

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

Supposing, then, that St. Paul had written anything to the "Dispersion" of the Hebrews which was not as yet recognised as "Scripture," this sentence of St. Peter would at once give it the Apostolic seal. Just as St. Paul himself, by citing a sentence from Luke x. 7 alongside of the Law of Moses as "the Scripture," stamps St. Luke's Gospel as Canonical, so does St. Peter stamp what St. Paul wrote to the Hebrews of the Dispersion, together with "all his Epistles," with the same character. He sets this writing by itself as remarkable for its "wisdom," and classes the other Epistles separately, but all alike he pronounces to be "Scriptures."

What Epistle, then, can St. Paul's Epistle to the "Dispersion" of the Hebrews be?

There is no difficulty, if we accept this as St. Peter's endorsement of the extant Canonical "Epistle to the Hebrews," and suppose that St. Peter intended (1) to supply the missing signature, in his place as Apostle of the Circumcision; and (2) since the Jews are the appointed trustees of the Divine oracles, to show that it was needful that every Scripture should be formally consigned to them.

What I have said is tantamount to affirming—not my own belief in the Pauline authorship of the Canonical Epistle to the Hebrews, which matters nothing—but that St. Peter has affirmed the Pauline authorship of that Epistle, which, if it be so, is a matter of some importance.

C. H. WALLER, D.D.



THE MONTH.

THE special Mission services held by the Bishop of London have been the most noteworthy feature of Church life during the past month. In several of the most prominent West End churches Dr. Ingram has preached to large congregations with undoubted tokens of blessing. This episcopal emphasis on the need of evangelistic work in our Church will doubtless be very fruitful in spiritual results, and we could wish that the Bishop of London's example might be followed in other dioceses, in order to call renewed attention to the necessity of more definite evangelistic effort on behalf of the people of our parishes. Among the plain and telling messages given by the Bishop, we cannot help calling attention to one on the familiar text Rev. iii. 20, in which the following timely words were spoken:

There were people who were apt to think that Missions were rather un-Churchy, and that there was something "not quite Catholic," to use a

certain phraseology of the day, in speaking of the "knocking at the door" and the supping of Jesus with the soul. He believed that no class of people more wanted a revival of the Mission spirit and love of Jesus Christ than our orthodox Church-people. Was there no danger of a hard and mechanical Churchmanship, no danger of a use of the Sacrament, without seeking for Jesus in the Holy Communion? Could we ask for a more beautiful thought in coming to that service than "I will come that He may sup with me"? Therefore he prayed that the fruit of this Mission would be that they would more adequately realize what they were doing, and that Church-people would have a revival of love, and feel more than ever that the Holy Communion was the communion with a living Christ. Be zealous, therefore, and repent. Repent of the pride which keeps the door shut. Repent of the callousness which has come from hearing His message so often. Repent of that inner sin which makes you wish to keep the door shut. Repent of that mechanical Churchmanship which has killed your love for Christ. Repent of the brambles which have overgrown the closed door, and let the answer be :

"Oh, come to my heart, Lord Jesus;
There is room in my heart for Thee."

We may thank God and rejoice that such a faithful message was given in a part of London where, perhaps, it was most of all needed. We cannot but believe that this noteworthy Lenten Mission will be the commencement of evangelistic efforts on the part of other prominent dignitaries in many of the dioceses of our Church.

In connection with the Torrey-Alexander Mission in South London, that well-known and honoured clergyman, Canon Allen Edwards, in expressing his sympathy with the movement, gave utterance to some weighty and very necessary words. He called for prayerful sympathy with the Mission on the part of all Church-people, and especially deprecated the objection that "there is no Church teaching in it," for, as he went on to say, "What does the man in the street care about Church teaching?" The Torrey-Alexander Mission, as Canon Allen Edwards rightly urged, is for the purpose of doing the first work of evangelization, and then the converts are handed over to the Churches for membership and instruction. The Canon's concluding words are deserving of special attention :

"As a loyal Churchman, one who has spoken and worked—ay, and suffered—for the Church of England, I say she will have a rude awakening one day if she cannot recognise spiritual work like this when it is absolutely thrust upon her path."

We believe that this is the right spirit to show towards a movement which is being so evidently blessed of God as the work of Dr. Torrey and Mr. Alexander. No one could be present at the meetings in the Albert Hall without being conscious that the clear, simple, pure Gospel was being preached apart from any emotional excitement, and with unmistakable spiritual results.

We are glad to notice that the Dean of Norwich has been taking up the subject of the Prayer-Book Services and their need for revision, to which we referred last month. Dean Lefroy rightly urges that the language of the Prayer-Book is "too stately" for many people, and that greater freedom in public worship is one of the wants of the Church to-day. We might well take pattern by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, which gives a fair amount of liberty to the clergy, both as to the shortening of services and also as to the choice of other Psalms than those appointed for the day. It is difficult, for instance, to see why the Lord's Prayer should be used three or four times within an hour in our Morning Service. Above all, the services need to be shortened and varied by being broken up into sections for separate use, which could then be taken in rotation. The subject is, of course, a thorny one, and probably tends to controversy; but when men like the Head of the Oxford House on the one hand, and the Dean of Norwich, on the other, testify to one and the same need, we may be sure that the subject will not "down," but will press again and again for solution. And it ought not to be impossible to solve it in a way that will be satisfactory to all, and yet safeguard our services against individual idiosyncrasies and pure license. If our Church cannot prove her worth by adapting herself to present-day needs—needs so different from the days when the Prayer-Book was drawn up—we are indeed in a sorry state. In this connection we note with great satisfaction the unconventional and undoubtedly unusual features of some of the Bishop of London's services in West London. Certain services were given over to the answering of questions invited on prior occasions, and, what is still more interesting, the Bishop offered extempore prayer before and after the sermon. This is an exercise of the *Jus liturgicum* which we imagine would be welcomed by all.

Attention has been called in the *Cornhill* and the *Guardian* to the astonishing number of reprints of famous books which are now in circulation. The article in the *Cornhill* tells us that more than a thousand sixpenny editions are on sale. The "Temple Shakespeare" sells a quarter of a million copies a year; seventeen other editions of Shakespeare are either in progress or have just been completed; in the "Temple Classics" twenty thousand copies of Dante have been disposed of; during the last three months fourteen different editions of Bacon's "Essays" have been published; in the last nine years thirty thousand copies of "Cranford" have been sold

in the "Temple" version alone. Well may the *Guardian* ask, "Who reads all these masterpieces?" and, "Where are the twenty thousand students of Dante?" We cannot suppose that all these books are bought simply to be looked at; and yet the literary results of all this large circulation are at present somewhat far to seek. The writer in the *Cornhill* has also something to say on another matter of great moment to us all. He tells us that, although nearly a million (is it not well over a million?) of the Rationalist Press Association publications have been sold, a decided falling off is noticeable in the issue of religious books, except in the case of À Kempis and Augustine. We fear the Christian people of our land have scarcely realized as yet the imperative need of meeting the publications of the Rationalist Press Association by similar cheap and telling works on the Christian side. Much is being done, but very much more is needed. As a speaker at the last Islington Clerical Meeting truly said, these rationalistic publications are not being bought for fashion's sake, but to be read, and they are being read by tens of thousands of young men and women and intelligent artisans. All this constitutes a loud call to Christians to unite in issuing, and keep on issuing, the best and cheapest works in defence and furtherance of the faith of the Gospel.

The question of traffic in advowsons has again been raised by means of a leading article in the *Guardian*. The writer shows that the traffic still goes on, though to a greatly diminished extent. Advertisements of livings for sale still appear in the *Times*, and the article refers to a catalogue recently issued by an agent, giving particulars of about one hundred and fifty livings which he has for sale in different parts of the country.

In each case the annual value of the living and the age of the present incumbent are given, and generally stress is laid on the excellence of the house, the attractiveness of the neighbourhood, or the lightness of the duties. Most of the marketable livings appear to be country parishes, but in some instances important town parishes are treated in this fashion; one London parish of over sixteen thousand souls is to be found in this list.

A recent Parliamentary return gives the number of the transfers of the right of patronage during the last three years as between three and four hundred. The *Guardian* thinks that many, perhaps most, of these were of an innocent character, but there was a minority which could not be satisfactorily explained. This points to a continuation of a system by which many undeserving men are afforded opportunities of purchasing the preferment which they would other-

wise almost certainly not obtain. We can well understand the reluctance Churchmen feel to proposals to abolish all private patronage, though there can scarcely be any doubt of the dangers which must accrue from time to time in certain cases from a continuance of the system. On the other hand, there would be the gravest possible objection to vesting all patronage in the Episcopate, or even in a Diocesan Patronage Board, unless adequate safeguards were provided to prevent the feelings and convictions of congregations being overridden and set at naught by changes in the services and teaching. Every Churchman must hope and strive for some way of still further restricting the sale of livings for unworthy purposes; for, as the *Guardian* truly says, "the primary obligation is to make illegal all that morally deserves the name of simony." It is pretty certain that no other Church possesses or would tolerate the incongruities of our system of patronage.

It may not be known to all that the British and Foreign Bible Society now publishes an excellent little monthly magazine called *The Bible in the World*, which is full of the greatest interest to all who are concerned for the world-wide circulation of the Holy Scriptures. In the April number a well-known and leading missionary of the Baptist Missionary Society, Dr. Timothy Richard, writes on "The Prospects of the Bible in China," and makes the novel and important suggestion that the Bible Society should arrange for the publication of selected portions of the Old Testament among uneducated non-Christian Chinese. Dr. Richard states that certain passages of the Old Testament have actually been used to produce and justify persecution in China, and that the indiscriminate circulation of all parts of the Old Testament is capable of being abused in such a case as to do Christian missions an immense amount of harm. He considers that there is great danger lest, while the missionaries "are trying to build up a modern Church with all the light which God has given, the general circulation among heathen Chinese of the whole of the Old Testament may appear to sanction moral standards which are those of years outgrown, and which will need extensive commentaries to explain." Dr. Richard therefore advocates the publication of a hand-book of selections about the size of the New Testament, and he believes that such a selection might become a text-book in Chinese schools and colleges, and even a book of devotion in Chinese homes; while the complete Bible would, of course, continue to be carefully studied by the more advanced Chinese Christians,


pastors, and theological students. Dr. Richard's eminence in the mission-field gives the greatest possible weight to this important proposal. We can readily understand how impossible it must be for the non-Christian Chinese to understand the idea of progressive revelation, and the fact that the Old Testament is to be read in the light of the New Testament revelation. We do not doubt that Dr. Richard's proposal will provoke warm discussion, but it seems to us deserving of very careful and serious consideration.

The Archbishop's Bill for the reform of Convocation is naturally receiving the careful and earnest attention of Churchmen. It proposes to give Convocation the power to legislate without the consent of Parliament for two purposes—to reform their own constitution, and to unite the Convocations of the two provinces for special purposes. The Dean of Ripon writes in the *Times* in strong opposition to the Bill. He bases his objections on the fact that it is "the first step taken since the Reformation to enable the clergy to legislate alone," and that, in view of the character of the Reformation, "the present proposal is an attempt to gain sanction for an unconstitutional practice which aims at undoing *pro tanto* the work of the Reformation." The Dean also objects to the Bill because it implies the distinct augmentation of clerical power, by enabling them to become a legislative body. He condemns the Bill, therefore, as being "a first step towards a substitution of a clerical for a lay government of the Church of England." The Dean's characteristic criticisms will tend to clear the issues, though we consider his fears are not at all well founded. The *Record*, in a sympathetic leading article, rightly points out that one provision of the Bill safeguards the royal supremacy, for the power to amend the constitution is expressly subject to "His Majesty's royal assent and license." And, moreover, the "making, promulging and executing of Canons" is to be in all respects subject to the provisions of 25 Henry VIII. for "the submission of the clergy." The Bill seems to us to be well worthy of the fullest consideration as a step in the direction of that Church reform which we all want, but of which we are most of us afraid. We need have no fear that Parliament will allow its prerogatives to be set aside, and meanwhile anything in the direction of a satisfactory reform of Convocation by which that august but at present not very useful body might become a real expression of the mind of the clergy of the Church of England would be a great point gained.

The following words appeared recently in one of the London papers in the course of a description of a church service and sermon :

The sermon—the essay would more accurately describe it—was delivered without emotion, and it may be safely asserted that no one present felt the least disquiet from beginning to end.

Making every allowance for possible exaggeration on the part of the writer, the statement points to one of the great weaknesses of so many modern sermons. There is no direct personal appeal, no conviction of sin. People are not made to feel uncomfortable, and they assuredly ought to be made. The great realities of sin, repentance, and personal accountability are not pressed home as they should be upon the congregations, and the results are seen in the self-satisfaction, the absence of self-sacrifice and missionary interest, the abstention from Church work, and the *vis inertiae*, which characterize large numbers of communicants. Nothing but a full, frank, fearless preaching of the Cross in the power of the Holy Spirit can ever overcome these evils and bring about a revival of spiritual religion. A recent volume of sermons was felicitously described as “sermons that required an answer.” This is as it always should be; our preaching should expect and demand the answer of personal surrender and personal service.



Notices of Books.

A Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by J. HASTINGS, D.D. Vol. V. (supplementary volume). Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. Price 28s.

The previous volumes of Dr. Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" have been noticed with such fulness in the pages of the *CHURCHMAN* that any detailed description of the concluding volume is, perhaps, unnecessary. Yet, inasmuch as it differs from its predecessors in some important particulars, a brief examination of its contents may not be thought out of place. This volume—which is entitled an "extra volume"—supplements the "Dictionary" in several respects: It contains an elaborate series of indices (or, as the Editor prefers to call them, indexes) viz. : (a) Authors and their articles; (b) subjects; (c) Scripture texts and other references; (d) Hebrew and Greek terms; (e) illustrations; (f) maps. From these sources many interesting particulars come to light. We observe that close upon two hundred contributors have, in all, written for this *magnum opus theologicum*. Most of these are Englishmen (the word is used in its largest sense); but a few continental scholars have helped, the most noteworthy being Professors König, Nestle, Schürer, and Hommel. Dr. Selbie appears