

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

JUNE, 1901.

ART. I.—THE MISSIONARY OUTLOOK IN 1901.

THE missionary outlook to-day is very different from that which existed in the first year of the last century. In that year the Church Missionary Society was venturing upon its first anniversary sermon. That function had been delayed a year because the Archbishop of Canterbury of that day was still hesitating how so to reply to the request for his patronage as not to commit himself too incautiously to this new movement.

At that time woman's work in the mission-field was so far from being recognised, that women were not even permitted to attend meetings either of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel or the Church Missionary Society. The idea of lay help was so little understood, that John Newton wanted to decline to preach the first Church Missionary Society anniversary sermon, because he could not quite see his way to encourage it. The first sermon for the Church Missionary Society makes little mention of the Lord's command; and strangely enough, when it is remembered that no one had as yet volunteered to go out as a missionary, it disclaims any desire to excite "disproportionate or romantic zeal!" The sermon does quote the Lord's command, and suggests that "no doubt" it is still in force! In view of the multiplication of societies in the present day, it is noteworthy that the preacher argued that several societies are better than one, but that they should work in harmony. This preacher was the Rev. Thomas Scott.

Two great events—the Church Missionary Society Centenary and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel Bi-centenary—have recently brought the past into more or less vivid contrast with the present. It has been abundantly evident that, whether in the colonies or in heathen and Mohammedan

lands, results have been realized, blessings received, beyond anything the Church had a right to expect. There are one or two visible results of a century's work: The press no longer ignores missionary enterprise, and statesmen sometimes come upon missionary platforms to warn societies against imprudence and excess of zeal; globe-trotters have found their way even to the pestilential swamps of Western Africa, and at once write books to criticise missions in principle, and their methods and results. A few, like Mrs. Bishop, travel amongst missions to question and criticise; but remain ever after as zealous defenders and friends. Perhaps the greatest result of devoted society activity in the nineteenth century has been the waking up of the Bishops and many of the clergy of the Church of England to the urgency of this long-neglected duty. It has now gone forth from the Lambeth Conference of the Bishops of the Anglican Communion that the evangelization of the world is the primary duty of the Church. It sounds rather odd that this has only recently been discovered, and we must be prepared to find that such a late awakening will bring its own peculiar difficulties.

The first May Meetings of a new century are just over. Many an enthusiast from the mission-field has been trying in his brief few minutes to explain to various audiences the awful needs of heathen lands. Many a committee has been presenting its annual report. With all these stirring sounds in our ears, with the experiences that a century of missions to the heathen have garnered, and in the light of the satisfactory attitude of the Church's leaders, it may be useful to consider the outlook for missions in this new century.

In this outlook some plain facts must be faced, some obvious difficulties must be considered, and some desiderata must be pointed out.

1. The facts are these: The situation is greatly complicated by the very wideness and variety of Church life and effort. It is impossible to say, however, that there has been any very extraordinary diversity of organization. It is impossible to do without the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and its great colonial enterprise, now long since overflowing into heathendom. It would, on the other hand, have been a misfortune to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and to English Christianity if there had been no Church Missionary Society. The South American Missionary Society is one that cannot possibly be spared. The Church of England Zenana Missionary Society must exist, unless the greater societies are prepared to give the fullest play to woman's enterprise. The London Jews' Society cannot possibly be questioned. The Universities' Mission, if indeed it repre-

sents the interest of the Universities in missionary enterprise, has an intelligible *raison d'être*. The British and Foreign Bible Society is the indispensable handmaid to them all, and is used by all.

But it is when these limits are passed that the complication is visible. It must be admitted that the Colonial and Continental Church Society, the Delhi Mission, the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, and other smaller organizations, would not be so necessary if there were more general confidence in the methods and work of the older and larger societies; they must be taken as, no doubt necessary, expressions of Church life and thought. They exist, and they cannot apparently be spared. Outside these limits, again, are the smaller efforts of Colonial and missionary Bishops through their diocesan funds, and the special interests connected with the work of individual missionaries. These, again, though somewhat distracting, are really the result of great activity and enterprise on the part of the greater societies. Such special funds were unknown and impossible a century ago. They will, however, have to be taken account of now.

But in the midst of all this bewildering set of organizations is there no possibility of united action? Is there no body representing the Church as a whole, which can look out broadly on the entire missionary problem, and that can, so to speak, gather these varied societies under its wings?

The need for such a body has long been widely felt. That need has been met in the United Boards of Missions of Canterbury and York, which is still in the infancy of its existence.

Exaggerated ideas of what this organization was to attempt no doubt obtained at first. But, owing very much to the wisdom and common-sense of its first secretary (Canon Jacob, now Bishop of Newcastle), this Board steered its way safely through many shoals and quicksands. And now it is thoroughly representative of the Church of England in its membership. All who are keen about missionary enterprise find from time to time a place in its councils. The greater societies are well represented; and these United Boards meet from time to time under the presidency of the Archbishops to study "the science of missions." They constitute a sort of Vigilance Committee on behalf of the Church at home. They are now studying the growth and development of what are called "native churches"; and one of their pleasantest duties is to arrange for a Reception annually some time in May or June (this year on May 22) for all Colonial and missionary Church-workers who may be in England, together with members of committees with which they are connected. Their Graces the

Archbishops of Canterbury and York are good enough to receive the men and women workers who accept the Boards' invitation. This gathering is held in the Great Hall of the Church House.

So far from having any exaggerated ideas of their own importance, the Boards are now told, in the pages of a great missionary magazine, that they are not ambitious enough. Should their latest idea of a commission of inquiry to various missionary centres abroad become an accomplished fact, possibly the charge of want of ambition may be withdrawn.

2. But there are *difficulties* that have to be considered in any serious outlook upon the future.

There is the great initial difficulty that the Church as a whole is not paying anything like adequate attention to the last command of the Lord. When it is remembered that the third clause in the baptismal vow reads thus: "Thirdly, that I should keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life," it is astonishing that every confirmation candidate is not made into a missionary. But the rank and file of the Church are not keen in this matter. This enterprise is still regarded as a sort of spiritual fanaticism. Men and women who are met in society, and who claim to be good Churchfolk, are often not ashamed to bring up "travellers' tales" as proving that missions are a failure. Somehow or other they are not taught or will not see that, even if their assertion were correct, their responsibility to obey Christ's command themselves is rather increased than lessened by the fact. A reverent study such as every Churchman is bound to give to "God's holy will and commandment" can have only one result: it must be seen that that command enters not into any discussions about success or the reverse. It will soon, however, become a matter of experience that obedience to that command, though it does not necessarily convert either England or the regions beyond, blesses him who obeys and those to whom the witness is borne.

In a return to loyal obedience to this command, in a readiness to place in the forefront what Christ places first, in a readiness to let the river of the water of life flow through instead of being dammed up in this country, will be found the best solution of home Church problems.

It would be impossible for men to attach such supreme importance to incense and vestments, and all the amazing paraphernalia of present-day ecclesiasticism, if they saw the Church's duty and opportunity and responsibility in its true proportions, and felt the value of that Gospel which is committed to their trust. Here is the line of most necessary "Church instruction and Church defence." Such a Church

would need no defence! "When a man's ways please the Lord, He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."

No mere organization on the part of missionary societies will produce this happy result. No clear and satisfactory information about the success of missionary work will of itself do this. It will only be as the clergy live and preach the Gospel, and that Gospel is interpreted by the Holy Spirit to the hearts of men, that such things can come to pass.

And this is not the only phase of this difficulty. Why do statesmen and politicians apologize sometimes for their hardihood in attending missionary gatherings? Why are they afraid just now of our activities in China and the Soudan? It is because they ignore the fact that missionary work created our Empire; that Christ is the source of all our civilization and prestige; and that the great place this country holds in the world to-day arises, not from the successes of great generals or diplomatists, but because Christ still trusts the nation that has His cross in her flag, and has still a work in the world for her to do. Well did a member of the present Government say on the platform of Exeter Hall at the Church Missionary Society Centenary that the extension of our Empire could not be justified unless it meant the extension of the empire of Jesus Christ. He was applauded to the echo. Let him now persuade the authorities to allow Christ's witnesses, at least, to speak of Him in Khartoum!

But there is another form that this superficial character of our home Christianity takes. It is, perhaps, the most grievous of all. Young men and women who are confirmed in the home Church—many of the former in public school chapels—go abroad in every sort of capacity. They represent the country in the army, in the navy, or in some civil department. But in tens of thousands of cases (with honourable exceptions, be it allowed) they misrepresent their country's Christianity. Who has not keenly smarted under this reproach? It is quite unnecessary to state the inevitable results. And such people are not content with being disobedient to Christ. They not only refuse to be unofficially His witnesses abroad, but they come home to disparage the humble efforts that a few loyal souls have made. Thus it comes to pass that what are called the "upper ten thousand," who read the "travellers' tales," and listen to the worldly-minded returned official, meet the missionary appeal with a scarcely concealed prejudice and hostility. Indeed, it was this known feeling in certain quarters that undoubtedly influenced the minds of some of those who recently supported the idea of a commission of inquiry by the Boards of Missions.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty of all at the present time lies in our unhappy divisions.

Very hard things are constantly said about party societies, and about the necessity of being liberal-minded, and fair to all the Church societies. But this is quite beside the question. Missionary enterprise represents the keen sense of certain members of the Church that there is a precious message that is positively owed to and intensely needed by the heathen world. The degree in which this keenness takes possession of the whole Church will be exactly the degree in which the whole Church will be ready and able to direct that enterprise. But at present this keenness is confined to the few; those few naturally co-operate together.

Some strongly feel that nothing but an intensely spiritual and evangelical conviction has the least chance of success when face to face with age-long heathenism. Others, again, consider that no such thorough equipment is needed, and that anyone ordinarily engaged in Church work at home might serve abroad without regard to special spiritual conviction. And as the home Church is now the arena in which almost every sort of theological view and ecclesiastical practice obtains, it follows that there is an overflow of this sort of thing through one society or another into heathendom. Surely, then, societies will continue to command the support of those who believe in their particular methods; and the remedy for anything like unseemly competition must lie in greater faith in the power of the one Gospel, a deeper sense of duty to propagate the Gospel in all its simplicity, a greater readiness to leave Church organization to *follow* and not to *precede* such propagation; then, although there will still be diversities of operations, there will be one spirit.

3. There remains to notice some desiderata. Under this head shall be mentioned, not what would be possible if the Church were absolutely of one mind, but only some things that might be attempted under ordinary conditions of Church life.

Surely it would greatly simplify the missionary propaganda if there could be now, at the present time, some common understanding between the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society as to spheres of operation.

Why should not Churchmen be content to trust the Church Missionary Society to send the simple Gospel to the heathen and Mohammedan peoples? and why should not the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel be recognised as the main society for the colonies? And when there is this general understanding between the Societies, why should there not be the same understanding between those who

support the Societies? No doubt there are many who would chafe at the alleged narrowness of the Church Missionary Society; but it is hard to see how Churchmen who really believe in the propagation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ can find real difficulty in trusting a Church Missionary Society to do it faithfully and well.

Then, again, there are many others who will not trust the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; but the rules and principles of that venerable society encourage the belief that all loyal Churchmen may claim to sit on its committee, or to be its missionaries abroad. High Churchmen and Evangelical Churchmen co-operate in other ways—why should they not cheerfully co-operate in assisting the overflow of loyal clergy to our great Colonial Empire through the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel?

Many feel, and strongly feel, that in the near future the colonies that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has done so much to build up should be doing a main part of the evangelization of that part of heathendom which lies nearest to hand. Here is a great work to which this venerable society should increasingly address itself. Until, however, some clear line has been taken as to who are loyal clergy and who are not, it is useless to expect a mutual understanding of such a character in regard to the work abroad.

Then, again, the Boards of Missions of Canterbury and York might do much to stir up a greater missionary spirit throughout the Church. Let it be clearly understood that these two Boards will never claim to supersede society effort. Let their work be seen to be the study from a central point, of the *science of missions*; let them, through some regular periodical, constantly keep the needs of the world before the home Church for prayer and praise; let them seek access to all Churchfolk, and specially to the young at Confirmation time, and represent to them the bounden duty of every baptized person to be a witness to Jesus Christ; let them watch the overflow continually going on to our colonies and beyond, and seek to lay on every soldier, sailor, and emigrant the duty of loyalty to Him who made us a nation, and gave us a commission to the world. Unless something of this sort is done, and done from the centre, and done soon, those forces which created our Empire will degenerate, the work of missionary societies will be counteracted, and the best of all ways of evangelizing the world will be lost.

There are minor desiderata, as, for instance, that the clergy of the Church of England should preach their own missionary sermons or exchange with their neighbours; that home-workers should cease to expect missionary societies, not only to supply

foreign stations, but home platforms; that tired workers from abroad should be allowed more rest; that, instead of their merely stimulating the home parish, the home parish should rather refresh them. These and many other thoughts arise; but enough has been written to point the fact that much magnificent work has been done, that many difficulties remain to be overcome, and that unique opportunities present themselves at the dawn of this twentieth century.

E. GRAHAM INGHAM (Bp.).



ART. II.—THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE:
II. THE EUCHARIST PRESENCE IN RELATION TO
SACRIFICIAL DEATH.

IT appears that the distinction drawn by Bishop Jeremy Taylor (as alleged in the Fourth Session of the Conference, p. 70) between the two senses of "Spiritually" as applied to the Eucharistic Presence is regarded by some as little better than a quibble. In truth, the distinction is far-reaching and very important. The two senses are necessarily connected with two divergent and widely separate systems of doctrine. "By 'spiritually'" (says Taylor) "they [the Romanists] mean 'present after the manner of a spirit'; by 'spiritually' we mean present to our spirits only"—that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith or spiritual susception" (Works, vol. vi., p. 17, ed. Eden).¹

This distinction is intimately connected with a question which was much discussed in the Conference, and on which the Conference was divided with a division which on both sides, I think, was felt to be serious, viz., the question: "What is the true *Res Sacramenti* in the Eucharist? Is it the Body of Christ as now living and glorified in heaven? Or is it the Body of Christ as offered in sacrifice for our sins?" All present were agreed that in the Eucharist there is in a very true and real sense a giving, taking, and receiving of that which is signified by the outward and visible signs. And none, I think, were desirous of explaining away or watering down the "verily and indeed" of this taking and receiving. All were also of one mind as to the real union and

¹ For Patristic testimonies against the Romish view of a body present after the manner of spirits, see Dr. Patrick's "Full View of Doctrines and Practices of the Ancient Church," chap. v., in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. ix., p. 111 *et seq.*; London, 1848.