

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE CHURCHMAN

May, 1910.

The Month.

The Appeal for Canada. THE Appeal of the Archbishops on behalf of Western Canada has been making good progress during the past month, both as to money and also as to men. We are glad that the gigantic needs and truly magnificent possibilities of that wonderful country should receive the closest attention of English Church-people. The tide of emigration to Canada, both from Europe and America, is flowing more strongly this year than ever, and the prospect of a large increase on last year's high figures is already assured. This alone constitutes a call which it is impossible to overlook. And yet it is necessary to point out that Churchmen in East Canada are watching very carefully the effects of the Archbishops' Appeal. Concern is being felt in relation to the men and also to the money. As to the former, it is not every Englishman or every clergyman who will be successful in Canada, for unless a man is prepared to adapt himself easily to his new surroundings, and show himself ready to avoid any purely English stiffness of habit and Churchmanship, he is not likely to prove the type of man required for the great North-West. In regard to the money, the problem is more complicated. North-West Canada has been developed ecclesiastically almost entirely from England, without much regard to the more settled territories of Eastern Canada, and for this reason it is

natural and inevitable for the North-West to look to England for men and means. But Eastern and Western Canada now form one Church, with its own Missionary Society, and as the Eastern Dioceses are being assessed year by year towards the support of work in the North-West, it seems essential that there should be some correlation of plans in regard to funds, and in particular that the Missionary Society of the Canadian Church (known as the M.S.C.C.) should be made aware from time to time of what England is doing for the North-West. The writer happens to know the case of a clergyman who felt led to give up pioneer work in Eastern Canada for similar work in the North-West. The poverty of the Eastern parish did not admit of a larger stipend than £160, but the clergyman was promised a stipend of £200 in the West. Canadian Churchmen in the East naturally conclude that, as they and others in England are contributing to the work in the North-West, the difference in stipend must necessarily come out of missionary funds. This is only one instance that can be adduced to show the reality and complexity of the problem, which we feel sure will have the careful attention of those who are carrying out the work connected with the Archbishops' Appeal. Meanwhile, we would repeat our suggestion of last month, and recommend all Evangelical Churchmen to send their contributions direct to the Colonial and Continental Church Society, Serjeant's Inn, Fleet Street, E.C.

This is the month of May Meetings, when
Missions. attention is particularly called to the great work of world-wide evangelization. In addition to this, there are some other facts which give special point to the consideration of this great subject at the present moment. Preparations are now well advanced for the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in June, and we would call earnest attention to the paper on this subject in our present number. The *Guardian*, in a warmly sympathetic article, has recounted several results which may be anticipated from the Conference, such as the

checking of overlapping in missionary work, the question of co-operation in the mission-field between various societies, and the advance of Christian unity; while "the last, but not the least, valuable effect will be the education of the United Kingdom in missionary principles." This is to be brought about by the scattering of the delegates over the whole country in a campaign of missionary work at the conclusion of the Conference. That such results are much to be desired may be gauged by the serious, though not unexpected, announcement of a deficit in the funds of the C.M.S. for the past year, and the appointment of a special committee to consider the situation. That this deficit should have occurred just now is particularly saddening, when China, Japan, and India seem to be opening to missions in a truly marvellous way. But, notwithstanding all checks, drawbacks, and discouragements, the true attitude of the Church to missions is found in the words of the Bishop of Southwark, on his return from his recent tour in India :

"I should like to say that I do return—I think I may reverently and humbly say it—with faith deepened and strengthened in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ as being visibly meant by God as the one religion which, sooner or later, the world shall come to acknowledge and know as such, because it is intrinsically such in the perfection of its Divine mind and in the perfection of its human revealing. I say that while there is fresh upon me the impression of the enormous structures, as I may call them, of India's great religions, and while I become conscious of the way in which those religions are bound up with the life of the people, and gather the people into them by the very strongest bonds of custom, of order, and of hierarchical influence. I see all that, and yet, in spite of it, I feel what I have said."

And if it be argued, as is so often the case, that there is abundance of work at home, the Bishop of Southwark may be quoted again :

"We are all desperately busy here, and no doubt we have got burdens enough upon our shoulders. Still, there is India. There is its relation to the Church and Empire, and it does need that we should attend to it more and work harder to discharge the responsibility."

This is the only true spirit and attitude for those to whom the Christianity of the New Testament is a living reality. Shall we not, therefore, seek at the approaching Whitsuntide

for a fresh anointing of the Spirit of missionary intercession and service to come upon the whole Church?

One of the questions dealt with by the Bishop of London during his recent Lenten Mission was on the subject of evening Communion. He was asked why evening Communion were discouraged, seeing that our Lord celebrated the first Communion in the evening. This is the Bishop's answer as reported in the papers :

Evening
Communion.

"I know there are many good, conscientious people in the diocese who believe in evening Communion, and, as Bishop, I try to secure fair play for different views. But if you ask my own opinion, I answer that the Church has been guided, as we believe, by the Holy Spirit in this matter. Early in St. Paul's day it was discovered that a celebration in the evening led to irreverence and disorderly scenes. From that day to some fifty or sixty years ago—nearly 2,000 years—there never were evening Communion, except occasionally on Maundy Thursday. And the reason why the great majority of Church-people discourage evening Communion is that they believe that the Holy Spirit had guided the Church to make Holy Communion the first service of the day, when we come quite fresh in the early morning. That, no doubt, was the instinct of the Church."

With great respect we venture to ask whether these statements are historically correct. (1) Is it true that the cessation of evening Communion was due to the disorderliness recorded in 1 Corinthians xi.? This is the implication of the Bishop's words, though there is nothing whatever in the New Testament to justify the conclusion. (2) Is it true to say that from the day of St. Paul at Corinth to some fifty or sixty years back there never were evening Communion except on Maundy Thursdays? Bishop Lightfoot's authority will hardly be questioned, and he said that evening Communion continued for the first 150 years of the Church's life. (3) Is it true that the great majority of Church-people discourage evening Communion because they believe the Holy Spirit guided the Church to make the Lord's Supper the first service of the day? Is it not rather the case that the desire for fasting Communion is the reason why very many, perhaps most, object to Communion in the evening? We are not now discussing the

pros and *cons* of evening Communion, though, in view of the way in which the practice is discouraged in some dioceses, we are thankful to know that the Bishop of London tries to secure fair play for those "good, conscientious people in the diocese who believe in" it. But it is imperative that in a matter of this kind we should be true to historical fact, and if the report now given is correct, we are compelled to say that the Bishop of London's reasons for his own attitude to evening Communions do not accord with what is known of the history of the primitive Church. If the subject is to be discussed on historical grounds it is imperative to keep strictly to fact.

A welcome article recently appeared in the *Over-organized Parishes.* *Guardian* on the great spiritual danger of a multiplicity of parochial organizations. We are deeply thankful that attention should thus be called to one of the most serious evils of our modern Church life. When we observe in a parish magazine a long list of organizations, we are tempted to think that it denotes a high state of parochial efficiency; but further inquiry often reveals the sad fact that the organizations exist largely on paper only, and also that a number of them are purely secular, and form no real part of the work which Christ sent His Church to do. We are not surprised at the responses made to this article in the correspondence columns of the *Guardian*, for the truth has evidently gone home to some earnest souls who are burdened with parochial details, and who find little or no leisure for that spiritual work for which they have been commissioned. The clergy are ordained to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and not for the service of tables in the form of club-management, however admirable in its way. It is, of course, much easier to organize and superintend a club than it is to study hard day by day for sermons and Bible-classes; but when the latter work is given the place accorded to it in the New Testament and the Prayer-Book, the results are spiritually far more fruitful. It is

no exaggeration to say that in many parishes the abolition of half the organizations would be followed by double the spiritual efficiency. We must do less in order to do more, or rather, we must do less in order to *be* more. There is a grim truth in the advice given to an intending candidate for Ordination to avoid going to a place advertised as a "well-organized parish."

A correspondence has been taking place in the *Kneeling in Church* *Guardian* on the subject of the modern custom of kneeling during the Epistle, and it has given rise to the following editorial note in that paper, which we make no apologies for reproducing in full :

"The correspondence upon 'Kneeling in Church' which we have been publishing during the last few weeks has proceeded upon antiquarian rather than practical lines, and we had hoped that something might have been said upon the closely allied subject of sitting in church. We shall not be suspected of desiring in any way to limit the reverence of the worshipper's attitude, but it is a frequent complaint of the elderly and the indisposed that there is an unnecessary amount of standing in the services of the English Church. Anyone who doubts need only observe the frequency with which delicate or elderly women are obliged to sit when they should stand. We sit, stand, and kneel by custom rather than by law, and we should be guilty neither of irreverence nor illegality if we sat down to sing hymns. Both the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans do so, and if we followed their example we might in time get rid of the ear-splitting screechiness characteristic of so much modern English Church music—it is difficult to shout when you are sitting down. Religious music ought to be sweet and soft, with a touch of contemplative tenderness. The modern Church musician, with his high notes and colossal organs, is too apt to think it is his business to make the welkin ring."

This is truly refreshing teaching, and ought to do much to further the cause of naturalness and spirituality of worship. The practice of kneeling during the Epistle is purely modern and entirely inappropriate, and it is to be hoped that the weighty and convincing words of Provost Vernon Staley against it will be heeded by all who now practise it. Another change in line with the paragraph in the *Guardian* would be to remain seated during anthems, especially if they happen to be long and elaborate. The reverent appreciation of the words and the

music would be much greater and much more spiritually profitable, if the anthem were followed without the fatigue of standing. The spiritual is always best served through the natural, whether in mind or body.

“In Quires
and Places
where they
Sing.”

A very useful discussion has been proceeding lately in the *Church Family Newspaper* on the subject of Church music. Mr. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P., complained that we are suffering from too much music, especially in village churches, where choirs attempt musical responses and settings for which they are evidently unfitted. Several correspondents who are well known in the world of Church music pleaded for greater simplicity and less concern for the purely personal interests and partialities of choir-members. Two things are essential in regard to Church music: first, it should be effectively rendered, and second, it should be as congregational as possible. Some years ago the writer was in a village church where the small and not too capable choir attempted the well-known *Gloria* from Mozart's Twelfth Mass. The effect of the unsuccessful endeavour to reach the high G in the familiar theme was too painful for description, and it was a very obvious illustration of how *not* to do it. An Evangelical of the old school once said that in his tiny country parish, where the music was necessarily as simple as possible, it was his aim to have it so good that the most fastidious musical ear should not be offended. If only clergymen and organists would insist on three requirements in reference to music—that it should be good, simple, and congregational—it would make an immense difference in our times of worship, and would do much to help forward the spirituality of those seasons. We must never confuse the worship of music with music in worship.

The Saint.

The death of Bishop King of Lincoln was the occasion of a very interesting leading article in the

Times on "The Saint," in which the question was asked, "What is a saint?" This was the answer of the writer :

"We can only say this—that a saint is a good man whose goodness gives delight, and who makes us understand the meaning of the words 'the beauty of holiness.' The virtue of action alone is not enough to make a saint. There must be in him a virtue of being that reveals itself when he is at rest, a beauty of the soul that is as constant as beauty of the body."

In other words, according to this description, a saint is a person of exceptional goodness, which impresses, charms, attracts, and influences those around. It would be well, however, to remember that this is very different from the idea of a saint taught in the New Testament. According to St. Paul, a saint is synonymous with a Christian, for, as is well known, the title is given to all believers, and is true of them from the very moment of the commencement of their Christian life. It indicates the Christian's relation to God, and the truest Biblical definition of a saint is "one who belongs to God." A saint is one who is dedicated to God, who is God's possession by virtue of his union with Christ. The idea of sainthood, therefore, refers to our spiritual position, not to our spiritual condition; to our relation to God, not to our attainment in holiness. It is essential to keep this in mind, for our modern idea of a saint as a specially holy person, a Christian of exceptional goodness, is only too apt to lead us far from the New Testament teaching. We must not let even our use of "St." before great names blind us to the fact that every Christian is a saint by reason of his relation to God in Christ. This is not by any means the only instance of ecclesiastical and theological usage leading us away from the New Testament.



NOTE.—We deeply regret that, through unforeseen circumstances, we are compelled to hold over Dr. Plummer's second article on "Early English Church History" until next month.