that he had too much respect for Dean Wace's power in controversy to have risked some of the statements he had made, if he had not known that there would be no discussion.

Professor MARGOLIOUTH moved a vote of thanks to Dean Wace, and especially he would wish to voice the thankfulness of the Meeting that he was able to be present with them, and again to use his hand in writing.

The Rev. JOHN TUCKWELL seconded this vote of thanks. He remarked that among the previous speakers there had been four clergymen of the Church of England, and he presumed that as this was an undenominational Society it was because he was a minister outside that Denomination that he had been asked to second this vote. All regretted the absence of Lord Halsbury, but all were glad to welcome and congratulate the Dean of Canterbury on his recovery from his recent accident. He had the highest regard for him both as a Churchman and as a Christian, and he begged to commend to the cordial acceptance of the Meeting the resolution which he had been asked to second. He then put the resolution to the Meeting and it was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN briefly responded and the Meeting adjourned at 5.50 p.m.