

Ad Filios: A History of SSM¹

Herbert Kelly

I am commanded to write a History of all you call ‘Kelham’, and of its inner life as you have a right to know it. I ought not to write an autobiography, but then all the early years were left solely to me. I do not like writing an autobiography for there is no single part of my life (except perhaps in Japan) which I would not much rather forget. But you will not understand SSM unless you realise that it was begotten of failure.

Shortly, I was at school and learnt nothing. And at Woolwich (RMA) where I learnt a little of war. At both places I was an incredible fool, made no friends, learnt no games, and was very unhappy. I was brought up an extreme old-fashioned evangelical and gave my soul to God.

I went to Oxford and liked it; learnt a little boating (no use), a little gym, (quite useful), a fair lot of history (very useful). I read Maurice and I learnt to think (most useful). I’ve long forgotten M, but you’ll find all my theological stunts there. I had no friends worth anything and made an extravagant mess of my degree.

Then I was ordained (in 1884 – no Theological College nor any training). Between 1886 and 1900 I was curate of a mission district (S. London – Southfields) with a fool flunky for a vicar. I had a tin tabernacle. A man who knew his work could have done anything, but then I was hopelessly incompetent. I meant to do everything, but I never knew how to get in. I never could make friends – anywhere. The big people (mostly very big) would have nothing to do with me. I read a great deal (to no special profit) and went on thinking.

This failure was the pith of the business. If I had succeeded at Oxford, I might have been a fellow. If I had succeeded at Southfields, I might have been a vicar by now even a rural dean. ‘You think of what you can do. God leads you through what you cannot do.’

The latter ‘80’s were C of E flush times – over 800 ordinations a year – yet there were just the same incessant demands for men, and lamentations over lost opportunities. I longed to go anywhere, wherever the need was greatest: out, looking at the Church whole, what was one life in a sea of need? If the Church wanted men, why did she not try the poor? You can do anything with boys. Of course, there was S. Augustine’s, but I knew its tone and its education. Why not ask on a basis of devotion, and then train it?

¹ This account was written in 1920 by Herbert Kelly to give a new generation of students (‘associates’, those who were studying at the college but not entering the Society) ‘a history of all you call “Kelham”, and of its inner life as you have a right to know it’. It was an attempt to explain and limit the damage done by the constitutional crisis (often referred to as the Carleton affair) which threatened to destroy SSM in 1917–20. It is certainly a raw and honest account, setting out the tensions that existed in the Society from the outset and came to a head with the clash between the ritualist, Anglo-Catholic, monastic party and the Society as mission organisation for the Church. In his (private) ‘Newsletter’ to family and friends, of October 1920, Kelly noted: ‘Bedale (in charge of associates) wants a paper on the SSM. It is to give new men a thrilling history of our doings, shorter and more thrilling than the ‘Idea in the Jerking’, as the House calls it now. I’ve done it. It took a ghastly time and is not really finished. If they stand to it, I’ll let you see a copy someday, and you’ll know more of what this business has (been) than the magazines have ever been allowed to tell you. It is a challenge to the House; incidentally, it offers a solution of the questions we debated at Chapter’.

I was ready to have sold my soul for my people. I saw if I stopped longer, I should have sold it, but I should not get the goods. (Earnestness is no use at all if you can't use it). I went to Scott Holland, the only big person I knew.² I said (in 1890) '(1) Bp Corfe is sent to Corea, a new Mission.³ In six months he has got one deacon. I shall be utterly useless, but someone must go. (2) Or – shall I try Australia? I am much too ignorant to be any use in England, but even a second-rate students might be of use there. (3) Or is there no chance of someone making a bid for training these untouched classes?' He said – 'Try Corfe'. I groaned and did.

I told Corfe all this. I couldn't do mission work. I never could learn a language. Was there any use for a 'ousted' student? Yes. A dozen men had offered to go – a printer, stone-mason, etc. Would I take charge of them? 'You bet,' 'ses I, 'but look here, you mustn't take all those raw things to Corea. You must cook them here'. 'Oh,' 'ses he, rather stiff, 'then you must talk to Brooke'.⁴

I did. I had by now formulated the scheme – 'You have any number to choose from. Make them choose themselves – on THREE CONDITIONS. (1) We do not offer ordination (to many it just means pious gentility). Ask them to give their lives simply to the Divine Service. (2) No pay. Corea, Universities Mission to Central Africa [UMCA], is a Community Mission. (3) By consequence, no marriage. We can't ask a binding *promise*. We must be content with an honest *intention*.

Next, the life must so correspond as to make sacrifice a present reality.

Finally, we must have a real four-year education. Men must learn to *think* their faith.

With all this unused material, we shall yet have a House of hundreds.

And it will come to a Religious Society. Brooke, as Commissary, was our Superior and took it on.

We rented an ugly Brixton House, to hold eight men. 'Ah! Give you room to expand', says Brooke. The fun began. Of the bishop's dozen all except one forthwith disappeared. However, we opened (1 January 1891 – just 30 years ago) with two, and another appeared directly. Most of that year drew blank, but a letter in the *Church Times* brought sixty applicants. Eleven were accepted. We took another house. Of the eleven, six more disappeared before the day, but now the fun began in earnest.

II. Vassal Road

And the fun was lively. First, the life. The only pattern I knew was Cowley.⁵ We had Mattins and Prime at 6 am followed by Mass and Meditation from 7–8 am. Plain breakfast (no extras at all); Sext at 12 noon; Dinner at 1pm. No supper. We began with one month's holiday in the year. In 1893 we got a little scrap football by walking out two and a half miles. I began to play then at the age of thirty-three. I do not know why we did not all break down, but in fact our health was as good as it is now (or better).

During those six years, we had a succession of odd tutors, none of them very effective, some very mischievous, and one or two curates helped. We started within the Kelham system (one lecture a day). It was a difficulty that I had done no consecutive theology – no philosophy at all, no Church

² Henry Scott Holland, 1847–1918, was regius professor of divinity at Oxford University. He formed the Christian Social Union in 1889.

³ Charles John Corfe, 1843–1921, was the first Anglican bishop of Korea (Corea) from 1889–1904.

⁴ Canon C. E. Brooke, of St John's, Kensington, the Bishop's commissary in England, worked with Kelly to help recruit men for the Korean mission.

⁵ Kelly spent a month with the Cowley Fathers (the Society of St John the Evangelist) in Oxford in 1890, to study their community life.

History after 180 AD, no real dogmatics. I had to work my own way, dragging the classes with me, but we never got better work out of the men.

Which was odd, for the spiritual state was mad. Men quarrelled endlessly, made parties, scamped rules. Little as I knew of theology I knew less of men. I never could understand men's ignorance of the English Language. It always puzzles me now. For Christ and His Church they had given up personal ambitions and status, but they thought of nothing else. They promised to obey rules but didn't keep them. I believe most of them were sincere, honest and truthful, yet they accepted principles and were angry at being asked to carry them out. They were truthful but they would not tell the truth; honest and sincere, but they behaved dishonestly and insincerely.

If I had had the pluck of a mouse, I'd have told them to play up or go. If I'd had the savvy of a rabbit, I'd have known who to sack. But I believed they were sincere in their own mad way, and I had a weird belief that you can do anything if you go on (you can't). Perhaps if I had had these essential gifts, I should have broken the House up.

In explanation, everything has come to me by way of thinking. I thought myself out of Protestantism, (never, thank God, out of evangelicalism). Before Southfields, I was a fortnight at a High Mass Church on appro'. (I was dis-appro-ved for a better man) but I had never otherwise seen Catholicism till I went to St John's. It is to me always more a faith than a system. I never was any use at doing anything. It took years of thinking before I could get an idea far enough to use at all, and then it was generally too late. I learnt the proper way to kick a football just after I had stopped playing. I did learn to manage the House passably in time (I tried several times to get someone else to come and be the Superior. They wouldn't).

III. SSM

In 1891, there were three men. In 1892, there were eight and it was a silly bear-garden. In 1893, we thought it time to make a Society if we were ever to do it. If we were to devote our lives, for some at least devotion must be permanent, and it must be organised – not merely an individual ideal. The religious life is just that – devotion organised as a system. I was always thinking of the Church and in army terms we would be a regiment. There were possibilities in it.

Of course it was absurdly premature. Only a fool would have tried it in the then state of the House. I was that fool. The odd thing is God wanted it that way. I began to think again. We had drafted a constitution in 1893 to start with, and the 'Principles' were done. I thought it all out again, and, in 1894, we drew up the Constitution as we have it now – with a little polishing of details. Fr. Woodward and I made our Profession, and there was a very, very, ragged little bunch of novices.⁶

Somehow, to this exiguous life, recruiting was always a difficulty. The 'three conditions' frightened a lot. The life did for more. Numbers of men left. In 1895, we decided to try boys. I had always believed in boys. I hoped to get from them a whole-hearted enthusiasm that we were not getting from men. By the beginning of the summer holidays we had engaged six. Before the end, they had all cried off except one. I did a prophesy – 'I cannot take one boy alone. I will take you in a month' That was

⁶ Herbert Willoughby Woodward, 1854–1932. He and Kelly were the first professed members of SSM.

Fr Bradbrook.⁷ Within a week, another appeared, named Gerald Murphy – quite a smart boy.⁸ You may have heard of him. At the end of term there were four boys, Fr Wrenford was one.⁹

IV. The End of Vassall Road

The change to Mildenhall in 1897 was much more than a change of place. We had been working for two missions – Corea and UMCA – and on their funds. That could not go on. In 1896 Trollope went out, and most of the older men with him.¹⁰ They were still novices, but then they belonged to the mission. We could only hope that they would complete their life there, so Corea took its men and now it wanted its money.

Just then Miss Eva Jameson blew in.¹¹ I want you to notice from the very beginning the entirely irresponsible way in which all vital things happened, Bishop Corfe, the boys, and Fr Woodward. Sometimes they happened. I never knew why. Sometimes they did not happen, I never knew how to make them happen. Perhaps I did not pray enough, I suppose it was just helplessness – partly my incapacity for getting to know people. The only resource was a letter to the *Church Times*. That saved us several times. In general result, things got done at all only by a succession of special miracles.

Miss J. said, ‘You must appeal to the Church.’ ‘All right’ ’ses I. ‘You must have a meeting’ ’ses she. I done it.

It was also plain that we must have a House. There were fourteen men, and we were very crowded. There was a busted school at Stoney Stratford on sale for £25,000. Now I was not like some Directors who just ask for a House and get it. Nor had I staff. Fr Alfred had come as tutor and half-curate at S. John’s.¹² Otherwise, there was just me. Miss E.J. knew no more about raising money than I did. As to S.S., the Bishop of Oxford was very rude. I think we got £150. The Plymouth Brethren got the school.

But money for living, in small sums, blew in cheerily, and Canon Bullock-Webster got us a dream of a House at Mildenhall with room for fifty men. It had seven acres of real lovely garden, and for the same rent we were paying in London. The Coreans were all gone. We still had men for UMCA, but we were free to work for the Church.

V. Mildenhall

⁷ Edwin George Bradbrook, 1877–1954, was one of the ‘uneducated’ boys who would not have been accepted as an ordinand elsewhere. He had received only an elementary education in Shoreditch East London and worked as a cook before joining the community. He was ordained in 1919 and served for many years in Africa. He died in Bloemfontein in 1954.

⁸ Arthur William Gerald Murphy came from a very different background to most of the boys. He was one of the first to be sent on by the Society to take a degree at Oxford. Although perceived as a ‘high-flyer’ Fr Murphy left in 1925 after failing to be elected as Director in 1920. At the time of writing *Ad Filios* he was still in community but had become increasingly disgruntled.

⁹ William Lawson Brooks Wrenford, 1879–1955, lived and worked for many years in Africa.

¹⁰ Mark Trollope entered SSM in 1895 after a short period at Cowley. He was committed to the Korean project and had learnt the language. He was sent to establish a house at Mapo, Korea, the following year. He stayed there as a member of the Korean Mission after SSM withdrew from the country in 1904.

¹¹ Eva Jameson had been secretary of various Missionary Associations and in 1897, took over fund-raising for SSM.

¹² Alfred Davenport Kelly, 1872–1950, Herbert Kelly’s youngest brother. He joined SSM in 1898 and was Provincial in South Africa for many years.

We went to Mildenhall in Lent 1897 and began by going mad with joy. We had a row. Then we agreed to forget London and settled down. Sincerity, honesty, peace, love – all shone in upon us. You see – now we were ourselves. We were a family. We were not lost in the wilderness of London, where everyone had friends to go and grouse with.

We even eased off a bit into a luxurious style of life. We allowed porridge at breakfast three days a week. Ultimately, we allowed it every day. We allowed afternoon tea, and late dinner. This was luxury. It was a long time before we came to allow meat at breakfast. In spite of all, I never thought men's health was as good as at Vassall Road. Perhaps it was the extra strain of trying to be good – because we did try, and it's hard work if you're not used to it.

We also made games compulsory and had afternoon lists. A certain Brother Joseph was responsible for that. Above all, we made something like a real lay-brotherhood. In London, there was nothing but study. There was nothing for lay-brothers to do. Now we had a garden, and a kitchen, and a carpenter's shop, and, presently, a printing office.

But tutors? We left Fr Alfred behind. For one year there was Fr Drake. Then Trollope and most of the novices broke down in Corea and Fr Drake had to go out to save what was left. For another year a Mr Chignell blew in. And there were curates to make shift. Then Chignell left, but in 1899, Fr David and Fr Norton arrived, and Fr Alfred came back (Fr Carleton came some years later).¹³ Now I thought it was my turn, and I snapped off short. I had been living for eight years on an allowance of six hours sleep. The Doc said something about 'six months: complete rest' – or maybe it was five months. I went to the lakes for a fortnight, and later was sent to Norway for a month.

About this time, we became officially a Theology College, taking on the statutory exams and the CE course.¹⁴ We added these to our system, which otherwise we kept as it was.

A year or two later, BSA came up.¹⁵ We had been asked several times to send missions before, but there was no one to send. We had only enough priests for the House. Practically all the old men went out in 1896–7, so that no one was due out till 1901. Further, we are accustomed to boys going off suddenly but, in those days, men also were always doing it. When Modderpoort appeared, it was a new case. The offer was complete. We were asked to take over funds (in a very dubious condition), land (extensive, out of value), buildings (tolerable), and it was very urgent. I thought it premature, and tried to put it off, but God would not allow it. Fr Norton must go for health. Fr Firkins had been invalided from Corea and must go somewhere. Wrenford had already gone. I had a man just ready for ordination. One of the best. We gave up Fr Alfred, and two lay brothers. We accepted, and I went out to see them settled, coming home by UMCA.

VI. The End of Mildenhall

¹³ George Dundas Carleton, entered SSM in 1902. Another high-flyer who clashed with Kelly and others. He was involved in the leadership crisis over Catholic/monastic observance, which became known as 'the Carleton Crisis'. He was suspended as Provincial in South Africa in 1922 and left the Society in 1924.

¹⁴ For the Common Entrance Examination.

¹⁵ British South Africa.

At Mildenhall finally, we made a momentous change of system. All through we had one aim. We wanted to serve the Church. The Church needed men. The fall in ordinations was by now very serious, but she needed most a higher devotion, and, also, a devotion which could be used effectively.

We appealed to the enthusiasm of the Church. We did not ask men for the Religious Life, because most people did not even know what it meant except Monasticism.¹⁶ But the conditions were intelligible:

- (1) Come and serve God anyway, anywhere
- (2) Freely and in poverty
- (3) Without marriage.

Now it seems to us that if men honestly gave themselves to God in this spirit, it would be obvious common sense to most of them that they could serve best together, as a regiment rather than as freelancers – on their own. I say – ‘to most’, for there are always some whom God has made differently, who can only work ‘on their own’, who are fretted and restless under a common discipline.

Mildenhall was a very happy place. There was no great difference between Society and Non-Society, since everyone was there on the same avowed idea of devotion. And almost everyone joined the Society.¹⁷

But though the life was so happy, the results were very unsatisfactory. We were the only place which offered a free training. Men came forward in crowds – as we expected. And they turned back in crowds, often at the last moment. They left in crowds. I believe every holiday someone failed to return. And it was often – especially among candidates – the best men who drew back, while the feebler men came on to drop out later.

The primary difficulty was over ‘Vocation’. Very many of the clergy (Catholic) insisted that the Priesthood was a divine vocation, and no superior had a right to turn a man off (say) to gardening. That as it happens, is the fundamentally Protestant view. We held to the Church view, which is also commonsense, that it is the Church which calls and chooses.

On that point we could not give way, but any system must (a) be intelligible in itself, so that the authorities may work consistently. (b) It must be intelligible and reasonable to men in the House, who have to live under it. (c) It must, in the end, be intelligible to those outside, who may in time want to enter it.

Our system was not understood outside. We hoped people would come to understand us, but we began to realise that the three conditions on which it was based had ceased to have any real meaning, and it was fatal to the honesty of the House to have paper forms which could not in fact be applied. There were three issues:

1. Ordination. We could not promise ordination. But in fact, men came either with a definite offer of lay service, or in the *hope* of ordination. And, although we said nothing it was plain enough to us and to the men, what we were going to do. Furthermore we had very little choice. At first missionaries encouraged us in believing that there was an almost indefinite opening for lay-workers. It is not so. SSM can use all kinds of people, the secular missions, only in the rarest way. It was clear that lay work was not really a genuine alternative.

¹⁶ See note 23 below.

¹⁷ As opposed to doing theological studies for ordination and then becoming a parish priest.

2. Poverty. Instead of the ‘intention’ of poverty, we accepted the principle of ‘repayment’ (already adopted at Mirfield). We expected a rapid growth (and we got that). If the men who went through repaid the bare cost, our money would pay for staff, and failure.

VII. Kelham Theology

There was, however, another matter growing in our mind. I call it THEOLOGY. One who has more right to speak than I have says ‘the essence of SSM is a VISION’.¹⁸ Both of us find it a little difficult to explain, yet it is very vital.

There was first, the vision of the Church. Only the Church counts. We are not thinking of *parishes* out of England, and nothing but the Church *whole* can affect the whole country. You cannot *really* cut it into squares. Even the parish as a whole (apart from the fancy Congregation) is more really affected by C of E as a whole than by the individual teaching of its vicar. The Lambeth Conference says of our Missions, ‘They have aimed at making converts *out of all* nations. They have forgotten that Christ commanded them to make the *Nations* His disciples’.

That had always been in my mind. Apart from my own failure, it was what drew me from Southfields, and turned me back from Corea. Even SSM was nothing in itself. For the sake of the Church only we tried to provide men, devoted, disciplined, educated – and in our simplicity, it was clear that must be an education in theology. We were not, at first conscious that there was any novelty in all this. Then it began to dawn on us as a very strange thing that the universities and the authorities on the one hand and the clergy and the parishes on the other, did not like our idea of a theological education, nor in the least understand it.

To the Universities and the Church authorities, education (no doubt a most important matter) was essentially a secular business, intended to give ‘broad’ interests and views. They know that ‘the correct doctrines’ are more or less necessary and some knowledge of modern criticism and controversy, but this technical and professional knowledge is a secondary matter.

The clergy and the parishes put a higher value on correct doctrine, and cared less for ‘breadth’, but they cared equally little for technical and professional knowledge. All that was really useful could be learnt from a few handbooks, and the parish was its own school. Devoutness, energy, and commonsense were everything. The scornful indifference they expressed for theology was staggering.

To us, theology was not a technical and professional knowledge. We were studying God’s view of ‘human life’ – what God was doing on the Somme, and at Westminster, and at Tilbury Docks. In this our Vision of ‘theology’ was part of our vision of the Church. I do not want to know what you can do with Christ in a church (building) half so much as I want to know what Christ is doing in the street. We were well aware that you must find Christ in the church (chapel) before you will find Him anywhere else (on the football field) but the two are not the same. It is quite possible to find Him in Church and never think of looking for Him anywhere else. The worship of the parish church is the key which should unlock the mystery of God in the world. Just so. Is it being used to unlock the mystery? Is it not being very generally used to lock the mystery up – to lock itself up – safely within the Church itself?¹⁹

¹⁸ The source of this quotation is uncertain.

¹⁹ In this paragraph Kelly sets out his theology and position on ‘faith’ and ‘religion’ in a nutshell. The living God, not the structure of the Church was to be his mantra for his whole life.

This Kelham Theology of the will of God in the world was a Kelham Gospel to the world. I do not mean that only Kelham believes it. Every orthodox Christian admits that it is in some sense orthodox doctrine however little he recognises the consequences. There are, no doubt, many others who preach it. I only say it was ours to preach, and that we had shaped our whole ideals upon it. We had made it the basis of our education – in that, I think, we were alone.

VIII. Kelham

Once the ordination question was put in a shape the outside world could understand, we began to grow by leaps and bounds. Mildenhall would no longer do, besides the landlord wanted his house. Again we tried for a derelict school in Norfolk, and again we failed. We asked for £15,000, and got £1,500 (Dr Barnardo's got this building). Then Kelham blew in. We came here in 1903.

We began very badly. We were about fifty in number. Men groused at themselves (always a very bad sign). 'It was too big. Nobody loved anybody. Nobody cared. Nobody prayed. The great world was very wicked. And, oh yes, their souls were being starved'. Abbot Aelred OSB paid us a visit and taught them that refrain. How a good man could play the mischief he did, God knows. He apologised for it afterwards.²⁰ It was summer, 1904, before we found out how men were justifying their complaints of the House. Then we had a gaudy row and sacked a man or two. That cleared the air. But it had gone on too long and the mischief was done. It was years before we got at all straight, and the Mildenhall spirit was killed dead off, just when we needed it to carry through the new life and ways.

Everybody now knows Kelham, but it was a very long battle before we could win a recognised position. We went on under the shelter of friendly bishops, but we were suspect. It was not till 1910 – nearly my last act as Director – that we came through, largely by the help of the glorious Archbishop.²¹

But the bishops now were wedded (under Bishop Gore's leadership) to the Mirfield system and Universities. They laid down a law that, after 1914, everyone who was to be ordained must have a degree. The Church could provide for it. It was not aimed at us, but we must come in. We argued and protested. When 1914 drew near, as the Church had not made any provision, it was put off to 1917. Now they implored us to come in. We absolutely refused. Our theological faith was at stake. In 1914 – oh well, something else happened, and in 1917 the authorities were thinking much more of submarines and the Russian debacle. There is a certain humour about these dates, which students of predestination will appreciate.

By this time also the bishops had established the Central Board of Theological Studies. I like to think we had been urging it for years. It only arrived long after my time (1910) and the Central Board, knowing the business more directly than the bishops, agreed that whatever rules there might be, Kelham should go its way. Whoever else was or not educated, Kelham men were. There – that is what you chaps have got to live up to.

You may think of the C of E as very stupid and very slow to learn. I do not think so. The Japanese missionary world was a very small affair. If you dropped a teaspoon, it would echo all over the place. But the C of E is very big indeed. The bishops are very busy and it takes us a long time to hear of

²⁰ Aelred Carlyle was Benedictine abbot at Painsthorpe in Yorkshire (later Caldey Island). Around 1904 he led a retreat at Kelham and four men left with him to join his community. When the Benedictines left Painsthorpe they offered to let the buildings to SSM (SSM/HK/C/L/366).

²¹ Randall Thomas Davidson, 1848–1930, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903–1928.

anything outside our own beat. All things considered, one might equally well say that she learnt very quickly.

You may imagine that those years, when the very existence of Kelham was hanging in the balance, were years of great anxiety. They were, but not in the least for this reason. The bishops were an amusement. Mostly they treated us very nicely. In the end they all did. Money was a much more constant and wearing trouble, but we always managed somehow.

Remember again what our aims were. We were not thinking of ourselves at all. We had no aim even for the Society as such. We were thinking of the glory of God – that is, of the Church. The Church needed men (a) in numbers and (b) in devotion, and (c) in training. We conceived of these in the simplest way. The Society was a means by which devotion could be made more real, permanent and effective to the glory of God. It was only very slowly that we learned how very complex and difficult these things were. In the abstract everyone accepts them as obviously desirable. When you come to the point, they are not only hard to get – as it is difficult to be really devoted or really ‘educated’ – it is extraordinarily difficult to get people to see that they mean anything in particular.

But we did not succeed in getting the Church to take us seriously. For ten years people said, ‘Oh yes, a place for training lay missionaries, isn’t it?’ At Mildenhall they said, ‘Oh yes, a Missionary College’. At Kelham they said, ‘Oh yes, a Theological College – a branch of Mirfield, I believe’.

This only hurt our pride. The serious part was that for ten vital years, from Fr Carleton (in 1902 or so) to 1912 practically no priests whatever joined us from outside. (One very brilliant man came for two terms and did some mischief). Here also there is no one to grouse at except ourselves. We – I – failed to attract, or to get understood. A work like this needs a big man (like Gore) with lots of savvy and influence, not an ousted curate.

IX. The Old Kelham Life

This lack of experienced help caused difficulties as will be seen later, but nothing here really matters except the House itself. The future is always in the hands of the men – in your hands. What they will stand to, that they will in the end get done. If they fail, everything has failed.

We made a bad start at Kelham, and never really recovered. Every now and then we seemed to be recovering the old idealism; then everything would lapse back. It is not a pretty story, but we ought not to shirk it. We might forget past sins but the difficulties are the same today, and the temptations are the same. The difficulties turned on the meaning of S.S.M. and its relations to the Church. In the House it turned on the relation of SSM to Associates. In one way nothing could be more simple. Some have a vocation to the Religious Life and some haven’t. In reality, it is a much more complex business.

We were thinking of the needs of the Church and substantially, the Church here means the ordinary secular clergy. It is they who must do the main mass of the Church’s work. But I do not think that anyone will deny that the level of ordinary clerical devotion is very low. Some people like to think other bodies are worse than we are; some like to think they are better. In fact, the same criticism is made of all. All suffer from clerical professionalism but all in different ways. Our own church suffers from the prevalent ideal of middle-class gentlemen, respectable, married and reasonably comfortable. It is the ideal which constitutes its alienation from labour. Why should we be bound by all these questions of status and style? (How much is due to the loss of the Idealism of Religious Orders?)

We did not begin at Vassal Road with a Society but with a secular College, but then it was a college for certain Community Missions, and when we asked for ‘devotion’, the word had a very clear

meaning (The Conditions). When we had to think of the Church at home, we still insisted on devotion, and we meant substantially the same thing, but now the SSM was almost the hinge of the question. If we could make a strong body of organised devotion, we might hope to keep the ideal in being and the Associates who went out from us as secular clergy might, and we hoped would, make possible to the Church the ideal of priesthood which could live among working men as working men themselves live. The Kelham life need not be an ideal which men once went through at College; it might be a normal type of living. If the SSM was weak, the few men we sent out for ordination would be just absorbed by the prevalent system.

The war, the poverty it brought, the social upheaval, possibly the revolution, are already making our ideal more intelligible and may, in a few years, make it common and essential. It may soon be normal. But I am speaking of pre-war days. We had asked for 'devotion' but in fact men just came from their parish clergy with a view to being parish clergy. What was 'devotion'? Of course, they knew that some clergy were slack and self-indulgent. Also of course they did not mean to be slackers (few people ever do) and they imagined that they at least were safe from such temptations. What more does 'devotion' mean except keenness, and of course they were going to be keen?

What is the Kelham vision of priesthood? Why is the Kelham life so different from the normal theological college? Is it merely a better, or perhaps only a cheaper, way of training 'energetic clergy'? Is there a vision? Is it leading to anything different to the ordinary ideal of keen and successful curates and, in due time, vicars? I cannot tell you very definitely what the Vision is. It is for you to work it out. Everyone admits the present C of E system is not satisfactory. Multitudes say this is because of the lack of consistent Catholic teaching. Granted, but is that the only need? Might not the parochial system itself, the status and life of the clergy be a bit different somehow?

Anyhow in the years of which I am speaking (1903–1914) men did not see it. They never asked themselves what the Kelham life meant. They kept rules fairly well, but with no more enthusiasm than some felt for barrack life. It was *pro tem* a necessity. Presently they would go back to their parishes and live as other *good* clergy lived.

The existence of SSM, however, did force another possibility on them, and they resented it. There was always a party in the House, definitely anti-SSM, bent on discouraging novices.²² Partly they justified themselves by their Anglican ignorance. Anglo-Catholics know very little of the 'Congregations' and it is quite common to find them asserting that the Religious Life can only exist for itself, i.e. for its own members, which is the ideal of Monasticism.²³ If some of us wanted to be monks, that would not have affected them. But we were hankering after *one ideal* of devotion, even though there were *two ways* to it.

Quite often, the anti-SSM party was a dominant party. Then they fought against the ideals of the House, against Kelham theology, against anything which implied a criticism of the Parochial system they meant to join. Of course it was very dishonest, and it was all the worse because no one thought himself dishonest. It is not an easy but a very difficult thing to be quite honest. We knew what men were doing in the House but how could we meet it? We made some explanations. Men listened and scoffed – in private. Once or twice I challenged individuals, but they expounded indignantly their

²² Here Kelly goes on to describe the heart of the constitutional crisis which came to a head with the Great Chapter of 1920. It centred on bitter disagreement between factions within SSM as to the nature of the Society and the nature of Catholicism. One party favoured a more rigorous ritualistic and monastic ethos, the other side a Society, as Kelly conceived it, at the heart of the Church and *for* the Church. The latter eventually prevailed.

²³ Congregations here refers to active or apostolic, non-monastic, religious communities. Kelly's description of monasticism as only existing for itself might be contested by monastics themselves, who would argue that the contemplative life is not self-serving at all, but rather a service to the whole world made possible by the very fact of their removal from it.

fervid gratitude and admiration for the Society. I could not break the ‘Honour’ of the House, because they did. I could not make enquiries as to private conversations, nor even quote as evidence what I did know. Were they lying? I do not suppose they thought they were. People seldom do. They preferred not to think. That people often do.

In due time, these men were ordained. The examining chaplains said with joy, ‘These men have learnt to think’ so, after all, Kelham had done something for them. They make quite good curates, but there is nothing, so far as I know, to distinguish them from any other good Catholic curates. To modify the Chaplains’ words, I should say ‘These men have all by now forgotten how to think’. The proportion of men who are willing to go on foreign service is always something of a test. Of the Kelham men of this period, it is a lamentably small number.

Of the Society part, I will not say much, but all this opposition and strife had a disastrous effect even on those who did join. They at least must see the Vision, but it is difficult to see Visions in a blizzard. There was also a great difficulty over ordination. Men came up one or two at a time. We could not send everybody to Africa. And, here came the difficulty of having no experienced priests, we could not take up new ventures with young deacons. Curacies were inevitable, and they offered a chance of outside experience. What between the difficulties of novitiate in a hostile house, and the attractions of independent parochial life, the curacies were fatal. The universities were still more fatal.

All sorts of reasons for our failure have been given by others, and by ourselves. Undoubtedly there was a great lack of firmness and insistence on reality, partly due to personal timidity, partly to excessive trust in men’s sincerity. There was too much persuasion and too little rule.

Again, we appealed essentially to the mass of common devotion to the Church simply. Many maintained, taking devotion in our sense, that there is no such thing. There is only the special devotion to the Religious Life as such, (monasticism) and the common zealous professionalism of a good parish priest – with a decent salary. The ‘devotion’, for example, of the Community missions, was very rare, and could not be either common or thorough. Anyhow, it was no use trying for the modern developments of ‘Congregationalism’ until the simpler ideal of Monasticism were understood.

Others said that our practice was too intellectualist, and that we paid too little attention to the spiritual life.

All these criticisms are partly true. We did our best. I need not discuss the past, except to point out that what some called our impossible theory of Religion, and our excessive ‘intellectualism’ were to us, in fact, part of our Vision of the Church, and of that other ‘Theological Vision’. So we are back at these stupid words which I have admitted are so hard to explain. I once wrote a book about it and called it *an Idea*, but Vision – someone else’s word – is much better than mine. It is quite natural that you should dislike this vague indefinite phrase. We all like to know exactly where we are, and what we have to do, but I do not think that is God’s fashion. The C of E is very muddled. I think the Church of Rome is very muddled too (all the more so because that is just what she professes she isn’t). Russia and Sinn Fein and colliers are also muddled. But is not God leading us, all of us, by desperately perplexing roads to something only He knows? Anyhow you’re in for it – all your life. So were we. But in this case, I have more to say, which if you will be patient, may perhaps make the meaning a little clearer.

X. The Question of Parochialism

I have shown all through how we began by accepting quite simple ideas, and then found they were extraordinarily difficult ideals. I have shown this in regard to ‘devotion’, and ‘theology’. They were

things everybody desired, but when we tried to follow them no one knew what we meant by them or would have anything to do with them. I have pointed out the difficulty of ‘parochialism’. That is what I want to explain now.

I have already said that, just as in war, guns, aeroplanes, tanks, red tabs, green tabs, are only the guides and helpers to the common infantry man; so bishops, dignitaries, Religious Orders, lecturers, are only more or less frillings. The work of the Church rests in the end on the common priest, ministering to common souls. The work of the parishes is practically everything.

When I criticise parochialism, I am not going back on that. I am talking of ‘parochialism’ as we have it. I have spoken of the curious idea of middle-class respectability which it has absorbed, of its consequent lack of ‘devotion’, and the narrowness of its theological outlook. We saw these defects more or less dimly at the start; we only learnt their significance more or less clearly as we went on. They explain some of the difficulties we had with outsiders. They do not explain the difficulties we had with our own men.

In fact, however, all these difficulties are only consequences of the way in which the whole parish system is dominated by modern INDIVIDUALISM. This we learnt last of all. And I must explain it, because it has had a large place in life, and will have a still larger one in the future.

The C of E has in fact chopped up the whole of her work into what are fundamentally one-man jobs or ‘spheres’, by drawing a line along four streets on the town map, the area thus bounded is called a parish, and has a vicar. With the Church at its centre, the vicar is virtually free to run this area in his own way, according to his own idea. This is what makes the work so fascinating. He calls it ‘my’ parish, and ‘my’ work. There is just himself to look to. If you are at all good at doing it, it has the extraordinary joy of ‘self-fulfilment’ – such as an artist takes in his painting or a musician in his music. In fact many people cannot do it, then it becomes just misery for them and their people (I’ve been there and know). But to realise your own incompetence is not only very difficult it is a most dangerous spiritual act for to admit failure is almost inevitably to acquiesce in failure. Few people dare (or do) admit their uselessness (I didn’t – not at the time). Of course, the curates are rather different, but even they talk about ‘our’ work, and try to bite off bits – ‘my’ street or district, ‘my’ scouts, and they hope someday to have a sphere really their own.

Let us come to the results:

1. You will observe that while we all talk about it ‘the Church’ (especially when arguing with Protestants), the Church in fact counts for nothing. Every parish does its own work quite separately.
2. This parochial separation is the ground of the party division which has paralysed everything. Gregariously, we associate ourselves with a like-minded clique, but in effect every parish is its own denomination.
3. A great many Church necessities cannot be met at all. Nottingham University stands in a parish, but no parish can pretend to deal with it. The students live anywhere. The same thing happens to all foreign work. The Church appoints a bishop, but there is no way of providing any help. He must just go round and see if he can find a few curates (who have not got spheres) to find their spheres his way.
4. To my mind *nothing* can be done effectively this way. The vicar struggles to build up a devout congregation in his own way of thinking. The Church is only a name; it is the parish which counts. It is as if each captain with his subalterns were carrying on a private war with the opposite company in his own section. But it is England (not the captain) which is at war with

Germany. Even in your own parish, except for parts of your congregation, the C of E counts for much more than the particular teaching of the clergy of the moment.

5. This system of 'spheres' intimately affects the question of 'devotion'. A man may devote himself to the Church – body, soul, and mind – without any thought of what he is going to get or be, or even do. But on our present system the C of E says: 'No. You choose a parish and go there.' There are some very wonderful people who have thus 'devoted themselves' to the service of the souls God gave them, but it is rare and difficult. It is one thing to devote yourself to your people; quite another to devote yourself to your work. Normally, you receive the curacy (in due time a parish), as your sphere of work. Everybody looks to you hopefully (as a Kelham man) to show what you can do. It is expected that you shall be an energetic, popular, and successful curate (or vicar). The worst is that *you* are, must be, looking anxiously to yourself in just these ways. Energy, self-denial in the form of hard work, etc., all these are necessary to self-fulfilment and success in the sphere which is now yours, but they do not make what people ordinarily mean by 'devotion'. And where self-forgetfulness has so little space to operate, self-indulgence and easy-goingness come in only too readily – especially if you begin to find you are not going to be one of the popular and successful ones. Remember, practically no one ever thinks he is going to be (or that he is) a slacker.
6. This isolated individualism has produced in many of the clergy an extraordinary mental nervousness. I have known men whose theological interest was confined to what would go into a sermon; multitudes who, if you talk of any question affecting the Church, at once reply: 'Ah yes! I am constantly telling my people', etc. Missions only bring up missionary meetings. Nothing interests, except what can be translated directly into parochial terms – the terms of *their* individual work.
7. But the most disastrous effect is theological. Practically they are not even interested in their parishes, but only in what goes on, or may go on, in the four walls of the Church, *plus* the Parish Room. Football clubs are a means of 'keeping the young men together'. You ought to be interested in the discussions of your working men, because then they will be interested in what you have to say, and 'come to Church'. It all ends in that. It does not occur to them to be interested in labour questions, because *God* is interested in them.
8. The clergy are so absorbed in getting people to 'come to Church', or (if Catholic, to come to Mass), that the Church services (matins and mass) have become a substitute for God, nigh all there is of Him. I said above – 'Church worship is the key of the street. It has been used to lock itself in.' To the clergy (generally) the mass does not lead to the street, because they are wholly preoccupied in getting the street to come to mass.

That, in the end, is why the system works so badly. It is the parson's show. It makes a certain appeal to the religious interests which belong to religious people. Pusey said, 'I never urge people to come to Confession. I talk about sin.' I would say, 'Never ask people to come to Church. Talk about God.'

I dwell on these points partly as a warning of the difficulties in which we are all involved. The SSM was trying to find a way to meet them. But I allude to them primarily because they explain the difficulties and opposition we meet in the House. Men came to us with no other aim than that of clerical work in a parochial sphere of their own. 'Devotion' meant only that they would be in earnest over their work. When they found that by the Church we meant something much bigger, that by devotion we meant a looking beyond personal spheres and the ambition for personal success which they imply, when we criticised the weakness of the modern parochial system, they did not differ – which is quite reasonably possible – many of them resented it hotly, and resentment (wherever you meet it) always means that a man feels his own ideals and position are imperilled.

Their resentment at our Theology puzzled me, but they saw sooner than I did that if the Church is to be identified with the sum of parochial spheres of work, then the Gospel must be identified with religion and devotions practised and taught within the ‘four walls’ *and* the Parish Room.

They said we were setting ourselves above the Church (which was silly). They meant above the parishes (and not even that was true). They also said that we wanted to revolutionise the Church (which is perhaps true); that we wanted to substitute religious orders for parish clergy (which is certainly not true). They came from parishes, they went back to parishes, and ceased to think of anything else.

XI. End of H K

In 1909 the House let on in private that it meant to fire me. I was not expecting it, but I saw it was inevitable.

I am only a thinker, perhaps a dreamer, I never could do anything, attract people, or persuade them. Also I was worn out.

As the Church had given us so very few men to help carry on, it was only natural she should say, ‘SSM was just HK’. The House said it. I must get out of the road. I implored the 1910 Chapter to let me go out and return as a Novice. Then I should not even have seniority. I hate big personalities. They refused – (the greatest mistake SSM ever made in my opinion).

In 1910 Fr David became Director, and for the rest you must ask someone else.²⁴ To my mind the House went from bad to worse, but in January 1913 I went to Japan. Possibly things began to mend in that year. Certainly in 1914 there were 25 novices and I am told they were a very hefty crush. And then the war came down.

XII. The Question of the Future

I put the problem this way. Our whole business is with the Church, and it is quite plain that the substance of the Church lies with the parishes and missions. The ‘needs of the Church’ are the needs to be found there. It is clear enough that the Church wants a whole heap more devotion, in her clergy as well as in the laity. And we must somehow get away from this exaggerated individualism which can think, work and believe only in terms of individual spheres. Only the whole Church really does anything, and only the whole can inspire the devotion of a life. It is the individualism of spheres which restricts the Gospel to that religionism which it is especially the clerical business to keep up, and with which it is so easy for them to be contented.

To make any change is, however, a huge business, and we ask, ‘What can we do?’ As you know, I always answer, ‘I am not at all sure we can do anything’. Certainly, it is not possible for us to turn all this crookedness straight. The Church is in God’s hands. But I do not thereby mean that faith in God is a substitute for work. First, it is the *inspiration* of work. Just because things are in God’s hands, not in ours, we need not be afraid of failing or of blundering. Secondly, it is the *condition* of work. We must work as men who realise that the value of their work is the use God makes of it.

(1) So far as *SSM* goes our ideal is Community work, i.e. team work. I think the parishes need a lot more team *spirit*, but I doubt if the *SSM system* can be applied to parishes very usefully. Our proper

²⁴ David Jenks, 1866–1935.

work lies with those special things (e.g. Kelham College, Nottingham University, the Bush Brotherhood areas) which used a continuous team system, which, therefore, cannot be done on the parochial fashion, and therefore is mostly not being done at all. But I hope the Society will always keep its eyes fixed on the Church as a whole, and never look on any work as merely her own job.

The Society up to now has worked on so small a scale that it is not easy to keep away from the community – individualism of thinking – ‘this is ours’. But it’s not our purpose to think of anything as our own. I hope the Society will be able to do something, and to help you to do something, to deepen the common life of the Church – the team spirit. Someone said, ‘HK wants to do things in ten years. SSM will take a century.’ (HK used to say a ‘lifetime’, but I expect a century is nearer the mark).

(2) I have spoken very shortly of SSM because I am speaking here to Associates. You, at least, must go to parishes, and for you there seems a plain course – ‘If the parish system is wrong, it is no use having dreams. You cannot do anything to mend it. You must just accept it as it is and make the best of it.’

That is, in one-way, plain common sense. In another way, it is a mischievous thing to say. If a system has real evils in it, if you accept it just as it is, you are not making anything of it. You are letting it make you to its own pattern. In result, you will do the worst with it just as much as the best.

And here is the importance of what I said about faith. It is not possible for you to do anything with the parish system, but I think at this time God is preparing a great many things. Watch! – so that when ‘the day of the Lord’ comes you may be ready to go with Him.

What are we to do? A very sensible question. Of course you will have to work in the parish system – as it is – and I want you to make the best of it. Here are three main things you must study while at Kelham and go on studying when you have left it.

1) Thinking and studying. Football, fighting, parishing – you must accept, and work in with, the system of your team, your army, your church – and not insist on freak-systems of your own. For the system you find is that which God gives you to work. But you must never simply accept it ‘as it is’. From a common-sense view that is stupid; from a theological point of view, it is idolatry. The will of God is here, but it is not a dead finished thing. In the art of football, war, or ecclesiastics, the will of God is a living growth with infinite possibilities, as God leads men on.

Your business as students here is to learn the whole will of God. It’s an enormous job. Of course, it is impossible to learn what the will of God is. It is Himself. But you can learn something of its vastness and complexity, and of its fashion of working. You can learn enough to be always looking for it in your parish, enough to prevent you from imagining that your parish stunt is all there is of God. I have heard men admit, I have heard men boast, of having left all their ‘theology’ and all their thinking behind. In my opinion that’s where the difficulty of C of E comes in. They say they are doing God’s will. You can’t be doing God’s will if you are not learning and thinking always. Whether it’s football, or parishes, or Kelham College, things go wrong not because the system is so very wrong, but when everybody assumes it’s all right, and when people have stopped thinking if they cannot do better. Use what there is and be always looking for what is missing.

When we talk of thinking or studying, we do not, we never ought to mean just a lot of clever stuff you get out of books. Thinking and studying mean simply that you are always trying to learn God’s will. That is the whole substance of Reverence. People stop studying, when they think they know all about God’s will, and that is irreverent.

2) Prayer. I put study first because it is more difficult to see what it is about, but Prayer, devoutness, piety, religion, sincerity, the love of God, are far greater matters. It is perhaps absurd to say that prayer is *more* necessary than thinking. If there is something to be done, is it more necessary that you should want to do it, or that you should know what it is? It is not really a matter of more or less. But here are some important distinctions.

The love of God and sincerity comes before everything. It is quite true that the love of God and sincerity are not the same as prayer, religion, devoutness, and it is also true that reading books and writing essays are not the same as thinking. There are people who love God very sincerely who are very poor hands at praying, and there are people who pray a lot, most beautifully, and have very little love for God. There are also people who think a great deal, but are only confused by books, and there are people who are very clever and read everything who never think seriously and are not learning God.

All that is quite true, but for most of us it is very difficult to learn without books, and other special effort. And very few people indeed will really go on thinking if they despise study. In exactly the same way, for most people it is impossible to go on loving God without a real long effort over prayer and other devotions. And this time I will not say very few people, I say *no one at all* can keep the love of God, or keep his sincerity, who has a contempt for devotion.

Now for the work. I have known many pious people who never seemed to know even what thinking was, who did an awful lot of good and next to no mischief. They were very simple, humble, careful about what they said or did, but, you see, that means that in their own way they were thinking and learning.

I have also known many very devout and earnest people, some had learnt to think and given it up as too much trouble, some had never tried to think and despised thinking. You cannot be in earnest and not do good, but you cannot be contemptible of truth and not do harm. You do harm to the Church, and to yourself. I never knew one such person who wasn't the worse for it.

Yet devotion is the greater thing because it is a more continuous necessity. The priest's soul is like a steamer. The mind is on the bridge. Day and night the officer should be there – thinking of the position and the course, watching everything that does or may, pass or happen. You must never for one moment let your mind sleep. Yet there isn't very much to do that is new or difficult. It is mostly simple, only it must be done carefully and rightly. But devotion is the ship's engine, and there the work never stops. The fires have to be stoked and the bearings oiled – all day long it goes on. You may not know very much about navigation, but if you are careful and keep the course, you'll get in provided the engines are kept up. If you stop loving God, you may be ever so clever, but you'll get nowhere. Do your best to understand things, but there is never any finality or certainty about understanding. The sincerity of your soul towards God is a matter of life and death.

3) Humility. There is one last thing intimately concerned with sincerity, and that is *humility*. It worries me a great deal, I've heard a lot of people say that Kelham men were very nice, but they were so self-complacent, so frightfully conceited, so cock-sure of their own opinions – so sure they know all about everything. Perhaps I should care less about what people said if I didn't see this in myself. It is not that we are all so proud of Kelham, but we are (well, mostly all) individually and severally infallible. Most of us SSM are and the Associates seem to me worse than SSM. I have heard a lot of reasons for it. Perhaps most of them are true, but none of them satisfy me.

Many say that it is because we think so much of our intellectual and so little of our devotional life. It may be, yet the most devotional and anti-intellectual men we had seemed to me the most infallible. Some said it's just HK because he is all that himself. Personally, I should not have thought HK had

that much influence, and the most anti-HK people were no better than the pro-HK. That does not go for much. Conceit is very catching. Some say it's because we have a dogmatic faith. Of course, it is very easy to be conceited because we have such beautifully clear, thought out, ideas; but then, I have known lots of (Varsity) men who were equally conceited because they had such beautifully muddled ideas.

No. I do not know what the cause is, but you have a new House, and you must get rid of old evils. And self-complacency is a most dreadful evil. It is very difficult. You must go on thinking, and if God gives you to see something, you cannot pretend you do not see. I can only give you two suggestions:

Intellectualism. I wonder if you, or those who were before you, ever really understood what you are doing? You can put it up to the tutors and say, 'You talk about studying the infinite will of God, but in fact you are just jamming on to the students your own theories. Can you wonder if presently they make up their own patent theories and are equally pleased over them?'

Or, we tutors may put it up to you, 'We tell them of the will and manifoldness of God. They say, "Ah! How true". But all they really think about is whether they can make a decent show over their essays.'

It does not matter in the least who is wrong. What does matter is how we can get right. I have given you some possible causes of our failing, so that you may know some things to watch against. Here also are three things you ought to watch for and realise.

1) You can never know the whole truth. With patience, care, humility, you are likely to be quite wrong, but you have at most learnt a little bit.

2) You cannot really teach anyone nor can they teach you. We, you, I, can explain and talk, and prevent people going to sleep. You can prepare the way of the Lord, and if you go round selling oil, there may be one or two less foolish virgins. But nothing really happens till the Lord comes. It's so with the Church, and it's so with students, and it'll be so with your parishes. No one really sees anything till God sends him the Vision.

When you have to lecture, and when you're stuck in a pulpit, then you have to look as if you were teaching. It's a horrible business. All the worse if you love doing it (as I do).

No one can do it and have a soul at all, except by a special miracle. But as to all your special theories, *you cannot think too much*, you cannot learn too much, and, as a rule, *you cannot talk too little* or too cautiously. If people find you thinking, they may want to know what it is, but never push your opinions forward, and never argue about them with people who disagree. It does no manner of good. Wait God's time.

Conclusion

God has given you students a new House. What are you going to do with it? I have told you a lot about old evils, failures, disappointments, and so forth. You may fall into all those old shell-holes yourselves. Please don't. The top people are doing their best, and it's an awful business for them if the children won't play up.

I have a sort of notion that God may yet give you youngsters a new Church. I do not think the Church can go on long as providing 'spheres of operations' for parsons. I do not suppose you will have a brand new Church next Tuesday morning (as you had a nice new Kelham in 1919). When God comes there will be a lot of desperately new and puzzling things. Be sure you are found waiting and ready. Mind you, there is always something new in everything that happens.