
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

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

intelligent faith in the Word of God, be taken as a foundation and starting-point, it is quite vain to repeat the Nicene Creed or to profess the Catholic faith. Unless a man be a Protestant in this sense, he cannot be a Catholic in the sense of the early Church. If Prebendary Villiers be not a Protestant, he cannot be truly and historically a Catholic. According to his own turbid reasoning, this means that he cannot be a Christian without being an infidel. The "purer" his Protestantism is, the greater his infidelity. The absurdity of this conclusion is all his own, and no one can deliver him from it but himself.

ARTHUR GALTON.

The Month.

THE grand event of the past month has been the Coronation of the King and Queen. It is an event which, in all its circumstances is one of the most memorable which has occurred in the history of England, and it ought to mark a conspicuous turning-point in the life and reign of Edward VII. For him it marks the most signal warning, combined with the most signal mercy, which any Monarch, or even any man, could well have received. Never was a King or Emperor at a moment of more conspicuous glory than was Edward VII. on June 23 last: within forty-eight hours his Coronation was to be celebrated amidst circumstances of greater splendour and honour, alike for himself and for his realm, than any English ruler had ever witnessed. But at that moment his physicians had to tell him that he was stricken with a mortal disease, and that his only hope lay in submitting at once to a most dangerous operation. At once the pomp and splendour which was gathered around him dispersed, and his Queen, his family, and his realm stood in profound anxiety round his bed of sickness. Prayers were offered for him from all peoples and languages and religions in his realm, and he submitted himself in patience, and with a touching consideration for his people, to the will of God. Those prayers were speedily answered in a marvellous convalescence and recovery. His physicians were able to say that his Coronation could be fixed for August 9. Their admirable treatment and foresight were justified by the result; and on the day fixed the solemn ceremony was performed, and the King with his Consort was consecrated in Westminster Abbey. There could not have been a more striking witness to the truth that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will." The King, in a manly and thoughtful address to his people, has solemnly declared that "the prayers of my people for my recovery were heard; and I now offer up my deepest gratitude to Divine Providence for having preserved my life, and given me strength to fulfil the important duties which devolve upon me as the Sovereign of this great empire." The King has fittingly combined in this simple acknowledgment his sense of gratitude and his

sense of duty; and it only remains for his people to join their heartfelt gratitude to their King's, and similarly to combine with it their prayers that the grace may be bestowed upon him for which supplication was made at his Coronation, to enable him, for the many years which they trust may yet be granted him, to use more and more for the glory of God and the good of his people the immense powers and responsibilities which have been mercifully restored to him.

Probably the circumstance which is next in importance to the history of our country is the progress which has been made in passing the Education Bill of the Government through the House of Commons. That measure must, in any case, be the commencement of a new period in the development of National Education in England, and it may also prove the beginning of new problems in the relation of the Church to the education of the people, and through this to the State itself. As to the work of national education, it will henceforth be placed on a broader and more popular basis than ever before. Until 1870, popular education throughout the country was mainly, through the National schools, in the hands of the Church, guided and controlled by the Privy Council. But the Church was unequal to the task of extending education to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population, and the Act of 1870 established the machinery of School Boards, in order to supplement the work of the Voluntary schools throughout the country. The result of the work of the last thirty years is that, roughly speaking, the work of national education is almost equally divided between the Voluntary schools, including, besides the Church schools, those of other denominations, and the schools under School Boards. The latter are supported entirely by the rates and Government grants, and are consequently able to meet to any extent the requirements of the Privy Council for continuous improvement in the methods and the machinery of education. But the Voluntary schools have to rely upon private contributions to supplement the Government grants, and this resource has of late become more and more unequal to the strain. The broad result is, that it is found necessary to throw the maintenance of all schools, whether provided by the Church, or the Denominations, or by the School Boards, upon the rates and the Government grants combined—in other words, upon public contributions. This being the case, it was an inevitable consequence that the local control which attaches to the expenditure of rates should be extended to a certain extent to the Church and Denominational schools, as well as to the schools of the School Boards. It is at this point that the great problem has arisen. We need not, for the purpose of these pages, enter into the question of the general nature of the Local authorities to which the control is to be entrusted. The point at which the chief interest of the Church arises is that of the extent to which this control should be exercised by the new Local authorities.

The critical point, in short, is this: In what relation shall the new Local authority stand to the Church and the Denominational authorities through whom the Voluntary schools have been built, and by whom, subject only to the Privy Council, they have hitherto been managed? The proposal of the Bill, to which Mr. Balfour, now Prime Minister in succession to Lord

Salisbury, has firmly adhered, is that the Trust Managers—or Foundation Managers, as they have been variously called—shall hold four places on a Board of six, the remaining two being held by the Local authority or authorities. Against this proposal the Nonconformists and the Liberals generally have to the last most vehemently protested; and although Clause 7, in which it is embodied, was carried before Parliament rose, they declare that they will never let the matter rest as it is; and when the discussion on the rest of the Bill is resumed on the reassembling of Parliament on October 16, the shadow of this Clause will undoubtedly hang over all the debates. The case for the proposal of the clause rests on the fact, which is admitted by leading Liberals like Mr. Asquith, that, considering that the class of schools in question have been created by the Church and the Denominations, that they have thus a long history of denominational efforts and sacrifices behind them, and as these sacrifices were made expressly in order that definite denominational teaching might be given to the children in them, it is but reasonable that their denominational character should be preserved to them. Moreover, the Church and the Denominations will remain under the obligation of maintaining the fabric of the schools in a condition to satisfy the Local authority. This will amount to a very considerable charge, to which many friends of these schools look forward with much anxiety. On the other hand, it is urged, and it must be owned with great force, that since the total current cost of the education given in the schools, both secular and religious, so far as it is given by the teaching staff, will be borne by the Rates and the Exchequer, it is required by all precedent in such matters that the predominant control, at all events, should rest with the Local authority, and that the Trust Managers, consequently, should be a minority, and not a majority, of the whole. The Bishop of Hereford proposed a third course, which he put forward as a compromise, but which was regarded by the representatives of the Church as amounting to a complete surrender, that the Trust Managers should form a third of the Board of management, the remaining two-thirds being appointed by the Local authority and the Parents. The only practical effect of the Bishop of Hereford's action—as is usually the case when one member of an order offers so-called concessions without the consent of his colleagues—has been to weaken the case of the Church, without giving satisfaction to the other side. The Bishop would have added a proviso that the Head-master of such schools should be always a Churchman, which at once rendered his proposal unacceptable to the Nonconformists, whom he wished to please. Sir Michael Foster, the Member for the University of London, urged that the denominational character of the schools might be secured by statute, and that with this protection they might then be left to popular control. But Mr. Balfour justly urged that to yoke a statutory denominationalism with a possibly undenominational management would be an impracticable arrangement. Mr. Asquith urged that some arrangement of the kind might be devised, but made no attempt even to sketch its terms; and Mr. Balfour held the Opposition skilfully and firmly in the dilemma that, if the Denominational character of the schools was to be preserved, the only practical method was to give a majority to Denominational managers. There was much searching of heart and muttering among some of his followers, but in the end the

dilemma was felt to be unavoidable, and the Clause was carried, before the House adjourned, by a majority of 122.

Nevertheless, those who wish to keep their eyes open to the actual facts of the case cannot fail to recognise that a situation has been created which it will be very difficult to maintain. In the first place, the whole of Secular education has been placed in the hands of the Local authority, subject to the control in disputed points of the Privy Council; and though the Trust Managers of Church schools will be in a majority on the Boards of management, there will be representatives of the Local authority on the Boards, who, as speaking for those who hold the purse, will have a potent voice in the administration. Secular education is formally and visibly taken out of the hands of the Church to an extent which, though approached under the old system, was greatly disguised; and the relation between Secular education and Religious education is, after all, so unavoidably close that the new arrangement cannot fail, sooner or later, to affect the whole character of Church schools. But, apart from this gradual effect, there is, we cannot but apprehend, a formidable truth in some observations in the speech with which Mr. Asquith practically closed the debate on the Liberal side. "For himself," he said, "he regarded the operation of this Clause as regarded the principle of popular control with a great deal more of equanimity than some of his friends. He was perfectly certain that the moment they admitted, as the Government had admitted, that there must be an element of popular administration in the government of these schools, it was as certain as that the sun would rise to-morrow that that element must be extended, and must ultimately control the whole. Therefore he did not feel any very great alarm about it. But if he were, as he was not, a friend, supporter, and advocate of the system of Denominational schools, he should view the proposals of this Clause with the greatest alarm and apprehension. He ventured to warn those who, like his noble friend the Member for Greenwich, believed that in the maintenance of the Denominational system rested the only chance for a really efficient and enlightened system of education in this country, that by accepting the principle of rate-aid, and its necessary English corollary of popular local control, they had given up the keys of the position, and had sealed the doom of the system to which they professed themselves to be attached." We very much apprehend that that is the practical truth of the matter. The school of the parish will no longer, or not for long, be the instrument it has hitherto been for religious education in the hands of the Clergyman. A material step has been taken in ousting him, and the Church through him, from the position of authority they have hitherto held in the education of the children of the parish. There is a certain anomaly in an arrangement which places the Local authority, by which the teaching of the school is entirely maintained, in a minority. This anomaly may be endured for a time, under a sense of the obligation due to the Denominational managers for their services in the past. But it will be ruthlessly pressed by the Nonconformists and the Liberals, and it cannot well be permanently maintained. The Nonconformists have seen their opportunity with their accustomed astuteness, and we must add that they have pressed their advantage with their accustomed determination, not to use a harsher word.

It is difficult to conclude a review of this memorable struggle without one reflection which has an interest more than political. It is that this lamentable spectacle of denominational and antidenominational jealousy —these "miserable" dissensions, as Mr. Balfour justly termed them— raging around the simple question how little children can best be taught the elements of Secular and Religious education is really one of the best object-lessons ever given of the evils of Schism. It is because of the schisms among the Christians in England, and for no other reason, that a great step has now been taken towards the secularization of our elementary education, just as was previously done with our University education. In this case the spectacle is peculiarly scandalous. As Mr. Lambton justly said: "To tell him, in this twentieth century, that there was such a vast difference between Nonconformist Christians and Church of England Christians that they could not agree to give religious teaching in schools to children up to fifteen years of age, was perfectly astounding." It is worse than astounding, it is disgraceful, and a deep and painful responsibility rests on all to whose action such a result is due. This is not the time, on the one hand, to be making light, as some so-called Liberal Churchmen are now disposed to do, of "the dissidence of dissent." On the other hand, it is still less the time for Churchmen to be emphasizing and exaggerating their differences from their Nonconformist brethren, and endeavouring to render the English Catholic Church only one degree less exclusive than the Roman Catholic. The danger with which we are threatened by "our unhappy divisions," on which Mr. Dimock has lately been giving us such admirable counsel in these pages, is nothing less than the practical secularization of all education, with its inevitable result of a tendency to the secularization of our national life. It is the greatest danger to which a nation and an empire could be exposed, and it is to Schism, in the main, that such a danger is due.

Review.

The Study of the Gospels. By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Canon of Westminster and Chaplain in Ordinary to the King. London: Longmans.

WE welcome cordially this interesting and instructive contribution to the series of "Handbooks for the Clergy" which is being issued under the editorship of the author's brother, the Vicar of All Hallows, Barking. In about 160 pages Canon Armitage Robinson, who is one of the first authorities on early Christian literature, whether at home or abroad, gives a lucid and devout sketch of the present position of learned inquiry on the authorship and composition of the Gospels. He tells us that it grew out of a series of lectures, of which the first three were delivered from the pulpit of Westminster Abbey, and the remainder in the Divinity School of Cambridge. With great advantage, for the purpose of such a handbook, he has preserved "the easier style and more direct address which belong to the lecture as compared with the formal manual." His