

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, 1908.

The Month.

The Pan-Anglican Congress. DURING the present month this long-expected gathering will be held, and it is already evident that it will be a very noteworthy occasion and one fraught with far-reaching results. It will give definiteness and point to the meaning of the term, "the Anglican Communion," in a way that has hitherto not been the case, and the Church at home will be brought into close and beneficent contact with the younger branches of the Communion in the United States and the mission-field. The articles in our last three numbers, together with the one in the present issue, will, we hope, stir our readers to much prayer on behalf of all those who will attend the Congress as delegates. In the May number of the *Church Gazette*, that always admirable magazine of the National Church League, there is a very striking article on "Anglican and Nonconformist Development," to which we would call the earnest attention of our readers, for, as the writer very well says, amid the necessary and legitimate congratulations of the Pan-Anglican Congress there are certain broad facts patent to all who have eyes to see. He points out that while the Anglo-Saxon world has been moving rapidly forward during the past seventy years, it is impossible to say that the Church of England or the Anglican Communion as a whole has grown with it. "Bishoprics have been founded and the world is dotted over with Anglican sees, but men and women have not been attracted, as they are drawn to other religious systems. . . . The Tractarian Movement has been accompanied by a world development of Nonconformity which far overshadows the expansion of the Anglican Communion." This is true both at

home and abroad. In the United States the members of non-episcopal Churches far outnumber the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In the mission-field it is computed that the members belonging to our Communion are less than one-sixth of those attached to other Protestant Churches, and even at home our Church does not keep pace with the population. All this, and much more, is brought before us in the article to which we are now directing attention, and demands the earnest, prayerful consideration of all Churchmen. It is impossible for us, even amidst our congratulations, to avoid inquiry as to the cause of this comparative inability of our Communion to make progress, whether at home or in other lands. How is it that in new countries non-episcopal Christianity has an attraction which our Church does not possess? Is there not some connexion between this lack of spiritual power and progress and the prevalence of certain features of Church life which may be summed up in the term "ecclesiasticism"? At any rate, whatever may be the explanation, the facts seem undoubted, and we press them upon the earnest attention of our readers as constituting one of the most serious problems affecting Church life to-day.

The
Licensing
Bill.

The passing of the Second Reading by a majority of 246 was a noteworthy and encouraging event, and the analysis of the voting clearly reveals the united force of the Temperance party, to say nothing of the political party which is responsible for the introduction of the Bill. We cannot be too grateful to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London for their firm stand on this question. The Archbishop wisely pointed out the necessity for examining carefully into the character and grounds of the opposition to the Bill, and he showed the great danger lest personal interests should be allowed to overshadow the predominant moral interests of the community. When the Archbishop receives postcards from widely separated places, all couched in the same terms and written in the same handwriting, it

is natural for him and others to wonder whether advice given and appeals made under such circumstances can be quite disinterested. The rejection by the Representative Council of the Bishop of London's moderately worded resolution will not excite much surprise. The Council is in no sense representative of the Church. As the Bishop of London said, the danger of such an assembly is that it is too respectable, and by reason of sheer ignorance of the actual conditions of life among the poor may fail to realize the terrible need of dealing with the drink traffic. The Bishop said that since he had left the East and had come to live in the West of London he had to be taking midnight marches and holding missions, lest he should shut out of his mind the real truth concerning the condition of England and of the homes of the poor. He was also afraid lest Churchmen might through utter ignorance make a great mistake at a crisis in our national history. This is the true line to take. Those who have read Mr. G. R. Sims's awful account in his "Black Stain" of the massacre of child life, cannot understand anyone remaining unmoved in the face of all the cruelty and crime caused by the drink. The Bishop of London's closing words at the Albert Hall Demonstration on May 16 express truth to which all Churchmen should give most earnest heed :

"If the Bill were wrecked, the trade would be for ever in an impregnable position, a licence would become a freehold, and a yoke would be put on the manhood of the nation which would never be taken away."

Will the Bill Promote Temperance? Opponents of the Bill have taken up two attitudes which it is difficult to reconcile. On the one hand it is asserted that the Bill will mean the ruin of the brewing interests. On the other, it is said that the Bill will not promote temperance. Now, it is evident that both of these cannot be true. If the brewers are ruined, the Bill will promote temperance; if the Bill will not promote temperance, the brewers will not be ruined. The *Morning Post*, which on political grounds is one of the strongest opponents of the Government, has rendered immense service to the cause of

truth and common sense by its discussions of this subject. Let us quote from a recent article :

“The imposition of a time limit to the present licensing system is in reality the most valuable feature of the Bill from the point of view of temperance. If it effects no reform at the moment or in itself, it secures to the community the freedom of action which is indispensable for thorough-going reform at any time. The interests established under the present licensing system are necessarily a barrier in the way of temperance ; they are fetters upon every project of reform. . . . The point is not whether men can be made sober by Act of Parliament. The point is whether much is not now being done by Act of Parliament, or under the Acts of Parliament maintaining the present licensing system, to make men drunk. The 90,000 licensed victuallers in England and Wales to-day are—look at the matter how one will—90,000 licensed promoters of the drink traffic. . . . The present system of annual licenses with an undefined expectation of renewal ends inevitably in the loss of effective public control. The alternative, if it is not to be disinterested management, must be licenses for a term of years sufficient to attract respectable men to the trade, but short enough to involve frequent revision of the conditions and methods of sale in the public interest. . . . It cannot, therefore, be said that a Bill which proposes to end the present licensing system does nothing for the cause of temperance. It would be fairer to say that if it did that alone it would do practically everything of any importance that can be done at present. . . . The second question remains : Does the Bill violate the principles of equity ? To that the fairest answer seems to be that the Bill in its present form is conceived without due regard to admitted equities, but that it is not inequitable in principle. In other words, the principle of a time limit may be defended, and must, indeed, in the public interest be asserted. Opposition to it can be based only on a claim to a legal perpetuity for which there is no shadow of justification.”

These are considerations that should be faced by all opponents of the Bill. As long as public-houses remain permanently beyond public control and in the hands of people whose interest it is to increase rather than to decrease sales and to sell the sort of liquor that brings the best returns, it is simply impossible to bring about any temperance reform. These are fundamental facts, and they must not be set aside by questions of personal interest.

In union with all Evangelical Churchmen, we
 “The
 Record.” rejoice in the new signs of life and vigour which
 have recently shown themselves in our honoured
 contemporary the *Record*. During the past eighty years the
 paper has done noble service to the cause of true Churchman-
 ship, and its witness was never more thoroughly needed than

to-day. The letter in the issue for May 1, signed by a large number of well-known Churchmen, was a noteworthy and welcome reminder of how the great cause of Biblical, Evangelical, and Protestant truth can unite men and inspire them to work together. We look forward with hope and confidence to the great part to be played by the *Record* in the work that lies before Churchmen. Evangelicals—and, indeed, the entire body of sober and sound Churchmen—should make a point of reading and circulating the paper, for it is only by a united effort on the part of all who are concerned for the best interests of the Church that we shall be able to accomplish those ends which are the aim of all true Churchmen. This is a time for all sober, peaceful, and conscientious sons of the Church of England to unite on behalf of those great principles, “Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant,” which are the glory of our Church, and without which she would cease to be a true Church of Christ. In these days of periodical literature, it is imperative for Churchmen to have as their weekly Church organ one that has no uncertain sound.

The
Idea of
Purgatory.

The Bishop of Birmingham, with that frankness and fearlessness which are such welcome features of his public utterances, gave a series of Lenten Addresses in Birmingham Cathedral on various aspects of the future life. Among them was one on “Purgatory,” by which the Bishop meant some place and opportunity of the cleansing of imperfection after death, and in arguing for it he said that “we must have this belief in purgatory to make possible those tremendous ideas of the final state,” especially because of the multitude of men who were imperfect at their death. Bishop Gore said that this belief had been the product of the instinct and natural reason of men everywhere, and in the Christian Church was found in its noblest form in Dante. He set aside very definitely the purely Roman idea of purgatory as a place where the judicial penalties of sin are wholly remitted, and then pointed out how in recent years, especially through Newman’s “Dream of Gerontius,” many

people had come to a belief in the probability, credibility, and even inevitableness, of a purification after death. And yet Dr. Gore was equally frank in adding that "it must also be admitted that in the providence of God there was nothing whatever disclosed or revealed on the subject. The idea of purgatory received no contradiction, but it could hardly be said to receive any kind of confirmation in Scripture." And so the Bishop is content to leave it as a matter of speculation based on human probability, though without any Divine revelation. It occurs to us to ask two questions: (1) Is it at all likely that so momentous a question would be left without any reference in Holy Scripture? (2) Is there not some confusion between this idea of cleansing and the idea of spiritual development? Development in a future state is one thing, but cleansing from imperfection is quite another. Besides, what is the imperfection in the future life which is said to need cleansing? Does it mean that sin is carried over into the next world? If we believe that sin is left behind here, then it is obvious that there cannot be any need of cleansing, even though there is the full possibility of spiritual development apart from sin. Again, what about all those who will die on the eve of the coming of our Lord? and still more, what about those who will be actually alive when the Lord comes? Are these to undergo some process, it may be a long one, of purgatorial cleansing before they can have their "perfect consummation and bliss"? Will they not rather be changed at once by the sight of Christ when they see Him as He is? And if so, why may not those who have the beatific vision immediately after death experience a like change through beholding our Lord? These are points that, so far as we can see, the Bishop has not faced in his consideration of this subject, and yet they are vital to any proper conclusion.

The
Needlessness
of Purgatory.

The fact is that all this teaching about purgatory, whether in the Roman or in any other form, is very largely due to the almost entire loss of the true meaning of Justification, and the consequent confusion

between our relationship to God and our fellowship with Him, between our spiritual position in His sight and our spiritual condition or state. By the act of Justification through faith all the judicial demands of God's law are met, and the believer at once receives his title to glory, so that when he passes into Paradise he passes as a man who has already been absolved because of the righteousness of God in Christ. His particular place in heaven will, of course, be due to the degree of his sanctification, but his *title* to heaven was settled at and from the moment of his justification. It is this confusion between Justification and Sanctification that leads to all the discussions about cleansing after death. The man who has been "justified from all things" has no need of any form of purgatory. The modern confusion between Justification and Sanctification which is so characteristic both of the Roman and extreme Anglican positions is a cause of constant spiritual trouble. Justification concerns our standing, Sanctification our state. The former affects our position, the latter our condition. The first deals with relationship, the second with fellowship. We must never confuse the two, even though they are bestowed together. Justification is the foundation of peace, and is the result of Atonement—"Christ for us." Sanctification is the foundation of purity, and is the result of the indwelling Spirit—"Christ in us." We must never identify acceptance and attainment. Sanctification admits of degrees; we may be more or less sanctified. Justification admits of no degrees; it is complete, perfect, and eternal. If only we had a revival of the Reformation doctrine of Justification through faith as it is taught by St. Paul and stated in Article XI., we should not need to hear anything about cleansing after death.

The
Education
Question. The prospects of educational peace were not
furthered at the Representative Council last month.
It is impossible not to agree with the *Times* in
deploring the vote of the Council. At a time when there was
good hope of a peaceful settlement, a majority of the laymen

(not, however, a very large majority) opposed the efforts of the Bishops to bring about a state of peace. Well might the *Times* refer to "those ecclesiastical laymen who will not accept proposals for a settlement, no matter from whom they come, and who seem to be for ever maintaining the *esse* of episcopacy in theory and denying its *posse* in practice." The result of the debate was about as vague and indeterminate as it well could be. The Bishop of Birmingham moved an amendment in favour of "absolute equality of treatment in denominational and undenominational teaching," and this was amended to "as far as possible equality." Could anything be much more indefinite and impotent? As the *Guardian* truly said, "'Equality so far as possible' might mean anything." A general policy which unites such Churchmen as the Bishops of Southwark, Wakefield, and Gloucester, Canon Body, Canon Henson, and Mr. Eugene Stock cannot be said to represent any narrow view. As these lines go to press the debate is proceeding in the House of Commons, and we still hope that the efforts of those who are working for peace will be rewarded, and the dangers of an obscurantist policy averted. We entirely agree with Canon Body that "secularism is no bogey," and if the reference of the Bishop of Southwark to the House of Lords is carefully considered, we believe, with the *Guardian*, that it can only be interpreted as meaning that "the Upper House will not be content indefinitely to continue destruction of Government Education Bills." Will the Church continue to learn nothing from the events of 1904 onwards?

The plea for absolute equality for all sorts of teaching is rightly described by the *Times* as "an academic aspiration . . . wholly removed from present circumstances and apparent probabilities," and we commend the following words of the *Morning Post* to those who favour it.

"Absolute Equality." "It is impossible for any Government in the present state of religious opinion to pay out of public funds for the teaching of doctrines distinctive of each and every denomination. It is possible for it to say that no religious

teaching whatever, Cowper-Temple or any other, shall be given at the cost of the State. But is it really desired that it should do so? Is this equality of disabilities the equality for which any section of opinion really strives?"

As Mr. Eugene Stock, with characteristic clearness and directness, wrote to the *Westminster Gazette* :

"The fallacy about 'absolute equality' needs to be exposed again and again. It is urged that it is unfair for the public funds to pay for undenominational teaching, and not for denominational. But the undenominational teaching is church teaching as far as it goes. What the Government have said to the Church is really this: 'We will pay for Church teaching up to the point at which you and the Nonconformists diverge. From that point you and the Nonconformists must pay for your additional denominational teaching.' That, surely, is absolutely fair and equal!"

To those who still believe that absolute equality is feasible, we commend the speeches in the Representative Council of the Bishops of Southwark and Gloucester, Mr. H. J. Torr, and Mr. Eugene Stock. As Bishop Talbot forcibly pointed out, no Conservative Government will ever venture to touch Council Schools, and the only way in which absolute equality can be accomplished by means of entry into the Council Schools is by a Liberal Government being brought to do it. Absolute equality of treatment is as far removed from practical politics as it is essentially unnecessary on any reasonable grounds. We again put in a plea for sober consideration and for an endeavour to bring about a reasonable settlement, satisfactory and honourable to all. As we read such a speech as that delivered by the new Member for North-West Manchester, with its threat of dictating terms, we see the utter hopelessness of a policy that gives nothing and demands everything. We pray that the Church may be saved from such an unfair attitude, and may be led to consider the interests of the children of our country, and not the empty glory of a political or ecclesiastical victory.