

of my life to untie it. But it is a practical question intimately mixed up with our hopes and expectations. Terrible evils are impending over the Church. I have referred to some of them. Others cannot be laid open here. A flood of error is sweeping over us. Surely the time has come when all that can be said to arrest it should be said now. Feebly, but not, I hope, falsely, I have said my say. Soon, very soon for one like me, nearing fourscore, we must enter on that future life of which I have long been thinking. Then I know what it will be. At rest from this body of infirmity and sin. At home with the Lord in a new body of glorified humanity which He shall give, for He giveth us a body as it pleases Him (1 Cor. xv. 38).

FRANCIS GELL.

---

ART. VIII.—THE MONTH.

THE most interesting occurrence in the month, from a Churchman's point of view, has been a correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. Horton, the eminent Nonconformist, respecting the possibility of a compromise on the question of religious education in elementary schools. The Archbishop invited a conference, subject to the acceptance of certain "large and leading principles." These principles were, in short, first, "that the elements of the Christian faith, as taught in Holy Scripture, should form part of the regular instruction given in elementary schools," subject, of course, to a conscience clause; secondly, that the persons to give this teaching "should be qualified to give it genuinely as well as efficiently"; and, thirdly, that "it would not be right to banish wholly from our elementary school system the giving of denominational instruction within school hours." A more moderate statement of the principles to which Churchmen must adhere could not well be made. It seems to amount to a readiness to forego some distinctive features of Church teaching, provided it were possible to secure, by common consent, the maintenance of some definite religious teaching on which Churchmen and Nonconformists might agree; and in some quarters it has been thought that the Archbishop was going too far in the direction of compromise. But the result has been to show decisively the uselessness, at the present time, of attempting to make any compromise at all. Dr. Horton consulted his Nonconformist friends, and replied—with some reserve, as it would seem, of his personal opinion—that the proposed conference is only possible subject to the acceptance of two

"fundamental positions": (1) "That all schools maintained by public money must be absolutely under public control." (2) "That in all schools maintained by public money all teachers must be appointed by public authority, without reference to denominational distinction." At the same time Dr. Clifford writes to the *Times* to say that the system of religious instruction he desires to see everywhere established is that of the late London School Board; and, in effect, his demand is that the Non-provided Schools, which have hitherto been Church Schools, or schools of specific denominations, should be placed absolutely under "popular control," without any guarantees for denominational education being maintained.

Dr. Clifford is right in saying that this correspondence "clears the air." It puts on record the fact that the militant Nonconformists will be satisfied with nothing but the absolute surrender to "popular control" of the schools of the Church and of denominations like the Roman Catholics; and that the moderate Nonconformists, like Dr. Horton and Mr. Campbell, are unable to moderate this demand. In fact, the Archbishop's almost too generous offer of compromise has been met by a more positive and aggressive demand than ever. It may be well, though it may be useless, to remark in passing that the Church Schools are not, as Dr. Horton's conditions imply, "maintained by public money." Their current expenses are maintained by public money; but the schools themselves were provided, and the buildings will always be maintained, by the voluntary subscriptions of Churchmen. It would be possible, therefore, to accept Dr. Horton's principle, and to deny its applicability to the old Church Schools and all the Non-provided Schools. But apart from such points of accuracy, and even truthfulness, of statement, it is now positively avowed by the Nonconformist leaders that nothing will satisfy them but the abolition of definite Church teaching in all the former Church Schools, and the substitution of the "undenominational" scheme of the late London School Board. It is, indeed, by no means certain, as the Archbishop has previously suggested, that the "popular control" which Dr. Clifford desires would in all cases abolish Church teaching and substitute undenominationalism. "Popular" feeling is not everywhere so alienated from the Church as Dr. Clifford and his friends seem to suppose. But, at any rate, his demand is that Churchmen are to surrender every legal guarantee for the maintenance in the schools they built of the religious teaching for the sake of which they so built them. To that demand it is impossible for Churchmen to offer anything else than an unqualified

opposition. It is nothing less than a claim for confiscation. All the sacrifices of Churchmen in the past, all that they have done for generations in order to secure the education of the people at large in the principles of the Church, all that they are contributing now, is to go for nothing, and its material results, in the existing schools, are to be confiscated in the interests of the undenominational, or, it might be, secular, education which is preferred by Nonconformists. We venture to say that a more inequitable—if we thought it becoming to use Dr. Clifford's vocabulary, we might say a more iniquitous—demand could not well be put forward. But it cannot be too clearly realized that it has been put forward, and it renders plain the position which should be henceforth adopted by Churchmen. It is vain to expect that any concessions will be made by Nonconformists which can settle this controversy. They demand from Churchmen the sacrifice of everything they care for in the religious side of elementary education, and they will be satisfied with nothing less. That being the case, Churchmen can have nothing further to say in this matter. We believe that the Education Acts have done us no more than bare justice, and nothing remains for us but to stand by them.

---

### Notices of Books.

*The Amen of the Unlearned. A Lay Commentary.* By M. C. E. London: Elliot Stock. Pp. x+227. 5s.

The anonymous papers collected here appeared originally in the *Spectator*. Mr. St. Loe Strachey, the editor of that journal, has written a brief introduction, in which he observes that the author makes a free but reverent attempt to draw forth the inner meanings of the Bible, and to awaken feeling in regard to the essentials of the religion of Christ. To a certain extent the book deserves the praise it has received from admiring critics. It is gracefully written, reflects exactly a particular phase of cultured thought, and a few of the essays are extremely suggestive, such as those entitled "St. Luke as Artist," and "Friendship in the Bible." That on "Byways of the Bible" brings to light the beauty of some of the less familiar incidents of Holy Scripture, and "Good Breeding in the New Testament" is a pleasant discourse on manners. The writer is most at home in dealing with subjects like these, being better fitted to discuss æstheticism and the amenities of social life than to expound theology. When we find an important passage in Romans quoted as from the Epistle to the Hebrews, without any reference to its connection, and evidently misunderstood, we naturally feel suspicious. St. Paul's