

Society of the Sacred Mission

AD FRATRES

1906

Catholicism offers the plain man an observance, which is at least within their reach, and which has availed to save thousands from that moralist Pelagianism which I take to be the most godless of all heresies. It has been the alliance of sacramental faith with evangelical piety which has made the later forms of the Catholic movement into the most effective religious power today, and yet Catholicism based its rules of observance on the authority and immemorial teaching of the Church. This conception of intellectual submission involves an ideal of a beautiful humility, but it is not especially those who have been trained in scientific schools. We are bound therefore to sympathize with the aims of the *Lux Mundi* school, even if one feels that it is too evidently in the nature of a compromise to affect the situation very deeply. It well recognizes that there are two elements which want recognizing, and those who are not inclined to think very deeply or have given it up in despair may be content. Few genuine thinkers however are likely to be satisfied with unresolved antinomies, or with balance for its own sake.

This then is the explanation of our present position. It is that vast mass of people who are not constitutionally capable of piety or of submission to authority, as these are commonly understood, who have fallen back upon a Pelagian and anti-dogmatic morality.

The real and central hinge of all hope of a religious regeneration, lies in substituting faith as the dominant religious motive instead of feeling; and, for its object, the actual power of God in the place of 'piety'; the delight of learning, beholding, obeying, in the presence of all the width of its operation, for the mere enjoyment and possession of a comfortable sentiment within one's own individuality. The first is possible to all men, most to the busiest, for it is the guide, the motive, and purpose in what they have to do. The second is a thing apart, belonging to a world of its own, accessible to the leisured.

While then it has been the whole substance of our aim in teaching to show how religion can be brought, through knowledge of the will of God, into effective possession of men's whole lives, all existent clerical training has regarded theology as a technical study, only to be pursued as a voluntary and scarcely necessary addition after the serious business of education was over, just because it was based on the latter ideal of religion. The result is manifest in all schools alike. The evangelical idea was developed without any philosophic basis, and to this day the growth of any keen study of theology, though real and effective, has been too much cramped by exclusive attention to authority, in the sense of precedent. Philosophy therefore has been left to the latitudinarians who are more anxious to pare Christianity to what they think it ought to be than to learn what it is.

We have therefore suffered somewhat from the suspicions of all schools. The evangelical feels that we are reaching into an atmosphere where he cannot breathe; to the catholic we seem to be abandoning what he takes to be the only safe ground; the latitudinarian resents an invasion of his ground in the name of a faith he thought he had superseded. So far as we ourselves are concerned these objections may not be felt very seriously, but so far as the adoption of our method is concerned, they reveal what is our greatest difficulty—no one knows what we mean by theology.

So far what I would maintain is (1) that the religious reformation for which we are all hoping must, like all real and permanent religious movements, be founded upon a new theological principle: (2) that this principle must be constructive. Men receive life from the beliefs they gain, not from those they have lost, and in the new state they must seek 'not to be unclothed, but to be clothed upon.' (3) Neither is the principle to be 'a new thing vainly invented,' but new only in the sense in which the teaching or thoughts or ideas of Cyprian, Origen, Augustine, Athanasius or Cyril were new, in which life is always new, growing from the latent seed of the one Sower, having waited for the spring.

If this be sound, we have so far justified our immediate method, the work of the SSM College, and its second main principle of making theology the basis of clerical education. The incapacity of English men to follow principles or theories of any kind makes them suspicious of theology in any shape, and therefore, not only unwilling to criticize the ground of their action, but also extremely ready to assume motives in us in place of those which they fail to understand. I do not think we have any reason to be astonished at this; there is ample reason to wonder rather at the rapidly growing sense that an education of this kind is right. The theological movement however is an entirely different matter. I would not say that it lies altogether beyond the possibilities of an individual. Wesley is a proof to the contrary. The Oxford Movement was effected by at least a group of individuals. Westcott and Gore have exercised a tremendous personal influence. But we must observe, first, that all these were men who did possess a marked and exceptional personal power and, secondly, that the work of those within our own time has only resulted in the formation of 'schools of thought,' not in anything national, not in anything we might call a regeneration. The conditions of our time seem to be unfavourable to personal influences. We are all too eagerly sceptical and 'independent' to follow any one; too anxious about opinions to be deeply swayed by a teaching.

Men ask, Why cannot we do again by Wesley's methods what Wesley did?—and others, Why cannot we do again by Newman's methods what Newman did? I answer, nothing is ever done *again*. I ask, is it not possible that something like what Wesley effected yet in the Church of England, new and untried forces of organization? There is at least one good reason for hoping as much. Where the strength of feeling has dissipated itself in emotionalism and the strength of teaching in the jangle of opinions, there all the more the manifestation of power reveals actuality; and that manifestation is organization.

Now herein is the wonder, not to ourselves perhaps, but certainly to others. Kelham is to them a very real power; from their way of thinking they assume it must be an individual power. But while I am (as its head) a conspicuous person, they are all as conscious as any of us that my own personal influence, whether as a writer, as a thinker, or as a man, outside our own circle, are just exactly *nil*. In talking to men without, I can feel the growing sense of bewilderment, the sense of a power they do not understand, but which I know, and which we know, to be the power of an organization, of a band of men who, not by virtue of opinions, but in the clear simple conviction of what God has given them to *know*, work steadily in one unity for one purpose.¹

All modern religion is based on the principle of individualism, and I assert that this is as true of Catholicism as of Protestantism. The demands are different, but the ends are the same. Both agree in the use of the phrase, 'the preciousness of the single soul,' and in the duty of moving heaven and earth to make one convert. That the single soul is precious in God's sight we have express warrant of Scripture for believing, but we have no less warrant for affirming that no single soul is in a state of salvation so long as it is precious in its own sight. Salvation is in Scripture only a salvation of individuals so far as it is a salvation from individualism. There are in the end two things for which a many may live—God and himself. The deplorable thing is that while all religiously minded people recognize that humane 'culture' may be only the gilding of that idol of self which remains essentially detestable, they find it much harder to recognize that just the same thing is true of religious culture. Is there an expression of the fundamental basis of religion more false than Newman's saying 'God and his own soul'? True religion is forgetfulness of self, faith in God's will, purpose in its acceptance, joy in His operations, in the manifestation of His glory. Its practices are only efforts, exercise, to call the mind back to this central purpose, but its substance is nothing more than to rejoice in God.

I do not want even to seem to criticize religious societies such as Cowley. God has called them and given them their own work. They have done it far better and more successfully than we have ours; but it must be plain that for this which we set before us, this of which we are to be witnesses, a system of perfected devotion, a system involving some specific separation from the normal life of the church is no use at all. We cannot be ascetic. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and to appreciate, to enjoy, the reasonable pleasure which God gives, are really part of our work and witness. Again, we cannot have

¹ *Ad fratres* (1906)

a separate life. We are bound to find God's will where He operates. We cannot seek a separate and distinct work. It is men, it is the Church as made for men, which is our special sphere of usefulness. It is really part of our calling that we should enjoy food, sights, games, that we should be tremendously interested in politics, business; that we should seek the commonest and simplest forms of Church work.

Asceticism, devotion, separation, are all good, for they are witnesses by men of rich spiritual gifts that sensual pleasure and worldly occupation are not things in themselves good, cannot dominate a true human soul. We are only witnesses that all things are good, if God is seen in all. We, being just the commonest possible sort of men, are witnesses to just the commonest and simplest things. Yet we too are separate; we too have our own calling. All true hearts make sacrifice to God. Some have given up enjoyment; some have given up their way of life, some their work. We are too small for great things, but we have been called to give ourselves. Our rule exists but to ensure in us the reality of this one thing. Our life is very plain, but when we get our Sunday breakfast, we make no shame to enjoy it and laugh. When we come to a fast day, there are beans, and we enjoy the contrast and laugh again. In games and holidays, we enjoy ourselves and give thanks to God, and when we come under discipline once more we enjoy our own helplessness and submission and laugh also. God's will fulfilled in the knowledge that it is always good.

I am a soldier, and I speak as a soldier. In two ways an army may be lost; if it breaks up, or if it takes refuge in a fortress. Bit or little, advancing, standing fast, it is always a power to be reckoned with so long as it holds stubbornly together and keeps the power of moving in the open field. The Prussians, beaten at Jena, broke up to make a disgraceful peace. The Austrians at Ulm fell back on their fortifications—to lay down their arms. In 1813 the allies beaten at Bautzen and Lutzen would neither break up nor seek their own safety, and shortly after they destroyed the Napoleonic empire at Leipzig. But if my military lessons do not comment themselves, then I speak as a priest after the fashion of a priest:

In the way of Thy judgements, O Lord
Have we waited for Thee,
Therefore have I set my face as a flint
And I know that I shall not be ashamed.²

² *Ad fratres* (1906)