

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

Canaan. . . . I will bring you from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you . . . and I will take you to Me for a people, and I will be to you a God . . . and I will bring you in unto the land concerning which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, and I will give it to you for an heritage" (Exod. vi. 4, 6-9). Compare this language with that used in Num. xiv. 30: "Doubtless ye shall not come unto the land which I swear to make you dwell therein." See also our Lord's words: "The children of the kingdom shall be cast out" ("the good seed are the children of the kingdom," Matt. xiii. 38), Matt. viii. 12, and the teaching of the Apostle in I Cor. x. 1-13.

NOTE.—Since this paper was prepared the Evangelical Free Church Catechism, for use in home and school, has been published. It contains fifty-two questions and answers, double the number in our own Church Catechism, than which it is considerably longer, and on which it is largely based. It possesses many excellencies, as was freely admitted by several speakers at the late Church Congress, although in the eyes of Churchmen it has its defects. To attempt to discuss either would demand more space than an already too long paper will allow.

THOMAS ALFRED STOWELL.



### ART. III.—THE USE AND MISUSE OF RITUAL IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

IT will be well if recent events may lead the minds of devout Churchmen away from the question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of certain ceremonial observances to the consideration of a much higher and wider and more important subject—a subject which has been of late years far too little regarded—I mean the subject of the USE AND MISUSE OF RITUAL in the worship which belongs to the Christian Church.

In venturing to submit some thoughts on this matter to the attention of the readers of the *CHURCHMAN*, let me say that I approach the subject not from the standpoint of Puritanism. I am aware, indeed, that appeal may be made to the writings of some of the Fathers in support of some of the Puritan positions. But I regret the hardness and severity with which Puritans obstinately (in face of lawful authority) sought to enforce their somewhat narrow and sometimes misguided persuasions, while I admire their faithfulness to the great fundamental doctrines of grace which they held in

common with such Churchmen as Jewel and Hooker and Andrewes, in whose footsteps—not in the way of slavish following—I humbly desire to tread.

The true use of ritual—if I may express in one word what seems to me the true view—is to assist in raising earth to heaven. The abuse, or misuse, of ritual is the giving it over to the service of a vain attempt to bring heaven to earth.

The distinction needs explanation. The explanation may be brief.

At the root of the distinction lies the true view of redeemed man, waiting for a while in this world of sin, and rejoicing in hope of the glory of God.

Strangers and pilgrims upon earth—convinced of sin by the teaching of God's Holy Spirit, yet knowing ourselves as baptized believers "washed and sanctified and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God," knowing the Divine love which has made us (who were in very deed God's outcasts, the children of His righteous wrath) to be the very sons of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven—we travel through this wilderness, walking by faith, not by sight, seeking a city which hath foundations whose maker and builder is God.

Standing fast in this faith, we are to be ever hearkening to the word of Apostolic inspiration—"Forasmuch as Christ has suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind." We may be thankful indeed for days of peace, we may bless God for being hurt by no persecutions, but we are ever to bear in mind that the normal condition of the Christian in this world is one of present suffering, of assured expectation of future glory.

As of old, God brought his people *out* "that He might bring them *in*," brought them out from the house of bondage that they might know no rest till they entered the promised land of rest; so now Christ has brought us out that He may bring us in—brought us out from the Egypt of this world's Pharaoh, not that we may here be among the number of those who would be at ease in our Zion, delighting themselves in the invention of musical instruments like David, but that through a wilderness of woe He may bring us into His Father's house, where among its many mansions He is gone to prepare a place for us.

Now, if I am right in this, our ritual (I use the word in a wide sense for the sensible surroundings of our worship) should be all-subservient to this truth, should assist us in realizing it, should help our faith in rising above the things of sight and sense, should stimulate our hearts in pressing towards the mark for our heavenly prize. And so far as it

may minister to present joy or delight, it should be (in its ultimate aim) the joy and rejoicing which comes of our being carried out of ourselves, far away from and above the pleasures of sense, that we may be filled, not indeed with anything like the drunkenness of wine, but, to use Patristic language, with the sacred up-lifting inebriation of Divine truth, the inebriation which comes of the holy ecstasies of faith, speaking to ourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in our hearts to the Lord.

This is the very truth of "Sursum Corda." And this, as I believe, should be the aim of all true use of ritual. It should be all-subservient to the purpose of raising earth to heaven, of bearing human hearts aloft on the eagle-wings of faith, that they may join with angels and archangels and all the company of heaven, in lauding and magnifying the One Glorious Name.

To turn now to the abuse or misuse of ritual. I must speak for a moment of that which I know not from my own observation, but of that which I have gathered from the report of those who should know. I am under the impression that in certain churches in the United States is to be seen in its highest development the tendency which delights to combine what is called high ritual with the highest attainments in the art of what I will venture to call *religious luxury*. Churches, however, in which this combination is manifested are not to be sought and found only on the other side of the Atlantic. The same tendency, if I am not mistaken, is to be seen in many places much nearer home. Now, let us contemplate for a moment an extreme case—say, in one of the most wealthy suburbs of some great American city. Should I be very wrong in saying that whatever money can do to make the worship of God luxurious is there? Is not provision made at a great cost that every sense may be gratified there? And if this is so, have we not an instructive example of the abuse of ritual there?

What is the result? Looking to the natural tendencies, there must be that which is to be deplored in the result. Effects may be produced and emotions may be deeply stirred which the deceitful heart of man (or woman) may delight in, and may easily mistake for devotion. And thus a very subtle and most dangerous form of Pharisaism may be cultivated, and the seeds sown broadcast to bring forth a plentiful harvest of what I must take leave to call the religion of unconversion.

"They return, but not to the Most High" (Hos. vii. 16). More literally, "They return *not upwards*"; their hearts are not carried *heavenwards*. There is a returning not merely to *proprieties* and *respectabilities*, but to *religiousnesses*—a

returning to take delight in religious functions, and advanced Church services, and ornate ceremonialism, and the cultivation of the most beautiful, most artistic, most elaborate Church music. But for the returning of the soul to God, what shall we say? Has all this tended to convince the soul of sin, and bring it to a saving knowledge of Christ? Where is the secret heart-hiding in the Rock of Ages? Where the true soul-rejoicing in the Rock of our Salvation? Where the joy and peace of believing?

But the congregation goes home with much self-satisfaction. "It was all heavenly." Their hearts delighted in it. "It was just heaven upon earth." "Sursum corda" has given place to "Deorsum cœlum."

This is what I mean by the vain attempt to bring heaven to earth by the misuse of ritual in Christian worship.

If in this I am right, shall I be wrong in saying that there is great need of caution—not to say much call for heart-searching—in this matter?

We are all familiar with the word of the Lord by His prophet Isaiah, which (as it seems to me) indicates for us the true use to be made by Christians of the Lord's Day. If we would "delight in the Lord" we must turn away our foot from doing or seeking our own pleasure on God's Holy Day. We are to call the Sabbath a delight. But the delight is to be sought and found not in the way of doing our own ways, nor finding our own pleasure, nor speaking our own words (Isa. lviii. 13). I do not mean, indeed, that we are to seek to bury the joy and gladness of the day which the Lord hath made in the sepulchre of legal severity, and lay upon it anything like the burdensome stone of Jewish Sabbatism. But I venture to think that it is to lead Christians in just the opposite direction to that indicated by the prophetic word, if it is made an obvious and prominent aim of our ritual to give to the congregation a striking spectacular delight for the eyes, an attractive musical treat for the ears, a sweet aroma of incense for the gratification of other senses, and something of a brief intellectual feast for the mind—a feast furnished with flowers of rhetoric, and language of poetry sweeter than flowers, with the flashing of brilliant thoughts and the flowing of words softer than silk and smoother than oil, with no arrows to wound the conscience or pierce the heart. To fill the senses with earthly delights—however they may be called heavenly—is not to make our worship subservient to anything like real delight in the Lord.

An American paper has lately expressed what it calls the prevailing sentiment thus: "Fine singing draws the crowd; the Church is behind the age without it. We do not wish to

be annoyed by the discordant notes of congregational singing. We are progressive; we are ambitious; indeed, we are fashionable."

At a Continental Chaplaincy many years since a grand German gentleman presented himself before me, and requested to be allowed to act as organist in our English Church for the next Sunday. He said: "If you will permit me, I will so play your organ that I will make your congregation devout." He played once; never for me again. I dare say the service was much admired. To some it was probably a real delight—a musical treat. I don't doubt it was grand; but I do doubt very much if for any it tended to devotion. There was a very feeble attempt to sing; there was too evident a straining at musical effect. Attention was all drawn to the artistic display of talent. The artist had certainly not learned the truth that "*Ars est celare artem.*" The organ was everywhere; the singing was nowhere. It was a striking illustration of the saying of Hooker: "In Church music, curiosity, and ostentation of art . . . doth rather blemish and disgrace that we do than add either beauty or furtherance unto it (*Ecc. Pol.*," Book V., chap. xxxviii., § 3).

The following Sunday I was glad to have the services of an English lady, who was far from being an artist, but whose simple and expressive playing of familiar tunes sufficed to support the singing. The organ was nowhere; the singing was everywhere—such singing as many times cheers and rejoices and really lifts up the heart in English congregations abroad. Who is there who has not felt at times the inspiring power of the human voice—rather, of the voice of a multitude of human hearts—and been almost disposed for a moment to be a convert to the teaching of such men as Chrysostom<sup>1</sup> and Theodoret and earlier Christian writers (Thomas Aquinas<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Ὡσπερ οὖν Ἰουδαίους διὰ πάντων τῶν ὀργάνων, οὕτως ἡμῖν παρακελεύεται διὰ πάντων τῶν μελῶν ἀνυμνεῖν τὸν Θεόν . . . καὶ τὰ ὄργανα δὲ ἐκεῖνα διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιτέτραπτο τότε, διὰ τε τὴν ἀσθένειαν αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. — Chrysostomi "Expos. in Ps. cxlix.," Op., tom. v., p. 502; edit. Montfaucon; Paris, 1724. Cf. "Expos. in Ps. cxliii.," p. 465.

Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα κατὰ τὴν νομικὴν ἐπετελεῖτο λατρίαν. — Theodoret "Inter. in Ps. xxxiii.," Op., tom. i., p. 806; edit. Schulze; Hæge, 1769. Συνεχώρησε ταῦτα, διὰ τούτων αὐτοῦς ἐφελεκόμενος, καὶ τῇ ἐλάττει βλάβη κωλύων τὴν μείζονα, καὶ διὰ τῶν ἀτελῶν προπαιδεύων τὰ τέλεια. — *Ibid.*, "In Ps. cl.," pp. 1584, 1585.

An early writer, after telling of the rejection of instrumental music from the churches, adds: καὶ ὑπολείπεται τὸ εἶσαι ἀπλῶς ("Quæst. et Resp. ad Orth.," in Op. Just. Martyris, p. 486; Hæge, Com., 1742).

<sup>2</sup> In the "*Secunda Secundæ*" of Aquinas, Quæst. XCI., Art. II., the question is discussed, "Utrum in divinis laudibus sint cantus assumendi." And the words sometimes quoted as from Aquinas: "Instrumenta musica, sicut citharas et psalteria, non assumit Ecclesia in divinis

expressed somewhat similar views), who held that musical instruments (like animal sacrifices) were fit for Jewish worship, but were to be discarded from the higher and spiritual service of the Christian Church?

At a Chaplaincy in South America after an English service some years ago, a Roman Catholic priest (who, I suppose, had entered the Church to spy out the nakedness of the worship of heretics) came up to the Chaplain to say how deeply he had been affected. Indeed (I believe), he was moved to tears as he spoke. He had never, he said, experienced anything like this before. He went on (as I was assured) to say words like these: "You know, we have beautiful music in our churches—grand, magnificent masses; but our music is not like yours. Ours is of earth, yours is of heaven, and lifts up to heaven."

These anecdotes are mentioned merely for the sake of illustrating the distinction I have desired to draw.

If I am right, it follows that ritual is most in true use when it least draws attention to itself while it most aids the aspiring motions of faith in the heart, when it assists the congregation in calling forth and giving natural expression to the heart's devotion with the least possible display of that which is artificial. And ritual is abused or misused in proportion as

*laudes, ne videatur Judaizare,*" come as from the mouth of one advocating the negative, which is not necessarily according to the mind of Aquinas. Nevertheless, the statement of fact is not questioned on the other side.

The following words from Aquinas's conclusion on the question are well worth quoting: "*Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod cantica spiritualia possunt dici, non solum ea quæ interius canuntur in spiritu, sed etiam ea quæ exterius ore cantantur in quantum per hujusmodi cantica spiritualia devotio provocatur. . . . Aug. dicit in 10 Confess. Cum mihi accidit, ut me amplius cantus quam res quæ canitur moveat, pænalter me peccare confiteor, et tunc mallet non audire cantantem. . . . Hujusmodi enim musica instrumenta, magis animum movent ad delectationem, quam per ea formetur interius bona dispositio. In veteri autem testamento usus erat talium instrumentorum: tum quia populus erat magis durus et carnalis; unde erat per hujusmodi instrumenta provocandus, sicut et per promissiones terrenas: tum etiam quia hujusmodi instrumenta corporalea aliquid figurabant*" ("*Summa,*" tom. vi., pp. 73, 74; Lugd., 1663).

It was not many years after the death of Aquinas (1274) that organs began to be brought into more common use in Christian churches. Organs, indeed, of some sort had been in use in royal palaces long before, and one had been sent as a present to Pepin by Constantinus Copronymus in 766. But there seems to be no good evidence of their being generally approved for use in the worship of Christian congregations before 1290. See Bingham, "*Antiq.,*" Book VIII., ch. vii., § 14. It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that the use of instrumental music was forbidden or altogether unknown before this. See Durandus, "*Rationale*" Lib. IV., cap. xxxiv., § 10, p. 236; edit., Neap., 1859; and Smith's "*Dictionary of Christian Antiquities,*" vol. ii., p. 1524, *et seq.*

it aims at moving the admiration of the senses and producing delight, as an artistic performance, in the natural heart of man.

Perhaps I may be stating the case rather too baldly. But I shall hope to have another word to say on the subject in the next month's CHURCHMAN.

*(To be continued.)*



#### ART. IV.—HORA PETRINA; OR, ST. PETER'S LIFE AND CHARACTER AS SEEN IN HIS EPISTLES.

THE great value of the branch of Christian evidences opened out by Archdeacon Paley in his "Horæ Paulinæ" will be still generally admitted. The many minute and undesigned coincidences between St. Paul's Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, as well as between the Epistles themselves, have been exhibited by him in the most masterly and convincing manner. To some minds this line of defence carries more weight than external historical proofs, whilst to all it is most helpful. The question arises whether the same method may not in some measure be applied with advantage to the two Epistles of St. Peter. It is true that they are both catholic, and thus differ in their nature from those addressed by St. Paul to particular Churches or to individuals. On this point Paley remarked: "A person addressing an Epistle to the public at large, or under the form of an Epistle delivering a discourse on some speculative argument, would not, it is probable, meet with an occasion of alluding to the circumstances of his life at all; he might or might not—the chances on either side are nearly equal. This is the situation of the catholic Epistles. Although, therefore, the presence of these allusions and agreements be a valuable accession to the argument by which the authenticity of a letter is maintained, yet the want of this certainly forms no positive objection."

Paley evidently did not much expect to find such allusions and coincidences in these catholic Epistles, although if found he was ready to accept them as additional evidences that they were the compositions of the writers whose names are attached to them, and so indirectly of their inspiration. So far as this is the case with the second Epistle, whose origin was even in early times called in question, even the few points of agreement with the records of the Apostle's life are of no slight moment. The inquiry is thus suggested, What marks of authenticity may be traced in both documents?